



**BOISE CITY PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION  
HEARING MINUTES  
JANUARY 4, 2021**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

PRESENT: Squyres (Remote), Blanchard (Remote), Mohr (Remote),  
Gillespie (Remote), Finrock (Remote), Stead, Schafer

ABSENT:

**II. CONSENT AGENDA**

**\*2. CUP20-00055 / Twisted Sugar**

10804 W Fairview Ave

Conditional use permit for a drive through window associated with an existing 6,045 square foot building on 0.59 acres in a C-2D (General Commercial with Design Review) zone. *Karla Nelson*

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Bob Schafer, Co-Chair
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Janelle Finrock, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Squyres, Blanchard, Mohr, Gillespie, Finrock, Stead, Schafer
	<b>UNANIMOUS APPROVAL TO PLACE ON CONSENT</b>
	<b>ALL IN FAVOR, MOTION CARRIED</b>

CITY OF BOISE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

IN RE: )  
CUP20-00055 / TWISTED SUGAR )  
10804 West Fairview Avenue )  
 )  
 )  
 )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

TRANSCRIPT OF RECORDED PUBLIC HEARING

MONDAY, JANUARY 4, 2021

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

MEREDITH STEAD, CHAIR

BOB SCHAFFER, CO-CHAIR

ASHLEY SQUYRES

CHRISTOPHER BLANCHARD

JENNIFER MOHR

MILT GILLESPIE

JANELLE FINFROCK

TRANSCRIBED BY:

VICTORIA HILLES

1 (Begin transcription at 0:18:56 of audio  
2 file.)

3 INTRODUCTION

4 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay. So the first item for  
5 consideration of the consent agenda is Item No. 2.  
6 This is CUP20-55 for Twisted Sugar. It's at 10804  
7 West Fairview Avenue, a conditional-use permit for a  
8 drive-through window.

9 Is the applicant present?

10 Please virtually raise your hand.

11 Hi, Jarron.

12 And are you in agreement with the terms  
13 and the conditions of the staff report?

14 JARRON BOLINGBROKE: Yes, I am.

15 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Great.

16 NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

17 N/A

18 PUBLIC TESTIMONY

19 CHAIRMAN STEAD: And is there anybody present  
20 tonight who would like to testify in opposition of  
21 this Item No. 2?

22 Please virtually raise your hand.

23 CÉLINE ACORD: Madam Chair, we have a Jay that  
24 has a hand raised, but I believe his hand's been  
25 raised earlier. I'm just going to un-mute him real

1 quick so we can find out.

2 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Perfect.

3 CÉLINE ACORD: Oh, and it went away.

4 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Oh, his hand's down. Okay.

5 CÉLINE ACORD: Never mind. Poof. He's gone.

6 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay. So seeing nobody is here  
7 to testify in opposition of this item.

8 We'll place Item No. 2 onto the consent  
9 agenda.

10 REBUTTAL

11 N/A

12 MOTIONS

13 N/A

14 ROLL CALL

15 N/A

16 (End transcription at 0:20:03 of audio  
17 file.)

18 -o0o-

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

\*3. **CUP20-00057 / neUdesign Architecture**

5310 W State St

General exception to apply the standards of the C-3D (Service Commercial with Design Review) zone to an adjoining 1.65 acre parcel in the C-2D (General Commercial with Design Review) zone.

*Ethan Mansfield*

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Bob Schafer, Co-Chair
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Janelle Finfrock, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Squyres, Blanchard, Mohr, Gillespie, Finfrock, Stead, Schafer
	<b>UNANIMOUS APPROVAL TO PLACE ON CONSENT</b>
	<b>ALL IN FAVOR, MOTION CARRIED</b>



1 (Begin transcription at 0:20:11 of audio  
2 file.)

3 INTRODUCTION

4 CHAIRMAN STEAD: The next item for consideration  
5 is Item No. 3. This is CUP20-57 for neUdesign  
6 Architecture at 5310 West State Street. It's a  
7 general exception to apply the standards of the C-3D  
8 zone to an adjoining acre parcel.

9 Is the applicant present?

10 Hi, Larry. And are you in agreement with  
11 the terms and the conditions of the staff report?

12 It looks like you're still -- oh, there we  
13 go.

14 LARRY MONKARSH: We are.

15 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Great. Thank you.

16 NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

17 N/A

18 PUBLIC TESTIMONY

19 CHAIRMAN STEAD: And is there anybody present to  
20 testify in opposition of this item tonight?

21 Please virtually raise your hand.

22 Okay. Seeing none.

23 Then we will place Item 4 on the consent  
24 agenda.

25 And -- sorry. That was Item No. 3 on the

1 consent agenda.

2 REBUTTAL

3 N/A

4 MOTIONS

5 N/A

6 ROLL CALL

7 N/A

8 (End transcription at 0:21:14 of audio  
9 file.)

10 -o0o-

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- \*4. **CUP20-00052 / Curtis McKenzie**  
412 W Franklin St  
Conditional use permit for single family home on 0.14 acres in a  
L-OHD/CD (Limited Office with Historic District and Conservation  
District Overlay) zone. *Kevin Holmes*

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Bob Schafer, Co-Chair
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Janelle Finfrock, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Squyres, Blanchard, Mohr, Gillespie, Finfrock, Stead, Schafer
	<b>UNANIMOUS APPROVAL TO PLACE ON CONSENT</b>
	<b>ALL IN FAVOR, MOTION CARRIED</b>



1 (Begin transcription at 0:21:13 of audio  
2 file.)

3 INTRODUCTION

4 CHAIRMAN STEAD: The next item for consideration  
5 is Item No. 4. This is CUP20-52 for Curtis McKenzie  
6 at 412 West Franklin Street. This is a  
7 conditional-use permit for a single-family home.

8 Is the applicant present?

9 Please virtually raise your hand.

10 Hi, Curt.

11 And are you in agreement with the terms  
12 and conditions of the staff report?

13 CURT MCKENZIE: I am.

14 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you.

15 NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

16 N/A

17 PUBLIC TESTIMONY

18 CHAIRMAN STEAD: And is there anybody in  
19 attendance tonight who would like to testify in  
20 opposition of this item?

21 Okay. Seeing none.

22 We will place Item 4 on the consent  
23 agenda.

24 REBUTTAL

25 N/A

1 MOTIONS

2 N/A

3 ROLL CALL

4 N/A

5 (End transcription at 0:21:53 of audio  
6 file.)

7 -o0o-

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

\*5. **SOS20-00026 / Sawtooth Land Surveying**

9798 W Arnold Rd

Waiver to the Subdivision Ordinance requirement to construct curb and gutter as part of a minor land division on 1.377 acres in R-1C (Single-Family Residential) zone. *Crystal Rain*

**RESULT:** **APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]**

**MOVER:** Bob Schafer, Co-Chair

**SECONDER:** Janelle Finfrock, Commissioner

**AYES:** Squyres, Blanchard, Mohr, Gillespie, Finfrock, Stead, Schafer

**UNANIMOUS APPROVAL TO PLACE ON CONSENT**

**ALL IN FAVOR, MOTION CARRIED**



1 (Begin transcription at 0:21:53 of audio  
2 file.)

