

**City of Bellevue
Planning & Zoning Commission
9/21/20
ZOOM Online meeting**

Kurtz called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m. Commissioners present were Ray McCollum, John Kurtz, Paul Hopfenbeck, Robert Wiesen and Alexis Lindberg. Staff present was Diane Shay, Community Development Director and Ashley Dyer, Land Use Planner.

Notice and Hearing Compliance:

Legal notice for this meeting was posted in accordance with Idaho Code 67-2343 by the following:

1. The agenda was posted at the Bellevue Post Office, the bulletin board outside City Hall and on the City website on September 16, 2020.
2. The legal was published in the Idaho Mountain Express on September 2, 2020.

McCollum made a motion that the notice was done in compliance with 67-2343, Wiesen seconded, and the vote was unanimous.

New Business:

The action item on the agenda today is a City initiated Text Amendment to Title 10 Chapter 6; 10-6-25 of the Bellevue City Code. The amendment will create a new Residential High-Density Zoning District (RH) allowing for more diverse multi-family housing options and smaller single-family size lots.

Kurtz turned the meeting over to Shay for an overview of the proposed Text Amendment.

Shay explained that our Comp Plan amendment and the ACI negotiations both support multi-density housing and smaller lot sizes. Through negotiations, Bellevue said they would modify their current zoning code to allow smaller lot sizes, in the hopes that when we acquire some land through future annexations, we will be able to create this zone. This is really a place holder at this point because we don't currently have land to put this type of residential zoning in. Tonight, really is more of a work session on this more than anything. I would really like to get public comment on the creation of these smaller lot sizes and more flexible multi-family opportunities. This is truly a starting point.

Lindberg asked if this amendment will only apply to new development areas? Are there no current lots that can be subdivided to create these smaller lots?

Shay answered that yes, there are probably a few infill lots out there, but that would make us spot zone and that is not generally a great planning principal. Looking at the zoning map there

isn't much in inventory that we would be able to use for this zone. In saying that, we do however have several 6,000 square foot lots that are still out there that are undeveloped that can be subdivided for multi family use. Our current restriction on duplex's on 6,000 square foot lots is that you have to be associated with ARCH or Habitat for Humanity, and it's not available for just anybody. There are plenty of other people that have wanted to duplex a lot, but haven't been able to because of that restriction, so I would like to remove that restriction.

We are creating a new zoning district once we get some land area to do that. Our current minimum lot size is 6,000 square feet and I know when I talked with Wiesen he had mentioned that this is something he went to school for and is very happy to see the city doing this. I've been toying with several different size lots and the number I landed on is 4500 it's up for discussion. There isn't anything that is a perfect 4500 square foot lot, it's either over or under. You could configure a 4500 square lot by a perfect square of 67 on all four sides or 53x83, and those are approximating, it's closer to our normal lot size. It's again a starting point.

Shay continued to review the standards for the RH district Text Amendment – including the minimum dwelling sizes which shall be no less than 600 square feet, and parking requirements of 2 off-street parking spaces per unit. Shay said after talking with another planner and learning that their code allows for 1 parking space if it's under 1000 square feet, that she agreed with their code. She went over accessory uses as well as conditional uses which are the same as the GR district. Zoning Districts are working like this when they are placed close to public amenities.

Kurtz asked about this single-family code could be applied in the Strahorn annexation or only to future annexations.

Shay stated that because Strahorn annexed into the city with a development agreement, they have somewhat of a plan, and I don't believe there is a plan or will be one, to develop the property differently than what's in the agreement.

Kurtz asked that once we get new land annexed into the city, who is responsible for setting the lot sizes and zoning?

Shay answered that the minimum lot size that we currently have of 6000 square feet applies to all development and already set in ordinance. It's completely up to the developer on how they want to break up their property. They're restricted to the minimums. There are subdivision standards in place for subdividing properties, an example is Strahorn.

Lindberg asked staff if we currently regulate short term rentals in Bellevue. Shay stated we do not.

Lindberg stated that after briefly reviewing the large document that was sent about diversifying housing types, I pulled from the executive summary that not only should communities be committed to the financial aspect but also interest in good design and investing in communities. I feel like what I think might be missing from this is if we want to develop

standards like architectural design, color scheme, not cookie cutter necessarily but something that Bellevue doesn't already have and if we have a solid standard of what we are looking for them it might be really appealing. I think attracting people to Bellevue is valuable and doing so by regulating more what is being built.

