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

May 6, 2019

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 p.m.

ROLL CALL OF COMMISSION MEMBERS

Present
Not-Present
Present

STAFF PRESENT

Melissa Cleveland, Community Development Director John Cafferty, Legal Counsel Donna Phillips, Senior Planner Heather McNulty, Commission Clerk

FLAG SALUTE

Commissioner Taylor led the meeting in the Pledge of Allegiance.

CALL FOR CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

No conflicts were reported.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The consent calendar included the approval of the meeting minutes for April 15, 2019, the written decision in Case No SUP 0058, Avondale Irrigation District Well house, and the written recommendation in Case No ZC 0035, Chapin Zone Map Amendment. The motion was made by Commissioner Taylor, and seconded by Commissioner Davis to approve the consent calendar. All were in favor, none were opposed.

Chair Petersen welcomed Gavin Mobraten, Commissioner and asked him to give a brief introduction. Mr. Mobraten stated that he works with US Bank in commercial lending. He has lived in Hayden for 15 years, and that he and his wife moved from the Seattle area. He continued by stating that he moved from the Strawberry Fields Development into a 100 year old home that was moved from Athol, Idaho to his new address off of Orchard Avenue. Commissioner Mobraten continued by stating that he is excited to be a part of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

CONTINUING BUSINESS

Zone District Discussion

Donna Phillips, Senior Planner started the presentation for the zone district discussion with the discussion of accessory structures she reviewed definitions and comparisons of the Residential and Residential Multi Family Zone as defined in the Comprehensive Plan:

Residential - Areas where a variety of residential types and densities are allowed, ranging from larger lots to higher densities, as based upon the Residential densities map

The Comparison Type is as follows:

	A	R-S	R-1	R-MF
Min. Lot	5 acres	0.5 acres	8,250 sq. ft*	8,250 sq. ft**
Height	35'	35′	35′	35'
Lot Coverage	35%	35%	45%	35%
Front Setback	15'; 25'	15'; 25'	15'; 25'	15'; 25'
Side Setback	10'	10'	10'	10'
Rear Setback	25'	25'	25'	25′

Ms. Phillips then discussed lot coverage in the City of Hayden defined as: The area of a lot occupied by the principle building or buildings and accessory buildings. Presenting the following visual table within each zone district as a guideline for the workshop:

Zone	Size	Max Coverage Area	Minus Ave House
R-1	8250	3712.5	1212.5
R-MF	9900	3465	965
R-MF	15000	5250	2750
R-S	21780	7623	5123
А	217800	76230	73730

She continued with a background of neighboring Cities examples. The City of Coeur d'Alene accessory structures must meet setbacks, and height restrictions. They have no specific language found for size restrictions. The City of Post Falls Accessory structure must meet design standards, setbacks, and all single family and duplex residential must at a minimum have a single family car. The City of Rathdrum requires the accessory structures must meet, design standards, setbacks, right-of-way access improvements, and there size limits shall be limited in size to no greater than a footprint of one thousand two hundred square feet or a footprint equivalent to that of the primary structure, whichever is greater.

Suggestions for the City of Hayden were then discussed Agricultural, no change. Residential Suburban: Must look at how the lot could be re-develop, review administratively related to lot coverage and site placement; follow appeal process to Planning and Zoning

R-1 and R-MF: shall be limited in size to no greater than a footprint of 1500 square feet or a footprint equivalent to that of the primary structure, whichever is greater; and must not exceed the lot coverage of the lot. Ms. Phillips gave visual tools through the Kootenai County web map depicting multiple examples of single accessory structures and lots with multiple accessory structures within the City limits.

Chair Petersen stated that he has heard applicants raise two different points in regards to accessory buildings. One being that the applicant feels that they should not have to come forward with a special use permit for an accessory building on their property. The other point is that when neighbors come in to a hearing they are focused on whether the building is being placed to close their property line or that their view is now blocked do to the height of a structure not that they are building another shop on their property.