3 INTRODUCTION

4 CHAIRMAN STEAD: The next item for consideration  
5 is Item No. 5. This is SOS20-26 for Sawtooth Land  
6 Surveying at 9798 West Arnold Road -- Arnold Road.  
7 This is a waiver to the Subdivision Ordinance  
8 requirement to construct curb and gutter.

9 Is the applicant present?

10 Please virtually raise your hand.

11 Looks like -- do we have anybody from  
12 Sawtooth Land Surveying on the call?

13 Okay. So I don't see anybody here.

14 NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

15 N/A

16 PUBLIC TESTIMONY

17 CHAIRMAN STEAD: So I'll still see -- is there  
18 anybody from the public that would -- is here to  
19 testify in opposition of this item?

20 Okay. Seeing none. Then we will place  
21 Item 5 on the consent agenda.

22 REBUTTAL

23 N/A

24 MOTIONS

25 CHAIRMAN STEAD: And that's the end of the

1 consent agenda. I'll entertain a motion.

2 CO-CHAIRMAN SCHAFFER: Madam Chair.

3 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Schafer.

4 CO-CHAIRMAN SCHAFFER: I move to approve the  
5 following items on the consent agenda: Item 2, Item 3,  
6 Item 4, and Item 5.

7 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Great. We have a motion to  
8 approve the consent agenda.

9 Do we have a second?

10 COMMISSIONER FINFROCK: Second.

11 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you, Commissioner  
12 Finfrock.

13 ROLL CALL

14 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Will the clerk please call the  
15 vote.

16 THE CLERK: Stead.

17 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Aye.

18 THE CLERK: Schafer.

19 CO-CHAIRMAN SCHAFFER: Aye.

20 THE CLERK: Squyres.

21 COMMISSIONER SQUYRES: Aye.

22 THE CLERK: Blanchard.

23 COMMISSIONER BLANCHARD: Aye.

24 THE CLERK: Mohr.

25 COMMISSIONER MOHR: Aye.

1 THE CLERK: Gillespie.

2 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Aye.

3 THE CLERK: Finfrock.

4 COMMISSIONER FINFROCK: Aye.

5 THE CLERK: All in favor. Motion carries.

6 (End transcription at 0:23:47 of audio  
7 file.)

8 -o0o-

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

III. NEW BUSINESS

\*1. **ZOA20-00004 / City of Boise**

Amend the Development Code regarding Specific Procedures (Section 11-03-03) including changes to the posting requirements for specific application types, the radius of neighborhood meeting notice mailings, and the timeline for submittal of administrative variance applications. *Josh Wilson*

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>RECOMMENDED APPROVAL [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>First Motion:</b>	Commissioner Finfrock moved to recommend approval. Commissioner Gillespie second.
<b>Second Motion:</b>	Commissioner Gillespie moved to amend the First Motion by excluding condition #4 from the staff report. Commissioner Finfrock second.
<b>Third Motion:</b>	Commissioner Finfrock moved to recommend approval and exclude condition #4 from the staff report. Commissioner Gillespie second. Motion Passed [unanimous].
<b>MOVER:</b>	Janelle Finfrock, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Milt Gillespie, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Squyres, Blanchard, Mohr, Gillespie, Finfrock, Stead, Schafer
	<b>ALL IN FAVOR, MOTION CARRIED</b>



1 (Begin transcription at 0:23:49 of audio  
2 file.)

3 INTRODUCTION

4 CHAIRMAN STEAD: So now we're going to start  
5 with hearing Item No. 1, and I will welcome Mr. Wilson  
6 as the staff to present the item.

7 JOSH WILSON: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of  
8 the Commission. I will share my screen.

9 The City of Boise Planning and Development  
10 Services is a -- is proposing an amendment to the  
11 Zoning Ordinance, Section 11-03-03, in relation to  
12 Specific Procedures. We would propose changes to the  
13 required neighborhood meeting notice, mailed notices,  
14 and site posting for specific types of applications.

15 If you'll recall, in 2019 there was an  
16 extensive effort to revamp the way that we notify and  
17 post public hearings. There was a work group  
18 consisting of members of the community and City  
19 leadership that took a look at the way that we do  
20 things, like neighborhood meetings, mailed notices,  
21 and site postings.

22 We have been working with those changes  
23 for a year, and City leadership directed us to take a  
24 look at those improvements to the process in place and  
25 see how they're working and what additional

1 improvements could be made. Through that process,  
2 staff has identified that there are some additional  
3 changes to the Specific Procedure section of the  
4 Ordinance that we would like to propose.

5           The first of those is to eliminate the  
6 12-day waiting period to submit an administrative  
7 variance application. When applicants hold their  
8 neighborhood meeting and gather signatures for the  
9 submittal of that neighborhood administrative variance  
10 application, all of the effective parties are required  
11 to sign off on that notice. So the 12-day period to  
12 wait to submit that application is unnecessary, so we  
13 propose eliminating that.

14           We would also propose to increase the  
15 mailed notice radius to 500 feet for specific types of  
16 applications, and those are Comprehensive Plan Land  
17 Use Map amendments, annexations and rezones, special  
18 exceptions, subdivisions greater than 5 acres,  
19 conditional-use permits greater than 1 acre, and  
20 planning and developments greater than 1 acre. The  
21 neighborhood meeting notice should be changed to align  
22 with the required mailed notice of the public hearing,  
23 so we would propose that change.

24           Additionally we would propose to increase  
25 the signs posted for Category 3 Hillside Grading work

1 sessions to 4 feet by 4 feet to align with the size of  
2 signage required for annexations and rezones and  
3 planned-unit developments, which often do -- or which  
4 are often associated with those Category 3 Hillside  
5 Grading sessions, so that the increase in size makes  
6 sense for those applications.

7           And finally we would propose eliminating  
8 posted sign requirements and mailed notices for large  
9 subdivisions within Specific Plan areas -- these are  
10 the SP zones, such as Harris Ranch, Barber Valley, and  
11 Syringa Valley -- with the idea being that these areas  
12 have gone through years -- months, if not years, of  
13 extensive public outreach.

14           The subdivision application is largely a  
15 technical review for agency comments and compliance  
16 with dimensional standards, and we could save City  
17 resources and staff time by eliminating the posted  
18 signed and mailed notices for those types of  
19 applications.

20           I will note that we have received some  
21 public testimony in regards to the last item in  
22 opposition to that change. There is some included in  
23 the packet. There is some included in late  
24 correspondence.

25           And there some -- and there is a letter

1 from the Barber Valley Neighborhood Association that  
2 due to some technical difficulties we did not receive  
3 prior to the hearing. So I'd like to quickly  
4 summarize the contents of that letter. And I also  
5 believe their representative is on the call tonight to  
6 speak to this.

7           The Barber Valley Neighborhood Association  
8 recognizes that extensive previous public outreach  
9 regarding the Specific Plans has taken place. However  
10 one of our observations regarding the Specific Plans  
11 is they can be too rigid and limit the opportunity for  
12 the City and developer to incorporate merging best  
13 practices into City Code.

14           We believe a robust public notification  
15 process should be retained to Specific Plan areas to  
16 inform new neighbors in the Specific Plan areas of  
17 these subdivisions.

