



May 1, 2025

**VIA EMAIL**

Aaron Qualls, AICP  
SCJ Alliance  
aaron.qualls@scjalliance.com

Re: Sandpoint City Council Decision on Application PPUD24-0002 – Ridley Village Court

Dear Mr. Qualls:

The Sandpoint City Council, following the public hearing held April 16, 2025, voted to approve City Application #PPUD24-0002 – Ridley Village Court Planned Unit Development (PUD) Preliminary Development Plan. This letter serves as notification of the Council's decision, which is based upon consideration of:

- the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission
- written and verbal evidence and testimony contained in the public record
- the criteria and relevant standards of Idaho Code and Sandpoint City Code

This approval is subject to the conditions outlined in the staff report as presented and reviewed during the hearing and modified by Council, a copy of which is provided with this letter, along with the meeting minutes reflecting the public hearing and Council's decision. Further, it should be noted that this approval is solely for the Preliminary Development Plan.

Sincerely,

Deborah Ruehle  
Sandpoint City Council President

c: Sandpoint Mayor and City Council  
Sandpoint Planning and Zoning Commission  
Jason Welker, Community Planning and Development Director  
Bill Dean, City Planner  
Fonda Jovick, City Attorney

Attachments:

- City Council minutes from April 16, 2025, meeting/public hearing
- Staff report and conditions of approval for PPUD24-0002



## AGENDA REPORT

### City Council Meeting

---

**TODAY'S DATE:** April 7<sup>th</sup>, 2025

**MEETING DATE:** April 16<sup>th</sup>, 2025

**TO:** Mayor Grimm, and members of the City of Sandpoint City Council

**FROM:** Bill Dean, City Planner, Brandon Staglund, City Engineer, and Jason Welker, Planning & Community Development Director

**SUBJECT:** PPUD24-0002: Ridley Village Court Planned Unit Development Preliminary Development Plan

### I. Executive Summary

The request before the City Council relates to residential development of an approximately 5-acre property at the western terminus of Autumn Lane and River Rock Rd, west of the existing Maplewood Village Planned Unit Development. The property is Zoned as Residential Multifamily. The property owner and her developer representative are seeking to utilize the Planned Unit Development (PUD) Permit process as a means to introduce a development pattern otherwise not accounted for in the City's zoning regulations.

Due to the creativity and flexibility involved in creating a PUD, the City's ordinance establishes a high threshold and lengthy process prior to permitting land to be subdivided for development. It is through this process of review that the concept for development is adjusted as necessary by the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council prior to approving subdivisions and building permits.

Inherent in the PUD process is evaluating the public benefits the development represents against the waivers and flexibility from City zoning standards. The developer received a recommendation for approval from the Planning and Zoning Commission, but that recommendation included several major conditions of approval for the City Council to consider. The conditions of approval affect the layout of the project, access, as well as building location/setbacks. City Council is requested to evaluate the application, and Planning and Zoning Commission's recommendations/conditions of approval and to take action on the project. Action on a PUD is a multi-step process; the step before the City Council is called the Preliminary Development Plan (PDP), which if approved would then allow a Final Development Plan (FDP) to proceed, which could be processed and evaluated at the same time as a subdivision. Generally, a FDP involves minor refinements to the development concept identified in a PDP. Tonight's step is action on the Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) for the Ridley Village Court PUD.

### II. Planning and Zoning Commission Action

Attached to the staff report is the report and analysis of the project provided to the Planning and Zoning Commission (Attachment A: Staff Report to the Planning and Zoning Commission). Attachment B to the staff report is the Report of Actions on the PDP, including the recommended conditions of approval from the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Leading up to the public hearing on March 4<sup>th</sup>, and including testimony at the hearing, the City received numerous comments on the project from nearby property owners and neighbors of the Maplewood Village neighborhood (also developed as a PUD in the early 2000s). The attachments to the original staff report summarize the public comment, and the report includes all written comments leading into the hearing on March 4<sup>th</sup>.

