



**CITY COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES**

**October 4, 2022
6:00 PM**

Location: City Council Chambers, 408 N. Spokane Street, Post Falls, ID 83854

WORKSHOP – 5:00 pm Basement Conference Room

ROLL CALL OF CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

Kerri Thoreson, Josh Walker, Joe Malloy, Nathan Ziegler, Lynn Borders, Kenny Shove - **Present**

Topic: Cottage Home Design Standards

REGULAR MEETING – 6:00 pm City Council Chambers

CALL TO ORDER BY MAYOR JACOBSON

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL OF CITY COUNCIL MEMBERS

Kerri Thoreson, Josh Walker, Joe Malloy, Nathan Ziegler, Lynn Borders, Kenny Shove - **Present**

CEREMONIES, ANNOUNCEMENTS, APPOINTMENTS, PRESENTATION:

- a. Congratulations to Idaho's 2023 Teacher of the Year, Karen Lauritzen! Karen is a 4th grade teacher at Treaty Rock Elementary in Post Falls. We are so fortunate to have such great teachers like Karen teaching our children.
- b. Proclamation – Safe Infant Sleep Awareness Month

AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA

Final action cannot be taken on an item added to the agenda after the start of the meeting unless an emergency is declared that requires action at the meeting. The declaration and justification must be approved by motion of the Council.

None

DECLARATION OF CONFLICT, EX-PARTE CONTACTS AND SITE VISITS

The Mayor and members of the City Council have a duty to serve honestly and in the public interest. Where the Mayor or a member of the City Council have a conflict of interest, they may need to disclose the conflict and in certain circumstances, including land use decisions, they cannot participate in the decision-making process. Similarly, ex-parte contacts and site visits in most land use decisions must also be disclosed.

Shove – Received emails regarding tonight's public hearing.

Warren Wilson, City Attorney: Councilor Shove sent me the emails and the email sender was notified that comments for public hearings needed to be submitted through the correct channels. We looked through the record and saw that the emails were not in the record, but there was email that said almost the exact same thing.

1. CONSENT CALENDAR

The consent calendar includes items which require formal Council action, but which are typically routine or not of great controversy. Individual Council members may ask that any specific item be removed from the consent calendar in order that it be discussed in greater detail. Explanatory information is included in the Council agenda packet regarding these items and any contingencies are part of the approval.

ACTION ITEMS:

- a. Minutes – September 20, 2022, City Council Meeting
- b. Payables – September 13, 2022 – September 26, 2022
- c. Morris Annexation Reasoned Decision
- d. Bel Cielo III Legislative Decision
- e. Ashlar Ranch Annexation Reasoned Decision
- f. Hydrilla Estates Zone Change Reasoned Decision
- g. July Cash and Investments
- h. The Northshore District Master Development Agreement
- i. Mongeau Meadows Subdivision Construction Improvement Agreement
- j. Pasture View Estates Subdivision Plat Application
- k. Mongeau Meadows Annexation Development Agreement and Dedications
- l. Mongeau Meadows Master Development Agreement

Motion by Malloy to accept the Consent Calendar as presented.

Second by Borders.

Vote: Malloy-Aye, Walker-aye, Borders-Aye, Shove-Aye, Thoreson-Aye, Ziegler-Aye

Motion Carried

2. PUBLIC HEARINGS

There are generally two types of public hearings. In a legislative hearing, such as adopting an ordinance amending the zoning code or Comprehensive Plan amendments, the Mayor and City Council may consider any input provided by the public. In quasi-judicial hearings, such as subdivisions, special use permits and zone change requests, the Mayor and City Council must follow procedures similar to those used in court to ensure the fairness of the hearing. Additionally, the Mayor and City Council can only consider testimony that relates to the adopted approval criteria for each matter. Residents or visitors wishing to testify upon an item before the Council must sign up in advance and provide enough information to allow the Clerk to properly record their testimony in the official record of the City Council. Hearing procedures call for submission of information from City staff, then presentation by the applicant (15 min.), followed by public testimony (4 min. each) and finally the applicant's rebuttal testimony (8 min.). Testimony should be addressed to the City Council, only address the relevant approval criteria (in quasi-judicial matters) and not be unduly repetitious.

ACTION ITEMS:

- a. Hargrave-Hathaway Annexation File No. ANNX-22-8

Public Hearing opened at 6:07 pm.

