

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
VIRTUAL MEETING
APRIL 14, 2020**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Tom Messina, Chairman
Jon Ingalls, Vice-Chair (Zoom)
Lynn Fleming (Zoom)
Michael Ward (Zoom)
Peter Luttropp (Zoom)
Lewis Rumpler (Zoom)
Brinnon Mandel (Zoom)

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Hilary Anderson, Community Planning Director
Tami Stroud, Associate Planner (Zoom)
Sean Holm, Senior Planner
Mike Behary, Associate Planner (Zoom)
Shana Stuhlmiller, Public Hearing Assistant
Randy Adams, Deputy City Attorney (Zoom)

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:

CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Messina at 5:30 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

March 10, 2020

Motion by Luttropp, seconded by Ward, to approve the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting on March 10, 2020. Motion approved.

STAFF COMMENTS:

Hilary Anderson, Community Planning Director, provided the following comments:

- She welcomed everyone to the first Zoom virtual Planning Commission Meeting.
- She asked persons wanting to provide public comment to sign up using the linked located on the agenda.
- She explained that staff will do a mass swearing in by having people raise their “virtual hand” located on the Zoom task bar. There will be a presentation from staff, the applicant and then the public will be able to provide comments, with the applicant doing a rebuttal to have a chance to answer any remaining questions not answered earlier.
- She reminded the participants that if they are not speaking, to please mute their audio source which would help to reduce background noises.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Applicant: Lake City Engineering
Location: 4301 N. Crown Avenue
Request: A proposed zone change from C-17L to C-17
QUASI-JUDICIAL, (ZC-1-20)

Mike Behary, Associate Planner stated the applicant is requesting approval of a zone change from C-17L (C-17 Commercial Limited) to C-17 (C-17 Commercial) zoning district.

Mr. Behary provided the following statements:

- The property is located between US Highway 95 and Crown Avenue.
- There is an existing auto dealership sales facility on the southern portion of the subject site and the property has been used for retail sales of vehicles and RV's for many years.
- The northern portion of the property is vacant and currently undeveloped. The prior use of the vacant portion of the lot was RV sales.
- Prior to 1982, the subject site was located within the unincorporated area of the County. In 1982, the City of Coeur d'Alene applied for a large area of land to be annexed into the City in conjunction with zoning in Item ZC-7-82A.
- The total land area that was annexed at that time consisted of 638 acres and included the subject property. The annexation/zoning request was approved by City Council on November 1, 1982. Through this action, the subject property was zoned R-12.
- In 1984, a request to change the zoning classification from R-12 to C-17L on the southern portion of the subject property was made in Item ZC-12-84SP and was subsequently approved.
- In 1998, a request to change the zoning classification from R-12 to C-17L on the northern portion of the subject property was made in Item ZC-9-98SP, and that was also subsequently approved.
- The zoning ordinance requires auto dealerships that want to locate in the C-17L Zoning District to be approved by a special use permit. In the C-17 Zoning District, auto dealerships are allowed as a permitted use.
- All uses located in the C-17L and the C-17 zoning districts are required to meet the City's Commercial Design standards. The applicant has indicated that they would like to expand the existing auto dealership into the vacant northern portion of the subject property.
- The applicant is aware that site improvements, commercial design standards, and paving of display lots and maneuvering areas are required in order to expand into the vacant portion of the property.
- Mr. Behary stated that the Comprehensive Plan designation for the property is US 95 Corridor.
- He noted the various Comprehensive Plan goals and objectives that might apply for the project.
- He referenced the various staff comments located in the staff report indicating that all departments don't have any issues with the project.

- He stated that there were no conditions.

Mr. Behary concluded his presentation.

Commission Comments:

Commissioner Ingalls asked if staff did a project review with the applicant. Mr. Behary answered that they did.

