

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
AUGUST 9, 2022
LOWER LEVEL – LIBRARY COMMUNITY ROOM
702 E. FRONT AVENUE**

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

Tom Messina, Chairman
Jon Ingalls, Vice-Chair
Lynn Fleming
Phil Ward
Peter Luttrupp
Sarah McCracken
Brinnon Mandel

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Hilary Anderson, Community Planning Director
Tami Stroud, Associate Planner
Sean Holm, Senior Planner
Shana Stuhlmiller, Public Hearing Assistant
Randy Adams, City Attorney

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:

CALL TO ORDER:

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Motion by Luttrupp, seconded by Ward, to approve the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting on June 13, 2022. Motion approved.

STAFF COMMENTS:

Hilary Anderson, Community Planning Director provided the following statements:

- She noted for the September Planning Commission meeting we have one hearing item and that the annexation request for Coeur Terre is tentatively scheduled for October.
- She announced the Regional Housing and Growth Issues Partnership (RHGIP) is continuing efforts and that the group has a website and Facebook page which is updated weekly with new information and a “Weekly Update.” Staff is working on scheduling a multi-jurisdictional joint workshop with all the Planning Commissions of the neighboring jurisdictions looking at dates for the workshop in September to learn about RHGIP partnership and discuss some of the tool kit ideas. She explained that this workshop will be noticed as a public meeting, but no public comments will be allowed. A Doodle Poll link was recently sent to all commissions, so please pick a date that would work for you.
- She announced that staff released a request for qualifications to update the City’s Development Impact Fees. Statements of Qualifications from qualified consultant teams are due by August 22nd. She explained once we get those back, staff will convene the selection committee and soon we will start working on updating those fees.

- She noted developments from our Community Development Block Grant funds (CDBG) that the Community Opportunity Grants are open and available to organizations and businesses that are seeking projects that would benefit low/moderate income individuals. She stated that the information about these grants is on our website and Facebook page with applications due September 23rd and stated that we also have an Emergency Minor Home and Accessibility Repair Program (EMARP) that is open to low-to-moderate income people to apply who need assistance with an reroof or ramp to their homes, leaky pipes etc.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Applicant: Todd Kaufman
Location: 2810 N. 17th
Request:
 - A. A proposed +/- 2.3-acre PUD known as “Kaufman Estates” QUASI-JUDICIAL, (PUD-3-22)
 - B. A proposed 24-lot preliminary plat known as “Kaufman Estates”. QUASI-JUDICIAL, (S-2-22)

Tami Stroud, Associate Planner, provided the following statements.

The applicant is requesting approval of the following decision points that will require separate findings to be made for each item. The applicant is requesting approval of the following:

1. A residential planned unit development (PUD) that will allow for 24 lots and three tracts with the following modifications.
 - a. Lots fronting on a private street rather than a public street.
 - b. Allow for twin home type construction in the R-12 Zoning District.
 - c. Minimum Lot Area of 2,250 SF for a twin home unit rather than 3,500 SF.
 - d. Side Setback (interior) of 5' and 0' rather than 5' on one side and 10' on the other.
 - e. Street Side Setback of 5' rather than 10'.
 - f. Sidewalk on one side of street rather than sidewalks on both sides of street.
 - g. 25-foot lot frontage for each twin home lot.
2. A 24 lot, three tract preliminary plat to be known as Kaufman Estates.
 - The subject property is located at 2810 N. 17th Street, East of Stiner Avenue and south of Nettleton Gulch Road.
 - The property is approximately 2.3-acre site with an existing single-family dwelling and accessory structure that will be removed. The applicant is proposing a planned unit development (PUD) as part of this request.
 - The PUD will consist of 24 lots, two open space tracts, and one tract that will contain the private road. The applicant has indicated that the 24 lots are designed for duplex units
 - The 24 proposed buildable lots will have access to a private road within the development and the private road will have a single access connection to N. 17th Street.
 - The applicant is proposing 11% open space that will be located in two separate tracts. The open space amenities include a grassy area with a walking path, benches and a dog area in the

northeast open space tract and a lawn and picnic area with a gazebo in the southwest open space tract. The applicant has indicated that these open space areas will be maintained by the Homeowners' Association (HOA).

