

# PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION



Dennis Wilson  
Commission Chair  
[P&Z@ci.moscow.id.us](mailto:P&Z@ci.moscow.id.us)

**Regular Meeting**  
~Agenda~

Michael Ray  
Staff Liaison  
208.883.7008

<https://www.ci.moscow.id.us/581/Agendas-and-Minutes>

---

**Wednesday**  
**June 24, 2026**

**7:00 PM**

**Council Chambers**  
**206 E Third Street**

---

## WELCOME AND ATTENDANCE

## REGULAR AGENDA

### 1. **Approval of Minutes from May 27, 2026 (ACTION ITEM)**

**PROPOSED ACTIONS:** Approve minutes as presented; approve minutes with amendments; or provide Staff with further direction as deemed necessary.

### 2. **Public Comment**

Time limit 15 minutes. Members of the Public may speak to the Commission regarding matters NOT on the Agenda nor currently pending before the Planning and Zoning Commission. Please state your name and resident city for the record and limit your remarks to three (3) minutes.

### 3. **Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) and Manufactured Home Code Draft Ordinance (ACTION ITEM)**

Senate Bill 1354a – Accessory Dwelling Units and House Bill 800 – Manufactured Homes are two bills that were signed in to law during the 2026 Idaho Legislative Session. There will need to be amendments made to Moscow City Code to bring the code into compliance with the new laws. Staff has prepared a draft ordinance for the Commission’s consideration.

**PROPOSED ACTIONS:** Review the proposed draft ordinance and provide Staff with further direction as deemed necessary.

### 4. **Citizen Survey Questions (ACTION ITEM)**

The City has distributed Citizen Surveys to 1,200 randomly selected addresses every two years since 2002. The 2026 Citizen Survey will be distributed this fall, and every City Commission has been requested to provide two questions to be included in the survey.

**PROPOSED ACTIONS:** Discuss and provide staff with feedback and further direction if necessary.

## REPORTS

1. Transportation Commission meeting report.

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

## UPCOMING EVENTS/MEETINGS

The next Planning & Zoning Commission regular meeting is scheduled for July 8, 2026.

## ADJOURN

**NOTICE:** It is the policy of the City of Moscow that all City-sponsored public meetings and events are accessible to all people. If you need assistance in participating in this meeting or event due to a disability under the ADA, please contact the City’s ADA Coordinator by phone at (208) 883-7600, TDD (208) 883-7019, or by email at [adacoordinator@ci.moscow.id.us](mailto:adacoordinator@ci.moscow.id.us) at least 48 hours prior to the scheduled meeting or event to request an accommodation. The City of Moscow is committed to ensuring that all reasonable accommodation requests are fulfilled.

# PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION



Dennis Wilson  
Commission Chair  
[P&Z@ci.moscow.id.us](mailto:P&Z@ci.moscow.id.us)

**Regular Meeting**  
~Minutes~

Mike Ray  
Staff Liaison  
208.883.7008

<https://www.ci.moscow.id.us/457/Planning-Zoning-Commission>

**Wednesday**  
**May 27, 2026**

**7:00 PM**

**Council Chambers**  
**206 E. Third Street**

**Wilson called the meeting to order at 6:59 PM**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Dennis Wilson, Chair; Rich Beebe, Joel Hamilton, Nels Reese, Sue Scott, Victoria Seever  
MEMBERS ABSENT: Scott Gropp, Cole Mize  
OTHERS: Sage McCetich  
STAFF: Jennifer Fleischman, Mike Ray

## REGULAR AGENDA

### 1. Approval of Minutes from May 13, 2026 (ACTION ITEM)

Scott moved for approval of the minutes as written, seconded by Seever. Roll Call Vote; Ayes: Hamilton, Reese, Scott, Seever, Wilson (5). Nays: None. Abstentions: Beebe (1). Motion carried.

### 2. Public Comment

*Time limit 15 minutes. Members of the Public may speak to the Commission regarding matters NOT on the Agenda nor currently pending before the Planning and Zoning Commission. Please state your name and resident city for the record and limit your remarks to three (3) minutes.*

None offered.

### 3. Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) and Manufactured Home Code Amendments (ACTION ITEM)

*Senate Bill 1354a – Accessory Dwelling Units and House Bill 800 – Manufactured Homes are two bills that were signed in to law during the 2026 Idaho Legislative Session. There will need to be amendments made to Moscow City Code to bring the code into compliance with the new laws. Staff will present what is contained within each of the bills and then discuss proposed amendments to Moscow City Code.*

Ray reviewed the information shared with the Commissioners from April regarding two new Idaho Legislative Bills that required changes to Moscow City Code, as described above. The Commission had a conversation about the potential code amendments and any effects on the community. There was one public comment submitted by email for the Commissioners' consideration (see attached).

