

**PLANNING COMMISSION
SPECIAL CALL MEETING
MINUTES
NOVEMBER 6, 2019
LOWER LEVEL – COMMUNITY ROOM
702 E. FRONT AVENUE**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Tom Messina, Chairman
Jon Ingalls, Vice-Chair
Lynn Fleming
Lewis Rumpler
Brinnon Mandel

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Hilary Anderson, Community Planning Director
Shana Stuhlmiller, Public Hearing Assistant

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:

Michael Ward
Peter Luttrupp

CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Messina at 12:00 p.m.

ADMINISTRATIVE: *ITEM BELOW IS CONSIDERED TO BE AN ACTION ITEM.**

1. Applicant: City of Coeur d'Alene
 Request: Interpretation of Blackwell Island Marina Limited Design PUD Setbacks
 ADMINISTRATIVE (I-1-19)

Hilary Anderson, Community Planning Director, introduced Phil Boyd who will be presenting the Interpretation for the applicant. She explained that Hagadone Marine Group has been working on expanding the marina operation to be consistent with the Planned Unit Development (PUD) approved by the Planning Commission along with the annexation request in 2016. She stated that the applicant had been doing some additional work on designing a dry stack boat/indoor storage facility and after completing the design, realized there are some physical constraints on the site and will need to make some adjustments to one of the setbacks along a portion of the shoreline. She explained that the requested action by the Planning Commission today is to decide if this change will be consistent to what was approved in 2016 with PUD-3-16.

Ms. Anderson noted the comment in the staff report which reads,

Staff supports the applicant's request because permits approved by other agencies and the historical nature of the property show that the subject "shoreline" is not really the natural or historic shoreline. Furthermore, agency permits could supersede the Limited Design PUD setbacks as previously approved. The mitigation proposed by the applicant is above and beyond the required commercial design guidelines, and would improve the appearance of the dry stack boat indoor storage facility.

Commissioner Ingalls inquired if the size of the building will trigger a review by the Design Review Commission. Ms. Anderson stated it does not trigger Design Review Commission, but that it will have to comply with the Commercial Design Guidelines and that is something Mr. Boyd will explain during his presentation. She stated that with this request the applicant is proposing some additional mitigation to the building to help improve the design of the building which goes above and beyond what is required by the Commercial Design Guidelines. She added that the existing design has been approved by staff, and that the Hagadone Marine Group has proposed some additional design details with this request.

Commissioner Ingalls stated that Chairman Messina and he are members of the Design Review Commission and one of the things they see before them a lot is the issue with blank walls. By looking at what the applicant is presenting for these buildings, he likes what he is seeing. He inquired with this request if treatment of blank walls would be part of the requirement. Ms., Anderson stated they would be addressing blank wall treatment by adding windows on multiple locations on the building to break up what would be considered a blank wall and also adding a trellis feature to provide a "living green" component.

Commissioner Mandel inquired if the applicant could provide a list of the other jurisdictions mentioned in the staff report. Ms. Anderson replied that Mr. Boyd could address the other agencies who were involved during his presentation, but that generally the other agencies would be the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Idaho Department of Lands who have issued permits for the marina. Commissioner Mandel inquired if the other jurisdictions are comfortable with this request. Ms. Anderson stated that is correct.

Phil Boyd, Applicant representative stated that the requested modification to the setbacks along a small portion of the waterfront necessary for the approved dry stack boat indoor storage component of the marina operation is consistent with the Limited Design PUD, which was approved on August 9, 2016, as PUD-3-16.

Mr. Boyd provided the following statements:

- The Planning Commission approved PUD-3-16 for master planning facilities of the Hagadone Marine Group operations on Blackwell Island as part of the annexation request that came forward on August 9, 2016.

As noted in the applicant's letter requesting an interpretation,

"Much of the facilities have moved forward to completion, primarily in the areas of service and sales. We are now approaching the long planned dry stack boat indoor storage and marina facility, outlined as an integral part of the PUD master plan."

- Since the PUD was approved in 2016, the Hagadone Marine Group has been expanding its marina operations per the PUD. They have also been designing the dry stack boat indoor storage facility. The design work led them to realize the original building footprint and alignment would not be feasible for a number of reasons as noted in the request letter and excerpted below.

"Due to the dimensions required for boat stacking and storage, safe travel lanes for specialized forklifts, and required access and egress from the dry stack building, the proposed facility encroaches up to 15 feet into the designated setback along the marina waterway at the north end of the marina. Adjusting the location of the building to avoid the encroachment is not possible due to the existing location of a deep city waterline and gas line along the north side and buried power and gas lines on east side of the proposed building. All these utilities are located within easements held by the City or Avista. We therefore formally request an addendum to the PUD to allow a minimum 25-foot shoreline setback along the eastern side of the existing marina area as shown in Figure 1."

The applicant is requesting a reduced setback along a small portion of the waterfront necessary for the approved dry stack boat indoor storage component of the marina operation. The approved setback for this area was 40 feet from the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHW).

