

DRAFT
MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING
FOR THE CITY OF HAYDEN, KOOTENAI COUNTY, IDAHO

Monday, August 31, 2026

Regular Meeting: 5:30 PM

Hayden City Hall Council Chambers, 8930 N. Government Way, Hayden, ID 83835

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 PM by Chair Shawn Taylor.

ROLL CALL OF COMMISSION MEMBERS

Present: Chris Morris, Shawn Taylor, and Ron Walters. Tony Grano and Vince Vargas were absent.

Staff Present: Donna Phillips, Community Development Director, and “Zack”, City Attorney representative.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Ron Walters led the pledge of allegiance.

ADDITIONS OR CORRECTIONS

N/A

1. CALL FOR CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

None

2. CONSENT CALENDAR *All items on the consent calendar are Action Items*

3. Approval of Planning & Zoning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes, 07-20-2026 and 08-03-2026.

Motion to approve the Consent Calendar as presented. This motion, made by Vice-Chair Morris and seconded by Commissioner Walters; Motion carried.

Tony Grano: Absent

Shawn Taylor: Yes

Chris Morris: Yes

Vince Vargas: Absent

Ron Walters: Yes

WORKSHOP

A. Code Amendment Review – Title 12 Subdivisions – Repeal and Replace:

Director Donna Phillips started by asking the commissioners if they would like to move closer, or if they would like to stay seated where they are. The commissioners responded by saying they will remain seated where they are. She went on to ask if they had read the changes made to Title 12, to which they verbally confirmed yes, or shook their heads yes. She continued by saying that today is about answering any questions that they might have

and then asked how they would like to review the changes. It was decided to have Ms. Phillips pull up her presentation onto the screen and go through the “clean version” of the changes together as a group.

Director Phillips pulled up her presentation and began by stating that Title 12: Subdivisions is proposed to be a repeal and replace which was identified at the previous meeting. She stated that there were many changes that they wanted to make because it “had not been touched in a while, and staff wanted to clean it up.” She stated that the first section covers the general provisions that are established, and those did not change. The authority that gives the city the ability to do subdivisions comes out of Idaho State Statutes: Title 67, Chapter 65, and Title 50, Chapter 13. As well as Article 12 Section 2 of the Idaho Constitution.

Next, Ms. Phillips covered the “schedule of fees.” Stating that it is adopted by the City Council according to the Fee Schedule, and “that is what’s charged.” She then explained the building permit process for a subdivision vs. building one structure on one tract of land/piece of property and the difference between the two. She also mentioned that infrastructure for a subdivision cannot be built prior to Preliminary Subdivision Approval which needs to be issued first.

Violations to this title were also discussed, and what the city’s recourse to that would look like to ensure compliance.

Ms. Phillips mentioned that the Interpretation and Conflict section has not changed.

Next, Condition Based Exceptions were discussed and it was explained that the sections that were left blank referring to Title 11 will get filled in once Title 11 changes have been completed. City staff have been working on Title 12 and Title 11 changes together concurrently.

Development and Construction Agreements were mentioned next. Stating that these agreements have been put back into code, and that there still may be times when “agreements may be needed, but not as many.”

Director Phillips introduced “Zack” to the commission and said he is the stand in for City Attorney, Fonda Jovick who was not able to attend the meeting.

Ms. Phillips asked if the commissioners had any questions at this point in the presentation, to which Commissioner Walters asked about 12-1-8 (A) and if the “state” needs to be listed under where it says “terms of agreements shall be consistent with the city...” should it list the state as well? To which Attorney Representative, Zach explained that whether it is written in the ordinance directly or not, it needs to align with state law.

Ms. Phillips also clarified to Commissioner Walters that these items have been moved from an Agreement and put into code.

She mentioned the new part to code that was added for a Minor Agreement vs. a Major Agreement explaining the difference between the two. She went on to note that the survey section has remained the same and noted the adopted standards and the adopted grid.

Next, Director Phillips highlighted Chapter 2 which covered definitions and interpretations. She told the commissioners that if they have any suggestions or questions as they read through these changes, to bring them to her attention.