18           That's largely a summary of their  
19 comments, but they are opposed to the final item that  
20 we would include in the amendment regarding the posted  
21 notices and mailed notices for the large subdivisions  
22 within Specific Plan areas.

23           With that, the planning team does approve  
24 or recommend approval of the Ordinance amendment, and  
25 the action tonight would be a recommendation to City

1 Council.

2 With that, I would stand for any questions  
3 from the Commission.

4 Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you. Thanks, Mr. Wilson.

6 NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

7 CHAIRMAN STEAD: So first we're going  
8 to -- before questions, we're going to hear from the  
9 neighborhood associations.

10 Can I have anybody that is a designated  
11 representative of their neighborhood association,  
12 who's here to speak on this item on behalf of the  
13 neighborhood -- to please virtually raise your hand?

14 Great. I see one.

15 So, Mr. Moore, please go ahead. Please  
16 start with your name and address, and you'll have up  
17 to 10 minutes.

18 CÉLINE ACORD: Madam Chair, I'm going to change  
19 Steven Moore to a panelist.

20 So, Steve, you're going to drop off for  
21 just a second, and we'll see you in just a second.

22 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Hi, Steve. Looks like you're  
23 back on as a panelist, so you can un-mute and even  
24 turn on your video or share your screen, whatever is  
25 best.

1 STEVE MOORE: Whoops. Hello. I'll move down  
2 here so you can see me a little bit.

3 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Great.

4 STEVE MOORE: Hello. Thank you very much,  
5 Commissioners and -- for the opportunity to comment on  
6 this.

7 So you've mentioned our letter. Thanks  
8 for getting that. I suppose with the holidays things  
9 got --

10 CHAIRMAN STEAD: I'm sorry, Mr. Moore.

11 STEVE MOORE: -- delayed a little bit.

12 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Can you start with your name  
13 and address.

14 STEVE MOORE: Oh, can you hear me okay?

15 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yes, we can.

16 Please just start with your name and  
17 address, and then right into --

18 STEVE MOORE: Okay.

19 CHAIRMAN STEAD: -- the testimony.

20 STEVE MOORE: Okay. It's Steve Moore. 2920  
21 South Shadywood Way, Boise, Idaho. Representing  
22 Barber Valley Neighborhood Association.

23 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Great. Thank you.

24 STEVE MOORE: I agree with -- Josh read the  
25 first part of our letter there. And we did think

1 highly of three of the four recommendations to kind of  
2 simplify the process, but we've just kind of  
3 noticed -- even though these Specific Plans go on for  
4 years in the planning process, it does seem like  
5 particularly new neighbors to the area can kind of  
6 miss out on what -- what's really going on.

7           And just having a big sign out there does  
8 kind of get people's recognition as they're driving  
9 by. And with the new SP-03 in Syringa Valley, there's  
10 very few residents out there. So I think, you know,  
11 it would be better to have it larger, have a little  
12 more public participation.

13           We agree there's been a very extensive  
14 effort in SP-01 and 2 and grade plans. But as we've  
15 gone through these processes, we still noticed  
16 sometimes there's an opportunity to make an amendment  
17 as maybe practices with planning have changed and  
18 improved over time. So it gives us a little more of  
19 an opportunity to chime in there at that point.

20           So SP-03 is still pretty early in the  
21 process, and you know, I think it needs full public  
22 engagement. And if it means just having a bigger sign  
23 up there, we -- you know, we just think that would be  
24 helpful. And as the plan evolves, hopefully it'll get  
25 more neighborhood involvement.

1           But that's about all I had, and I  
2 appreciate the opportunity.

3           Thank you.

4           CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you so much, Mr. Moore.

5           So next we'll move to questions from the  
6 Commission for either staff or the neighborhood.

7           Commissioner Gillespie.

8           COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Thank you, Madam  
9 Chairman.

10          Mr. Moore, thank you for joining us.

11          A quick question, Mr. Moore.

12          So this is really just about subdivision  
13 applications. And as the City stated, I think  
14 correctly, when a subdivision application is made, as  
15 long as it meets the dimensional standards of  
16 [unintelligible] plan, it's sort of an  
17 [unintelligible] approval. In other words, we  
18 actually don't have approval criteria at the  
19 Commission level as long as all of the technical  
20 requirements for the subdivision are met.

21          So it's not a great -- that particular  
22 hearing or process isn't really a great venue or  
23 process for discussing changes to a Comp Plan or a  
24 specifically adopted plan.

25          So I just -- I -- and this has come up a

1 time or two. I think the Commission will remember  
2 when we -- you know, we'd have a subdivision, it fit  
3 everything, but the Barber Valley Association wanted  
4 to change really what was some unrelated part of the  
5 plan, and it's hard for us to handle that.

6 So I guess, Mr. Moore -- I'm wondering  
7 is -- you know, what's your advice to the Commission  
8 on this point, given that -- you know, the nature of  
9 that subdivision application?

10 STEVE MOORE: Yes. Thank you, Commissioner  
11 Gillespie. I appreciate your comment there.

12 I just -- it just seems like as -- these  
13 things go on for years. We've been involved with the  
14 developer pretty extensively and -- as well as the  
15 Planning department in these subdivisions that are  
16 coming up. And often it's kind of hard to find a  
17 point where it's good to raise our hand and  
18 participate in the process.

19 We've done quite a bit of work on, well,  
20 changing the -- some of the transportation issues,  
21 bike lanes and pedestrian access, in some of these  
22 areas in the subdivision. And I guess it's just hard  
23 to know where we fit in that process. So if there's a  
24 better way, we're all for it.

25 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Madam Chairman.

1 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Gillespie.

2 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: So kind of what you're  
3 saying, Mr. Moore -- and I understand it -- is that  
4 the subdivision application is like a cue card -- or a  
5 cueing event that helps everybody focus their minds  
6 around whatever the issue is.

7 To answer your question -- and I think  
8 other Commissioners might chime in with questions or  
9 comments, but you as the neighborhood association or  
10 really anybody, you can always come forward with a  
11 proposed amendment to any of those SP-01, SP-02 plans;  
12 right? You don't have to wait for a subdivision or a  
13 CUP in that area to bring up the issues that are on  
14 your mind.

15 In fact bringing it up in a subdivision  
16 hearing is kind of difficult, because we can't really  
17 grapple with it usually very easily.

18 That's all I got. Thank you.

19 STEVE MOORE: Yeah, I understand. Maybe we just  
20 need to come forth in a different venue then, and  
21 we're all for that. We're just trying to, you know,  
22 [unintelligible] as many neighbors as we can --

23 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Sure.

24 STEVE MOORE: -- and this is, like you say, a  
25 way to kind of alert people.

1 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Yeah.

2 STEVE MOORE: Appreciate your comment.

3 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Do we have any other questions?

4 Okay.

5 COMMISSIONER FINFROCK: Madam Chair.

6 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Oh, Commissioner Finfrock.

7 COMMISSIONER FINFROCK: Thanks. I was

8 just -- question for the City.

9 At what point would it be appropriate to  
10 kind of come forward and address these concerns if not  
11 at this stage?