- Staff has determined that an interpretation of the approved PUD, instead of a modification of the PUD, is appropriate in this case and agrees with the applicant that modifying the OHW setback as proposed will not change the Commission's original PUD findings. The three applicable findings are B8C, B8G, and B8H.

The applicant is proposing additional features to the dry stack boat indoor storage facility as mitigation. These features include:

- Added corner windows on the southeast and southwest corners which are primarily viewed from north bound US-95 travelers. These windows will break up the mass and add additional texture.
- Added vertical masonry wall with vine planting on the south end of the building between the two large sliding doors. Initially, the masonry wall will provide a different siding texture compared to the metal siding and over time the vine will provide a nice vertical "green" plant element, which will be very unique.
- Add horizontal windows in the east and west sidewalls, similar to those they have installed on the recently constructed buildings. These horizontal windows will also break up the building mass.

He added will be putting large trees and adding windows on the Northwest building and will be wrapping the windows on the corner and will be putting ivy on the building.

The northeast side will wrap the windows objective this is a big building and adding landscaping around it and will make the building to look better.

Mr. Boyd concluded his presentation.

Commission Comments:

Commissioner Ingalls stated that this modification is minor and feels the justification has been met and that the modification is consistent with what was approved with the Limited Design PUD and that the added mitigation more than makes up for any changes that would be seen visually.

Motion by Ingalls, seconded by Rumpler, to approve Item I-1-19 as being consistent with the Limited Design PUD. Motion approved.

PRESENTATION:

Atlas Waterfront Development Standards – Phil Boyd

Phil Boyd provided the following statements:

- He announced an update to the Waterfront Park project that went out to bid and that we have chosen a contractor.
- He introduced Don Vehige, an Urban Designer with GGLO, who will be helping with this presentation.
- The objective today of the presentation is to review how the draft Development Standards have changed.
- He stated at the last meeting a question was asked by the commission on what the developers thought about our Development Standards, so they did a Developers Survey.

- He stated during this presentation we will discuss the site design changes, developer outreach, review the Development Standards and the parking analysis.
- Site Design changes – He explained road alignments were changed, because of the earth work, and some work to be done with the problem of unsuitable soils. He commented at the last workshop staff discussed putting in some more commercial and added some more single family in various areas that were in response to the Developers Survey.
- He noted that the Ped/Bike network is better with various connections added with a nice greenspace area called “Atlas Bluff” and explained where they would be moving the unsuitable soils.
- View sheds were important and that the corridors were substantial so when looking up the hill you can see the river.
- Developer outreach – A developer workshop was done to give developers the opportunity to ask questions and provide feedback, and to meet Heartland who is our real estate professional that is part of our team. He added they also did a Developer Survey that asked questions regarding project/product interest and what do you think of the Development Standards.
- He explained the results of that survey that the developers were less interested in townhomes and wanted more single family. He explained that staff will oversee how many single family units will be built in a specific area and that we need to generate revenue to pay back the city so the area can't be all single family homes.
- Not surprisingly, the developers were primarily interested in buying the property on the waterfront.
- Summary of the results – The developers thought the Design Standards were good and liked the certainty of having set standards in place. The developers want to know what they have to do, how long it is going to take, and what is the range of flexibility.
- The developers thought we needed more senior housing and asked how many blocks can you buy. The question was if they bought multiple blocks would they get some kind of an advantage when purchasing more.
- He stated that questions were asked if we should split the blocks, attracting commercial tenants and is the pricing correct.
- Parking has been a question and from the survey the results gave us a maximum and minimum on what they needed on the different product types.
- The developers wanted to provide more parking for the office areas than what city code requires.
- He added that one deviation they will be presenting at next week's public hearing is reducing the parking requirement for restaurants.
- Parking is very difficult since we don't know what the land uses will be.
- He explained that they will be presenting to the commission a framework on how we will analyze parking and as the areas are developed note the areas where there is a deficiency.
- He stressed that on-street parking is dynamic and driven from land use. We don't want to over park and diminish the area of a street.
- He stated that when we are developing this parcel will look at all requests and might be flexible on the amount of on-street parking allowed.

Commission Comments:

Chairman Messina questioned how much flexibility there will be for this project. Mr. Boyd explained that the commission's job would be to approve the concept of the framework. For example, if you have a deficiency in parking to maybe recommend the overflow is pushed to the street and how we would accommodate that. He stated they would provide a parking framework that would be part of the PUD that would tie the hands of the developer.

Commissioner Ingalls questioned if this project is a "one size fits all" if the Design Standards will cover everything, or do they vary block by block. Mr. Boyd commented that the potential land uses and businesses that are going into those spaces hopefully will be unique and we will be able to negotiate with the buyer. He added that we would need to look at the businesses peak hours as an example, a peak hour for an office is different than a peak hour for a restaurant. He stated that he would like the

commission to trust that the Development Standards will work.