The Conditions of Approval recommended by the Planning and Zoning Commission are as follows:

1. Revise development plan to show extension of both River Rock Road and Autumn Lane between Madison Avenue and Ridley Village Road, including water and sewer main extensions within the entire public right of way.
2. Revise the development plan to show all water and sewer main extensions either within a public right of way, or within an adequately sized public utility easement (20 feet for single pipe, 30 feet for two pipes in parallel), and all water and sewer mains located at least 10 feet from any proposed building.
3. Driveway for the townhouse units at the southeast corner of River Rock and Ridley Village, as shown on the submitted improvement plans, shall be located at least 35 feet from the proposed curb line along Ridley Village Road, pursuant to Sandpoint City Code 10-1-6-F.
4. Streetlights shall be installed at two intersections: Ridley Village / Autumn Lane, Ridley Village / River Rock Road.
5. The open space should be relocated to the eastern property to enable the 25-foot setback to remain and to create a buffer between the proposed development and Maplewood neighborhood (including along Madison Avenue and Cattail Court).
6. Require the installation of an adequate fence along Autumn Lane on the north boundary of the Forrest Bird Charter School property.
7. Require the applicant to coordinate with City staff to implement traffic calming measures for traffic flow through adjacent neighborhoods.

### III. Developer/Property Owner Re-Submittal

In response to the recommendations from the Planning Commission, the City received revised PDP documents on March 19, 2025. Attached to the staff report is the developer/property owner response to the Conditions of Approval recommended by the Planning and Zoning Commission (Attachment C: Developer’s memo to City Council entitled: Revised Alternative Exhibits Memo). The developer has re-worked the PDP to address a number of the Conditions of Approval, as follows:

<b><i>P&amp;Z Commission Condition of Approval (COA)</i></b>	<b><i>Design Feature Addressed by the COA</i></b>	<b><i>Developer Response</i></b>
1	Both River Rock Rd and Autumn Lane to be extended through development	Disagrees with the COA, Only River Rock Rd to be extended
2	Water and Sewer mains to be in adequately sized ROW or Easement, and located at least 10 ft from any building	Agrees with the COA

3	Relocate driveway River Rock and Ridley Village to be at least 35 ft from curb of Ridley Village Rd	Agrees with the COA
4	Streetlights to be installed at streets intersecting with Ridley Village Rd	Agrees with the COA
5	Relocate open space to eastern edge of the development and maintain the 25' setback between the development and Maplewood neighborhood, including along S. Madison Ave and Cattail Ct.	Developer provides 25' setback from S. Madison Ave, but identifies reasons why they believe it to be an inferior solution. Developer disagrees with 25 ft setback along homes of Cattail Ct, and offers a 15 ft setback and the corner lot to have 1 ½ stories of max height.
6	Install fence along northern property line abutting the Forest Bird Charter School	Agrees with COA
7	Developer to coordinate and implement traffic calming measures in Maplewood neighborhood	Agrees with COA

Attachment D to the staff report is the original PDP. Attachments E and F to the staff report are the revised PDP (Preliminary Improvement Plan and Landscape Plan), which includes modifications to the original project in response to the Planning and Zoning Commission conditions of approval. As noted, the majority of the conditions have been incorporated with the exception of extending Autumn Lane to create additional connectivity for this area of the City.

One detail that staff is highlighting for the record relates to the fact that the stormwater pipes and city sewer mains are shown in the revised PDP with an approximate 3-foot horizontal separation from center of pipe to center of pipe. Normally, such details would not be highlighted at the stage of reviewing a PDP. However, there are limited options in the proposed layout to convey stormwater and sewer in accordance with City standards, which can have a significant effect on the overall project design. This detail is highlighted to suggest additional engineering work is required.

#### IV. City Council Options

Following public testimony and subsequent deliberations, the City Council may take one of the following actions on the request for Preliminary Development Plan approval in accordance with Sandpoint City Code 10-3-10 E. The developer has requested of staff that both proposals, the original and the modified PDPs be available for City Council consideration.

The Council shall make findings of fact regarding the PDP. As this time the application is for a Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) only; subsequent applications would include a Final Development Plan (FDP) and a Preliminary Subdivision Plat, both of which require distinct findings of fact.

In addition to findings of fact that support any motion, the Council must conclude that the application as submitted complies with the applicable law cited within the report (original staff report), specifically:

1. This proposal was processed consistent with Sandpoint City Code §9-9-5: for hearing procedures.
2. The Planned Unit Development process is being conducted in a manner consistent with Idaho Code §67-6509.
3. The proposed PDP has been reviewed for consistency with the provisions of the Sandpoint Comprehensive Plan and the applicable sections of Titles 9 and 10 of the Sandpoint City Code.

