

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION AGENDA

**Hybrid Meeting Zoom/In person
City Hall – Conference Room #6
June 23, 2022**

ZOOM LOGIN INFORMATION

THANK YOU FOR JOINING OUR VIRTUAL MEETING. PLEASE FOLLOW THE ZOOM INSTRUCTIONS BELOW TO PARTICIPATE AND MUTE YOUR MICROPHONE/PHONE UPON JOINING.

Join by Computer <https://cdaid-org.zoom.us/j/95511362177?pwd=RTUrdlFuendocUpmNDNqQIRqRE1xUT09>
Join by Phone (Toll Free): 888 475 4499 or 877 853 5257
Meeting ID: 955 1136 2177
Passcode: 246148

4:00 P.M. CALL TO ORDER:

ROLL CALL: Walker, Emerson, Straza, Lowe, Burns, Marienau, Miller, Mueller, Sardell

MINUTES: ****ITEM BELOW IS CONSIDERED TO BE AN ACTION ITEM****
April 25, 2022

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

STAFF COMMENTS:

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS:

- **Awards:** (Establish voluntary program and certificate of appropriateness; Building Heart Awards)
Chairman Walker, Commissioner Mueller, Commissioner Emerson
- **Planning/Ongoing Projects:** (Infill standards for existing infill districts and Historic Overlay Areas and Garden District Nomination and Local Register)
Commissioner Burns, Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner Marienau, Commissioner Straza, Commissioner Lowe, Commissioner Mueller

OTHER BUSINESS: ****ITEMS BELOW ARE CONSIDERED TO BE ACTION ITEMS****

- Recommendation by the Awards Subcommittee to:
 - Formalize a Historic Preservation Awards Program with five award categories to include: Original Restoration, Contemporary Restoration, Historic Expression, Incentive Design Expression, People Boards or Organization, and a Mayors Award.
 - Nominate the Hamilton House preservation efforts to receive the 2022 Mayor's or Chairman Award (Clarify).

TRACKING TIME:

COMMISSION COMMENTS:

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS: ****ITEM BELOW IS CONSIDERED TO BE AN ACTION ITEM****

ADJOURNMENT/CONTINUATION:

Motion by _____, seconded by _____,
to continue meeting to _____, __, at __ p.m.; motion carried unanimously.
Motion by _____, seconded by _____, to adjourn meeting; motion carried unanimously.

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
MINUTES**

APRIL 28, 2022

**Hybrid Meeting Zoom/In person
City Hall – Conference Room #6**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Dave Walker, Chair
Anneliese Miller, Vice Chair
Walter Burns
Lisa Straza, Secretary
Alexandria Marienau
Sandy Emerson

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Hilary Anderson, Community Planning Director
Shana Stuhlmiller, Admin. Assistant

CITY COUNCIL ABSENT:

Kiki Miller, City Council

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:

Jon Mueller
Tyler Douglas Lowe

4:00 p.m. CALL TO ORDER:

ROLL CALL: Walker, Miller, Straza, Lowe, Burns, Emerson, Marienau, Mueller

MINUTES: **ITEM BELOW IS CONSIDERED TO BE AN ACTION ITEM**

Motion by Miller, seconded by Burns, to approve the minutes for February 24, 2022 . Motion approved.

STAFF COMMENTS:

Hilary Anderson, Community Planning Director, provided the following statements.

Ms. Anderson stated that she met with the Ongoing Projects subcommittee at their last meeting to discuss creating a local register, local district etc. and after that meeting had a conversation with Dan Everhart, SHPO and Commissioner Burns about possible options. She heard from another planner in Idaho that has concerns with the language in the State Statutes related to creating a local register and what that entails for the commission's design review authority. Staff needs to review this information with legal. She suggested that creating a Historical Overlay District that is stated in the Comprehensive Plan that might be the easier path forward. But she will follow up with legal and then schedule a time for Mr. Everhart to talk to the commission and answer questions.