Chair Taylor asked if “sewerage” was a word, to which Ms. Phillips said it is.

Definitions in this chapter have been updated to match definitions from other code sections to make the definitions clear throughout code.

She continued to go through the list of definitions, and read them aloud to the commissioners, explaining each one where there had been changes made.

Boundary Line Adjustments were mentioned and explained that they used to be at the end of the Subdivision chapter of code but have since been moved to the front of the chapter instead. She explained that no tracts of land that have adjusted boundary lines without the

city's knowledge will be able to get a building permit issued. It must go through the required process of the city first.

Director Phillips went on to talk about noticing requirements and explained that city staff have been working on this part of code to ensure it is consistent, and that they are in Idaho State compliance as well. She explained the process of noticing, and the timelines that are required. Chair Taylor asked if it's defined by business day or calendar day? To which Director Phillips said it's calendar day. She went on to explain that a hearing examiner for a Minor Subdivision is who approves or denies the application, while a Major Subdivision goes through an approval process with the Planning & Zoning Commission and City Council. She mentioned the standards of approval for a subdivision and explained the Staff Analysis process in detail.

Ms. Phillips explained the process for a Major Subdivision, and a Minor Subdivision. She covered the Pre-Development Meeting process, the submittal process for a subdivision, the noticing process, the public hearings that take place and the process once those public hearings are completed. She explained Master Development Agreements, and Memorandum of Understandings and the differences between the two.

She also explained the final steps of a subdivision, after it receives approval. The building permit process, recording process, and warranty surety were also covered. It was noted that a single phased project is allowed two years to complete the project, and five years if it is a multiple phased project. She mentioned that there have been projects who have not signed their Master Development Agreement after their Preliminary Plat Approval, so their subdivision process has not started the two year or five year timeline yet. Vice-Chair Morris asked if those projects get reviewed annually to see what has been approved but not started. To which Ms. Phillips said yes, they review them all the time. Vice-Chair Morris then asked if the commission would have knowledge about the projects that were approved but have not moved forward. He gave an example of another application coming through that is within the vicinity or affecting the infrastructure. To which Ms. Phillips said that is something that the Engineering Department identifies in their analysis of projects as they come forward. Commissioner Walters asked if someone submitted something, and it has been hanging out there for 10 years, are they now subject to the new plan if city staff makes changes to the process. Ms. Phillips explained that in these cases where they have not signed their Master Development Agreement, their construction plans have not been reviewed yet. But it all gets reviewed once they sign their agreement, and the construction plan review begins.

Ms. Phillips went on to explain Homeowner Associations (HOA's), and how they are not required or managed by the city. Commissioner Walters asked when a new housing development is built, are they required to do an HOA? To which Ms. Phillips said no.

She went on to explain the Preliminary Plat process, and the steps for constructing the subdivision including infrastructure, landscaping, demolition permits, right of way encroachment permits, sewer connection permits, and the construction approval process. Different types of surety were highlighted: performance and warranty surety, and the release that occurs.

It was explained that the final inspections of the required subdivision improvements for conformance with the approved construction plans will not take place until a certification packet has been received and reviewed by the city from the developer. Once received, the city will perform their final inspections.

Ms. Phillips talked about Plats where she addressed final plat requirements, the differences between subdivision, condominiums, townhomes, and lot consolidations. She discussed in detail the overall requirements, the process for approval, the application process, and the different types of plats. Commissioner Walters clarified that a "townhome unit is on a single lot." To which Ms. Phillips confirmed.

She finished her presentation of Title 12 changes by asking the commission if they had any questions or comments, to which Chair Taylor asked if they would be voting on the changes reflected at the next meeting. Ms. Phillips said they will be having another workshop in September to review the final revisions, and she told them to have their suggestions or questions ready when they come to that meeting. Commissioner Walters clarified that Title 11 is *within* Hayden City code, and Ms. Phillips confirmed by explaining that Hayden City code has multiple titles and chapters within it, yes.