Beebe moved to direct Staff to prepare a draft code amendment ordinance regarding ADUs and manufactured homes as discussed, seconded by Hamilton. Roll Call Vote; Ayes: Unanimous (6). Nays: None. Abstentions: None. Motion carried.

## REPORTS

### 1. Transportation Commission meeting report.

The last meeting of the Transportation Commission on May 14<sup>th</sup> included a review of a Right-Of-Way Vacation request.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**UPCOMING EVENTS/MEETINGS**

*The next Planning & Zoning Commission regular meeting is scheduled for June 10, 2026.*

**The meeting was adjourned at 7:34 PM**

---

Dennis Wilson, Chair

---

Date

DRAFT

## Planning & Zoning Commission

### 2002 Survey

**Would you support design review requiring city approval for specific building designs and appearance for construction in downtown Moscow to maintain its distinctive character?**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
19%	40%	19%	11%	4%	7%

**What type of economic growth do you favor? Please select your top three choices and rank 1, 2, 3 (1 being most favorable).**

	#1	#2	#3
No Growth	4%	1%	2%
Wholesale Distribution	2%	2%	5%
Forestry Related	0%	2%	4%
Retail Business	17%	12%	13%
Finance; Insurance	0%	1%	1%
Tourism; Recreational	2%	10%	10%
Light Manufacturing (Assembly)	8%	10%	9%
General Business Services	4%	7%	11%
Motels	2%	1%	1%
Heavy Manufacturing (lumber, pulp)	0%	2%	2%
Agriculturally Related	4%	6%	8%
Cultural/Entertainment Events	16%	15%	12%
University	22%	14%	12%
"High Tech" Industries	19%	16%	11%
Other	0%	0%	0%

## 2004 Survey

**Would you support design review requiring City approval for specific building designs and appearance for construction in downtown Moscow to maintain its distinctive character?**

Strongly Support	Support	Neutral	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Don't Know
18%	45%	21%	8%	3%	5%

**Allowing small retail or office businesses (such as physicians, accountants, engineers, business consultants, and beauty salons) in residential neighborhoods is a benefit to the community.**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
12%	27%	20%	24%	12%	5%

**Please identify the importance of the following neighborhood characteristics to you:**

	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Don't Know
Proximity to school	31%	34%	12%	20%	3%
Proximity to work	18%	35%	25%	20%	2%
Proximity to shopping	10%	26%	37%	25%	2%
Proximity to park or public recreation facility	18%	39%	29%	13%	1%
Proximity to downtown	9%	29%	34%	28%	0%
Single family housing neighborhood	31%	31%	16%	18%	4%
Duplex housing neighborhood	4%	13%	25%	53%	5%
Apartment housing neighborhood	7%	13%	22%	54%	4%
Large lot size (greater than one half acre)	7%	18%	21%	47%	7%
Medium lot size (quarter to one half acre)	9%	23%	27%	33%	8%
Small lot size (less than one quarter acre)	5%	14%	22%	50%	9%
Historic housing district (Fort Russel area or similar)	16%	23%	21%	32%	8%
Alley access	6%	18%	23%	47%	6%
Cul-de-sac or dead-end street	8%	15%	23%	47%	7%
Small street blocks with numerous intersections	4%	9%	23%	55%	9%
Proximity to public walking/bike pathway	23%	30%	27%	18%	2%

## 2006 Survey

**Would you support a design review requirement (which would require building design and appearance review and approval by the City) for construction located within the downtown historic district to maintain its historic and distinctive character?**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
19%	40%	22%	11%	4%	4%

**Do you support regulations that would require any new buildings constructed downtown to provide off-street parking?**

Strongly Support	Support	Neutral	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Don't Know
21%	42%	19%	9%	4%	5%

## 2008 Survey

**I support allowing gated communities within the City of Moscow (“gated communities” are housing developments that are surrounded by fenced barriers including restricted vehicular access.)**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
6%	16%	17%	27%	31%	3%

**I agree that new buildings constructed in the historically agricultural areas within Moscow should incorporate design features to be compatible with the previous and existing historic agricultural buildings.**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
14%	38%	24%	12%	7%	4%

**The City of Moscow is considering a greater allowance of limited commercial uses within new residential development. What commercial uses would be desirable to you to have in close proximity to your residence? (Please check all that apply)**

Daycare Facilities	Medical Offices	Professional Offices	Convenience Stores	Groceries	Personal Services	Eating & Drinking	Other
30%	30%	24%	25%	41%	23%	41%	18%