12 JOSH WILSON: Madam Chair, Commissioner  
13 Finfrock, really it's the -- I think Commissioner  
14 Gillespie did a good job of pointing out, that, you  
15 know, the neighborhoods could bring forward Specific  
16 Plan amendments at any time, which would have  
17 significant noticing, public outreach.

18 Beyond that it would really be at the  
19 formation of the Specific Plan during that public  
20 process, which is extensive, and it involves -- and I  
21 think Mr. Moore was correct in pointing out that in  
22 instances like the Syringa Valley, there are probably  
23 limited folks that participate.

24 But it does involve significant community  
25 outreach, outreach with this Commission and with City

1 leadership about that plan. So those would be the  
2 times where that public input would be more  
3 appropriate, I would say.

4 COMMISSIONER FINFROCK: Okay. Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay. Great.

6 PUBLIC TESTIMONY

7 CHAIRMAN STEAD: So next we would move on to  
8 anybody from the public who would like to testify.

9 Do we have -- if you are interested in  
10 testifying on this item tonight, please virtually  
11 raise your hand.

12 Okay. I am seeing none.

13 REBUTTAL

14 CHAIRMAN STEAD: So next we would move on to a  
15 rebuttal from the applicant.

16 Mr. Wilson, do you have any more to add  
17 based on the comments you heard?

18 JOSH WILSON: Madam Chair, I do not. I  
19 appreciate Mr. Moore's time and comments and the  
20 Commission's time, as well.

21 So thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you. Yes.

23 And, Mr. Moore, we definitely appreciate  
24 you coming out to be a part of the process.

25 So thank you for that.

1 MOTIONS

2 CHAIRMAN STEAD: And at this point, we will  
3 close the public portion of the hearing, and the item  
4 is before the Commission.

5 COMMISSIONER FINFROCK: Madam Chair.

6 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Finfrock.

7 COMMISSIONER FINFROCK: I recommend --

8 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Madam Chairman -- oh.

9 COMMISSIONER FINFROCK: Oh, go ahead, Milt.

10 Sorry.

11 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: No. No.

12 CHAIRMAN STEAD: No. Go ahead, Commissioner  
13 Finfrock.

14 COMMISSIONER FINFROCK: Oh, I recommend approval  
15 of ZOA20-4 along with the recommended and standard  
16 conditions of approval.

17 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Second from Commissioner  
19 Gillespie.

20 Great. Any discussion?

21 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Madam Chairman.

22 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Gillespie.

23 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Janelle didn't un-mute  
24 fast enough, so I jumped.

25 COMMISSIONER FINFROCK: Sorry. Sorry.

1           COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: It's like the buzzer in  
2 "Jeopardy".

3                       So I seconded it, but I would like to  
4 discuss -- I'm very okay recommending deleting the  
5 fourth point to the City Council.

6                       I -- although I -- you know, I said my  
7 piece vis-a-vis that point, I think in the end, even  
8 things that cue up neighborhood issues before the City  
9 in a funny kind of way like they do with subdivisions,  
10 I still think it's okay, because it gives -- it gives  
11 people who aren't really following this process very  
12 closely an opportunity to dialogue with the City about  
13 those issues.

14                      So if the original motion maker and the  
15 Council -- or the Commission wants to, I would be more  
16 than happy to support dropping that idea of -- that  
17 was the fourth point -- that, you know, Mr. Moore  
18 didn't agree with.

19                      I just wonder what everybody thinks.

20           COMMISSIONER FINFROCK: Madam Chair.

21           CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Finfrock.

22           COMMISSIONER FINFROCK: Yeah, I can definitely  
23 drop that fourth point.

24                      I think that Commissioner Gillespie brings  
25 up a good point in that -- I mean, anytime we provide

1 more notice to neighborhoods or the surrounding area,  
2 I think it's always a good thing. I mean, disclosure  
3 is important, especially -- you know, I  
4 sometimes -- I'll be walking my dog and come across a  
5 notice and read it, and I'm -- you know, I wasn't in  
6 the vicinity to get the notice originally or even be  
7 aware of what was going on.

8 So I'm -- I definitely concur with that,  
9 Commissioner Gillespie.

10 CO-CHAIRMAN SCHAFFER: Madam Chair.

11 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Schafer.

12 CO-CHAIRMAN SCHAFFER: I'm in favor of the  
13 motion, and I'm also in favor of striking that fourth  
14 point, as well. I think that there's absolutely no  
15 harm in the additional notifications.

16 I mean, I understand where staff's coming  
17 from and wanting to be efficient with staff time and  
18 even applicant time for that matter, but I agree that  
19 there's certainly no harm in additional notifications.  
20 And giving the community time to digest, you know,  
21 what's happening in their neighborhood, I think that's  
22 a positive.

23 COMMISSIONER MOHR: Madam Chair.

24 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Mohr.

25 COMMISSIONER MOHR: Is the -- I agree with the

1 motion and with striking Item No. 4. You know, even  
2 if it does comply entirely with the specific area  
3 plan, just giving people a chance to look at  
4 it -- they might not have known that that specific  
5 area plan existed in the first place. So just more  
6 involvement, more knowledge in where they live is, I  
7 think -- yeah, never a bad thing.

8 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Great.

9 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Madam Chairman.

10 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Gillespie.

11 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: I'd like to ask  
12 Commissioner Finfrock if she would be willing to make  
13 a friendly amendment to her motion to delete the  
14 fourth point.

15 COMMISSIONER FINFROCK: Madam Chair.

16 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Finfrock.

17 COMMISSIONER FINFROCK: Can I please amend my  
18 motion to read that I recommend approval of ZOA20-4  
19 along with the recommended and standard conditions of  
20 approval with the deletion of Item 4 in the staff  
21 report?

22 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yes.

23 And do we have a second --

24 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Second.

25 CHAIRMAN STEAD: -- from Commissioner Gillespie?

1 Great. Perfect.

2 ROLL CALL

3 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay. Well, with that, I will  
4 ask the clerk to please call the vote.

5 THE CLERK: Stead.

6 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Aye.

7 THE CLERK: Schafer.

8 CO-CHAIRMAN SCHAFFER: Aye.

9 THE CLERK: Squyres.

10 COMMISSIONER SQUYRES: Aye.

11 THE CLERK: Blanchard.

12 COMMISSIONER BLANCHARD: Aye.

13 THE CLERK: Mohr.

14 COMMISSIONER MOHR: Aye.

15 THE CLERK: Gillespie.

16 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Aye.

17 THE CLERK: Finfrock.

18 COMMISSIONER FINFROCK: Aye.

19 THE CLERK: All in favor. Motion carries.

20 (End transcription at 0:42:50 of audio  
21 file.)