B. Code Amendment Review – Title 11 Zoning Regulations:

Director Donna Phillips started her presentation of the Title 11 changes by telling the Commission to review these changes, with the current code side-by-side as they review. She continued by saying all the changes are very close to being finished. She proceeded to show them where they could find the link to Hayden City Code on the City's website. She explained the edits that have been made to the document which are shown on the margins in different colors depending on who made the edit or comment.

Ms. Phillips went on to explain that the definitions have been clarified in this Title to read more clear and help avoid confusion. She went through each of the sections of definitions with the commissioners, and covered Development Agreements from 11-1-3, and stated that they are specific to Title 11 and will remain, with no changes; or minor if any. 11-1-4 was discussed saying that they added language about the application process, and the certificate of title. She went on to cover 11-1-5, notice of violation / stop work, stating that language was added to the appeal process to make consistency across other chapters. Ms. Phillips mentioned 11-1-7, new and unlisted use. Then she discussed 11-1-8, which talks about administrative exception requests and gave examples of parking exceptions. Design standard requirements were also discussed. Lighting standards were mentioned stating that they already have a standard of approval in the lighting section of code, so the applicant would have to meet those standards of approval from that section, along with the standards of approval from the administrative exception section; meeting both of those standards of approval.

Next, Ms. Phillips discussed 11-1-9: appeal of the administrative decision (for zoning appeals), stating that language was added to clarify the process and procedures.

She called out 11-2-3 (A) which is the site area and building setback requirements table. She referenced the allowance to have ADU's in all single family residence areas in accordance with the new Idaho State Statute changes.

Density provisions were discussed, stating that "should densities be proposed that are in excess of those identified within the zone designation, and or within the various master plans, then additional studies shall be required to ensure that adequate services are available prior to development approval."

Home Occupations were mentioned. Clarifying that a Class A Home Occupation requires a Conditional Use Permit, while Class B does not.

Development Standards and requirements related to ADU's were pointed out during the presentation.

The short term rental code, manufactured home regulations, and ADU's were discussed further. Chair Taylor asked for clarification on where it states (in the ADU code) "shall not exceed 1,000 sq ft or 75% of the primary residence which ever is greater." He asked if a 4,000 sq ft house, could then have a 3,000 sq ft ADU? To which Ms. Phillips confirmed yes, and that is what Idaho State Statute required them to do. She went on to say that the applicant would still have to meet lot coverage and setback requirements in order to build the ADU of that size.

Next, roadside stands were mentioned, and those requirements that have been put into code for safety concerns. 11-2-7: Neighborhood Commercial Nodes were discussed and were mentioned to be in context with the Comprehensive Plan. Next, Ms. Phillips pointed out the additions that staff had made to incorporate food trucks into code per the commission's request. Starter Home Subdivision design standards were pointed out to the commission, noting that these were discussed at the last workshop as well.

Parks and Open Space Design Standards were highlighted, and General Standards of Development definitions were discussed to make it read clearer and have consistency across the code. Vice Chair, Morris asked when a permit is required for fences. To which, Shannon Drappo, Planner, said fences typically do not require a permit unless they are seven (7) feet high. The Landscaping Table was also highlighted, stating that it was removed from code, then placed back in. Lighting Standards were covered next, and the requirements for when a photometric plan is needed.

Parking requirements were highlighted and urged the commission to read the differences made to the code in that section.

Site Plan standards of approval, requirements, and resubmittals were discussed next; covering site improvements, frontage improvements, and right of way dedication. Ms. Phillips asked the commission if they were satisfied with these changes and asked for better direction. Commissioner Walters stated that he agrees with standardizing things, but what if there is a scenario or area in the city that is an exception to the rule?

Ms. Phillips asked if additional language is needed to clarify anything on page 82 (F). Where it points out the "exceptions." After reading that section, Commissioner Walters stated he agreed with that language and can support that.