Staff Report

Jon Manley, Planning Manager presenting: The applicant is Kimberly and Brett Hargrave and the owners are Kimberly and Brett Hargrave and Will and Ute Hathaway. The applicant requests annexation with Residential Mixed (RM) zoning of the approximate 9.63 acres into the City of Post Falls. If approved this would require a Development Agreement which can have restrictions embodied within it. the desire is to construct about 77 townhomes or less and retain a 31,000 square foot commercial lot. It is located just a tad west of the intersection at Chase and Poleline, along the north side of the Montrose Development and just west of the Black Stallion lots. The current land use is larger residential lots in the county with no significant topology or vegetation matters and is over the Rathdrum Aquifer. Water will be provided by East Green acres Irrigation District and sewer would be provided by the City of Post Falls. Some of the RM design elements, you have a minimum lot size of 4 acres for the product types of duplexes, twin-homes, and single-

family. The maximum height is 35' and all other structures is 45'. The reason is because the RM allow for up to 20% multi-family and 10% commercial so the 45' goes towards those other uses. Open space requirements in the RM are 7% of the total site, they are planning on doing the town-home option of the RM with the open space being a passive recreation with some amenities. They are proposing a trail system that connects to the improved section on the south side of the development with the commercial site located along Poleline. Permitted uses multi-family residential uses cannot exceed 20% and neighborhood commercial/office uses cannot exceed 10%. Because they are planning to do townhomes, units on their own platted lots, they may have zero lot lines, but it is no different than any other single-family home. They have commercial restrictions and are capped at 7.4% of the development area. The future land use has this designated as low density residential. all types of single-family residential uses up to 8 dwelling units per acre, the 77 townhomes on 9.63 acres equals to 7.9 dwelling units per acre. So, this makes them eligible to request the RM as an implementing zone within that low density. Looking at it being consistent with the focus area, Central Prairie, support provisions for a variety of housing types and densities, the roadway classification is able to support in excess of 4,000 vehicles per day. 2035 project traffic volumes are for 3,000 vehicles per day. both Poleline and Chase are classified as minor arterials that are designed to accommodate traffic volumes of 6,000-15,000 vehicles per day. Poleline is estimated to have 2025 volumes of 1,7000 vehicles per day and 2035 volumes of 3,000 vehicles per day. With the Black Stallion development, the city received the improvements along Poleline and they also plan to extend Miss Hannah Ave. and would come back to Poleline and with development they would improve the northern portion of the trail connecting it to the north side with some improved pedestrian connection. We recently received a major PUD amendment and subdivision plan for Montrose, they are looking at phasing in their portion south of Poleline. They show the pedestrian network they intend to construct going east and west connecting to Clark Fork Parkway which would go up to Poleline. At some point in the future there is a plan to construct a bridge on Poleline o make that connection to the west towards McGuire. There currently are 2 users on the rail line and at such time they are no longer using it the city will discuss providing a green trail from Montrose to downtown towards our city center planning area. There is an approved subdivision to the east at the northwest corner of Poleline and Chase called Coleman Acres, they haven't started construction yet, but they are approved and for all intents and purposes except for a couple of county islands it may be feasible to attain those frontage improvements on both north and south side meeting the road classification requirements.

Malloy: What is Clark Fork Pkwy classified as?

Rob Palus, Assistant City Engineer: it is classified as a minor roadway estimated at 2,000 to 5,000 trips per day. Currently it is only at 20% percent of its capacity and by 2035 it is projected to only be at 35% of its capacity.

Malloy: the bridge over the railway is about 15 years out?

Palus: our transportation plan shows it being in place by 2035. We are collecting impact fees for 10% of that project and will apply for grants for the rest.

Applicant

Brett and Kimberly Hargrave presenting: We have owned this property since 2009 and have a great appreciation for the land. We are looking for a way to give back to the community. Our concern is for housing for people who are already here. This will be townhouses that will owned by the homeowners. With planning for this we had to take into consideration the unique shape of the property and the knuckle of Miss Hana that dead ended into our property. We are trying to create a please for neighbors to come together for a sense of community.

Malloy: you mentioned a lack of affordable housing for people who are here. I do not see anything in the development agreement that would limit yourself to selling to people who have had residency in Kootenai County for a certain time.

Hargrave: Correct, that is not in there. The goal is to hit a price point. Our children cannot afford to live here. All people can buy these, but this would be an opportunity for our kids to buy them.

Testimony

In Favor

Will Hathaway (Post Falls): I am co applicant on this project and have lived here since 2005. We have watched Post Falls grow over the years around us. Regarding the issue of privacy. This has been raised by someone who lives on the other side of the railroad tracks. The distance from their fence to the closest townhome block will be over 120ft about the size of a football field. Would the same concern be raised if it was a 2-story single family home? Also, the issue of decreased property values was raised. As a realtor I have access to the MLS and have looked at the property values of houses near apartment complexes in Post Falls. These homes values have increased over the years with the rest of the city. If being near a railroad track does not hurt the values of your home, then also being near an apartment complex will not either.

Neutral

In Opposition

Axel Artibruster (Post Falls) not wanting to speak.