Commissioner Emerson noted some of the older buildings in Coeur d'Alene in the past were up for auction because of existing code issues that made it difficult and costly to do a renovation. He questioned if we had a tool to use specific with an Historic District that would help reduce the cost of renovation. Ms. Anderson stated she had a discussion with Commissioner Lowe who explained if you have a property on the National Register for Historic Places, you could demolish the building without review since we don't have a local ordinance with "teeth." There are options for historic property owners to apply for a Historic Tax Credit, but the cost involved to qualify for the tax credit make that difficult. She added if we had something on a local level would be great and after working with our consultants on the Historic Preservation Plan, they recommended looking at our Building Code which allow more leeway for example, basement heights, etc. Many of these are already allowed with the City's current Building Code. She added some cities such as Boise are using grants specifically for these renovations where people

could apply for a grant using these funds.

Ms. Anderson reminded the subcommittees to keep in mind the RFP for the Garden District nomination process and that we won't hear until summer if we have been awarded and can't enter into any agreements with a consultant, but we can start "framing" the RFP and to hold out sending out the RFP until SHPO is done reviewing the boundary for the Garden District.

OTHER BUSINESS: **ITEMS BELOW ARE CONSIDERED TO BE ACTION ITEMS**

- Planning Commission and Design Review Commission Overview and Q & A with city staff and commission representatives.
 - Commission Representatives: Tom Messina, Chair and Jon Ingalls, Vice Chair
 - Staff Representative: Tami Stroud, City Liaison to the Design Review Commission

Ms. Anderson asked if the commission would like to get an overview or more of a Q/A with staff who recently sent out copies of the Design Guidelines for the commission to review a discussion with the representatives from the Planning Commission, Design Review Commission and staff on how an Historic Overlay District could be structured.

Commissioner Burns explained that we have been discussing the development of an overlay or a Historic Registry that could include some Design Guidelines for the historic areas in the city not including existing properties, but some Historic Guidelines used for new construction within an Historic District to help maintain the character of the neighborhood. He commented that it would nice to be involved in the process at the beginning before a property is demolished, but without guidelines that have "teeth," this would be a waste of time. He stated that he recently had a discussion with SHPO who suggested placing a moratorium on tear downs for a period of time until we get our local ordinances in place.

COMMISSION COMMENTS:

Tom Messina, Chairman of Design Review and Planning Commission remembered a similar situation with the Fort Grounds a few years ago, where a house was burned down and that the owner wanted to rebuild but was required to meet current guidelines, so staff discussed changing the current ordinance that required a certain percentage of approval from people living in this area to agree to change the current ordinance. He inquired if this type of scenario would work for the Garden District.

Ms. Anderson clarified that Mr. Messina is referring to two different items. The first was a code amendment that allows for nonconforming properties to be rebuilt if they were damaged. The second is a special use permit that was requested by Fort Grounds neighborhood to limit construction to single-family only. It required a majority of properties to be in support and it was initiated by the neighborhood. She stated that we could look at a similar process for the Historic Overlay if the majority of a neighborhood, such as the Garden District, wanted opt-in. Mr. Messina inquired if there is a faster way to get this through the process. Commissioner Burns explained that the Historic Preservation Commission is governed by state and federal issues where the process runs slow.

Mr. Ingalls commented that before the meeting he read the Historic Preservation Commission Plan to help prepare for today's meeting and thanked the commission for their efforts. He stated that the history section in the plan is great and thinks that section should be taught in schools. He concurred that Historic Preservation is similar to other districts like Downtown East, Midtown etc. and noted on page 13 of the Historic Plan that lists strengths, weaknesses and opportunities that lack local register. He noted a building in the city that burned down that could have been demolished but the applicant retained some of the historic features instead of demolishing the entire building for a more modern design. He suggested the commission look at the Design Review Guidelines. Ms. Stroud explained that she recently looked at a building façade on Sherman Avenue where the applicant mentioned leaving a lot of the brick and now is removing most of the brick that would have been nice to retain that for the historic features but without guidelines the applicant is allowed to change their mind. Mr. Messina explained a few years ago we changed the code regarding facades because in the past we reviewed all of them and learned that communication is a great tool to let the developer know what was expected to not have to go through the

process.

