

March 25, 2026

The LEWISTON PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION met in the Community Development Department Second Floor Conference Room at 215 "D" Street. Chair Iacoboni called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

I. CALL TO ORDER

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Gabriel Iacoboni, Chair; Emily Wolf, Vice Chair; Shaunita Cable; Zach Battles; Maureen Anderson; Cynthia Ball, arriving at 5:45 pm.

COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED:

COMMISSIONERS UN-EXCUSED: Kyle Harris

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Katie Hollingshead, Assistant Planner; Dawn Ortiz, Community Development Office Supervisor; Jennifer Tengono, City Attorney; Pat Severance, Development Supervisor; Julian Sorrell, Fire Marshal

II. CITIZENS COMMENTS

None

III. ACTIVE AGENDA

A. APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 11, 2026 MEETING MINUTES (ACTION ITEM)

Chair Iacoboni and Commissioner Anderson moved and seconded, respectively, approval of the February 11, 2026 meeting minutes with corrections. The motion carried 5-0.

B. PUBLIC HEARING AND SUBSEQUENT DELIBERATION AND DIRECTION TO STAFF REGARDING THE REASONED STATEMENT OF RELEVANT CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION CUP-26-2 BY BRANDON CLEVELAND (ACTION ITEM):

Chair Iacoboni explained the public hearing process, opened the public hearing and asked for a staff presentation.

Staff Hollingshead provided a verbal summary of the staff report with maps and photos so the commission could get geographically familiar with the area.

Chair Iacoboni confirmed that there will not be any access from Nez Perce Grade.

Staff Hollingshead stated that there would not be access from Nez Perce Grade.

Commissioner Anderson asked where the nearest fire hydrant is.

Julian Sorrell, Fire Marshal, pulled up the GIS mapping system and showed the Commission that the closest fire hydrant is a couple of parcels over. He stated there is sufficient access for a fire access road and more than the required fire flows needed for this type of project. Since the project will have fire sprinklers, a minimum response will be needed if there is a fire. Staff Sorrell provided standard comments on the requirement for a fire access road.

Commissioner Anderson asked what materials would be used for the driveway and parking, and whether it would affect stormwater.

Pat Severance, Development Supervisor, stated it will most likely be compacted gravel. The design guidelines will prevent water runoff by underground swells and drains. This would be a requirement that would be approved during the building permit process.

Commissioner Anderson asked if there is any requirement for street frontage along 6th St.

Staff Hollingshead stated that there is no requirement besides the 20-foot flag pole that would require improvement.

There being no further questions for the staff, Chair Iacoboni asked for applicant testimony.

Applicant Cleveland, Lewiston Idaho, stated that he is available for any questions that the commission might have.

Commissioner Ball asked if there would be a need for the foundation stability of the site.

Applicant Cleveland stated that there is about 18 inches of topsoil, and the foundations will be done per code; no blasting or drilling will be needed.

Chair Iacoboni asked if there had been any traffic impact consideration.

Applicant Cleveland stated there has not been anything done at this time. The main goal is to just get 5 apartments on the property.

Commissioner Anderson asks what they plan on charging per unit.

Applicant Cleveland stated \$2,500 to \$2,800 per unit.

Commissioner Ball asked if there would be a fire access road.

Applicant stated yes, there would be a hammerhead fire access road. Concrete and paved area will be closer to the apartments. The drive would be gravel and tested for compaction.

Commissioner Battles asked if there would be a sidewalk between the building and the parking stalls.

Applicant stated yes, there would be for ADA. The patio pads on the backyard of the units will be small, 8'x8'.

Commissioner Battles asked if the parcel had been reviewed for any private easements.

Applicant Cleveland stated only for the current utility easement that has the city sewer main.

There being no further questions for the applicant, Chair Iacoboni asked for public testimony.

Kevin Best, Lewiston, Idaho, stated that the fire access road would border his property, and people who own their homes take better care of it and their property. He has concerns that this project will degrade his property value. The noise is a concern, and how would someone in a wheelchair get to the end of the drive if it's gravel.

Dale Andrews at 3119 6th St stated that the pictures provided are deceiving, and he has lived there for 42 years. He is going to lose his partial view. Also, there are 10 new lots by Beacon School and even more over by Sportsman Warehouse. This project is going to increase heavy traffic, and there is no second access out; 6th Street is a dead-end street. The neighborhood should stay a single-family dwelling neighborhood.

Tim Graves at 3116 6th Street stated that 6th Street does not have any sidewalks, street lighting, shoulder or street lines. There is concern when adding 10 additional cars to a street where there are kids playing. There will be additional delivery trucks and garbage/sanitation trucks that will cause additional noise. The dumpsters are going to cause a smell. If these units are rented, then there is going to be additional traffic when the units have renter turnover. Approving this will cause the whole nature of the neighborhood to change.