22 -o0o-

23

24

25

\*6. **CVA20-00056 / Renaissance Remodeling**

4425 N Shamrock Ave

Variance from the front setback and the maximum driveway width for a proposed garage on 1.03 acres in a R-1A-BSN (Single Family Residential with Big Sky Neighborhood Overlay) zone. *Crystal Rain*

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>DENIED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Janelle Finfrock, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Christopher S Blanchard, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Squyres, Blanchard, Mohr, Gillespie, Finfrock, Stead, Schafer
	<b>ALL IN FAVOR, MOTION CARRIED</b>

CITY OF BOISE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

IN RE: )  
 CVA20-00056 / RENAISSANCE REMODELING )  
 4425 North Shamrock Avenue )  
 )  
 )  
 )  
 \_\_\_\_\_ )

TRANSCRIPT OF RECORDED PUBLIC HEARING

MONDAY, JANUARY 4, 2021

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

MEREDITH STEAD, CHAIR

BOB SCHAFFER, CO-CHAIR

ASHLEY SQUYRES

CHRISTOPHER BLANCHARD

JENNIFER MOHR

MILT GILLESPIE

JANELLE FINFROCK

TRANSCRIBED BY:

VICTORIA HILLES

1 (Begin transcription at 0:42:50 of audio  
2 file.)

3 INTRODUCTION

4 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay. Thank you.

5 So now we're on to Item No. 6. This is  
6 CVA20-56 for Renaissance Remodeling at 4425 North  
7 Shamrock Avenue, a variance from the front setback and  
8 the maximum driveway width for a proposed garage.

9 We'll first hear from staff.

10 And it's over to you, Ms. Rain.

11 CRYSTAL RAIN: Thank you. Madam Chair, Members  
12 of the Commission, the item before you contains two  
13 variances, one to encroach into the front setback and  
14 one to exceed the maximum driveway width for a  
15 proposed detached garage on a property located at 4425  
16 North Shamrock Ave in an R-1A-BSN (Single-Family  
17 Residential with Big Sky Neighborhood Overlay) zone.

18 The 1.03-acre lot contains an existing  
19 single-family house and attached garage with a  
20 circular driveway. Parcels within the Big Sky  
21 Neighborhood Overlay are subject to a front setback of  
22 35 feet, compared to the typical 20-foot residential  
23 setback. And the parcel is also located in the Big  
24 Sky subdivision and is subject to platted front  
25 setback of 50 feet.

1           The proposed third garage would sit  
2 20-feet from the front property line. Access would be  
3 taken from pavers connecting to the existing driveway.  
4 Direct access to Shamrock is not allowed, as driveways  
5 may not be closer than 50 feet to an intersection.  
6 And discussions with ACHD revealed an additional  
7 access point in this location would likely not be  
8 approved.

9           However the connecting driveway stub  
10 requires a second variance, as the configuration  
11 exceeds the maximum driveway width of 33 feet and a  
12 front setback.

13           There is a unique feature to the property  
14 that warrants consideration. The Marathon Pipeline  
15 and associated easement crosses diagonally through the  
16 property, [unintelligible] just behind the southwest  
17 corner of the home towards the intersection of  
18 Shamrock and Goldenrod.

19           While this easement does impact where an  
20 additional garage can be sited, choices are not  
21 limited to this location. The garage can be placed  
22 elsewhere on the lot without the need for a variance.

23           As such, the planning team finds that as  
24 there are other siting options that do not require the  
25 use of any variances, there is no hardship associated

1 with the property, nor is there an exceptional  
2 circumstance relating to the intended use of the  
3 property that is not generally applicable in the  
4 district.

5 Further the planning team finds that the  
6 granting of the variance would be in conflict with the  
7 Comprehensive Plan. Numerous goals and principles  
8 outlined in Blueprint Boise call for a limited  
9 presence of garage fronts.

10 Another goal states that development  
11 should support adopted neighborhood plans. The  
12 proposed aberration from the established setbacks of  
13 both the BSN Overlay and the Big Sky Subdivision Plat  
14 does not align with this goal.

15 Finally the granting of these variances  
16 may prove detrimental to the public health, safety,  
17 and welfare. The nonconforming design, multiple  
18 access points, and tight angles of the driveway  
19 creates a scenario for an increased number of  
20 vehicular conflict points, particularly in the close  
21 vicinity of an intersection.

22 It is the recommendation of the planning  
23 team to deny both variance requests. The Commission  
24 makes the final decision.

25 Thank you. And I'll be happy to answer

1 any questions you may have.

2 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you, Ms. Rain.

3 We'll next hear from the applicant.

4 You'll have 10 minutes, and please start  
5 with your name and address.

6 Céline, do you have the -- can the  
7 applicant please virtually raise their hand so we know  
8 who to -- there we go.

9 Thank you, Tammie. We'll scooch you over  
10 to be a panelist, so hang tight for just a moment.

11 Okay, Tammie. Go ahead and un-mute. And  
12 you can turn on your video if you'd like or share your  
13 screen. Please start with your name and address.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Go ahead  
15 [unintelligible]. Go ahead.

16 TAMMIE COFFEY: This is my husband Ken. He'll  
17 be probably doing most of the talking. Hello.

18 KEN COFFEY: Ken Coffey. 4425 North Shamrock  
19 Avenue, Boise, 83713.

20 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Go ahead, guys. You'll have 10  
21 minutes.

22 KEN COFFEY: Okay.

23 TAMMIE COFFEY: Okay. Sorry.

24 KEN COFFEY: We're kind of new at this, so  
25 excuse the [unintelligible] fumbling around here.

1           Madam Chair and Council members, pleased  
2 to -- appreciate your time and letting us have the  
3 opportunity to discuss this matter with you.

4           Crystal, real appreciation to you with all  
5 the time that we spent discussing this and trying to  
6 find the solution that's best suited for the  
7 neighborhood and us moving forward. Thank you very  
8 much for that.

9           What we're asking here is for the  
10 acceptance that the -- let me back up here.  
11 Boise -- or the Big Sky Neighborhood Association, in  
12 discussions with us on the best plan to add a third  
13 bay to our home -- was to put the garage where we had  
14 put it.

15           TAMMIE COFFEY: The attached.

16           KEN COFFEY: The attached garage.

17           TAMMIE COFFEY: Yeah.

18           KEN COFFEY: The neighborhood association  
19 stressed that they wanted to keep property as open as  
20 possible and therefore wanted to put the garage where  
21 it was. They were not aware of the significance of  
22 the Marathon Petroleum Line that crosses our property  
23 at the angle that it does, nor were they aware of the  
24 significant setbacks that we have to adhere by,  
25 16-and-a-half feet.

1           So the reason that we have to move the  
2 garage forward is -- what we're asking for is to  
3 vacate the Big Sky Neighborhood Association's variance  
4 of a 50-foot setback. But we are within the City's  
5 setback. The neighborhood association agreed with  
6 that and actually encouraged us to do this, as opposed  
7 to putting it anywhere else on our property.

8           TAMMIE COFFEY: [Unintelligible] over here.

9           KEN COFFEY: The -- on the north side of the  
10 property where it was suggested, my neighborhood  
11 association would not agree with that, even to  
12 consider something like that. I don't think anybody  
13 would want to see a house in their neighborhood  
14 book-ended by two garages. Not only that, there's a  
15 ditch that runs along the north side that we have a  
16 9-foot setback -- that makes the garage over on that  
17 side completely impossible.

18           We also have Idaho Power/Cable One lines  
19 that go north/south across the middle of our property  
20 that has a 13-foot arc.