Robb and Brenda Erickson (Post Falls) not wanting to speak: My name is Brenda Erickson; my husband and I are 30-year residents of Post Falls and 30-year business owners on Coeur d Alene. We currently live at 2598 N Ashraf Ct, Post Falls in Black Stallion Ranch on .40-acre lot (17,424 square feet) with a single home. The planning commission is asking you to approve a RM zoning on a 9.63-acre parcel to accommodate 77 to 80 townhomes a short distance away. The description says the lot sizes will be between 2000-3000 square feet in "zero lot line" configurations. This does not comply with the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map for this area as it is bordered by R1 and R1S developments on 3 sides. This is more like high density housing, not single-family housing. The proposed commercial space does not make sense in this location as Poleline is minor arterial with projected volumes of 1700 vehicles per day in 2025 and 3000 per day in 2035. Not 4000 as the plan recommends. This sets up a commercial business relying on local traffic to not be attracted to this location. The proposed open space of 7% is chopped un into small spaces that will be unusable. They are also adjacent to parking areas or surrounding the commercial acres. Some open spaces are bordering RR tracks and some bordering Poleline, seems to pose safety concerns. Poleline is not currently set up to handle more traffic as it dead ends wo west, to southwest enters another R1 neighborhood with a RR crossing and a school zone. The east intersects with Chase and to get to Seltice you must pass another RR crossing and school zone. If you take Poleline to Spokane Street to get to Seltice/I-90 you enter another school zone. These roads all minor arterials not yet developed to handle traffic. A RM development makes more sense closer to major collector roads and city centers. The Central Prairie Focus Area says, focus multifamily along Prairie Ave, focus commercial development along Prairies Ave and near identified commercial nodes and support provisions for a variety of housing types and densities. This parcel is adjacent to Poleline Ave not Prairie Ave. I believe the property owners are entitled to ask for a zone change, but City Council is also entitled to reject the plan and ask them to comply with the current Comprehensive Plan that clearly places this into the R1 category for development. We are asking our City Council to do just that, keep our area R1.

Linda Johnson (Post Falls) not wanting to speak: I and my husband live in the Black Stallion subdivision, which is a pleasant and low-density neighborhood. Now a developer has applied to build a high-density large apartment complex a block away with a road connected to our subdivision. This will lead to heavy traffic, noise, and a lot of safety issues. This significantly amount of traffic is a great worry to us. I oppose this rezoning.

Caren Godak (Post Falls) not wanting to speak: When following the description for when or where the RM zone is appropriate, I believe that if fails three of four criteria “areas readily serviced by streets suitable for higher levels of traffic”, two existing cul-de-sacs hardly constitutes suitable streets to accommodate the proposed plan. “Areas where public services are sufficient for intensity of use”, adding 77 townhomes and houses in this area will add to the already over-burdened services. “Areas where existing neighboring land uses are compatible”, the existing neighborhoods that this would connect to are 2 homes per acre. Attaching a housing community with 7 homes per acre is in no way consistent. Those of us who purchased or built homes did so with the goal of having a quiet neighborhood. The availability of a truly “quiet” neighborhood in Post Falls is rapidly diminishing. It is the single most common complaint I hear from people in this town. I implore you to consider the needs of the current residents instead of the builders/developers, who are not tasked with living in the neighborhoods they are decimating. This proposal is far from beneficial to the existing neighborhoods in this area.

Joseph Mitchell (Post Falls) not wanting to speak: In response to several items on the staff presentation as found on the city website: this plan will not retain existing quality of life assets. This proposed neighborhood is surrounded by low density single family residential neighborhoods. It is immediately adjacent to and will connect to two neighborhoods with 1 single home per half acre. The corresponding increase in population density and taxing of infrastructure and resources is a decrease in quality of life for existing residents. This plan does not improve Post Falls’ small-town scale, charm, and aesthetic beauty. Overcrowding and overpopulating the city is not charming and not aesthetically pleasing. It is repulsive for anyone wanting a legitimate small-town feel. Open space and fewer homes are charming, aesthetically pleasing, and in keeping with the small-town scale. The physical size of the town doesn’t really matter if the population density diminishes the experience. It isn’t sustainable to continue to overpopulate and overcrowd the city if the goal is small-town scale, charm, and aesthetic beauty. Additional rooftops and housing units in this area will not add to the vibrancy of Post Falls. It would look like an out of place pocket of overcrowding in a sea of low-density housing. Street connectivity is good where it makes sense. However, adding 77 condos and all the associated vehicle and pedestrian traffic to a small residential road like Miss Hana Avenue does not improve the transportation network. It will increase traffic levels by a factor of more than 4. This will cause substantial congestion on the road and decrease safety. Increasing the traffic on Miss Hana Avenue by a factor of more than 4 will substantially decrease safety for the children in these neighborhoods and pedestrian traffic in general. Miss Hana Avenue doesn’t have any traffic control mechanisms. Without traffic control mechanisms and enforcement, I fail to see how adding 4 times more traffic to a small residential road is an improvement. The current lack of enforcement of traffic infractions on this stretch of Poleline Ave speaks to how incapable current services are of managing the inevitable massive increase in traffic. Also, what walkability does connecting this neighborhood to the existing Miss Hana Avenue accomplish? The end of the potential Miss Hana and the end of Ashraf Ct will terminate at Poleline Avenue with no corresponding pedestrian infrastructure on Poleline. Both sides of the potential Miss Hana and Ashraf Ct horseshoe terminate on property that is not part of the city. Unless you also implement a pedestrian crossing over Poleline at the potential Miss Hana end or on the Ashraf Ct end, then there is nowhere to walk to that amounts to continuous safe walkability. I walk along Ashraf Ct and cross over Poleline every day. It isn’t what I would call safe and the only alternative, walking along