Commissioner Ingalls asked why the applicant chose to do a zone change rather than a Special Use Permit. Mr. Behary explained that if the applicant wanted to do an expansion or something else, they would have to come back through the public hearing process. With a zone change to C-17, that use is already allowed so if they wanted to do an expansion they would not have to come back to the City for approval.

Commissioner Ingalls stated that the benefits of a special use permit are tied to a specific use, rather than approving a “full blown” C-17, which lists many uses that may not be desirable. Mr. Behary responded that that was correct.

Commissioner Luttrupp asked what are the C-17 properties in the area. Mr. Behary said there are C-17 properties to the north, south and west of the properties.

Commissioner Mandel said that she had the same concerns as Commissioner Ingalls and that the answer was clarified by staff.

Public testimony open.

Drew Dittman, Applicant, provided the following statements:

- He stated that the property is off of Crown Avenue, just off of Highway 95 north of Super One Foods, and that he is asking for a zone change from C17 L to C-17.
- He added that as long as he has lived here, the property has been either an auto or RV sales for as long as he can remember.
- He stated that Nissan has recently purchased the property with the intent to expand the dealership to the north in the future.
- He explained the reason for choosing a zone change over a Special Use Permit is that auto dealerships are not allowed in C-17L, but are allowed in C-17. He added that by choosing a special use permit, if the applicant intended to expand, they would have to do another public hearing, but with a zone change that is not required.
- He commented that they recently did a project review where traffic was discussed and it is not an issue.
- He stated that he thinks it is a fairly straightforward request.

The applicant concluded his presentation.

Commission Comments:

Commissioner Ingalls said he understands if the goal is to legitimize the auto dealership and enable expansion for auto sales, which could be done with a special use permit. He added that in the future the property could be sold and another type of use could be put on the property that is allowed in C-17.

Mr. Dittman explained that a special use permit is only good for a year and if the applicant wanted to expand, they would have to come back for approval from the Planning Commission. Mr. Behary explained that once a special use permit is granted, the applicant has a year to prove that he is doing something on the property and, if not, would need to get an extension. He concurred that if there was to be an

expansion which was not part of the original special use permit, the applicant would have to go back through the public hearing process.

Commissioner Luttrupp asked if staff has received any public comments for the property. Mr. Behary replied that none were received.

Public testimony closed.

Discussion:

Commissioner Fleming said that she concurred with Commissioner Ingalls that by approving the property as C-17, it would leave them “wide open” to other undesirable uses on the property.

Commissioner Ingalls said that he thinks it’s a great fit, but is not sure if the zone change is the right tool to use to get there.

Commissioner Mandel replied that she feels the property is compatible.

Commissioner Ingalls said that he is comfortable with the property as a car dealership and a possible expansion and asked why it couldn’t be done by using a special use permit. He explained that if the zone change is approved as a C-17, it could open up the parcel to all uses allowed in the C-17 zoning district that might not be compatible.

Commissioner Rumpler noted that from Kathleen to Dalton is “auto dealer row” and he is comfortable with that particular area that has become dedicated to auto sales and service. He said that he doesn’t see another alternative use for the property and doesn’t see a need for a special use permit.

Chairman Messina noted on a map showing the property the connecting streets getting to the property and commented that it looks like the only entrance to the property is off of Crown Avenue. He asked if, in the future, there will be other entrances to the property like the other dealerships in the area.

Mr. Behary noted on the map the different access points to the property of all of the dealerships which have to exit US 95 to get to them.

Commissioner Ingalls concurred that the property will probably remain a car dealership and thought there might be another tool to use so the property would not be allowed for any undesirable uses in the future which are allowed within the C-17 zoning designation.

Motion by Rumpler, seconded by Mandell, to approve Item ZC-1-20. Motion approved.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Fleming	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Ingalls	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Mandel	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Luttrupp	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Rumpler	Votes	Aye
Commissioner Ward	Voted	Aye

Motion to approve carried by a 6 to 0 vote.