Chair Taylor and Vice Chair Morris both mentioned frontage improvements and the dilemma about requiring certain applicants to build sidewalks / frontage improvements on their portion of the street when there may never be sidewalks fully built out in the rest of the neighborhood.

Next, signage was discussed and Ms. Phillips showed a photo of what Government Way used to look like and then showed a rendering of what it could potentially look like in the future.

Director Phillips turned the floor over to Shannon Drappo, Planner. Ms. Drappo started her portion of the presentation speaking about sign code. She covered "banner" signs, saying that they are not allowed on fences and they are considered a temporary sign, only allowed to be up for 90 days. She went on to explain that during windstorms, these banners have flown off into traffic and caused safety issues in the past. She mentioned that staff would like to create a system for banner signs, allowing them to keep the sign up for 90 days, having the sign secured correctly and safely. She mentioned an idea of giving out a sticker to the owner of the banner sign, which would be placed on the banner to show the date of expiration, and maybe it could be color coded as well. The commission liked the idea of the sticker system.

Ms. Drappo continued by discussing signage for development complexes. Stating that a Master Sign Plan is requested by the owner of the building, so that City staff can make sure when a new tenant comes into the building, they have design standards to abide by. She asked the Commissioners to think about if they would allow for signage on a wall that does not have road frontage. As of right now, it is not allowed unless the wall has road frontage, and staff have received requests from applicants to allow for this.

Vice Chair Morris asked for an example, to which Ms. Drappo said if a building has road frontage on Highway 95, and on Government Way (where they would be allowed to have a sign on each of those walls facing those two roads) and would like to have an extra sign on a wall that does *not* face the road, would the commission be okay with allowing that third sign?

Ms. Drappo identified that the maximum square feet allowed for signage is up to 10% per wall. Chair Taylor stated that if they don't exceed the allotted 10%, then they should be allowed to have 1 additional sign. The commission discussed it further, and Ms. Drappo stated that maybe for the non-frontage facing wall they could allow for a sign up to 5% of that wall (instead of the regular 10% allotment). All commissioners agreed.

Commissioner Walters asked if there are requirements for what is displayed on a sign, to which Ms. Drappo clarified that the city cannot restrict what the sign says. When reviewing sign applications, she looks at the size, and other criteria, and the Building Department reviews how it is secured. She went on to mention vehicles (such as trucks or trailers) that have "signage" on them. She identified trucks or trailers around the city that are parked out on gravel lots, with signage on either side. Ms. Drappo stated that in her mind this is a "sign" in her mind, and there are no standards for "mobile signs." Chair Taylor suggested that the city not allow for those types of signs within the city, and to make that clear within the code. Design standards were discussed and Ms. Drappo encouraged them to read through that and give any feedback regarding signage or lighting or anything that they think might look nice to have in Hayden.

Commissioner Walters asked how the public gets informed of these changes before they get a violation notice, and Ms. Drappo explained that the Hayden Newsletter goes out, and she identified that she had previously put information and regulations in there about temporary signage. She also gave the example of when the city has public hearings, which there will be one coming up for these code amendments, and the public will get notified that way as well. During their sign permit review, the applicant will also get notified of any changes that they need to make.

Director Phillips finished the presentation by discussing land use applications, stating that some additional standards related to comments received from the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council were added. Ms. Phillips urged the commission to read through all of the changes, and any recommendations that they have, and to bring those to the next meeting on September 14th, 2026.

REPORTS

Ms. Phillips reported on the next meeting, stating that it will be on September 14th, when they will review the final changes and answer any final questions. She urged them to read all the current changes and come prepared to the next meeting. She asked Vice Chair Morris if he would like to give a report on the Impact Committee Meeting, to which he said they voted to approve the increase (of Impact Fees.)

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Taylor adjourned meeting at 8:14 PM

Motion to adjourn meeting. This motion, made by Chair Taylor and seconded by Commissioner Walters; Motion carried.

Tony Grano: Absent

Shawn Taylor: Yes

Chris Morris: Yes

Vince Vargas: Absent

Ron Walters: Yes

Respectfully submitted,

Sadie Roe, Clerk