Poleline with no pedestrian infrastructure, is far less so. Connecting the Berkshire neighborhood with this new development does not improve the pedestrian experience at all. This plan does not protect or maintain Post Falls natural resources. The math on this doesn't make any sense. The Black Stallion Ranch neighborhood alone is roughly the same physical size as this proposed annexation. There are 18 homes and 18 families in Black Stallion. How can multiplying the number of families on the same physical area using the same natural resources by more than 4 result in less taxation on our natural resources compared to less dense housing? There really isn't a single natural resource on the list in the presentation that is protected or maintained by adding a 77-condo development to this area. Light and noise pollution will increase substantially. Higher density development will tax the aquifer and river far more than lower density single family homes. More than 4 times more vehicles on the road will further pollute our air. Many of the goals and policies in the staff presentation discuss community needs. I have never spoken with a resident of Post Falls that approves of the current development trajectory. We the community do not want or need high density housing. We the community do not want or need more overcrowding in our neighborhood and city. I implore you to vote against annexing this development zoned as anything other than R-1... the same as all the surrounding neighborhoods.

Laura Schlenker (Post Falls) not wanting to speak: My main concerns are traffic and parking. Poleline is classified as a minor arterial and cannot handle the additional traffic if this is approved. The elementary school is just down the street on Clark Fork Parkway which is already inundated with many vehicles. If Hana is continued out to Poleline, there will be major traffic coming and going daily down our quiet street. The future land use map shows all the entire surrounding areas as low density residential. why approve to slam 77 townhomes/apartments right in the middle of all these homes. Please do not approve this request.

Jodi Chapple (Post Falls) not wanting to speak: When moving to Post Falls 21 years ago we enjoyed the small town and quiet town atmosphere. The past five years this has changed. Our quiet town and quiet streets have disappeared. Every area in this city now has apartments or duplexes or townhouses. Our street is not set up for additional traffic. Please do not allow this development to come into this area. I have grandkids that visit and won't be able to let them play in our neighborhood.

Angela Schlenker (Post Falls) not wanting to speak: RM with townhomes are not compatible with the surrounding areas, as all the surrounding areas are R1 & R1S. Poleline is designated as minor arterial and cannot handle all the traffic from 77 townhome lots & one commercial lot on less than 10 acres. Poleline also ends at a field at the west property line of said property & the elementary school just down the street.:

Scott Chapple (Post Falls) not wanting to speak: I keep wondering when the greed of this Council will slow down enough to seriously look at what you are allowing to happen to this community. We have enough apts. & high-density housing for the time being. Not to mention the roads are not set up for the traffic you are bringing. Our road is definitely not set up for this increase you seem to not care if you ruin every neighborhood in Post Falls just keep on making your money.

Harlan Schlenker (Post Falls) not wanting to speak: This proposed development does not meet criteria for consistency with future land use map and owner acknowledges that city has no duty to annex the property. All surrounding areas are designated R1S and R1 (even the current farmland). Poleline Ave. is classified by the city as minor arterial and cannot support more traffic. West Ridge Elementary is less than ¼ mile to the south and where Poleline Ave. ends at Clark Fork Pkwy it is 24' wide with no shoulder or sidewalk. This is not safe for anyone walking to or from school and this proposed development. Why would the city approve this complex having Miss Hana Ave. connected to this without requiring its own separate ingress and egress? Will these units be required to have fire sprinkler and fire alarm systems installed? When they propose up to 6 units connected there is a

definite risk involved. There are only 32 overflow parking stalls showing on the preliminary. Does the city really believe that is adequate to prevent excess parking on Poleline, Miss Hana and Ashraf Court? Where is the design for these units? Will they be equipped with 2 stall garages? What happened to our once quiet, light traffic prairie town? This development is better suited for Beck Road and West Pointe Parkway, with the other apartments! Because call it what they might, they will be rented out and the owners will be nowhere to be found. Please do not allow traffic to flow thru.