Commissioner Burns stated that he lives in the Garden District where most of the people who live in the district want to maintain the character of the neighborhood. He added that he doesn't expect someone to try and make a home look old but would like to see new construction fit in with the existing homes. He discussed the benefits of a local registry versus the National Register of Historical Places is that the National Registry is more specific on their modifications with buildings like the Wiggett Building that wouldn't qualify because of the wrong type of windows, but if it was on a local registry it would qualify as a historic building. That is an important part of the history of the city with restrictions that aren't as restrictive. He commented since we are a new commission, he feels educating the community is something we should be pursuing. Mr. Messina suggested having community meetings and stated that he would be happy to volunteer if needed.

Mr. Ingalls explained that the Design Review Commission looks at specific design guidelines when making a determination on a building and inquired if there is a definition for types of historical features that could be used as a checklist. Commissioner Burns commented that he put together a list of features that could be used by a homeowner to maintain the historic character. Commissioner Ingalls suggested adding those details and the use of pictures and drawings with a checklist.

Ms. Anderson referenced the comment from Mr. Messina who mentioned the house that burned down in Fort Grounds that we did a code change allowing the property owner to use the same foundation and build back to what was on the lot originally. She added that staff did start working on the Neighborhood Compatibility Ordinance for Fort Grounds which didn't happen, but some aspects of that proposed code might work for the Historic Overlay that included within the ordinance lot coverage, , second story setbacks, etc.

Next Steps:

Ms. Anderson suggested the following items:

1. We should look at the existing guidelines to see if there is anything that needs to be added
2. Look at the context of the Historic Overlay including the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) code Neighborhood Compatibility Ordinance, incorporate language from the consultant's input on Commissioner Burns design criteria
3. Make a list for neighborhoods to answer yes/no questionnaire or survey with photos that would be easy for people to use.

Commissioner Burns asked if there is a way to get a "heads up" from the Design Review Commission projects that might be historic. Mr. Ingalls explained the boundaries for Design Review and that the Garden District or Forest Heights we won't see those projects and suggested that historic preservation should apply to all existing districts. Chairman Walker stated that he thinks Forest Heights might be the next Historic District. Mr. Ingalls commented that there is a struggle for a definition and a problem for people to want to participate. Mr. Messina concurred to get feedback from the district.

*** Recommendation to City Council for the appointment of Anne Anderson or Shannon Sardell to the Historic Preservation Commission for the one vacancy.**

COMMISSION COMMENTS:

Commissioner Burns explained that one of the candidates knows the area very well and the other candidate who just recently moved here that had impressive credentials but would like someone who fits with the group. He added at the county they appointed someone who had wonderful credentials, but had their own agenda that countered to what everybody was trying to do and because of that lost most of the year going back and forth with this person and finally had to go to the Board of County Commissioners to request that this person be removed. He added that we have a great group and important to get someone who fits.

Commissioner Emerson noted that one of the candidates has a lot of experience in Oregon which is

similar to the northwest and mentioned we had a member in the Board of Realtors who came from Anchorage who was a go getter that had lots of experience and always heard him say “here’s how we used to do it” and wore everyone out and agreed that we must get someone that fits with the group. Commissioner Straza noted that one of the candidates is knowledgeable with grant writing which is important for this group. Commissioner Burns added this person had an extensive historic architecture background is important. Ms. Anderson added that we also have the code criteria that needs to be met.

Commissioner Burns that he would vote for Ms. Sardell. Commissioner Straza inquired if we can appoint an alternate. Commissioner Burns stated that the person who isn’t appointed let them know that the county is looking for a new member. Commissioner Emerson likes the idea of having an alternate and Commissioner Straza recommended them to be on one of our subcommittees.

Motion by Straza, seconded by Burns, to recommend Shannon Sardell to the Historic Preservation Commission.

- Discussion on possibly changing the day for Subcommittee Meetings to either the 2nd or 3rd Thursday of the month.

The committee discussed and since the two subcommittees Planning and Ongoing projects combined will be able to start the subcommittee meeting at 3:00 p.m. on that second Thursday of the month.