In taking action, all timely received written comments and oral testimony were considered as required by Sandpoint City Code §9-9-5

**Option 1:** Make a motion to **approve or deny** by determining whether or not:

- a. The plan is consistent with the intent and purpose of Title 10 Chapter 3; and
- b. The proposed development advances the general welfare of the community and neighborhood; and
- c. The benefits, combination of various land uses and the interrelationship with the land uses in the surrounding area justify the deviation from standard district regulations.

In addition, the Council must consider the general standards criteria applicable to Conditional Use Permits; in its action the Council would be determining whether or not the PDP:

1. Will, in fact, constitute a conditional use as established on the official schedule of regulations for the zoning district involved.
2. Will be harmonious with and in accordance with the general objectives, or with any specific objective of the comprehensive plan and/or applicable sections of the Sandpoint Code.
3. Will be designed, constructed, operated and maintained to be harmonious and appropriate with the existing or intended character of the general vicinity and that such use will not change the essential character of the same area.
4. Will not be hazardous or disturbing to existing neighboring uses.
5. Will be served adequately by essential public services and utilities such as highways, streets, police and fire protection, drainage systems, refuse disposal, water and sewer, and schools; or that the persons or agencies responsible for the establishment of the proposed use shall be able to provide adequately any such service or utility.
6. Will not create excessive additional requirements at public cost for public services and utilities and will not be detrimental to the economic welfare of the community.
7. Will not involve uses, activities, processes, materials, equipment and conditions of operation that will be detrimental to any persons, property or the general welfare by reasons of traffic, noise, smoke, fumes, glare or odors.
8. Will have vehicular approaches to the property which shall be designed so as not to create an interference with traffic on surrounding public roads.
9. Will not result in the destruction, loss or damage of a natural, scenic or historic feature of major importance

If the action is to approve, such approval is "in principal" only and shall not be construed to endorse a precise location of uses, configuration or parcels or engineering feasibility. In taking this action, if for approval, the City Council can articulate one of the following:

**Option 1a)** Approve either the original or revised PDP as presented;

**Option 1b)** Follow the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission and approve the original PDP with the conditions of approval as recommended by the Planning and Zoning Commission;

**Option 1c)** Approve either PDP with some and/or new conditions of approval.

**Option 2: Postpone consideration** of the applications to consult with staff prior to making a decision, within forty (40) days after the public hearing.

## V. Next Steps

Should the PDP be approved, the developer has the option to return with a Final Development Plan (FDP) and a Preliminary Plat for hearings before both the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council prior to commencing construction with Improvement Plans for infrastructure and building permits.

## XI. Packet Materials

The full packet, including all application materials, a primer on PUDs from the American Planning Association, and noticing documents including public comments received, are available on the [project page](https://www.sandpointidaho.gov/community-planning-development/page/ridley-village-court) on the City's website (<https://www.sandpointidaho.gov/community-planning-development/page/ridley-village-court>)

- A. Original staff report prepared for the Planning and Zoning Commission
- B. Planning and Zoning Commission Report of Actions
- C. Developer's memo to City Council entitled: Revised Alternative Exhibits Memo
- D. Original Application, Narrative and Submittal Documents, Agency Comments Received, Public Comments Received, Conceptual Elevations
- E. Revised Alternative Preliminary Improvement Plan
- F. Revised Alternative Preliminary Landscape Plan
- G. PUD Primer from American Planning Association





## CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

April 16, 2025 at 5:30 PM

Council Chambers at City Hall - 1123 W. Lake St. Sandpoint, Idaho

---

### Call to Order

Mayor Jeremy Grimm called the regular meeting of the Sandpoint City Council to order at 5:30 p.m. on Wednesday, April 16, 2025, in Council chambers at City Hall, 1123 W. Lake St., Sandpoint, Idaho.

### Roll Call

PRESENT

Mayor Jeremy Grimm  
Councilor Deb Ruehle, Council President  
Councilor Joel Aispuro\*  
Councilor Justin Dick  
Councilor Kyle Schreiber  
Councilor Pam Duquette

\*Councilor Aispuro was absent at roll call, arriving at 6:13 p.m. and present for all action items and votes.

ABSENT

Councilor Rick Howarth

As required by the City's adopted Code of Ethics and Civility, as the presiding officer, Mayor Grimm identified law enforcement personnel in the room serving as sergeant-at-arms for the meeting: Sandpoint Police Chief Corey Coon.