Dustin Gilmore (Post Falls) not wanting to speak: 77 townhomes in such a tight area with no additional infrastructure will make this unbelievably terrible. Getting to the main part of town is one road, Poleline. As a resident of Black Stallion Ranch traffic in the mornings east on Poleline and west towards West Ridge Elementary would be horrendous. This many units so close is a terrible idea. Strongly oppose this plan. Something with .25 to .5 acre lots would be more palatable.

Christina Gilmore (Post Falls) not wanting to speak: I strongly oppose adding any townhomes to such a small compact area. There is no room for that many vehicles and traffic will end up being awful, with only one way out towards town.

Manuela Armbruster (Post Falls) not wanting to speak: I live at 1480 w Broadwater Ct. in Post Falls. We purchased our property in 2013 and our decision to build on a one-acre parcel lot with the railroad tracks south of our back yard thinking if somebody would build south of us it would remain low density and R1 housing like it has been all around us and to this day still is. The proposed RM development with close to 80 townhouses on 9.63 acres and 15 of them along the fence line would mean directly south, east, and west of our backyard a wall with houses and concrete which means our privacy would be totally gone!!!! don't think the proposed development fit the Post Falls growth plan at all, especially for this area. Poleline Ave. is already overcrowded and a mess day and night. I don't even want to imagine how bad it will be moving forward with this development. The infrastructure cannot handle these many more vehicles. There is also a concern with the value of the residential property surrounding the development dropping dramatically. The "small town" feel as well as the aesthetic beauty of this area will be destroyed. While the local community may not be able to prevent developments and growth, which would be detrimental to the area in and of itself. Nearly all residents in the neighborhood are opposed to the addition of townhouses. The proposed development is completely out of proportion for this neighborhood. It will change the character of the area completely. I hope they took into consideration that there is a 50ft. right away for the gas line company, if they have it will be even less than 9.65 acres, they have available to build. It is the community that will be left to deal with the results of their decision, while the developers and land sellers pocket the profit and leave us with the mess they created out of greed. Why won't they consider continuing what has been started with the subdivisions like Meadows, Prairie Meadows, Black Stallion, Montrose, and Berkshire which are upper scale single family homes and all zoned R1 & R1S. Why putting an eyesore like the 75++ townhouses pressed on 9.65 acres in the middle of R1 zoned developments? This is just about money for them and nothing else!!!! They don't have to pretend they are doing something good for the community and for the people who can't afford buying a house...laughable! The decision made by the zoning and building commission to approve the proposed RM development was frustrating and shocking to most of us living in the neighborhood. We are devastated and I'm asking the Post Falls City Council to take in account the concerns of the residents around the proposed RM development. Please do not empower these developers to destroy our and our children's lifestyle which we have worked so hard to accomplish. We are all counting on you "our city council" that you will see through this unbelievable proposal and that you will keep your promises you made tot eh residents of Post Falls when you were running on "slow growth Post Falls". I also urge you to encourage these developers to rethink their plans for something more suitable for this area.

Helen Long (Post Falls) not wanting to speak: We bought our home because of the nice quiet neighborhood. Had we known there was any possibility of townhomes, condos or apartment buildings going up we would have looked elsewhere!

Marvin Long (Post Falls) not wanting to speak

Matt Forman and Tori Lennox (Post Falls) not wanting to speak: We are strongly opposed to the annexation project. We feel that adding 77 townhomes plus commercial space is not right for our community. This project will drastically impact traffic in our quiet community. And it does not fit with the surrounding single family residential homes. We would have 10+ townhomes immediately over our fence. We do not believe this project should proceed. It would negatively impact traffic and degrade the surrounding community. This is not the right development for this small area.

Kenny Johnson (Post Falls): I have lived in Post Falls for 57 years. It was a fine place to live. We raised our kids here. The last 2+ years it has been construction town up roads all over town. Most people complain about traffic and crime. I expect new homes and some businesses to start. All the apartments all over town any way you look. Do we need that many? It's all about money and the city council.

Willi Spiclea (Post Falls): I am not so opposed to the development of the land but what they want to put up there 77 townhomes. I think this will create a major traffic increase on Poleline and Grange. Parking will be a problem. Most families have at least two vehicles if not more with a potential of overflow. I think single family homes would fit better. Townhomes would fit better on the other side of town by Cabels.

Lynn Collett (Post Falls): We have called Post Falls our home for 6 years. We are opposed because of the traffic. Traffic is already lining up at the stop signs. This development would impact the Black Stallion area with the traffic going through there. This would also affect the home values in the area with an affordable income project of this size. I am also concern with safety with the Yellowstone gas line running along the front of the development. Townhomes are not an appropriate fit for this area.