2. Applicant: ETD Enterprises, LLC
Location: Lots 1-2 Block 1 Bunker Park
Request: A proposed Commercial Recreation/Sales special use permit in the LM (Light Manufacturing) zoning district QUASI-JUDICIAL, (SP-3-20)

Tami Stroud, Associate Planner, and Jake Plagerman, Planning Technician, stated that David Shrontz, Architect, is requesting approval of a total of six (6) activity uses (three (3) service activities and three (3) commercial activities) via the Special Use Permit process, to allow for the following uses in a Light Manufacturing (LM) zone. Note: The applicant has made this request for two (2) separate parcels as described by the Bunker Park legal description.

Ms. Stroud and Mr. Plagerman provided the following comments:

- They noted that the Comprehensive Plan designates the area as Ramsey-Woodland (Stable Established)
- They referenced the Comprehensive Goals and Objectives in the staff report.
- They presented a map showing the approved Special Use Permits in the area.
- They explained the various building renderings.
- They noted where the various staff comments were located, with all departments stating that the use is appropriate and can be served.
- They noted that there are 12 conditions if the request is approved.

Ms. Stroud and Mr. Plagerman concluded their presentation.

Commission Comments:

Commissioner Mandel said there are twelve conditions and asked if the applicant feels they are reasonable. Chairman Messina said that the applicant would be able to answer that question.

Public testimony open.

Dave Shrontz provided the following statements:

- He said they are proposing a use that is allowed under Light Manufacturing; specifically, commercial recreation that will be proposed for the first phase.
- He described Safe Splash as a franchise specializing in swim lessons that provides opportunities for triathletes to train year around.
- He said at the front of the property will be plans for future retail developments to include a coffee shop, or professional services.
- He indicated a potential future use on the opposite side of the property to provide retail on Schreiber Way with more office space on the opposite side.
- He showed a rendering of what the building will look like and noted that it will be a 7,500 sq. ft. single story building, and explained the floor plan.
- He stated that it is straightforward project and not out of the ordinary and, hopefully, will be approved.

The applicant concluded his presentation.

Commission Comments:

Commissioner Mandel asked if the applicant accepted all the conditions.

Mr. Shrontz stated that they accept all of the conditions in the staff report.

Public testimony closed.

Discussion:

Motion by Ingalls, seconded by Fleming, to approve Item SP-3-20. Motion approved.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Fleming	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Ingalls	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Mandel	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Luttrupp	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Rumpler	Votes	Aye
Commissioner Ward	Voted	Aye

Motion to approve carried by a 6 to 0 vote.

Applicant: Connie Krueger, Stonehenge
Location: W. of Atlas Rd., N. of the future ext. of Hanley Ave at N. Downing Ln & W. Andesite Way
Request:
A. A proposed PUD known at "Enclave at the Trails"
QUASI-JUDICIAL, (PUD-1-20)
B. A proposed 76-lot preliminary plat know at "Enclave at the Trials"
QUASI-JUDICIAL, (S-2-20)

Tami Stroud, Associate Planner, said that Lakeside Real Estate Holdings, LLC is requesting approval of a gated residential Planned Unit Development and a 76 lot, 10 tract, preliminary plat to be known as "Enclave at the Trails" within the Trails 4th Addition.

Ms. Stroud provided the following statements:

- The existing 19.4-acre site is currently vacant and within the "Trails 4th Addition."
- The proposed Planned Unit Development (PUD) will be comprised of 76 residential lots with private open space areas for residents of the development.
- The PUD is proposed as a private gated community with private roads. In addition to the proposed gate for vehicle access, there are also two proposed pedestrian gated access points.
- The applicant is proposing to install the streets and the subdivision infrastructure for the project in one phase.
- The applicant has indicated that construction of the PUD/subdivision infrastructure is anticipated to commence and be completed in 2020, with home construction beginning in the third or fourth quarter of 2020.
- The proposed PUD will have a density of 3.91 units per acre. The property is currently zoned R-8 and the current zoning allows for a density at 8 units per acre.
- The proposed PUD will have two proposed lot types: Type A and B.
- Type A is 6,000 sq. ft. with average dimensions of 50' x 120', and are rear-loaded lots.
- There are 50 Type A lots proposed.
- Type B is 7,920 sq. ft. with average dimensions of 72' x 110' and are front-loaded lots
- There are 26 Type B lots proposed within the development.