- The applicant has indicated that these open space areas will be maintained by the Homeowners' Association (HOA).
- The applicant has indicated that this project will be completed in one phase with construction beginning in Fall of 2022 and completed by Summer of 2023
- The City's Comprehensive Plan designates the subject property as Compact Neighborhood
- She stated if approved there are 18 conditions for consideration.

Ms. Stroud concluded her presentation

Commission Comments:

Chairman Messina inquired what will be the height of the buildings. Ms. Stroud replied the height allowed in R-12 zone is 32 Feet. Chairman Messina commented that this is the first time hearing the term "Twin houses" and asked if the term is part of the R-12 guidelines or is it R-17. Ms. Stroud explained the applicant references the R-17 code because within that code allows twin homes.

Commissioner Ingalls noted on page 8 of the staff report would like to clarify for the record that "The subject property is not within the city limits" and questioned if that was an error. Ms. Stroud commented that is an error and the property is in the city limits. Commissioner Ingalls noted that if parking isn't allowed on 17th Street and the development meets the two vehicle spots per unit with one unit physically in the garage and the second vehicle would be in the driveway. He inquired if staff could clarify if there would be room for additional parking for guests etc. Ms. Stroud commented that it is a good question for the applicant to answer. Chairman Ingalls inquired about the deviations that seem aggressive versus other previous Planned Unit Developments (PUD's) and in staff's opinion, are these deviations consistent with past PUD's. Ms. Stroud responded that these are standard requests related to setbacks and a sidewalk on one side.

Commissioner Ingalls noted the unit to the south and because of its orientation the home is turned with the setback 5 feet to the property line which is really close especially to the homeowner to the south. Ms. Stroud commented that would be a great question to ask the applicant who would be able to clarify.

Commissioner Luttrupp inquired if this request is considered "spot zoning". Ms. Stroud answered it wouldn't because this isn't a zone change.

Commissioner McCracken inquired about snow removal and if the applicant could address this when he does his presentation.

Public testimony open.

Jeramie Terzulli applicant representative provided the following statements:

- He stated that the city engineer reviewed the plan and clarified that we have adequate services and if approved, there will be improvements to 17th Street.
- He stated this location is close to a lot of services that include neighborhood businesses, and that is a great asset to be walkable/bikeable to these services.
- He noted within the area is a lot of single family plus duplexes, and some infill residential.
- He explained that these are townhomes where the buyers share a common wall and purchase them as individual units, which is good for first time homebuyers.
- He described this area close to recreation areas such as Fernan, Canfield Mountain, Tubbs Hill etc.

- He added that this is considered a transition area more urban to suburban.
- The property is vacant open grass lands with some large trees around the perimeter and would like to talk with the homeowners regarding the outcome of this meeting to discuss upgrading the fencing and incorporating new landscaping including using the existing mature trees on the property.
- He stated this property doesn't have any topographical issues with a moderate incline to the east that flattens out.
- He noted the deviations from code which aren't aggressive with to the rear side setback that was a decision based on the constraints of the property since the shape of the lot is narrow with a deviation from the rear yard to provide a more robust street section.
- He cited various quotes from the 2042 Comprehensive Plan which deals with homeownership to provide a home that people can purchase to be a solution to the workforce housing problem and that this project is consistent with the future land use map which identifies this area suitable for compact neighborhoods.
- He explained from a previous question asked why R-17 was chosen because the R-12 zoning district doesn't allow the use of Townhomes where R-17 does and also allows "party walls" that isn't allowed in the R-12 zoning district.

Chairman Messina inquired if that is allowed. Ms. Anderson explained that the PUD allows any deviations to be requested with a request of any housing types and explained that the property is already zoned R-12 and if built to that density they would be allowed to put more units on the property then what they are asking for through the PUD request, based on the 12 units per acre.

