



Legacy Crossing Subcommittee Special Meeting Minutes: May 25, 2023, 2:00 p.m.

City of Moscow Mayor's Conference Room • 206 E 3rd Street • Moscow, ID 83843

Members Present	Representative	Staff in Attendance
Gerard Billington	University of Idaho	Cody Riddle, Executive Director
Kevin Clary	Downtown Business	Jennifer Fleischman, Clerk
Sandra Kelly	Urban Renewal Agency	
Steve McGeehan	Urban Renewal Agency	
Phillip Mead (virtual)	University of Idaho	
Brandy Sullivan	Downtown Business	
Alison Tompkins	Urban Renewal Agency	

The subcommittee meeting was called to order at 2:04 p.m.

1. Introductions

The subcommittee members and the applicants introduced themselves briefly.

2. Review of Legacy Crossing Request for Proposal Requirements – Cody Riddle

Riddle informed the Subcommittee of the expectations regarding the meeting and the procedure for providing additional comments to the Urban Renewal Agency. A brief presentation was given with information about the Request for Proposals (RFP) requirements and the purpose of the Subcommittee.

3. Discussion Regarding the Legacy Crossing Development Proposals – Cody Riddle

Staff will provide an overview of the two proposals received for development of the Agency's property at 6th and Jackson and seek the committee's general input on each. This input will be used by the URA Board in selecting a respondent.

Staff walked the Subcommittee through each proposal separately, but mentioned the similarities of both. Neither of the plans proposed a hotel, but one of the plans lists Moscow Hotel, LLC as the business owner's name. The Rench proposal has mixed office and residential space on the 2nd floor. Some notable differences between the proposals were pointed out; including the level of detail of the submissions, the designs have different building profiles, the differences in style of parking spaces, and land use. Bike parking is included in one plan, with the addition of a pocket park instead of more vehicle parking. Vehicular traffic flow differences were also mentioned, one submission with a continuous flow through the property and the other with two lots having separate entrances.

Riddle reminded the Subcommittee that the City has requirements regarding parking, but the URA can approve a proposal regardless of whether or not it meets that requirement. Neither applicant met the full parking requirements for their proposed designs. Off-site parking could be an option for the applicants, and would need to be within 500-600 feet of the property. The Subcommittee suggested the applicants double-check individual parking requirements, as there appeared to be a discrepancy between the plans and proposals. Rench's submission had more two- and three-bedroom residential units, and the Lilly/Skandalos proposal had more studio- and one-bedroom units. Roof-top use was incorporated in both proposals. The Lilly/Skandalos submission had more details in their proposal regarding schedule and tentative timeline.

The Lilly/Skandalos proposal has the potential to create a gateway for Hello Walk with the pocket park on the other side. The Rensch submission had a better use of trees along Hello Walk, which created a more welcoming concept. The Lilly/Skandalos submission appeared more engaging and activate the 6th and Jackson Street corner, with a restaurant on the corner and open patio on second floor. The differences of projected prices for the rental and commercial spaces was discussed, and how one seemed to be more conservative. It was pointed out that the Lilly/Skandalos proposal had a greater mix of residential, office space, and retail space, as well as details about sustainability, green-building, and water-treatment in the plan.

The Subcommittee thought that a strength of the Lilly/Skandalos submission was the level of detail in the proposal, the restaurant and entertainment use, and the viability of the building being filled with tenants, considering the prior success of Sangria. Rensch's proposal had the good idea of putting a parking lot on the first floor of the building, but was not ideal for a Sixth Street building. Both proposals put in a lot of work, but the anchor tenant being a restaurant was intriguing.

This is the third RFP for the property and the viability of a proposal is important to consider when a decision is made. There was a discussion regarding the use and energy of the property, and the differences between activities during the day and at night. The proposed income generated from the Lilly/Skandalos proposal also incorporated affordable housing. Zoning laws cannot require affordable housing from private developers, but because it was part of the initial proposal, the URA Board can consider that as part of the condition of approval. The different traffic flow patterns were mentioned again and also the way each building profile changed the welcoming feel of the property. The pocket park could be used by everyone but the rooftop garden would only be for those in the building.

The Subcommittee talked more about parking requirements and how important that is for this particular site. It was a consensus that parking, though important, should not be considered absolutely necessary for the downtown area. Providing bicycle parking can replace some of the traditional parking spaces. It was acknowledged that residential parking is important and the Subcommittee does not want to create a negative parking situation. There was continued talk about parking on the first floor of a commercial retail building versus off-site parking for the residential units. Parking lots do not add value to property nor generate tax revenue. Both proposals had a greater height to their designs, and the Subcommittee found it to be a positive. Staff will provide a copy of the RFP to the Subcommittee.

4. Adjourn

The subcommittee meeting adjourned at 2:54 p.m.



Steve McGeehan, Agency Chair

Co-16-27

Date