Gary Alvaraclo (Post Falls): I was at the Planning & Zoning Commission and remember the chairman saying not a lot of facts, but emotion was coming out. I have asked what it means when they say affordable housing. What is the price point. Growth is invadable. I have been in Idaho since 1969. Development has to be sensible and aesthetically pleasing. Why would you put townhomes in the middle of single-family homes? (Showed a video of Clark Fork Parkway and the traffic and parking in the road). Please vote no.

Cinda Widman (Post Falls): These affordable townhouses will become like a trailer ct. in the surrounding neighborhoods. There are other correctly zoned properties for 70+ townhouses. I strongly oppose this annexation.

Samantha Steigleder (Post Falls): the annexation seems reasonable. The zoning is where I have an issue. The central Prairie Focus Area say that commercial and high density should be along Prairie. I do not think the RM fits. They are not bringing much to the community. I do not think they met any of the zoning goals. There is nothing demonstrating that RM or annexation would support identified needs other than vague language of "housing". Any annexation and increase in density will use more resources and increase light, noise and very potentially pollution (cars). The crosswalks on Chase are not lighted.

Doug Williams (Post Falls): I am opposed to this. This concertation of housing is not justified. This plan is anything but safe. The zoning is not consistent with the surrounding zoning. This does not meet your criteria. 8 units per acre is not low density.

Ava Doman (Post Falls): there are over 15,000 parcels in Post Falls almost 1,500 are bear acre, do we really need to annex this land. For a business to sustain itself it needs to bring in about \$1000 in revenue a day. a cup of coffee is about \$4 so that's about 250 people a day coming into that coffee

shop to keep it going. Multiply that by 4 or 5 more businesses. The crosswalks between Chase and Poleline are not there. Coming from the north on Chase there are no sidewalks. This project does not fit.

Kevin O'Neill (Post Falls): An RM zoning clearly violates the City's Comprehensive Plan. This area has been designated as R-1 on the Future Land Use Map. We used this map when buying our home. The neighborhoods in this area are some of the most sought-after neighborhoods in the city. There are better areas for this type of development in the city. This is not in keeping with the small-town charm in the City Comp Plan. The new Council member ran on platforms of keeping the small-town feel. Please vote for your constituents.

Jean O'Neill (Post Falls): regarding traffic, at the Planning meeting the projections that were used were done in 2014. I question the accuracy of those numbers. There needs to be a bridge to connect Poleline to McGuire and would be quite a burden to the taxpayers. The traffic on Grange is a lot. The issue of privacy is a great concern to me. we value our privacy. To hear that it is townhouses with a restriction of 35' looking down into by backyard is concerning.

Tyler Mort (Post Falls): I think the consonance is if this was R1 the meeting would be a lot shorter. It is scary to think we would put that many units off of Poleline right where it dead ends. It would be poor planning. With the amount of improvements that would need to be done to Poleline then the infrastructure inside the project, how affordable would this really be? If it is affordable investors will line up with cash, then it turns into rentals. It is poor timing. The knuckle at Miss Hana looks like it is set up to transition to larger lots.

Rebuttal

Brett Hargrave: per the Comp Plan R1 zoning would be up to 8 units per acre which this project is right at. The RM is designed for low density areas to service those areas and the commercial that would go in there is very limited. These are not apartments or condos but townhomes where you own them and the land underneath them. Traffic can be very subjective. Even through 2035 Poleline would only be at 30% capacity. The Yellowstone pipeline has a substantial easement that allow no building in it which we would not be doing. We are presenting what we believe is the best option for the city.

Ziegler: with the 30% capacity on Poleline in 2035, is there a number we can go off that?

Palus: 2025 – 1,700 in peak hours. 2035 – based on Poleline being a three-lane roadway, traffic volume would be at about 2,900/hour.

Public Hearing closed at 7:54 pm.

Discussion

Mayor: Do we want to annex this property?

Thoreson: Yes, I absolutely agree.

Walker: Infill yes

Malloy: Yes

Ziegler: Agree

Borders: Agree

Shove: Agree

Zoning Criteria

1. Amendments to the zoning map should be in accordance with the Future Land Use Map.

Malloy: there are some things for me that don't line up with the RM zone. Commercial property is to be situated along roads with higher classification of over 4,000. Even with KMPO projection estimate in the future it will still be below that threshold. The Comp Plan states over and over again the high density should be near high dense commercial. This is about as far away from that you can find.

Ziegler: I agree. We are focusing our commercial development on Prairie and not Poleline.

Thoreson: I agree.

Shove: I agree.

Wilson: Is there another zoning designation that would make more sense?

Motion by Thoreson to deny the Hargrave-Hathaway Annexation File No. ANNX-22-8 with the RM zoning designation.

Second by Malloy.