Upon clarification questions from Chair Peterson, Ms. Phillips realized that the setbacks and building heights identified in the table were those of the primary structure and she revised the table verbally as follows:

	A	R-S	R-1	R-MF
Min. Lot	5 acres	0.5 acres	8,250 sq. ft*	8,250 sq. ft**
Height	20'	20′	20'	20′
Lot Coverage	35%	35%	45%	35%
Front Setback	35′	35′	35′	35′
Side Setback	10'	10'	5′	5'
Rear Setback	10'	10'	5′	5′

He then asked the Commission if they would like to keep the residential building code to be stated that if an applicant would like to build an accessory structure over fifteen hundred square feet then the maximum building size would require a special use permit. The Commissioners all agreed there needed to be a change.

Chair Petersen then asked if the Commission believed that the R-1zone district with a minimum lot size of 8250 needed to change from the 1500 square feet maximum on a small lot and 2000 square feet would require a special use. The Commissioners all agreed it was fine to keep this number the same for R-1.

Ms. Phillips did note that sometimes the size of an accessory building directs home owners to believe that if they have a large accessory building, even if it is constructed in a residential zone that it can be used for commercial use and this can lead people to believe it is an approved use. Chair Petersen then asked if the Commission should limit the size of a residential accessory building. Commissioner Davis stated the accessory building would be restricted to the size of the primary structure. Commissioner Mobraten would like to see the footprint of primary structure match that of the accessory structure. Commissioner Andersen agreed. Commissioner Pricket commented that if the applicant wants to limit the quantity of the accessory buildings and have one larger one. If the home owner would like to have a small primary structure and a large accessory building he does not want to restrict the property owner. It seems cleaner to have one larger building then many smaller structures. He would like the lot size reviewed. Commissioner Taylor stated the lot coverage needs to be the deciding factor.

Chair Petersen stated there should be some limit that than accessory use needs to be proportional to the house, and it is messy to have several smaller building instead of a larger building. The Commission all agreed R-1 stays the same. Accessory buildings in R-S should not exceed three thousand square feet for the City.

Commercial and Light Industrial

Melissa Cleveland, Community Development Director, then presented on outdoor storage areas in the commercial and light industrial zones. Ms. Cleveland discussed the neighboring Cities.

- Post Falls Where all access drives, maneuvering areas, parking areas outdoor merchandise
 display areas, and motorized vehicle display lots shall be have paving or concrete. They allow
 compact gravel for outdoor non-vehicular storage areas enclosed within a sight obscured fence.
- Coeur d'Alene Outdoor storage accessory to the primary use can be surfaced with gravel unless the storage is vehicular or equipment storage, then paving or concrete is required.
- Rathdrum only needs to be paved for access to and from site, areas for staging, loading and offloading materials and trailers automobiles, trucks or RV storage / sales.

Ms. Cleveland then stated the City of Hayden requires all storage areas to be paved and this becomes a huge cost for Commercial property/business owners. The suggested requirements would be allow outdoor storage to be unpaved in commercial or light industrial zones. That the requirement to have a landscape buffer and /or site obscuring fence per code, require the approach to be paved to right-of-way, require parking, drive aisles, and maneuvering areas to be paved or concrete, require storage of vehicles or equipment on pavement or concrete, and require maintenance of the area to a dust free condition remain in effect. The Commission all agreed that compact gravel should be allowed for storage; however, paving shall be required for parking, car lots and/or approach. They would all like to see the cost for business development not drive them to another city due to a huge paving requirement.

REVIEW OF UP COMING MEETING CALENDAR, AND REPORT ON COUNCIL ACTION Director's Update

Melissa Cleveland, Community and Economic Director, the first phase of the transportation plan was approved through City Council and the approval of a frim to take traffic counts throughout the City for data regarding the transportation plan update.

Planning and Zoning Commission

May 13, 2019

- Consent Calendar
- Case No. SUP 0057, Heidi Peterson on behalf of the owner Petersen Place Adult Family Home (continuation of Public Hearing from April 15, 2019)

Tuesday, May 21, 2019

- Consent Calendar
- Hayden Canyon Land, LLC is requesting an Amendment to the Hayden Canyon Planned Unit Development Conditions of Approval to include amending the annexation agreement (ANNEX 011), the Final Planned Unit Development and associated Conditions of Approval (PUD 0007) and the Preliminary Plat and associated Conditions of Approval of the Subdivision of Phases IA (SUB 0028).

City Council Actions

April 23, 2019

Klim Zone Map Amendment – Public Hearing – Approved

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:22 p.m.

Heather McNulty, Commission Clerk