2010 Survey

**The City of Moscow is considering a greater allowance of limited commercial uses within new residential development. What commercial uses would be desirable to you to have in close proximity to your residence? (Please check all that apply)**

Daycare Facilities	Medical Offices	Professional Offices	Convenience Stores	Groceries	Personal Services	Eating & Drinking	Other
30%	24%	20%	21%	38%	20%	40%	16%

**I would be interested in high-quality high-density residential living opportunity (e.g. an apartment, loft, or condominium) near downtown and the University of Idaho campus.**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
15%	18%	21%	23%	18%	4%

**The presence of a mixture of residential uses (e.g. single-family homes, townhomes, and duplexes) within a single neighborhood that includes common open spaces as buffers to provide separation between those uses would make the neighborhood more desirable to me.**

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
18%	26%	26%	14%	6%	8%

**Please check the three most important items below that you feel should be addressed in planning for future growth in the community.**

Amount of growth	31%
Location of land uses	23%
Historic Preservation	11%
Economic Development	47%
Neighborhood Preservation	22%
Traffic Management and Congestion	44%
Condition of Streets and Sidewalks	30%
Location and/or Condition of City Parks	14%
Water Resource Planning	43%
Private Development Standards	17%
Location of Public Facilities	4%
Other	6%

## 2012 Survey

<p><b>g. The City of Moscow is considering allowing accessory dwelling units in residential neighborhoods. An accessory dwelling unit is generally a small studio or one-bedroom apartment within an existing home or in some cases can be detached from the home, but upon the same lot. These types of units provide opportunities for caring for aging family members and can encourage more efficient use of lot space and affordable housing. I would support allowing accessory uses in my neighborhood.</b></p>	25%	38%	17%	6%	10%	3%	2%
<p><b>h. If accessory dwelling units were permitted within my neighborhood, I would be interested in adding an accessory dwelling unit to my property.</b></p>	6%	7%	25%	22%	24%	14%	1%

## 2014 Survey

**Compare the two neighborhood characteristics provided and check the one that is more important to you**

A neighborhood that includes a mix of housing types, stores, and businesses that are easy to walk to.	52%	OR	43%	A neighborhood with primarily single-family houses only and you have to drive to stores and
Houses with smaller yards and you would have to have a short commute to work, it is easy to walk to school, stores and restaurants.	51%	OR	42%	Houses with larger yards and you would have a longer commute to work and you have to drive to get to parks, playgrounds and recreation areas.
Houses with small yards and where it is easy to walk to schools, stores and restaurants	49%	OR	43%	Own or rent a detached, single-family house, and have to drive to shops and restaurants and have a longer commute to work.
Own or rent an attached single-family home (where you share one or more common walls), townhouse, or condominium where it is easy to walk to shops, restaurants and have a shorter commute to work.	32%	OR	60%	Own or rent a detached, single-family house, and have to drive to shops and restaurants and have a longer commute to work.
A neighborhood with well-connected sidewalks and bicycle facilities (such as bike lanes and separated pathways)	84%	OR	10%	A neighborhood without well-connected sidewalks and bicycle facilities (such as bike lanes and separated pathways).

## 2017 Survey

**The City of Moscow currently allows public and private colleges and university as educational uses within the Central Business District (downtown Moscow) when granted a conditional use permit. The conditional use permit provides an opportunity to review the proposed use to determine if any conditions should be required in order to reduce any potential negative impacts of the proposed conditional use. Given this process, do you agree that educational uses would be allowed with the Central Business District through a conditional use permit?**

Yes	No
62%	32%

**The City of Moscow has recently received numerous inquiries from citizens wishing to construct and live in a Tiny Home within the City. Tiny Homes are generally a home of 400 square feet or less in size which are constructed on wheels or a foundation. The City of Moscow is considering allowing greater opportunities for Tiny Home development in the City. Do you support Tiny Homes as a method of providing affordable housing options in Moscow?**

Yes	No
79%	16%

**Currently, Tiny Home developments would be processed as a Planned Unit Development which requires a public hearing and approval of the Planning and Zoning Commission or City Council. Two impediments to Tiny Homes under the current City Code are the limitations on the number of homes that are allowed on a certain size property (density) and the number of off-street parking spaces for automobiles that are required. Since Tiny Homes are much smaller than a typical single-family dwelling, would you support amending the City Code to allow higher density and less off-street parking requirements for Tiny Homes?**

Yes	No
59%	34%

## 2019 Survey

### Please identify the importance of the following climate change strategies for the Planning & Zoning commission to consider in planning efforts and recommendations