Motion by Burns, seconded by Miller, to change the subcommittee meetings to the second Thursday of the month. Motion approved.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS:

- **Awards:** (Establish voluntary program and certificate of appropriateness; Building Heart Awards) Chairman Walker, Commissioner Mueller, Commissioner Emerson

COMMISSION COMMENTS:

Chairman Walker explained that we want to have five awards which will be given out when projects are warranted not because we need to give an award. Ms. Anderson inquired if one award to be given out each year based on those five categories. Chairman Walker explained there might be a year where we don’t have any award because nothing has happened and explained we shouldn’t have to force ourselves to find something but when we do it should be worthy. Chairman Walker announced the following categories: Original Restoration, Contemporary Restoration, Historic Expression, Incentive Design Expression, People Boards or Organization and a Chairman Award. He added that we will come up with some criteria to go with these.

- **Planning:** (Infill standards for existing infill districts and Historic Overlay Areas) Commissioner Burns, Vice Chair Miller, Commissioner Marienau, Commissioner Straza
- **Ongoing Projects** (Garden District Nomination and Local Register) Commissioner Burns, Commissioner Lowe, Commissioner Miller, Commissioner Mueller

COMMISSION COMMENTS:

Commissioner Burns explained Planning and Ongoing Projects items overlap and after some discussion decided to combine the two groups.

TRACKING TIME:

Commissioner Straza reminded everyone to track their time.

COMMISSION COMMENTS:

Chairman Walker noted a special invitation that the Museum of North Idaho has invited us to be present on Thursday, May 5th at 1:00 p.m. at the Old Sherman Chapel where an award will be presented to the Museum and a couple from SHPO. invited for award to the Museum next Thursday at the Chapel.

Ms. Anderson explained that we have added an Historic Properties layer to our GIS Map including Kootenai County.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS: **ITEM BELOW IS CONSIDERED TO BE AN ACTION ITEM**

ADJOURNMENT:

Motion by Emerson, seconded by Straza, to adjourn the meeting. Motion approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Submitted by Shana Stuhlmiller, Administrative Assistant

Historic Preservation Commission Meeting June 23, 2022

Please submit my Public Comments

Attn:

Shana Stuhlmiller

Public Hearing Assistant

Planning Department, City of Coeur d'Alene

My name is Ronald C McGhie, and I live at 7253 Big Sky Drive, which is the first house w/o Huetter Road on the s/s of Big Sky Drive. My son is the owner of the lot between me and is adjacent to Huetter

I thank you for your time today and I am here to request your assistance in making the existing Huetter Road a protected Scenic Rural Corridor through the Rathdrum Prairie from Seltice Way to Boekel Road.

After I purchased my home in 2015, I became aware that KCATT has been studying the Huetter Corridor since the 1970's, and KMPO and the State ITD has been studying this Corridor since 2003. After reviewing many of these studies, it's obvious that protecting the Rathdrum Prairie and this scenic Corridor was not high on their list. My family has had the pleasure of driving this Scenic Corridor and enjoying the view for the last seven years. I have now decided to try and get all the cities, county, and the state to consider protectngi this treasure for my children and the public for the future.

The KMPO April 2009, Huetter Corridor Right of Way Needs Report, on page 67 Environmental Conclusions summary states,

“North of Interstate 90, land use along the Corridor is primarily agricultural with rural large lot developments on the west and urban density are residential development from Poleline Avenue to Prairie Avenue. Areas north of Prairie Avenue are primarily rural in nature with agriculture being the predominant use.”
[The environmental scan revealed] *“Natural ecological communities have undergone nearly complete conversion to agriculture and urban land uses.”*
[The Recommendations state] *“There are no known environmental constraints with the Huetter Corridor study area that would preclude development of a high-speed route.... For most resources, some additional data collection and documentation would be necessary to confirm that impacts would be low or easily mitigated.”*

I must point out that the references to urban density and urban land used in the KMPO Needs Report are very questionable. The area within a half mile of either side of Huetter Rd appears to have been agricultural from 1982-1992, with rural large lots being added on the west side around 1998-2005. The Residential Landing and Trails developments

were added after 2006. Currently, the entire area within a half mile of Huetter Rd., including the Area of City Impact, appears to be void of any commercial, retail, or urban type development or building over two stories.