### Pledge of Allegiance

Mayor Grimm led all present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

### Announcements and Reports

1. Mayor's Proclamation: International Dark Sky Week

Mayor Grimm proclaimed April 21-28, 2025, as International Dark Sky Week in Sandpoint and presented the proclamation to Kodiak Ellis, a local proponent of dark sky initiatives.

2. Presentation: Monarch City USA

At the invitation of Councilor Duquette, local resident Perky Smith-Hagadone provided a presentation on a request for Sandpoint to participate as a Monarch City USA, with support from Mayor Grimm and the Council members present.

3. Report/Update: Development Impact Fee Study

Colin McAweeney with TischlerBise, the City's Development Impact Fee Study consultant, provided an update on the City's study, followed by remarks from the Mayor and Council members, with Council concurring on a shift to a residential fee schedule by square footage and assessing a parks impact fee on commercial development.

Following the reports and presentations specifically reflected on the agenda, Mayor Grimm additionally reported, in general, on the multitude of activities, projects, and events taking place citywide, recognizing

and thanking staff for all their hard work. He further reported that City staff met with representatives from the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality regarding the Wastewater Treatment Plant and provided information and an update on potential funding for reconstruction of the Plant.

Council members provided reports from recent meetings of the citizen advisory boards on which they serve as Council liaison. Councilor Duquette additionally reported that new recycling bins will be available throughout town.

At the invitation of the Mayor, Department Directors provided reports on projects and activities in their respective departments.

### **Public Comments**

Mayor Grimm recited the rules and procedure for public comment, followed by an opportunity for comments from the public regarding items on the agenda not related to a hearing, as well as other topics relevant to the business of the City of Sandpoint. Information only; no Council action.

### **Consent Calendar**

Mayor Grimm noted for the record the amount of bills presented for payment approval, and the Consent Calendar was approved by a unanimous vote of Council present, as noted below.

Motion made by Councilor Schreiber, Seconded by Councilor Aispuro.

Voting Yea: Councilor Ruehle, Councilor Aispuro, Councilor Dick, Councilor Schreiber, Councilor Duquette

4. The minutes from Council's March 12, 2025, Special Meeting were approved as presented.
5. The minutes from Council's March 19, 2025, Regular Meeting were approved as presented.
6. The minutes from Council's April 9, 2025, Special Meeting were approved as presented.
7. Bills presented in the amount of \$1,710,322.70, reflecting \$929,573.21 for regular payables and \$780,749.49 for payroll, were approved for payment.
8. The Monthly Financial Report on Cash and Investment Transactions for January 2025 was accepted.
10. **Resolution 25-017** Farmers' Market License Agreement (City Agreement No. A25-1970-6) - approved

### **Public Hearings**

Mayor Grimm recited the order and procedure for the evening's public hearings, along with instructions for public testimony and noted, for the record, that any written comments received were included in the meeting packet or otherwise provided to the Council if received in time to do so.

11. Public Hearing / Decision: Kodiak Aircraft Company - Daher #1 / Turbine Subdivision Preliminary Plat (File #PS23-0001)

Citing a possible conflict, Mayor Grimm recused himself, leaving the dais and passing the gavel to City Council President Deb Ruehle, who presided over the meeting beginning at 6:28 p.m.

Each Council member confirmed no ex parte contact or conflict of interest as pertained to this application.

The City's consulting planner, Daren Fluke with Jacobs Engineering Group, provided a presentation as an introduction of this application and, along with City Engineer Brandon Staglund and City Attorney Fonda Jovick, fielded questions from Council.

Following the staff presentation, David Schuck, representative for applicant Daher / Kodiak Aircraft Company, provided information regarding their application and made some brief remarks.

Following the applicant's presentation, Council President Ruehle provided a reminder of the public hearing procedures and explained the option for gifting time.

Council President Ruehle then opened the public hearing, with all those who who spoke testifying as neutral to the application: City residents Brad Smith and Molly O'Reilly, along with Jeff Stearns, not a resident of the City but representing SilverWing at Sandpoint. No one testified in support, and no one testified in opposition.

Confirming all who wished to testify had an opportunity to do so and following questions from Council, fielded by Mr. Fluke, Mr. Staglund, and Ms. Jovick, Council President Ruehle closed the public hearing, and Council deliberated.