	Highly Important	Important	Neutral	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Don't Know	No Answer
Work with the City Council and other commissions to develop a Climate Action Plan, which would detail the steps that the City can take to help mitigate and/or adapt to climate change.	43%	23%	9%	4%	16%	3%	3%
Encourage development that is at a density that is sufficient to support multiple modes of transportation (walking, bicycling, public transit, etc.)	45%	28%	8%	6%	8%	3%	2%
Encourage a mixture of land uses that allow walking or bicycling to service that you use on a daily or weekly basis.	42%	27%	13%	5%	7%	3%	2%
Require electric car and/or e-bike charging stations for large residential or commercial developments.	16%	25%	22%	8%	21%	6%	3%
Explore the development of an automotive parking lot outside of downtown for long term storage of automobiles that may not be used very often.	12%	17%	23%	12%	25%	10%	2%

### Please identify the importance of the following neighborhood characteristics to you

	Highly Important	Important	Neutral	Somewhat Important	Not Important	Don't Know	No Answer
A mixture of housing types (single family, duplex, townhouse, etc.)	17%	33%	19%	8%	19%	3%	2%
Smaller lot sizes with more neighborhood open space	11%	23%	23%	8%	28%	5%	3%

Neighborhoods with narrower streets and alleys	5%	9%	20%	5%	51%	7%	3%
A restaurant within a 5-10-minute walk from your house	10%	21%	17%	8%	39%	2%	3%
Other	14%	3%	2%	0%	3%	9%	70%

## 2023 Survey

### Q1: New Developments

Respondents were asked to rank their preferences of potential options to increase housing density in the City. The option to “Allow reduced lot sizes while requiring more common green spaces to reduce need for private yards” was the first choice with an average score of 2.8 and the least selected choice would be to “Allow all residential uses in single family zoning districts (duplexes, condominiums, townhouses and apartment complexes” with a score of 4.6.

**Denser housing developments can reduce housing costs, increase housing inventory, and help reduce urban sprawl and costs related to expansion and maintenance of public infrastructure. When considering new residential developments, the City should:**

	Rating (lower score indicates higher preference)
Reduce lot sizes, reduce private yards, more common green spaces	2.8
Reduce lot sizes in single-family zones, increase housing density, potentially reduce housing cost	3.2
Allow duplexes within single-family zones	3.3
Wider array of duplexes, condominiums, townhouses in single-family zones	3.5
Not allow densification of single-family zones	3.7
Allow all residential types in single family-zones	4.6

Some respondents chose to rank items with repeating numbers while others strictly rated each item 1-6. Some responses also selected certain ones to rank rather than providing all options with an answer, which caused a variance in response rates. This may be something to consider in future surveys if this needs to be re-worded. This question received an average response rate of 80%.

### Q2: Parking Problem

To address the various parking issues in the community, citizens were asked where they believe the most issues occur. Options to respond with were either “Significant Problem”, “Slight Problem”, “Neutral”, or “Not a Problem”. Downtown was by far the most selected with 40% of received surveys selecting “Significant Problem” whereas the other options were less than 10%. This question had an average 98% response rate.

**To what degree do you think parking is a problem within the City of Moscow in the following locations?**

	Significant Problem	Slight Problem	Neutral	Not a Problem	Don't Know
Downtown	40%	40%	6%	13%	0%
My Neighborhood	9%	20%	8%	61%	1%
Eastern commercial areas (Troy Hwy)	4%	8%	22%	57%	7%
Western commercial areas (Pullman Hwy)	3%	7%	20%	60%	7%

**Q3: Parking Solution**

The Commission provided respondents with a variety of potential actions that could assist with reducing parking demand or increase parking availability. By rating the options on a scale of 1-7 with 1 being the most preferred, the option to “Promote using more alternative mobility options (transit viability, biking, walking, etc.)” was most preferred and the least preferred was “A large, costly to build parking structure”.

**What options are you interested in that might relieve parking problems in Moscow?**

	Rating (lower score indicates higher preference)
Promote alternative mobility options (transit viability, biking, walking, etc.)	2.5
Utilizing garages/driveways more, rather than competing for street parking	3.0
Dedicated parking on outskirts of town for less-used vehicles	3.6
None of the above	4.1
More surface parking lots that generate low tax returns and are dead zones	4.2
Reduce parking spaces for residences/businesses, and go first come, first serve	4.5
A large, costly to build parking structure	4.6

While these results may be expected, this question may have some conflicting answers. Some respondents chose to rank items with repeating numbers while others strictly rated each item 1-7. Some surveys also had some of the options answered rather than all of them. For example, alternative mobility options had a 78.3% response rate whereas surface parking lots had a 67.8% rate. Furthermore, there were many comments left on the survey regarding the verbiage that was used for the options provided stating it was a “biased” question. Specifically, the option of “A large, costly to build parking structure” may have deterred some individuals from responding.