The Huetter Bypass would totally destroy this beautiful area! KMPO has now turned over the study to ITD for environmental assessment. To remove this scenic corridor and lower the portion adjacent to the ACI to 26 feet below the existing pavement is totally insane. In trying to mitigate one problem, KMPO has created several more.

I am a member of the No Huetter Bypass group, and our members have been contacting the ITD and will be contacting the City of Coeur d' Alene. The proposed bypass route should be stopped before the city approves any annexation request. I have submitted an alternate route for the ITD to consider. (See attached)

I am not against appropriate or reasonable growth, but I don't think the present vision of the Coeur Terre development is neither appropriate nor is it reasonable!

Their presentation at the Kroc Center displayed the vision of urban townhouses, commercial shops, and three-story buildings with an extremely high density that does not fit in with the current rural area or the nearby residential development. Can you picture driving down a scenic corridor to look at four story buildings with outside parking? The extremely high density of this project will make the traffic intolerable in the rural and residential area.

Lakeside Real Estate Holdings is doing a reasonable and appropriate development at the Trails. They should be required to do a similar development in the ACI area. The CDA Comprehensive Plan on page 43 shows the Area of City Impact to have a land use type of Single-Family Neighborhood along with Urban and Compact Neighborhood or Mixed Use. To save the Huetter Scenic View, the cities land use type of the Urban, Compact, or Mixed Use, high density should be removed from the ACI area. Single-Family Neighborhood land type should be required. Please consider requiring larger lots, green areas, and trees along and adjacent to Huetter Route.

I respectfully ask your assistance with the following.

1. Convince members to KCATT, KMPO, and the ITD to find a better route than the Huetter Corridor and help save the Rathdrum Prairie scenic area.
2. Convince Planning Commission and the City Council to understand that the goals they have set are not being properly addressed in the application for annexation of the Area of City Impact. (See attached goals)
3. Like the City of Post Falls, postpone the annexation request until the ITD finishes their environmental assessment.

4. Please let me know if there are any sites or building that currently have any or need Historic Preservation along Huetter Road or in the Rathdrum Prairie beside those previous mentioned.

5. "We recognize that others are drawn to the beauty of our area, continuing to expand our population. *Because we place such high value on our natural surroundings, we responsible plan for, manage and mitigate the impacts of growth on those surroundings.*"-Kezziah Watkins Report

Thank you for your time and consideration

Coeur d'Alene_2042CompPlan

Guiding Principles

Goals & Actions

Not being address properly

Community & Identity Goal CI 1 p 73

Action CI 2.1.C02

Foster a collaborative relationship with surrounding communities to manage development transitions at the city and county limits and establish unique identities while maintaining connectivity. Consider mutually agreed upon wayfinding signage and open space buffers in transition areas.

Environment & Recreation ER 2 p 85

Action ER 2.2.C01

Review and consider changing the Zoning Code to discourage obstruction of open view corridors of both public and private parks, green spaces, and natural areas.

Environment & Recreation ER 4 p 89

Action ER 4.1.J01

Partner with other organizations to identify potential funding strategies and management structures to preserve open space on the Rathdrum for public benefit.

Growth & Development GD 1 p 95

Action GD 1.7.C01

Establish a visual resources inventory in the community and determine if there are specific guidelines that should be defined and established in the City Code for public view corridors in development projects.

Growth & Development GD 1 p 95

Action GD 1.7.C02

Evaluate if building heights in zoning districts adjacent to shorelines should be modified to protect view corridors and limit shadows.

Growth & Development GD 2 p 97

Action GD 2.2.C04

Work with utility providers to relocate existing above ground utilities underground, as viable, as streets and alleys are built or reconstructed providing resiliency to weather and ensuring continued quality service while reducing the visual impacts.

G

ALT I-90 Along BNSF & UP Railroads

From Hwy 53 @ PV Interchange to Hwy 95 above Boekel Rd.
High speed, no signals with off ramps 2 to 3 miles apart.
Through the existing 200' BNSF buffer between the railroad and the Links Golf Course,
hence e'ly s/o Wyoming to cross Hwy 41, hence n'ly along se'ly side
of the UP railroad,
to where the UPRR crosses Altas St. n/o Lancaster St. hence e'ly &
n'ly to Hwy 95.

Legend