21           TAMMIE COFFEY: Easement.

22           KEN COFFEY: I guess you could call it an  
23 easement that we have to adhere by. So that puts our  
24 property back even further than that. And when you  
25 consider something like that, we're no longer talking

1 about an attached garage. Obviously we're talking  
2 about a shop or something that's in the back.

3 And for my wife and I, who bought the  
4 house just in the few years ago, the reason we bought  
5 a single-story house is because this is a place we  
6 want to remain and age in place. And if we are to be  
7 asked to walk a couple hundred feet -- literally  
8 200 feet -- from the garage to the house in ice, snow,  
9 rain, we feel that that's a hardship that should be  
10 taken into consideration here, as well.

11 TAMMIE COFFEY: And we have -- [unintelligible].

12 CHAD VINCENT: Driveways.

13 TAMMIE COFFEY: Yep, yep. [Unintelligible].

14 KEN COFFEY: The driveway widths that we're  
15 considering here are very typical for our subdivision.  
16 We are not asking for anything that -- the handful of  
17 photos that we have here as a PowerPoint, you'll be  
18 able to scroll through and see.

19 Are -- we're not increasing the traffic at  
20 all. It's still the two of us in the home. So there  
21 will be no more additional vehicles  
22 entering -- egressing or entering the property.

23 CHAD VINCENT: These are driveway examples.  
24 [Unintelligible].

25 KEN COFFEY: And these are driveway examples

1 that we'd like to --

2 TAMMIE COFFEY: Right next door to us, yeah.

3 KEN COFFEY: -- present to you within a quarter  
4 mile of our house, within our subdivision.

5 TAMMIE COFFEY: Right next to our house.

6 KEN COFFEY: These all are exceeding the  
7 33-foot-wide driveways. They're also accessing just  
8 one point. You can all see they have landscaping or a  
9 berm that we would also be adhering to.

10 It is my position that -- and my wife's  
11 desire not to sacrifice the integrity of the front  
12 elevation. We would like to add value to our home and  
13 to the subdivision.

14 And we believe what -- we are doing so by  
15 using similar materials that's on the existing home.  
16 We're using Oakley stone that's found on the existing  
17 home. The siting pattern will be exactly the same.  
18 It will not be a metal building. It will not be a  
19 metal roof. It will be a shingled roof that is  
20 consistent with our home.

21 And we feel that we have done what we can  
22 do within the restrictions that were given and the  
23 hardships -- the three hardships that we were given to  
24 put the best structure that we can on our property.

25 TAMMIE COFFEY: [Unintelligible] garage. Yep.

1 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you. Thanks so much.

2 NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

3 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Do we have a representative in  
4 attendance from the neighborhood association, somebody  
5 who's here to speak on behalf of the neighborhood  
6 association tonight?

7 Okay. Seeing none.

8 Then we will move on to questions from the  
9 Commission for staff or for the applicant.

10 KEN COFFEY: Did you want to say something?

11 COMMISSIONER BLANCHARD: Madam Chair.

12 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Blanchard.

13 COMMISSIONER BLANCHARD: Question for staff.

14 Crystal, can you walk us through  
15 the -- the clear-vision triangle there. So that --

16 CRYSTAL RAIN: Madam --

17 COMMISSIONER BLANCHARD: If I -- if I heard  
18 properly, there was -- that was one of the  
19 issues -- right? -- with the garage being up front?

20 CRYSTAL RAIN: Madam Chair, Commissioner  
21 Blanchard, that was not one of the issues that was  
22 discussed. They are clear of the clear-vision  
23 triangle.

24 COMMISSIONER BLANCHARD: [Unintelligible] with  
25 the garage in that proposed spot?

1           CRYSTAL RAIN: Madam Chair, Commissioner  
2 Blanchard, can you say that one more time? Sorry.

3           COMMISSIONER BLANCHARD: Okay. So in the  
4 proposed spot, it sounded like what you were arguing  
5 was that there would be additional concerns with  
6 traffic and safety with vehicles coming in and out of  
7 that garage potentially.

8           CRYSTAL RAIN: Madam Chair, Commissioner  
9 Blanchard, there is no issue with the clear vision  
10 triangle. The issue that I cited is that, according  
11 to Code, no driveway can come within 50 feet of an  
12 intersection. And the existing driveway is already at  
13 50 feet, so that's why there has to be the stub into  
14 the existing driveway.

15           COMMISSIONER BLANCHARD: Got you. Okay. Thank  
16 you.

17                     Madam Chair, if I could have a follow-on,  
18 please.

19           CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yes, Commissioner Blanchard.

20           COMMISSIONER BLANCHARD: Crystal, can you walk  
21 us through potential sitings on the property where an  
22 [unintelligible] building could go that wouldn't  
23 have -- that wouldn't impact ACHD's requirements.

24           CRYSTAL RAIN: Madam Chair --

25           COMMISSIONER BLANCHARD: So where else might

1 they be able to put the building?

2 CRYSTAL RAIN: Sure. Madam Chair, Commissioner  
3 Blanchard, the applicants could put the RV garage,  
4 albeit detached, in the rear of the property. The  
5 property is an acre.

6 Let me see if I can share my screen to  
7 give you a view. [Unintelligible] difficulties.

8 Okay.

9 COMMISSIONER BLANCHARD: Awesome.

10 CRYSTAL RAIN: Okay. As seen on the screen  
11 here, the proposal is -- okay. This might be a little  
12 better -- the proposal for the garage is here on the  
13 south side of the property. The pipeline does run  
14 through the length of it, but there could be any  
15 places back here that it could be sited. And ACHD  
16 said that they would likely approve an access point  
17 off Goldenrod.

18 COMMISSIONER BLANCHARD: Okay. Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Gillespie.

20 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Crystal, can you run  
21 through the actual -- the setback numbers -- again.

22 And I don't really care -- or at least --  
23 maybe I shouldn't say that. I'm not sure why I should  
24 care about whatever the HOA says.

25 I just want to know, you know, what's the

1 City's setback requirement per our Code and approved  
2 plans in the subdivision plat and -- and what is this  
3 building relative to that set of numbers?

4 CRYSTAL RAIN: Madam Chair, Commissioner  
5 Gillespie, the typical setback for a residential zone  
6 is 20 feet, and I think that that's the setback that  
7 the applicant cited.

8 However the Big Sky Overlay has a setback  
9 of 35 feet in the front, and so that would be what  
10 this variance is speaking to.

11 The platted subdivision -- or the platted  
12 setback of 50 feet would be the subject of a vacation  
13 of easement and is not the subject of this case.

14 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Madam Chairman,  
15 follow-up, please.

16 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Gillespie.

17 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: So Crystal, how far  
18 does this proposed garage stick into that 35-foot  
19 setback?

20 CRYSTAL RAIN: Madam Chair, Commissioner  
21 Gillespie, 15 feet.

22 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Thank you.

23 CO-CHAIRMAN SCHAFFER: Madam Chair.

24 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Schaffer.

25 CO-CHAIRMAN SCHAFFER: Question for staff.

1           Crystal, the applicant alluded to some  
2 correspondence they had with the neighborhood  
3 association, and I just want to make sure that I  
4 didn't miss anything in our packet.