The applicant is requesting the following deviations from existing standards:

- Front Setback: 10' rather than 20'
- Rear Setback: 10' rather than 25'
- Side Yard Setback: 5' and 5' rather than the 5' and 10' required for lots without alley access.
- Private gated vehicle access rather than open access for the public.
- Private streets rather than public streets.
- Right-of-Way width: Street Typical Section A: 44' rather than 55'
- Right-of-Way width: Street Typical Section B: 26' rather than 55'
- Sidewalk on only one side of the street for Street Typical A
- No sidewalks, curb or gutter on street for Street Typical B
- Ms. Stroud said that the Comprehensive Plan designates the area as Atlas-Prairie-Transition.
- She noted the various Comprehensive Plan Goals and Objectives for the PUD and Subdivision.
- She stated that the various city departments have commented on the project and noted in the staff report where those comments were located.
- She stated that if the application is approved, there are 18 conditions needed for approval.

Ms. Stroud concluded her presentation.

Commission Comments:

Commissioner Ingalls complimented staff on a great report. He noted that the applicant has asked for deviations for setbacks, gates and private streets. He asked if the past projects with deviations that have been approved in the last year are consistent with the project. Ms. Stroud said that the project is consistent with past Planned Unit Developments (PUD). Commissioner Ingalls if staff receives any feedback on how the recently approved projects are performing. Ms. Stroud said that sometimes they have received feedback in the past regarding snow storage, which is a requirement from the Fire Department to show on the plan which is discussed with the applicant.

Commissioner Fleming said that in the applicant's narrative they show the Type A home with 3- car garages, which looks like the garage will take up the width of the home. She asked if staff could explain how it can be done on a narrow lot. Ms. Stroud commented that she spoke with the applicant before the meeting and they will be providing the three-car garage as an option and suggested that Commissioner Fleming ask the applicant for clarification.

Commissioner Luttrupp asked if the setbacks for the residents to the north are similar. Ms. Stroud said that in the Landings development they have standard setbacks. Commissioner Luttrupp asked if all the streets in those developments are private. Ms. Stroud pointed out on a map of the surrounding areas where the public/private streets are located. Commissioner Luttrupp asked if the applicant provided renderings showing the style of homes to be built in the development and asked if those styles will be the only ones required per the PUD. Ms. Stroud explained that the requirement for submittal for a PUD is that the applicant has to submit a rendering or drawing of what the character of the development will be.

Chairman Messina commented that many developments approved in the area are a PUD and asked if that would be a true statement. Ms. Stroud said that most of the developments in the area are straight subdivisions with no modifications.

Commissioner Ward asked if the dividing line for the school district is on the east side of Carrington and if the Post Falls District starts on the other side. Ms. Stroud explained that she didn't receive any background information on that and the school district didn't submit anything either, but that it is a question that possibly the applicant will be able to answer.

Public testimony open.

Connie Krueger, applicant representative provided the following statements:

- She introduced Gabe Gallinger, who is the Civil Engineer for the project.
- She commented that the project is really a redesign of the Trails Fourth Addition and it is important to note that the Trails overall is an approved subdivision with 470 units, which has been constructed in phases.
- She showed an aerial photo of The Trails, showing the development that will provide a lot of greenspace and commented that this type of project is quite appealing to folks that are nearing retirement or with children who have left the nest, and also to the younger buyer.
- She said they had a pre-application meeting with the City that provided feedback from the various City departments to discuss where they felt the pinch points are with the development, and noted that, usually, there's going to be an issue with snow removal which was addressed and explained at that meeting.
- She said that they have read through the conditions and approve all of them.
- She stated the development is intended to be a gated community to appeal to the client who wants privacy.
- She provided a few slides showing the various renderings of the homes to be built in the development.
- She added that they recently met with the school district regarding a signal placement and to discuss the proposal.