Robert Hubbard, Lewiston, Idaho, stated that a 6 plex is not going to work, the fire department is not going to be able to get in. He does not want this 6 plex there, and he does not want his property value to go down.

Jennifer Vantassel, Lewiston, Idaho, asked if there will be fencing along Nez Perce Grade, and that 6th Street is very narrow.

Penny Jackson, 3116 6th Street, stated that stormwater washed out her driveway, the flog pole to the property in question, and her pond. The fire department is not going to want to come down the drive, and the noise is going to be loud. There will be heavy trucks coming down the easement, and the lot is .492 acres, not .51 acres. This project is to make money and ruin the valuation of the surrounding properties. She stated that a duplex would be more feasible for this property. She has tried to drive her RV down the easement and had a hard time turning it around, so how would a fire truck make it down it. If there were a fire, it could take out the neighbor's property even if the project has fire sprinklers. She does not want her easement destroyed and having to repair it due to the increased traffic. The neighborhood should stay low-density, and she asks the commission to deny this project.

Tim Row, 3115 6th Street, opposes this project. His concerns are the additional traffic that would have its headlights directed at their home. He has a concern about the renters blocking the fire sprinklers with their personal items. The information he received from the County website is that the property is .492, not .51 acres. There just isn't enough space for a 5 plex, and the construction traffic is going to be a nuisance. Sixth Street is just too small a street, and the area is low density, and there is not enough room for the additional traffic, garbage pickup, and ask that this request be denied.

Dale Andrews, 3119 6th Street, stated that the canyon is a tinder box in the summertime, and if there is a fire, it is going to catch fast. It has caught fire once before.

Dawn Ortiz, Community Development Supervisor, confirmed with the Commission that they received the 7 public comment emails submitted before the meeting.

Jennifer Tengono, City Attorney, stated that there have been multiple public comments related to this property being rezoned. This is not an application for a rezone; this is an application for a conditional use permit. In Lewiston City Code Section 37-6, it states, conditional uses are permitted in an R2A zone, and the following uses and their accessory uses are permitted when authorized in

accordance with the standards and requirements of Article 4 and 9 and number 8 of that is a multi-family dwelling that meets the standards of Section 37-124.1 of this code, which in and of itself states, where multifamily dwellings are allowed as a use permitted outright or as a conditional use, the following standards shall apply. Parking must be paved and meet all requirements of Article 7 of Off-Street Parking and Loading, and where more than one detached single-family dwelling exists on one lot, the minimum required lot area shall be the minimum required by the zoning district multiplied by the number of detached single-family dwellings. You've received multiple comments related to different building standards and other things that are outside the scope of what's considered the requirements about whether or not, the Commission can approve or disapprove of a conditional use permit, and for the sake of the record, I want to make sure that we're reading that out loud, because as the Commission has additional opportunities to ask questions of the public, the staff, and the applicant, these questions should be more, focused on the actual standards that you are to base your decision on tonight, and not ancillary or unrelated conditions that while they may be used to inform the Commission in making their decision on whether or not that information supports one of your decisions, they, are otherwise not a part of the considerations for the Commission. Again, this is related to an application for a conditional use permit in the R2A, and as long as the information provided to the Commission supports a decision, the use is permitted as a conditional use. This isn't necessarily a by-right use, where no input from the neighbors, the applicant, or staff is required, but this is one of those land uses that, because it's already permitted, with a conditional use permit. The things that the Commission is asked to consider as relevant criteria appropriate in standards is whether or not the proposed use of the property will result in conditions that will tend to generate nuisances, including but not limited to noise, dust, glare, vibrations, odors, and then the like, or if so, that any anticipated nuisances will be appropriately mitigated. The proposed use is or is not a public necessity, and is or is not justified by the applicant and deemed to be of benefit to the public. The character of the proposed use, if developed according to the plan as submitted, will or will not be in harmony with the area to which it is located. The proposed use will or will not endanger the environment or the public health or safety, and the proposed use will or will not be in substantial conformance with the comprehensive plan. So, the information that you're receiving tonight related to, comments about rezoning this property, this is not a request to rezone the property, so I would take that for what it's worth. But other conditions related to testimony provided tonight, if it helps you inform any of that criteria, I would ask that you take this opportunity to ask clarifying questions, or gather the information that's needed to support one of those five determinations, because you will be asked to explain in detail, what information was presented tonight. It sounds like there's been some questions about the size of the property, and whether or not the size provided justifies that