Vote: Walker-Aye, Borders-Aye, Shove-Aye, Thoreson-Aye, Ziegler-Aye, Malloy-Aye

Motion Carried

Motion by Malloy to approve the Hargrave-Hathaway Annexation File No. ANNX-22-8 with the assigned zone designation of R-1.

Second by Ziegler.

Shove: I am hesitant to do this. if we approve it then we would not see the development and it would go only to Planning and Zoning.

Zoning Criteria

1. Amendments to the zoning map should be in accordance with the Future Land Use Map.

Malloy: It fits the density criteria and fits the zoning around it.

2. Amendments to the zoning map should be consistent with the goals and policies found in the Comprehensive Plan.

Malloy: It would improve transportation networks and pedestrian connectivity.

Ziegler: Small town charm and beauty.

3. Zoning is assigned following consideration of such items as street classifications, traffic patterns, existing development, future land uses, community plans, and geographic or natural features.

Ziegler: blends with existing zoning.

Malloy: existing traffic patterns.

4. Commercial and high-density residential zoning is typically assigned along streets with a higher road classification.

Not applicable.

5. Limited or neighborhood commercial and lower density residential zoning is typically assigned for properties as they proceed farther away from the higher intensity urban activity.

Malloy: it is far from high density .

6. Industrial zoning is typically assigned for properties with sufficient access to major transportation routes and may be situated away from residential zoning.

Not Applicable.

**Vote: Walker-Aye, Borders-Aye, Shove-Aye, Thoreson-Aye, Ziegler-Aye, Malloy-Aye
Motion Carried**

3. UNFINISHED BUSINESS/RETURNING ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS

This section of the agenda is to continue consideration of items that have been previously discussed by the City Council and to formally adopt ordinances and resolutions that were previously approved by the Council. Ordinances and resolutions are formal measures considered by the City Council to implement policy which the Council has considered. Resolutions govern internal matters to establish fees and charges pursuant to existing ordinances. Ordinances are laws which govern general public conduct. Certain procedures must be followed in the adoption of both ordinances and resolutions; state law often establishes those requirements.

ACTION ITEMS:

- a. Ponderosa Lift Station Replacement – Change Order to Extend the Project Schedule and Increase to Contract Value

Andrew Arbini, Utilities Project Manager presenting: Strider Construction was awarded the Ponderosa Lift Station Rehabilitation project in May of 2022 with a planned completion on January 3, 2023. Prior to award, our design team recommended, and the city provided an extended construction period to accommodate long-lead items. However, over the summer, it was identified that the procurement of the backup generator and motor control centers would take several months longer than originally expected. The delay in gear prevents Strider from completing the work on time. Over the summer, strider filed a placeholder claim for additional time while the city and project team gathered information to understand the impacts of the delay and the revised delivery dates. In lieu of simply extending the contract, staff negotiated a project shutdown to account for the availability of the electrical gear and equipment. This negotiated shutdown will allow for the delivery of long-lead electrical equipment and a more efficient use of project resources to complete the remaining work next spring and summer. The negotiated extension will add 108 days and increase the contract value by \$10K. the revised project completion date will be August 22, 2023. Prior to the schedule extension discussions, the project has included one notable change, requiring upsizing of a manhole. Impact to the contract day for the upsizing were unknown at that time; however, the overall project extension accounts for this change and this item is included in the change order. The cost of this change is an increase in the amount of \$2,500. The combined value of these change orders represent utilization of 44% of the authorized project contingency of \$281,415. This is presented to City Council due to the dollar figure associated with the change order and does not require an adjustment to the already authorized contingency.

Motion by Malloy to approve the Ponderosa Lift Station Replacement Change Order to Extend the Project Schedule and Increase to Contract Value.

Second by Borders.

Vote: Borders-Aye, Shove-Aye, Thoreson-Aye, Ziegler-Aye, Malloy-Aye, Walker-Aye

Motion Carried

b. Ordinance – Mongeau Meadows Annexation

Motion by Thoreson to approve Ordinance – Mongeau Meadow Annexation on its first and only reading by title only while under suspension of the rules.

Second by Malloy.

Vote: Shove-Aye, Thoreson-Aye, Ziegler-Aye, Malloy-Aye, Walker-Aye, Borders-Aye

Motion Carried

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF POST FALLS, A MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF THE STATE OF IDAHO ANNEXING PROPERTY CONSISTING OF APPROXIMATELY 3.91 ACRES, WITH A PORTION OF LAND LOCATED IN THE SOUTHWEST ¼ OF SECTION 35, TOWNSHIP 51 NORTH, RANGE 5 WEST, BOISE MERIDIAN, KOOTENAI COUNTY, IDAHO; PROVIDING FOR AMENDMENT OF THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE HEREOF

Motion by Thoreson to approve Mongeau Meadows Annexation and to direct the clerk to assign the appropriate number and that it be published by summary only.