Mr. Terzulli continued his presentation:

- He explained that the biggest push back from the neighbors after reading various comments was density and noted on a map of the area comparing his property with others that are similar in the density with the various parcels surrounding this property with the average density that would be less units compared to the surrounding properties.
- He stated that we had lots of meetings with staff during the design process in order to keep in compliance and after reading the conditions from the various department is ok with the 18 conditions.
- He mentioned a letter that was sent to him that wasn't helpful to this discussion which stated this applicant doesn't care about the community with the letter stating that "the applicant doesn't care about me or neighbors only interested in one thing making as much money out of this community and leaving us behind to deal with this mess". He added this is unhelpful to the discussion and if they would have done five minutes of research, they would have found out that my client and family purchased this land, put their name on the subdivision that own a local business that employs 200 people and by providing this project would help benefit his employees by being able to provide housing that is affordable.

The applicant concluded his presentation.

Commission Comments:

Commissioner Ingalls inquired about parking on 17th Street where the city engineer made the requirement that there be no parking allowed on 17th street. Mr. Terzulli replied that is correct, because 17th is too narrow and that we will be required to repave the entire street section based on discussions about widening the street that would affect the homes to the south by pushing them to the road.

Mr. Terzulli explained that the current street design would allow parking on one side of the street within the project and in addressing a previous question regarding snow storage and explained that the street will be designed to have a "sheet drain" which isn't crowned with the intent to push the snow into the swales.

Commissioner Ward noted in the narrative references affordable housing/workforce housing and questioned is this something you will be able to provide with this project. Mr. Terzulli explained that this is hard to answer and that the applicant's intent for this project is *not* to make a huge profit margin however, there seems to be stabilization in the construction industry and hopefully try and target a price point based on using the income of Mr. Kaufman's employees and asking the question " could my employees afford this house?" Commissioner Ward inquired if these were duplexes how many could be put on the property. Mr. Terzulli answered we could put 12 units/per acre. Commissioner Ward stated if 12 units/per acre is allowed and questioned if twelve units would fit on the property. Mr. Terzulli answered we could possibly get 22-24 units on the property.

Commissioner McCracken inquired if diagonal parking would be an option on the south side of the street to provide for guest parking. Mr. Terzulli answered no.

Commissioner Luttrupp questioned if he has talked to the people in the community. Mr. Terzulli explained that he did make an attempt, but felt this community was united against this development and would offer an "olive branch" based on the outcome. Commissioner Luttrupp explained from his experience it seems like people who come to these hearings don't understand what is being proposed and that this is a platform for those people who don't understand to learn and would suggest using terms that are comforting. He stated in previous testimony that the applicant was basing the price of these homes on the salary of the people who works for Mr. Kaufman and inquired if this could be added as a condition. Mr. Terzulli explained that he would have to sit down with the applicant and discuss away to make that happen. He added that in the past, have tried to meet with the community and appreciates suggestions from this commission.

Chairman Messina inquired what is the height of the buildings. Mr. Terzulli confirmed that these homes will be two stories that would be 24 feet. Chairman Messina inquired how many units could be placed on the property without a public hearing. Mr. Terzulli answered we would have to make adjustments it would be a different looking product.

Tom Paulson explained that his mother lives near the property in a 1200 sq.ft. home surrounded by homes similar selling for \$400,000. and if the homes that are proposed anywhere near this price won't be considered affordable housing and will be changing the character of the neighborhood.

Kathy Moehling stated that she has lived in this community for 3 years and the community is friendly and is concerned about the traffic and if this will be an affordable housing project.

Kris Carey explained that she doesn't live in the area, but a friend does and as I was driving down 17th Street which is narrow and doesn't see how you can put 24 houses in this area where kids don't have a place to play and stated maybe this isn't the right place for this development.

Connor Kenna commented that he lives in the area and that there have been numerous trees removed. He explained that he has a young family and doubts these homes will be affordable or help the community.

Rick Rainbolt stated he has lived in the area for 30 years and density is a concern with surrounding properties that are 1-acre parcels with 1-2 families per acre and that he is trying to put 12 homes on 1 acre. He added traffic is a concern and if approved would have to put in a stop sign.

Joe Archbalt stated this is not going to work and will be a disaster. He added that he is also concerned about water and if there will be enough room in the schools to handle the overload of kids living in this project.

James Giraudo board member of Best Hills Association commented he has major issues with traffic on 15th and doesn't see how the fire department can service this property. He commented if approved, this project will change the character of the property. He has a problem with the number of homes in this area. He commented that he appreciates the previous testimony from the applicant representative and

questioned why isn't the applicant here to address the community concerns.