5           Do we have anything from the neighborhood  
6 association that puts in writing their opinion  
7 regarding this garage?

8           CRYSTAL RAIN: Madam Chair, Commissioner, I  
9 received -- I want -- I might have -- I think I  
10 included an HOA correspondence -- and apologies if I  
11 did not -- that said that any decision would need to  
12 be first brought forth to the City of Boise  
13 before -- that they would, you know, look at the  
14 design. That's the only correspondence I received.

15           CO-CHAIRMAN SCHAFFER: Okay. And that was in our  
16 packets.

17           So just to be clear, it seemed to me in  
18 that correspondence they were essentially deferring to  
19 the decision by this Commission and ultimately  
20 probably City Council regarding this issue before they  
21 rendered a decision; correct?

22           CRYSTAL RAIN: Madam Chair, Commissioner  
23 Schafer. That is correct.

24           CO-CHAIRMAN SCHAFFER: Okay. Thanks.

25           COMMISSIONER FINFROCK: Madam Chair.

1 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Finfrock.

2 COMMISSIONER FINFROCK: Okay. So just a little  
3 bit of clarification.

4 So the HOA is the Big Sky Neighborhood  
5 Plan; is that correct? Is that -- or is that one and  
6 the same?

7 CRYSTAL RAIN: Madam Chair, Commissioner --

8 COMMISSIONER FINFROCK: Or -- I'm sorry. This  
9 question's for the City, Crystal. Thank you.

10 CRYSTAL RAIN: Madam Chair, Commissioner, no,  
11 they are not one and the same.

12 COMMISSIONER FINFROCK: Okay.

13 Madam Chair.

14 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yeah, Commissioner Finfrock.

15 COMMISSIONER FINFROCK: Additional question for  
16 Crystal.

17 So if they're not one and the same, the  
18 Big Sky Neighborhood Plan put forth the plan that's  
19 now wrote into the Comprehensive Plan, and it's  
20 completely different from the HOA. So even if we had  
21 the HOA approval, it would have been different from  
22 the actual plan for the neighborhood; is that what I'm  
23 hearing?

24 CRYSTAL RAIN: Madam Chair, Commissioner, I  
25 believe so.

1 COMMISSIONER FINFROCK: Okay. Thank you.

2 COMMISSIONER MOHR: Madam Chair.

3 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Mohr.

4 COMMISSIONER MOHR: Just really quick -- there  
5 was some mention about an Idaho Power easement and a  
6 lateral easement, and I didn't see that in the packet.

7 Do we have any -- a graphic of some sort  
8 of where those easements lie?

9 CRYSTAL RAIN: Madam Chair, Commissioner Mohr,  
10 no, that was not included in the packets.

11 There -- it's -- the easements are  
12 not -- that were mentioned were not on the plat. I do  
13 know that the -- there is an Idaho Power easement  
14 right in the middle here, and those are the only ones  
15 that I'm aware of.

16 COMMISSIONER MOHR: Perfect.

17 And Madam Chair.

18 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Mohr.

19 COMMISSIONER MOHR: Just a quick follow-up,  
20 maybe for the applicant, in reference to that lateral  
21 easement.

22 Do you have kind of a -- just a really  
23 quick description of where that lateral easement might  
24 lie? I know you indicated the north side.

25 KEN COFFEY: Yeah, mm-hmm.

1 CHAD VINCENT: Is it us?

2 KEN COFFEY: Yeah.

3 CHAD VINCENT: This is Chad Vincent representing  
4 Renaissance Remodeling. My office here is at 4220  
5 North Osage Street in Boise.

6 If you will -- we spent a lot of time on  
7 this, and I appreciate everybody's patience with all  
8 this.

9 It really -- the issue starts with this  
10 diagonal through their property and where the diagonal  
11 starts going through their property for this pipeline.

12 As a remodeler doing a lot of ADUs in the  
13 North End, Idaho Power has clamped down on us being  
14 anywhere near their power lines -- actually that's not  
15 specifically correct -- being within 13 feet of an arc  
16 of their power lines.

17 So as our roof goes upwards for this RV  
18 garage, our roof gets closer to this -- the power  
19 lines that they will not allow us to move. So what  
20 we've been doing in the North End is having them move  
21 power lines, put additional poles in at a great  
22 expense in the North End when there is no other  
23 option, and that's really what's happening here.

24 The diagonal force of this pipeline going  
25 through their property pushes either the garage to the

1 front of the property or pushes a garage that's worth  
2 anything past the Idaho Power's easement.

3 I don't know if I'm saying that correctly,  
4 easement, but they will flat out not allow us to put  
5 any structure -- physical piece of the structure  
6 within that 13-foot arc of that line.

7 So what it's doing is pushing us further  
8 and further away from the house, which -- you know,  
9 it'd be fine if our -- if my clients wanted a shop,  
10 but really they're looking to age in place and just  
11 have a third bay of their garage.

12 We realize it violates a few things.  
13 We've tried and tried and tried to figure out a better  
14 way to do this without pushing that garage further and  
15 further away from the house, and it's just not  
16 feasible.

17 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you. Do we have any  
18 other questions --

19 KEN COFFEY: [Unintelligible].

20 CHAIRMAN STEAD: -- from the Commission?

21 KEN COFFEY: [Unintelligible] Commissioner Mohr,  
22 you were asking about the lateral easement there?

23 COMMISSIONER MOHR: Yes.

24 KEN COFFEY: If -- it's at the north of the  
25 property line there. There's that dotted line there.

1 [Unintelligible] can you -- [unintelligible] this.

2 Basically it starts right here. It comes  
3 actually from this property next door to the north of  
4 us, comes across here. It makes a 90-degree turn, and  
5 it comes right up, all the way up here. And it's open  
6 and exposed until you get to about -- back in here.  
7 And then it's tiled in, and it feeds the properties  
8 that are behind us right back here. The  
9 [unintelligible] that are right here really enjoy  
10 that.

11 So there's a 9-foot easement that we have  
12 to respect all the way across this property --

13 TAMMIE COFFEY: For the ditch.

14 KEN COFFEY: -- for the ditch that's there.

15 And again the power lines that are right  
16 here. So there's a 26 -- to 26-foot arc -- or a  
17 13-foot arc, but 26 feet if you go from side to side.

18 Does that answer your question?

19 COMMISSIONER MOHR: Yes.

20 KEN COFFEY: Okay.

21 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay. Great.

22 Seeing no further questions from the  
23 Commission.

24 PUBLIC TESTIMONY

25 CHAIRMAN STEAD: And I -- actually, Tammie, I

1 have you on our sign-up sheet. But as the applicant,  
2 I'm going to skip you on our sign-up sheet if that's  
3 okay.

4 TAMMIE COFFEY: [Unintelligible].

5 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay. Thank you.

6 And then if there's anybody else from the  
7 public that would like to testify on this item  
8 tonight, please virtually raise your hand.

9 Okay. Seeing none.

10 REBUTTAL

11 CHAIRMAN STEAD: We will move on then to -- it  
12 would be time for a rebuttal from the applicant.  
13 There was no testimony against.

14 Would you -- do you have anything else to  
15 add?

16 You'd have five minutes.

17 And no, you're going to waive that; is  
18 that what I'm hearing?

19 KEN COFFEY: Yeah, I don't -- yeah.

20 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay. Thank you.