5 limit, or that 5 units. Information such as that is definitely relevant to this, but, you know, questions about, the width of 6th Street, that's not relevant to whether or not this applicant's land use, in and of itself, at this stage of the process should or should not be granted, unless you're able to point to something specific about whether or not it'll create a nuisance, is a public necessity, is in harmony with the area, endangers the environment or public health or safety, or will not be in substantial or conformance with the comprehensive plan. If this property were developed as for any of the other permitted uses, you know, there's a very high likelihood that this commission would also get similar objections about the type of density or the type of permitted uses. And because of the fact that there's concerns about this being more than one unit, I would note that a use permitted outright for this property includes a manufactured home park, a mortuary, a school, a preschool, and a tiny housing village. There are additional development considerations related to the density, and some other things, as far as some special conditions, but those are permitted uses by right. A two-family dwelling is also permitted by right, and there's development considerations that are a later part of the land use and development process. Right now, you're just being asked about the land use. Can this property owner use this property as a 5-plex? And then to base your decision on the criteria and city code related to whether or not the applicant has met the conditions of the conditional use permit.

There being no further public testimony, Chair Iacoboni asked for the applicant's rebuttal.

Applicant Cleveland stated that he does not have anything to add.

Commissioner Ball asked how they would mitigate any stormwater runoff.

Applicant Cleveland stated there would be a retaining wall and storm drain to direct the stormwater, and there will be a containment area on the west side.

Commissioner Anderson confirmed the square footage of livable space.

Applicant Cleveland stated yes, the three middle units would be larger than the ADU units.

Commissioner Anderson asked where he came up with the valuation for rent.

Applicant stated that the appliances, cabinets, and countertops will be higher-end, so they would have higher-quality units and thus charge higher rent.

Commissioner Ball asked if there would be overflow parking.

Applicant stated that they added an additional parking spot per unit.

Jeniffer Tengono, City Attorney, stated whether or not this use and traffic generated is a later stage. Is the particular use going to create a public nuisance that affects the city as a whole, such as dust, odor, or smell. Some of the questions regarding the value of the units should not be used to base the outcome or consideration.

Commissioner Cable asked if the acreage was .492 or .51.

Staff Hollingshead said she did double-check the measurement based on the record of the survey and warranty deed and did confirm this with the city surveyor.

Chair Iacoboni asked how long the construction would take to finish.

Applicant stated 8 months start to finish from the time the permit is issued until the landscaping is done. It will not be heavy traffic throughout the whole construction process.

Chair Iacoboni allowed further comment from the public.

Penny Jackson, Lewiston, Idaho, stated that she was provided with the documented record of the lot, and it is only .42, not .51. When an access road is changed to a high-density use, it needs to be constructed as such. Wants to use what the county has used

Jennifer Vantassell, Lewiston, Idaho asked how many storage units and what size, and whether there is parking for these storage units.

Chair Iacoboni stated there will be 5 storage units, which are 200 sf, and they are attached to each unit.

Staff Hollingshead stated yes, the information Ms. Jackson mentioned was provided to all commissioners, and one of those items was the warranty deed. These measurements on the warranty deed were verified by the City Surveyor and they do add up to the .51.

Commissioner Battles asked if there are any indications that higher density would be in favor of sidewalks and transit access.

Staff Hollingshead stated yes, on page 8 of the staff report, it states that 2 city blocks south and west of the property is a bus stop.

Staff Tengono stated that parcel owners are usually not taxed on the easement of the parcel, and this could be part of the difference. She also stated she doesn't recommend relying on the information provided by the realtor, as there is no legal action against male practice, whereas a City Surveyor's information would have legal action against male practice.

Chair Iacoboni asked what .49 would allow.

Staff Hollingshead stated the lot is big enough to construct a duplex, and it could possibly be subdivided, but doesn't remember if the subdivision would allow for two duplexes or if it would be a duplex and single unit, but if it is less than, it would be a 4 plex.

Commissioners and Staff discussed the two different warranty deeds, what is taxed, whether easements are considered in the lot size, and which warranty deed the City surveyor reviewed.

There being no further public testimony or questions for staff, Chair Iacoboni asked for the applicant's rebuttal.

Applicant Cleveland stated he did not have any further comments.

There being no further questions for the applicant, Chair Iacoboni closed the public hearing.

After deliberation and discussion, Commissioners Battles and Anderson moved and seconded, respectively, to direct staff to draft the Reasoned Statement denying CUP-26-2. The motion carried 4-2.

IV. STAFF-COMMISSION COMMUNICATIONS:

A. Query of Commissioners for the April 08, 2026 meeting.

All commissioners in attendance should be in attendance for the April 08, 2026 meeting. Staff Hollingshead stated there will be a public hearing at the next meeting.

V. ADJOURN

There being no further business, Commissioners Ball and Anderson moved and seconded, respectively, to adjourn. The motion carried 6-0, and the Planning and Zoning Commission adjourned at approximately 8:24 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,



Dawn Ortiz,
Recording Secretary



Chairperson or Acting Chairperson
Planning and Zoning Commission

Approved this 8th day of April, 2026.