Following deliberation and Council questions fielded by staff, Councilor Dick made a motion that the Sandpoint City Council, after consideration of the criteria and relevant standards of Idaho Code and Sandpoint City Code and the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission, **approve** City Application PS23-0001, Daher #1 Subdivision, Kodiak Aircraft Company's request for approval of a preliminary plat to subdivide 29 acres into four lots on the east side of Great Northern Road on Parcels RPS00000105804A and RPS38630000050A, commonly known as 1200 Turbine Drive, noting that approval is based on the staff report, relevant evidence and testimony contained in the public record, including findings of fact, and is **subject to conditions** of approval as provided in the staff report, with an amendment to Condition #6, where, as opposed to installation of a 6-foot-wide asphalt path, the applicant is required to install a 6-foot-wide concrete sidewalk on the north side of the newly-dedicated Turbine Drive right-of-way.

Motion made by Councilor Dick, Seconded by Councilor Duquette.

Voting Yea: Councilor Ruehle, Councilor Aispuro, Councilor Dick, Councilor Schreiber, Councilor Duquette

Mayor Grimm returned to the dais at 7:13 p.m., presiding for the remainder of the meeting. The Mayor recessed the meeting for a break at 7:14 p.m., with the meeting reconvening at 7:22 p.m.

12. Public Hearing / Decision: Ridley Village Court Planned Unit Development Preliminary Development Plan (File #PPUD24-0002)

Councilors Ruehle, Aispuro, and Schreiber, along with Mayor Grimm, confirmed no ex parte contact and no conflict of interest as pertained to this application. Councilors Dick and Duquette, disclosing ex parte contact, recused themselves from this matter and left the meeting.

City Planner Bill Dean provided a presentation as an introduction of this application and, along with Mr. Staglund and Public Works Director Holly Ellis, fielded questions from the Council members.

Following the staff presentation, Kirk Rector with Affinity Real Estate Management, Inc., the applicant, provided some initial remarks in support of his application, followed by a presentation given by the applicant's representative, Aaron Qualls with SCJ Alliance, who fielded questions from the Mayor and Council members.

Following the applicant's presentation, Mayor Grimm provided a reminder regarding rules and procedure and then opened the public hearing.

City residents Richard Curtis and Molly O'Reilly testified in support. City resident Marilyn George testified as neutral to the application, as did Donna Griffin, who is not a resident of Sandpoint but was representing Selkirks-Pend Oreille Transit (SPOT Bus). The following, all City residents, testified in opposition: Stephanie Wilson, Tom Carroll, and Karen Hefley.

Following public testimony, Mr. Qualls made some rebuttal and final remarks and fielded questions from the Council. Mayor Grimm then closed the public hearing.

Following closure of the public hearing, Council deliberated, with City staff fielding Council members' questions during deliberation.

Council President Ruehle made a motion to **approve** the Ridley Village Court Planned Unit Development Preliminary Development Plan, City file #PPUD24-0002, as originally submitted to the City, **with conditions**, as outlined during Council's deliberation and summarized by Mayor Grimm as follows: 1) Construct the planned open space area toward the center of the development, as provided in the initial plan; 2) incorporate traffic calming into street extension design between Ridley Village Rd. and the Maplewood neighborhood; 3) setbacks along Cattail Ct. will be 15 feet, and the home design needs to include privacy windows and porches on the front for abutting properties; 4) installation of street lights as provided in the initial plan; 5) driveway setback in the southwest corner should be 35 feet from Ridley Village Rd.; 6) ensure planning for adequate and proper snow storage as required by City Code; and 7) installation of a 6 ft – 8 ft wide path on the north side of Autumn Ln. adjacent to the parking lot north of Road B. The motion was seconded by Councilor Aispuro. Following some final discussion, the resulting vote is reflected below.

Motion made by Councilor Ruehle, Seconded by Councilor Aispuro.  
Voting Yea: Councilor Ruehle, Councilor Aispuro, Councilor Schreiber  
Voting Abstaining: Councilor Dick, Councilor Duquette

**Old/Unfinished Business** - none

**New Business** - none

**Adjourn**

With no further business on the agenda, the meeting was adjourned at 10:02 p.m.

The foregoing minutes, prepared by the City Clerk, were approved by City Council during their meeting held \_\_\_\_\_, 2025.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jeremy Grimm, Mayor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Attest: Melissa Ward, City Clerk