Jennifer Price stated lives in the area where more VRBO's moving into the area and has concerns if these homes are affordable that they will get picked up by investors for VRBO's. She stated we love this area and if approved the project will change the character of the property. She explained that we also want to preserve the deer with this lot having been their home for along time. She noted that there is a lot of children in the neighborhood and understand this property will be developed and to please consider something less dense.

Pauline Jaklich stated this is a unique neighborhood. She stated on her property she has numerous fruit trees and that the stormwater coming from this property is toxic and doesn't want anything like this in the swale. She added this is too much project for this property and that she has lived here for 19 years and asked the commission to deny this property.

Tammy Rosenthal commented that she was offended that the applicant representative called her home "an aging piece of crap" and that this developer has never made an attempt to talk to this community. She added the developer wants to ruin the wildlife and has also pulled up all the trees and feels that her privacy will be violated.

Silvia Hicken commented that she drove a school bus for many years and is concerned that there isn't enough room for a bus to turn around. She commented that she enjoys the wildlife which will be affected, trees cut down and to please deny this request.

Kelly Wilderson commented this neighborhood doesn't have sidewalks and that kids are forced to ride their bikes in the street. She explained this property sits on a hill and people speed and she is concerned about safety.

Carol Flagel commented lived in this area for 62 years and was a small home which has been remodeled. She understands there needs to be progress and is concerned about traffic.

Kathy Hegemeyer is concerned about the traffic and that the street isn't wide enough.

John Thomassat is concerned about traffic and snow removal.

Tom Hungeford commented most of these homes in this area needs to be preserved. He added these homes aren't rentals with people living in them. This development won't fit this area. He understands there is a need for growth, but it should be responsible.

The commission took a 5-minute break.

Amber Hicks stated they bought their home on Gilbert 3 years ago and are first home buyers. She commented that she likes the area and has concerns for the safety of the children and parking issues.

Kyle Holmes stated that he lives on Gilbert and there are water issues and every time it rains the water comes onto this property goes into his basement that floods. He commented that he has traffic concerns especially for children that are playing in the street.

Megan Johns stated lives in this area and is concerned about the wildlife She appreciates the opportunity to testify and asked to leave the vegetation. She has concerns about light pollution and said there should be a condition to have the lighting be directed down and would love for the developer to work with the community on a project that fits with the neighborhood.

Al Hugstad stated he moved to Coeur d'Alene in 1981 and how the city has changed and is starting to look like California. He added that he isn't afraid of growth, but this area has changed and is zoned for high density, which we weren't aware of. He commented that this is the only community in the city that still

looks like what the city looked like years ago. He is concerned about running out of Aquifer water and the additional runoff from this parcel.

Rosanna Jacobson moved here 3 years ago and lives on Nettleton Gulch Road and concerned with the growth and stated if growth continues, she will have to leave her home.

Ryan Maucks commented he is third generation and dislikes this development and if approved it will take away the character of the neighborhood.

Josh Milligan commented lived in the area for less than a year and he thanked the prior home owner for picking them to buy this home. He asked the commission to please preserve this community.

Rebuttal:

Mr. Terzulli provided the following statements.

- He stated the City Engineer estimated the traffic wouldn't have an impact on traffic.
- He stated that we will be providing 28 parking stalls.
- He commented per the City Engineer we can't widen 17th Street, but they could revisit this with the engineer.
- He added the area is zoned R-12 allowing 28 units on the property.
- He noted that we could provide 3500 sq ft lot per dwelling lot for duplexes with no restrictions as a use allowed "by right" with no public hearing needed.
- He stated that this was the applicant's attempt to provide an affordable housing project.
- Stormwater will be addressed onsite with a design reviewed and approved by staff.
- Stormwater will be treated through injection wells with the city who has the highest standards.
- He noted the aquifer was analyzed 2 years ago and per Panhandle Health is in better shape.
- He commented VRBO's can be managed through the CC&R's and would discuss with the area agencies to discuss that local workforce people purchase these homes.
- He explained this housing issue is a problem and heard kids playing in the street and the reality kids grow up and want to come back to the community where they lived and by approving this request would provide a place for them to live.
- He stated this is a unique problem and maybe this doesn't work here and what we go by is the Comprehensive Plan and feel this project checks all the boxes.