Commissioner Mandel inquired if the parking framework table can be shared and could be used as a tool for future decisions. Mr. Boyd explained that he would propose to put a narrative together with a parking analysis for the commission and staff.

Ms. Anderson stated that staff can provide all this information to the commission especially if the parking framework will be “dialed in.” She stated that the commission will only be asked to approve a reduction from the code for restaurants. The other land uses would meet the parking requirements. She explained some projects in the past have requested reduced parking standards and that the Downtown and Midtown have different parking standards. If we followed the code, will not be creating a parking issue we have had in other PUD projects that have requested less parking than required by the code. The consultant team is trying to guide us so we don’t end up with a parking challenge.

Commissioner Fleming stated that we are “in the weeds” when it comes to parking. She stated that she is more concerned getting a push back in the City to historically fence in areas which tells us not to put in multifamily and towers. This is the last remaining water aspect and view of green space. She commented that single family homes have very little payback and cost of plowing and maintenance is less than multifamily and towers. She would like to see sectional elevations going up a hill to help preserve vistas and open spaces that are driven by multifamily, vertical towers, which provide aspects that are interesting instead of a bunch of fenced single family homes. She commented that she is not concerned about parking but we need to be concerned about providing affordable housing where people are able to live, work, and walk to places and not use their cars as much, and maximize the land uses.

Phil Boyd, Welch-Comer responded that the group involved in the Development Standards and project design have had diverse opinions, and that there will be many criteria factoring in to the RFP process and factor in many of the issues raised by Commissioner Fleming.

Don Vehige, GGLO, responded that the Illustrative Site Plan is just that – most of the blocks build in the option for more dense residential uses and take into account vistas and view corridors. Phil Boyd, Welch-Comer, provided more information on the parking calculations and locations in the project.

Don Vehige, GGLO, provided the following statements and high points on some of the changes that were made based on feedback from commission, design team, staff and developers:

- He addressed building separation and some dimensions of lots if there are single family, duplex townhouse lots and how the development might relate to each other.
- He explained they have increased the minimum building separation from 10 feet to 12 feet and have 6 feet to the property line.
- Developers requested lot sizes of 20 feet to 36 feet maximum width apply to duplexes and townhouses. Single family would have a 32-foot minimum width lot and up to 75 foot wide with 80-foot lot depth.
- Building heights – He explained that we proposing on many of the blocks to have a height limit of up to 40 feet and to allow a higher density of development to provide narrow single family homes or townhouses that would require a third story and a roof character.
- He continued to explain the changes to the different areas noted on the property.

Mr. Vehige concluded his presentation.

Commission Comments:

Chairman Messina asked if there are any modifications in the future, if will those will come back to the commission. Ms. Anderson explained that the design team has done a ton of work to come up with various options for each of the blocks with the goal not to have many amendments, and that by getting input from the commission, public and development community that hopefully most things will work

without needing to be amended. She added if there is something significant then it would need to come back to the commission.

Commissioner Ingalls stated that he agrees we have to trust the process and things will turn out alright. He stated that he appreciates Commissioner Fleming's comments and would agree that Riverstone is different from when it was first presented many years ago and thinks this project will turn out great.

Mr. Boyd explained that what is presented in the Development Standards ultimately will be approved. He stated as an example, when we get to Area 11 it is not eligible under this current Development Standards to have offices, so if a developer came in and wanted to build offices in this area, we would have to meet with staff and that approval would have to go back to the commission. He added that staff has discussed the possibilities of offices in this area.

Commissioner Mandel stated that she appreciates giving us a great working framework and stated that understanding the RFP process and how they get evaluated. She stated that the Design Standards will be a great tool to use as a reference.

Commissioner Fleming stated that she has worked in hotels for 30 years and thinks we need a hospitality factor next to Seltice. She noted that we need to consider some flexibility in Areas 10, 9, or 11 with one of those areas for a hotel that would provide an easy access route in/out and not disturbing other agencies by acting as a buffer for that traffic.

Mr. Boyd stated that is the type of feedback we were hoping for today about land uses. He inquired if the commission would consider adding hospitality in Area 13. Commissioner Fleming stated that would be desirable and nice to have a waterfront hotel.

Commissioner Mandel noted Area 13 by the water and other retail options should be available. She feels we have done a great job outlining what we don't want to see in this area, and excited to see what will be proposed.

Commissioner Rumpler stated that he wanted to commend Welch Comer and GGLO for putting together a plan that is planning to optimize for success. He addressed the question of adding additional hospitality and explained that this might stimulate development north of this project.

Ms. Anderson clarified that Area 10 is missing office/retail and that Area 11 includes it and maybe that is one we would like to have some discussion on.

The commission discussed and that Areas 10 and 13 should be included for office/retail.

Ms. Anderson inquired if Area 4 and 5 should be considered for hospitality.

The commission concurred to include Areas 4 and 5.

ADJOURNMENT:

Motion by Fleming, seconded by Mandel, to adjourn. Motion approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:25 p.m.

Prepared by Shana Stuhlmiller, Public Hearing Assistant