Gabe Gallinger provided the following statements:

- He stated they put a lot of time into the project.
- He addressed the question regarding fitting a 3-car garage on narrow lots and explained on the perimeter the lots are 72 feet wide, and with the proposed side foot side yard setbacks that would allow a 60-foot-wide structure. That would facilitate any of the homes in the Trails subdivision with a third car option on the base plan.
- He stated by having a number of trails around the area they are trying to move that active use and outdoor use away from the homes and into the common areas, which is why they have provided additional parking.
- They have provided access locations that connect the trail in the common open space along Downing Avenue that connects to the Prairie Trail.

Mr. Gallinger concluded his presentation.

Commission Comments:

Commissioner Messina asked if the applicant could explain how they intend to provide a three-car garage on a narrow lot. Ms. Krueger explained there will be a minimum 20-foot driveway approach in concrete that is the width of the garage which would provide an additional three parking spaces off of the street,

Commissioner Luttrupp said that in a PUD it is designed as a tool intended to facilitate the creation of better living environments. He asked Ms. Krueger to explain what will be the better living environment for the PUD. Ms. Krueger said that the subdivision is meant for the people that don't necessarily own a lawn mower and would like to have a Homeowners Association to do it for them, and still be able to use the outside space and not take care of it.

Commissioner Luttrupp inquired how connectivity will be maintained. Ms. Krueger pointed out within the development the various connection points to various subdivisions that will connect to the Prairie Trail.

Commissioner Ward asked if the applicant could explain the three-car garage concept.

Mr. Gallinger explained that on the narrow lots the garages will be set back 20' feet from the narrow section and will provide three interior spaces in the garage structure, for a total of six spaces, by providing additional space to keep the garage clean.

Commissioner Ward asked if the lot count is the same, versus the old plan. Ms. Krueger explained with the plan they are proposing 76 lots versus 71 lots with the original proposal.

Commissioner Ward asked if Carrington Street is still the dividing line for the Post Falls and Coeur d'Alene School Districts and if both school districts are aware of the request.

Ms. Krueger said that the boundary line has changed and recently had a conversation with both school districts and they didn't have any issue with the request.

Barbara Yeager stated that she lives in the area and is concerned with three things. First, is the notice that was posted on the property was very hard to see and she questioned if the project was posted in the paper. The second thing is eliminating the common area and putting in gates, and the third item is she wondered when they would be getting their park on Hanley Avenue.

Ms. Anderson explained that the notice in the newspaper is placed 15 days in advance of the hearing and a copy of the notice is mailed to people within 300 feet of the property and posted on the site. She explained how the posted notice includes the necessary information to learn more and participate in the meeting, and commented that she appreciates feedback on a way that they can make it better. She noted that the other two questions would be best to be answered by the applicant.

Rebuttal:

Ms. Krueger provided the following statements:

- She said that it is a large development and not unusual to see changes over time, and commented that it is too bad to hear it is a shock to some people but she is hoping that by providing the information tonight, it shows what was originally approved and how the development will be close to that.

Public testimony closed.

Discussion:

Commissioner Fleming said she sees no issues and her question would be if they will be able to build it out. She said that the project is a good end to the piece of the puzzle.

Commissioner Luttrupp said he has concerns with connectivity, private roads and gates and that the project doesn't seem to fit in with the area. He said that, for him, private roads and gated communities are not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Ingalls said that he feels there should be another comment in the Comprehensive Plan that states they should have housing types, and that most planners value having a variety of housing types. He said that he lives in a gated community within Coeur d'Alene Place which is a similar size, and they worked to provide housing choice, which is very important.