Chairman Messina inquired how many parking spaces are needed for duplexes. Ms. Anderson answered two spaces per unit.

Commissioner Luttrupp questioned if staff can define the term "by right". Ms. Anderson explained there are different uses allowed in each zoning district and for R-12 by right could do duplexes. By right means they could go to building permit; however, if they were going to do a subdivision that would need to have a public hearing for the subdivision. Commissioner Luttrupp stated that he wanted clarification for the public to understand what can be built on the property.

Public testimony closed.

Discussion:

Commissioner Ingalls commented that there was lots of discussion and understands that change is difficult and if you don't want change maybe get together the neighbors and "pass the hat" to buy the property. He added that change is coming and in previous testimony heard what can be done "by right" versus a PUD and that we have recently looked at a number of PUDs that sometimes is a better development than what could be done "by right" He explained part of our process is that we have to meet findings with the applicant mentioning that this project has checked all the boxes in the Comprehensive

Plan with comments from city staff seeing no issues with this project. He explained the finding he struggles with is the compatibility issue and that finding B8b states “the design and planning of the site is/isn’t compatible with the location, setting and existing uses on adjacent properties”. He added that in the staff report it noted that there are a number of larger lots with single family homes to the North, East and West of the site and near the site is pocket housing etc. and how finding B8b will be difficult to make if the location isn’t compatible. He added that he might support this plan if it was on 15th Street or Best Avenue etc. but this plan at this location, he can’t support.

Commissioner McCracken concurs and after looking at the parcels on 18th that haven’t been vacated, Gilbert is narrow and 17th Street never widened the project isn’t compatible. She noted when looking at the site plan the twin home that is positioned sideways affects the setbacks to the adjacent neighbor and appreciates the applicant finding a way for first time homebuyers a way to own their homes, but maybe the applicant should come back with a different proposal that would allow individual ownership with less density and she asked them to please talk to the community.

Commissioner Ward stated there is two parts. First is the site plan and in his opinion the site plan is overdone with insufficient parking for the residents, garages with parking space in front isn’t enough, and no parking on the street would create a congested corridor. Everything on this site plan is “minimal”. He added that he doesn’t think the twin homes can be justified. The number of by right units is controlled by the zoning which includes setbacks roadways etc. so you have 12 units/acre “by right” won’t fit on 2.3 acres unless the minimal units meet a lot of setbacks which is a problem. He added when looking at the Comprehensive Plan it talks about grid streets which these aren’t but considered more country roads and that the Comprehensive Plan isn’t a guide to build anywhere you want and feels that this is a “leap frogging” effect which is urban sprawl and that this project isn’t compatible with the neighborhood.

Commissioner Mandel commented that she stands by the Comprehensive Plan/ Land Use Map which was a good exercise for us when this was discussed and the effort involved a lot of community engagement. She understands some people didn’t participate, which was unfortunate since there were many ways to participate and provide comments, through the city website and other media. She added that the Land Use Map does show examples of compatible housing types and agrees that this project doesn’t have the right character and isn’t compatible. She comments she hopes the sincerity from the applicant/developer to be creative about housing options for the workforce will happen for future projects.

Commissioner Fleming stated that she has been involved with Planning and Zoning commissions in Coeur d’Alene and other jurisdictions and hasn’t seen a more passionate/engaged community come speak at a public hearing. She commented that this project isn’t in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan because we have to support community, unity and involvement by maintaining high quality for the residence and to preserve the housing stock and feels this project is a “slap in the face” She added that she is offended by the institutional design of the homes that isn’t compatible and is opposed to lawns where we use the water from the aquifer every day to have a pretty green lawn that is useless and rather farm it, grow it make it work for all of us and added that we have to protect the natural environment that this project doesn’t belong here and isn’t compatible with the neighborhood.

Commissioner Ingalls added there is some elements in the Comprehensive Plan for the developer to provide housing stock and concurs with the Comprehensive Plan goals this project doesn’t support.

Motion by Fleming, seconded by McCracken, to deny without prejudice Item PUD-3-22. Motion approved.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Fleming	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Ingalls	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Mandel	Voted	Aye
Commissioner McCracken	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Luttrupp	Voted	Aye

Commissioner Ward Voted Aye
Chairman Messina Voted Aye

Motion to deny without prejudice carried by a 6 to 0 vote.