Shay mentioned the sent housing document and the mentioned provisions- garden areas, front porches or something inviting and pleasing that would be required and could see CCR's regulating those standards since we don't do design reviews on single-family homes.

Lindberg asked if anyone else feels like we shouldn't consider adding this for the specific zoning district.

Shay stated that she couldn't imagine having to regulate all single-family homes by a design review process because of the time it would take.

Lindberg said she thought having clear standards for builders to follow that isn't this strict approval process because this would be so much more cut and dry. Not so objective.

Shay stated she doesn't expect this to go anywhere but back to the board for more work tonight, but I think that is something you should consider when you deliberate.

Shay said this could initiate an amendment to the subdivision standards to include some sort of check list to be built into them. Definitely a place for that to live if the commission likes.

Wiesen agreed that Architectural standards would be the proper language for that. I think for Bellevue it will be more of an architectural standard rather than a CC&R. That way when a designer come into Bellevue looking at the multi-use rules and regulations they understand what the standards are and what is expected. The only problem I see is we will end up with very cookie cutter homes like Woodside.

Lindberg stated that North 3rd has similar homes but it's adorable, it's just how it's done and I don't think parameters are a bad thing. Wiesen agreed. Wiesen said you have to have some, there are a lot that have very strict guidelines that they have to follow and that are becomes similar and unique.

MCollum said he kindof like the idea of the check list/ cookie cutter idea, I like my house but what makes it unique that it's one block of the same house design, not a whole subdivision, so it makes me a little apprehensive.

Shay said she'd continue working on the single-family home section.

Shay said in the multi-family piece we talk about duplex units being allowed on a 6000 square foot lot, which is already in our code, but I removed the restriction that it has to be done by ARCH or Habitat for Humanity. Density for multi housing I thought might be more of a flexible design component to do as many units as you want to, but you have to meet all requirements;

parking, open space, snow storage and landscaping. All multi family pieces would go through design review which prompts an amendment to the design review guidelines. There cannot be a house and an ADU on the smaller lots. There is one piece I didn't include because it wasn't ready, but I'll have it ready for the next meeting. The Cottage development concept is something that is becoming more desirable and something that is very popular and something I would like to incorporate into this if the commission agrees. A little cluster of homes with a common open space and exterior parking.

McCollum agreed with the aspect of the shared courtyard in multi-family and really likes it.

Wiesen said the standards could be looked at closer but this is something that is desperately needed. No young adults can afford to buy a home here. Bellevue needs something like this in order to grow. Bellevue needs affordable housing.

Hopfenbeck asked about being cautious when moving use out of the downtown core, wouldn't this kind of housing be done through a PUD? And if it was, wouldn't we be able to help determine the development?

Shay said that she would need to think about it a bit.

Hopfenbeck asked if we have defined where this district would be? Would it be Eckles?

Shay said no, right now we don't have a designated space for this new zone.

Shay said the zoning map would be amended to add that new district once we acquire the land needed for it. This amendment would create this new zone, somewhere that would be able to handle this density. It's kind of a place holder.

Kurtz said this would then give the developer some guidelines to be able to provide these types of housing for different opportunities. This gives them guidance instead of them creating it, to get out in front and to drive the ship instead of someone else driving.

Lindberg said she would like to come up with more specific design perimeters for the whole HR zone, including carports etc.

Kurtz opened the meeting to public comment, there was none.

Shay read a public comment from Mark Reineman, who represents a possible future applicant. He is concerned about requiring too much parking for the 600 square foot lots, which we already agreed that 1 parking space would be more appropriate.

Kurtz closed public comment.

Kurtz said this is a great starting point and is curious how to move forward with new design standards to consider as a group. What is the best way to do this without prolonging it too long.

Shay said she thinks we need to rework the design and street standards guidelines which Frank is already working on. If anyone has something to add please let us know and we can keep working on this document which is what I anticipated would be the result of tonight's meeting. We can start incorporating things into the document and revisit it sometime in late November to bring this back around.

Hopfenbeck made a motion to table this meeting to a future date, McCollum seconded, and the vote was unanimous.

Hopfenbeck made a motion to approve the minutes from August 17, 2020, McCollum seconded, and the vote was unanimous.

All Commissioners are available for the proposed meeting date of October 5, 2020.

McCollum made a motion to adjourn the meeting, Hopfenbeck seconded, and the vote was unanimous.

Approved this 16th day of November, 2020



John Kurtz, Chair



Diane Shay, Director