Motion by Lewis, seconded by Ward, to approve Item PUD-1-20. Motion approved.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Fleming	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Ingalls	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Mandel	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Luttrupp	Voted	NO
Commissioner Rumpler	Votes	Aye
Commissioner Ward	Voted	Aye

Motion to approve carried by a 6 to 0 vote.

Motion by Mandel, seconded by Fleming, to approve Item S-2-20. Motion approved.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Fleming	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Ingalls	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Mandel	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Luttrupp	Voted	Yes
Commissioner Rumpler	Votes	Aye
Commissioner Ward	Voted	Aye

Motion to approve carried by a 6 to 0 vote.

4. Applicant: AT&T
Location: 215 W. Anton
Request: A proposed Wireless Communication Facility Tower special use permit
QUASI-JUDICIAL, (SP-2-20)

Mike Behary, Associate Planner, stated the applicant is requesting approval for a special use permit to allow a wireless communications (Cell Tower) facility in the C-17 Zoning District.

Mr. Behary provided the following statements:

- The applicant is proposing to build a 90-foot-tall mono-pole wireless communication facility. The applicant has indicated that the proposed cell tower is intended to fill a significant gap in AT&T's 4G LTE coverage and capacity experienced by its customers in the surrounding area.
- The subject site is currently used by the owner of the property (General Construction Services) for outdoor storage and offices to support BCR Land Services' construction, site work, snow services, and trucking operations.
- There are three separate parcels and three addresses, but the site functions as one for the BCR operations. The two parcels that are part of the request support an office building, a shop building, nine shipping containers, eight storage buildings, and construction materials and equipment.
- The applicant is proposing to locate the 90-foot cell tower in the northeast corner of the property, primarily on parcel C-2680-001-003-B with access through parcel C-4095-000-004-A.
- A portion of the cell tower facility may also extend into the larger parcel. It is unclear from the site plan. The tower and accessory ground equipment cabinets will meet the setbacks for wireless communications facilities in the C-17 Zoning District.
- The applicant has indicated that the proposed cell tower will not be stealth in design.
- The stealth design is not a requirement in the C-17 Zoning District. The applicant has also provided a map illustrating the coverage area that the proposed cell tower will serve.

- While it does not affect the cell tower request, the construction operations on the subject property and adjacent lot (205 W. Anton Way) may not be in compliance with the Building Code, Water and Sewers Code, and Zoning Code. Those potential issues will be addressed with the property owner separate from the Special Use Permit request.
- Mr. Behary referenced a map submitted by the applicant showing cell coverage without the proposed tower/and with the proposed tower.
- He noted the various findings required for the application.
- He stated that the Comprehensive Plan designates the area as US 95 Corridor.
- The applicant has requested that the ancillary ground equipment be screened by a sight-obscuring fence without buffer landscaping and irrigation.
- Mr. Behary provided a copy of the applicant's rendering showing the placement of the cell tower on the property.
- He said that all City departments have reviewed the project and noted where the comments were in the staff report.
- He said if the application is approved there are five conditions for consideration.

Mr. Behary concluded his presentation.

Commission Comments:

Commissioner Luttrupp said that he thought that the City required all cell towers placed within the City must be a Stealth Tower. Mr. Behary explained that within the C-17 zoning district a Stealth Tower is not a requirement.

Public testimony open.

Sharon Gretch, representative for AT&T, provided the following statements:

- She thanked the commission and staff for doing a Zoom meeting in order to move the item forward. She introduced Sara Springer, also a representative for AT&T, and said she was available for questions.
- She explained the reasoning behind why they chose the northwest corner; specifically, because it will help minimize the visual impacts of the facility and meets the setback requirements and is surrounded by C-17.
- She said that they will be leasing a 30' x 30' fenced area surrounded by a 6' foot chain link fence with privacy slats with all equipment be located within that leased fence area.
- She explained that they will place a diesel generator within the 30' x 30' area that will run for approximately 5 minutes a month for testing and will only be used for emergency services.
- She said they are proposing a 90' foot mono-pole per code to provide additional space for two carriers to locate on the tower.
- The tower will be painted using a mat foundation that is anti-glare.
- She explained the amount of coverage need was determined by their engineers who proposed the upper center north location in order for the facility to work appropriately. She added that the tower had to be located on elevated terrain that was located near US 95 and I-90 in order to provide a strong signal dominance needed for commercial and residential establishments that will provide uninterrupted wireless service with less dropped calls and improved access for emergency 911 calls throughout the area.
- She presented a map showing cell tower coverage and stated that once the facility is constructed, the area will be covered.
- She commented that the next step would be to apply for a building permit and it may take a few months to construct the tower.