Motion by Fleming, seconded by Luttropp , to deny without prejudice Item S-2-22. Motion approved.

2. Applicant: Coeur d’Alene Homes, Inc. dba Orchard Ridge Senior Living
 Location: 704 W. Walnut
 Request: A proposed R-34 density increase special use permit.
 QUASI-JUDICIAL, (SP-2-22)

Sean Holm, Senior Planner, **provided the following statements**, as indicated in the applicant’s narrative:

- Coeur d’Alene Homes, Inc. dba Orchard Ridge Senior Living, represented by Gordon Longwell, is requesting an R-34 Special Use Permit for increased density from R-17 to R-34 (34 units per gross acre).
- As, current independent living units contain only 1-bedroom unit types, they do not accommodate retired couples well. In addition, the restriction of "low-income housing" does not reach those who fall into the middle-income range.
- Mr. Holm continued presenting which included a recap of prior hearing(s) and the staff report for the current request.
- He explained that the Planning Commission heard a similar request back in 2015. Planning Commission heard two combined public hearings of a similar nature: PUD-3-15 and SP-4-15, on September 8, 2015. Both requests were approved at that time. There was a one-year extension request that was approved in 2016. Since there were no building permit(s) or other significant improvements to the site, the Planned Unit Development and Special Use Permit expired in 2017. The expired request was for an elderly housing residential multi-family structure consisting of fifty (50) total units over two (2) levels of parking.
- The applicant does not need alterations to setbacks or other zoning performance standards; thus, a PUD was not made in conjunction with the current request.
- He explained that there are three findings that need to be made.
 - “That the proposal is or isn’t in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan”. He explained that the property is in the city limits and known as an Urban Neighborhood Place type which is one more dense than the Compact Neighborhood. He added that the property is zoned R-17 and that an R-34 special use permit is something that could be supported assuming they meet the findings. He noted the bicycle Network map indicates that there is connectivity to the site as well of some improvements on U.S. 95 including the city transient system “Citylink” and noted where that location is located on the map. He added that the Comprehensive Plan framework staff felt they met four areas of the policy frame work that include: Community/Identity, Growth/Development, Health/Safety and Jobs/Economy.
 - “The design and planning of the site is/isn’t compatible with the location, setting and existing uses on adjacent properties”. The subject property is gently sloped (<5%) along the Northwest Boulevard exit ramp up to the proposed building site where a recently demolished structure would be replaced by the proposed building. Along the US-95 frontage the property is generally flat. The abutting properties are owned by the same non-profit and are of similar use in a “campus style” arrangement. Land uses in the area are

primarily multi-family residential and civic with some single-family residential and commercial uses located north of US Highway 95 and Walnut Avenue, and some single-family and residential duplex located east of Lincoln Way. He noted on the site plan the R-34 would increase potential of the site from 35 units to 68 units and the height would increase from 45' to 63' foot. He added if the structure reaches 50,000 sq.ft. that Design Review will be required with the applicant indicating that they will meet that standard so there will be "additional eyes" in the future of the design of the structure. He noted that the property is zoned R-17 across 95 is commercial including R-12 with a lot of commercial along Northwest boulevard with limited commercial on U.S.95 as it goes North to Ironwood shopping center. He noted that the land use for the project is largely Civic with Winton and Winton Park to the north. He noted the pictures of the property included in the staff report and indicated that the gradual slope of the property doesn't happen until you get to the Northwest Boulevard off ramp with the majority of the slope located North of U.S. 95.

- "The location, design, and size of the proposal are such that the development will/will not be adequately served by existing street, public facilities and services" He noted on page 14 and 15 of the staff report are the comments provided by staff and that indicated that there are adequate public services and facilities and any infrastructure improvements are the responsibility of the developer.
- He stated there is one additional special use condition for consideration that applies to an R-34 request. The required finding is, "The proposal is/or isn't in close proximity to an arterial, shopping, schools and park areas (if it is an adult only apartment complex proximity to schools isn't required). He described uses in near proximity to the subject property, that US-95 and Northwest Boulevard are adjacent, and reiterated that school locations do not apply to this request.
- He noted the findings and indicated that there are adequate services and any infrastructure improvements are the responsibility of the developer.