Second by Malloy.

Vote: Shove-Aye, Thoreson-Aye, Ziegler-Aye, Malloy-Aye, Walker-Aye, Borders-Aye

Motion Carried

4. NEW BUSINESS

This portion of the agenda is for City Council consideration of items that have not been previously discussed by the Council. Ordinances and Resolutions are generally added to a subsequent agenda for adoption under Unfinished Business, however, the Council may consider adoption of an ordinance or resolution under New Business if timely approval is necessary.

ACTION ITEMS:

a. Belt Filter Press Rehabilitation Project

Craig Borrenpohl, Utilities Manager presenting: The Water Reclamation Facility proposes to rehabilitate an existing Andritz belt filter press, that was originally purchased in 2011, as part of a larger WRF Plant solids dewatering and storage improvements effort. Biosolids are generated as part of the wastewater treatment process. Biosolids generation will increase with the start of tertiary treatment increasing demands on existing equipment. A company representative from Andritz evaluated the existing belt press and provided quotes for parts and labor and their recommendation for needed work on the aging unit. \$70,552.10 was quoted for parts and \$23,932.00 was quoted for labor for a total of \$94,484.10 and would be funded out of the Solids Dewatering and Storage line fund.

Motion by Malloy to approve the Belt Filter Press Rehabilitation Project.

Second by Borders.

Vote: Thoreson-Aye, Ziegler-Aye, Malloy-Aye, Walker-Aye, Borders-Aye, Shove-Aye

Motion Carried

5. CITIZEN ISSUES

This section of the agenda is reserved for citizens wishing to address the Council regarding City-related issues that are not on the agenda. Persons wishing to speak will have 5 minutes. Comments related to pending public hearings, including decisions that may be appealed to the City Council, are out of order and should be held for the public hearing. Repeated comments regarding the same or similar topics previously addressed are out of order and will not be allowed. Comments regarding performance by city employees are inappropriate at this time and should be directed to the Mayor, either by subsequent appointment or after tonight's meeting, if time permits. In order to ensure adequate public notice, Idaho Law provides that any item, other than emergencies, requiring Council action must be placed on the agenda of an upcoming Council meeting. As such, the City Council can't take action on items raised during citizens issues at the same meeting but may request additional information or that the item be placed on a future agenda.

Michael Burgess, Kootenai Classical Academy: To keep with their timeline to open the school they are asking for a speed up in the building approval process.

David Russell (Post Falls): Concern to what he sees as an over kill of Police presence on an arrest of a drug dealer where 18 officers showed up.

This issue started on Sunday night with the individual barricading himself into a very small crawlspace and we had no idea if he was armed. We take this very seriously and the activation of SWAT very serious. In the last year we activated SWAT 3 times. SWAT is 11 members so 18 officers showing up is not unheard of

6. ADMINISTRATIVE / STAFF REPORTS

This portion of the agenda is for City staff members to provide reports and updates to the Mayor and City Council regarding City business as well as responses to public comments. These items are for information only and no final action will be taken.

None

7. MAYOR AND COUNCIL COMMENTS

This section of the agenda is provided to allow the Mayor and City Councilors to make announcements and general comments relevant to City business and to request that items be added to future agendas for discussion. No final action or in-depth discussion of issues will occur.


8. EXECUTIVE SESSION

Certain City-related matters may need to be discussed confidentially subject to applicable legal requirements; the Council may enter executive session to discuss such matters. The motion to enter into executive session must reference the specific statutory section that authorizes the executive session. No final decision or action may be taken in executive session.

ACTION ITEM (To enter into executive session only):

None

ADJOURNMENT 8:34 PM



Ronald G. Jacobson, Mayor



Shannon Howard, City Clerk

Questions concerning items appearing on this Agenda or requests for accommodation of special needs to participate in the meeting should be addressed to the Office of the City Clerk, 408 Spokane Street or call 208-



773-3511. City Council and City commission meetings are broadcast live on Post Falls City Cable on cable channel 1300 (formerly 97.103) as well as the City's YouTube Channel (<https://www.youtube.com/c/CityofPostFallsIdaho>).

Mayor Ronald G. Jacobson

Councilors: Kerri Thoreson, Josh Walker, Joe Malloy, Nathan Ziegler, Lynn Borders, Kenny Shove

Mission

The City of Post Falls mission is to provide leadership, support common community values, promote citizen involvement and provide services which ensure a superior quality of life.

Vision

Post Falls, Idaho is a vibrant city with a balance of community and economic vitality that is distinguished by its engaged citizens, diverse businesses, progressive leaders, responsible management of fiscal and environmental resources, superior service, and a full range of opportunities for education and healthy lifestyles.

"Where opportunities flow, and community is a way of life"