Ms. Springer commented that the facility is a wireless facility identified and recognized as an essential infrastructure under the State's Order to Self-Isolate requirement that is incorporated under the Department of Homeland Security.

The applicant concluded her presentation.

Commission Comments:

Commissioner Fleming said that she understands it is a leased portion of land that is owned by someone else and asked if the applicant will provide a Knox box and access to the lot for an afterhours situation.

Ms. Gretch said that it is one of the conditions in the staff report and she fully supports the request. Commissioner Fleming asked if the owner is aware of the condition. Ms. Gretch said that AT&T is aware and will fulfill the conditions. Commissioner Fleming said that she was referring to the owner of the property and if they are aware of A T & T providing a Knox box. Ms. Gretch explained that the Knox Box would go on the AT&T equipment and that the property owners have seen the proposed plan and have agreed to what they are proposing. She said that it was a good question and she will bring it up with the property owner.

Commissioner Ingalls said that this is the second tower the commission has seen in two months and feels that nobody is fond of cell towers but the reality is we need them. He asked what would happen if they couldn't find a spot in the vicinity for coverage.

Ms. Springer stated that every cell site they have is finite, so it can only handle so much volume and so many different users. She explained that when they propose a new cell phone tower site, they look at what is out there and make sure they have stretched their existing towers as much as possible by adding additional antennas and radio units, but at some point, they can't add anymore. She continued that they then have to look at the best option possible and see what is out there to relocate on which is location dependent and they have to be centered to provide coverage. She said that every site can handle only so much and they look at what is there and make sure to add additional antennas to existing stuff, but sometimes that doesn't work. Their next step is to look for what they can find that is existing.

Public testimony closed.

Discussion:

Commissioner Rumppler said they have recently have seen two cell towers come before the commission in the last two months. He understands that the applicants are trying to achieve better cell coverage and fully supports the request. He concurred that it might be a good idea to change the code in the C-17 zone to address Stealth Towers.

Commissioner Ingalls said that Commissioner Luttrupp made a good point but, in fairness to the applicant, they have met the City code and can't make that change tonight. He suggested that if the commission feels like the code should be changed to require a Stealth Tower in C-17, they should ask staff to bring forward an ordinance request to make that change.

Commissioner Ward said that he supports Commissioners Ingalls and Luttrupp to allow Stealth Towers in the C-17 zoning district and added that before they make the requirement to provide that type of tower to look at the surrounding area to see if it will blend with the surroundings. He stated that in the proposed area, a mono-pole makes sense since there are no trees in the area and a tower looking like a tree would look out of place.

Commissioner Fleming said that she concurred with all the comments.

Ms. Anderson stated that staff will look at the code to allow Stealth Towers to be included in the C-17 zone and they should look at the code and then include Legal to see if the request could be added to allow Stealth Towers.

Motion by Fleming, seconded by Ingalls, to approve Item SP-2-20. Motion approved.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Fleming	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Ingalls	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Mandel	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Luttrupp	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Rumpler	Votes	Aye
Commissioner Ward	Voted	Aye

Motion to approve carried by a 6 to 0 vote.

ADJOURNMENT:

Motion by Luttrupp, seconded by Ingalls, to adjourn the meeting. Motion approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Prepared by Shana Stuhlmiller, Public Hearing Assistant