Mr. Holm concluded his presentation.

Commission Comments:

None.

Public testimony open_

Gordon Longwell applicant provided the following statements about the requested R-34 density increase to provide additional senior housing options:

- He stated they want to provide additional senior housing on the campus that is 12 acres and contains 154 one/bedroom subsidized units and 69 assisted living units in memory care units.
- He explained that all previous projects were approved with a density increase to R-34
- He explained seven years ago, the commission approved this request with approval to build the allowed units to be built to the maximum of 68 units unfortunately after this approval couldn't find the funding for the financing and that it is important for him to get this project completed.
- The reasons for the request are to:
 - Relieve some of the high demand for senior apartments we are experiencing.
 - Offer a choice for those who do not qualify for HUD subsidized apartments.
 - Increase demand for retail and healthcare services nearby.
 - Help seniors age in place.
 - Encourage couples to live together or near each other on our campus.

Ann Johnson Executive Director provided the following statements:

- She has been with the project for 13 years which has a reputation for excellent care and providing a loving home that honors older adults.
- She explained in the 13 years being with the company has seen a gap as an example currently we have a man who visits daily in his 80's who drives to the campus visits his wife who is in memory care and he has asked several times when is this project going to happen because he doesn't qualify for the low-income housing and needs a place on campus that he can walk over and visit his wife. She explained has seen this numerous times and can't supply that need especially for couples who want to age in place together and can transition when needing more assisted care.

Mr. Longwell continued his presentation:

- He stated that the impact of senior housing provides options to our campus allowing couples to live together.
- Orchard Ridge has successfully served seniors for over 100 years. Our decades-old nonprofit mission continues as we provide a faith-based, loving home that honors older adults. Our current campus consists of 154 1-bedroom apartments for low-income seniors (Section 8/202 HUD subsidized affordable housing) and 69 assisted living and memory care units (with 35% of our residents receiving charitable care). We are governed by a board of directors and employ 80 staff on our campus and impact over 1,000 seniors and their families every year with the services we provide.
- Since our current independent living contains only 1-bedroom unit types, it does not accommodate retired couples well. In addition, the restriction of "low-income housing" does not reach those who fall into the middle-income range. The tragedy of only offering low-income independent housing is that we often see those who have their spouse in our assisted living forced to live miles away because they do not qualify as low income and thus cannot live on our campus.
- Our proposed 67-unit building project will enhance our mission and diversify our campus. It will allow older adults to live among their peers in a gated community with opportunity to transition to assisted living if it becomes necessary. For those living on our campus, we give priority when it becomes time for moving to our assisted living facility.

The impact of adding senior housing options with this proposed project will:

- Relieve some of the high demand for senior apartments we are experiencing.
- Offer a choice for those who do not qualify for HUD subsidized apartments.
- Increase demand for retail and healthcare services nearby.
- Help seniors age in place.
- Encourage couples to live together or near each other on our campus.
- Planning Commission heard two combined public hearings of a similar nature: PUD-3-15 and SP-4-15, on September 8, 2015. Both requests were approved at that time. There was a one-year extension request that was approved in 2016. Since there were no building permit(s) or other significant improvements to the site, the Planned Unit Development and Special Use Permit expired in 2017. The expired request was for an elderly housing residential multi-family structure consisting of fifty (50) total units over two (2) levels of parking.
- He stated that this is a very much needed service for this community and to please approve this project.

The applicant concluded his presentation.

Commission Comments:

Commissioner McCracken stated that she is familiar with this project and is excited that it is coming forward.

Public testimony closed.

Motion by Ingalls, seconded by Mandel, to approve Item SP-2-22. Motion approved.

ROLL CALL:

Commissioner Fleming	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Ingalls	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Mandel	Voted	Aye
Commissioner McCracken	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Luttrupp	Voted	Aye
Commissioner Ward	Voted	Aye
Chairman Messina	Voted	Aye

ADJOURNMENT:

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

The meeting was adjourned at 9:44 p.m.

Prepared by Shana Stuhlmiller, Public Hearing Assistant