21 MOTIONS

22 CHAIRMAN STEAD: So we'll close this portion of  
23 the hearing then, and the item is before the  
24 Commission.

25 COMMISSIONER FINFROCK: Madam Chair.

1 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Finfrock.

2 COMMISSIONER FINFROCK: So before we even talk  
3 about like the motion itself, I just had a big -- or  
4 like a question for maybe the other Commissioners.

5 Like if Big Sky Neighborhood Plan spent  
6 all that time to get it adopted into the Comprehensive  
7 Plan, I just -- I struggle with not maybe following  
8 the -- you know, the structure of the plan itself.

9 And maybe Commissioner Gillespie can like  
10 speak to this. I'm not really sure, because I know he  
11 has a lot of experience in this department.

12 But the -- you know, I think that there  
13 may be some hardships associated with this property.  
14 I just -- I struggle because, you know, hearing after  
15 hearing, we hear the Commission and the City tell  
16 these neighborhoods to go ahead and work towards  
17 getting a plan in place so that we know what  
18 they're -- what they envision for their neighborhood.

19 And so when some of these applications  
20 come before us, I just -- I would struggle with going  
21 against anything they had actually adopted into the  
22 Comprehensive Plan, and I'm just wondering if somebody  
23 can maybe comment to that.

24 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Finfrock, I think  
25 you're on the right track. I would love if we could

1 get a motion on the table, and then we can discuss it.

2 But I think -- you know, yeah, I think you  
3 should make a motion.

4 COMMISSIONER FINFROCK: Okay. Let me -- let  
5 me -- let me try it, Commissioner -- or Madam Chair.

6 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yes, Commissioner Finfrock.

7 COMMISSIONER FINFROCK: I will try a motion,  
8 but --

9 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Go. Go.

10 CHAIRMAN STEAD: There will be plenty of  
11 discussion. Don't you [unintelligible].

12 COMMISSIONER FINFROCK: Okay. Okay. So I move  
13 to deny ZOA20-4. And hopefully somebody will comment  
14 or have some feedback for me.

15 COMMISSIONER BLANCHARD: Madam Chair, I would  
16 second.

17 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Great. A second from  
18 Commissioner Blanchard.

19 Let's get into some robust discussion.

20 JAMES SMITH: Madam Chair, the motion was  
21 ZOA20-4. I think the Commissioner intends CVA20-56 --

22 COMMISSIONER FINFROCK: Oh.

23 JAMES SMITH: -- correct?

24 COMMISSIONER FINFROCK: Thank you.

25 Madam Chair, let me -- can I correct that?

1 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Please.

2 COMMISSIONER FINFROCK: I move to deny CVA20-56.

3 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you, Commissioner  
4 Finfrock.

5 And do we still have a second from  
6 Commissioner Blanchard?

7 COMMISSIONER BLANCHARD: And I would second.

8 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Great. Discussion?

9 We know where Commissioner Finfrock lands.  
10 Are there other Commissioners that would like to chime  
11 in based on this -- yes, Commissioner Gillespie.

12 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: So I think Commissioner  
13 Finfrock is correct that the adopted plan, the -- this  
14 is kind of like an SP01 or SP02. In this case, it's  
15 the Big Sky Plan. I think that one's been around for  
16 a while. So yeah, that -- the 50-foot setback in that  
17 plan is -- you know, it's a real number, so that's why  
18 they're asking for a variance, basically.

19 So the question is -- is there enough of a  
20 hardship here, particularly with that natural gas red  
21 sash across the diagonal of the property? And so to  
22 my calculation -- it comes down to -- is -- is do they  
23 have a right for an attached garage?

24 In other words, we all see that they could  
25 do it on a detached basis, but they presented some

1 claims for why -- well, you know, we really -- "it's  
2 really a hardship for us to have to detach it."

3 So this is an interesting one,  
4 because -- you know, we're really being asked to  
5 assess the difference between an attached and detached  
6 garage.

7 In this particular case, and like all  
8 these cases, I'm going to vote for the motion, simply  
9 because I don't think we should be considering the  
10 nature of the current owner, because this variance  
11 lasts forever; right?

12 And it's something we talk about all the  
13 time. And they may sell the house next year anyway.  
14 So the idea that -- "well, we want to age in place  
15 here," I understand that, but we're not directed to  
16 consider this very specific nature of the applicants  
17 in deciding if something's a hardship or not.

18 There's a ton of flat [unintelligible].  
19 There's places to put -- garage, so I'm going to vote  
20 for the motion.

21 COMMISSIONER BLANCHARD: Madam Chair.

22 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Blanchard.

23 COMMISSIONER BLANCHARD: Yes, as I seconded the  
24 motion, I'll just go ahead and throw out my thoughts  
25 here.

1           I mean, you know, there's a whole lot of  
2 caveat emptor here. I mean, you know,  
3 this -- the -- the pipeline and the electrical  
4 easements were well known when they bought the house.  
5 And if they were contemplating something like this,  
6 you know, that -- again, that's their -- really their  
7 responsibility on that.

8           And as Commissioner Finfrock and Gillespie  
9 both noted, you know that -- we just don't have any  
10 input hardly from the neighborhood association, and no  
11 one showed up here tonight. We don't have  
12 anybody -- we just really don't have anything on the  
13 record from those guys, and so, I mean, we're really  
14 bound to go by what the neighborhood worked for all  
15 these years.

16           So we have the Big Sky Overlay, and we're  
17 being asked for all these variances that just frankly  
18 don't make sense.

19           I'm not swayed by the age-in-place  
20 argument. I would -- you know, if you can't walk 200  
21 steps to your RV garage, I don't know how you'd be  
22 functional enough to use an RV that would fit in a  
23 garage that size. So that just doesn't make a whole  
24 lot of sense to me. And you wouldn't be using an RV  
25 in the snow and the ice, as argued. So those

1 arguments just don't make any sense.

2 I think we just have to stick with the  
3 plan. And if the applicant wants to appeal to Council  
4 and bring back -- or are we the final -- I can't  
5 remember on this.

6 But anyways. Yeah, I think we just have  
7 to stick with the plan, hearing no input from anybody  
8 from the association.

9 COMMISSIONER MOHR: Madam Chair.

10 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Mohr.

11 COMMISSIONER MOHR: I agree with the motion,  
12 too, and everything that Commissioner Finfrock said.  
13 The fact is that ACHD is allowing an access off of  
14 Goldenrod, as I understand it. There is location on  
15 the property to put a garage. The easements don't  
16 restrict a garage entirely, so you are still -- there  
17 is still space on the property to have one.

18 A lot of -- this property isn't an  
19 alley-access, but it's not uncommon in the City to  
20 have a detached garage for this -- for something very  
21 similar.

22 And I understand that the easements  
23 [unintelligible] to the restrictions imposed, but with  
24 the garage still feasible on this property, I'm in  
25 support of the motion.

1           CHAIRMAN STEAD: Great. I'm actually going to  
2 chime in on this one, too. I had the same thought as  
3 Commissioner Gillespie in that, you know, we really  
4 try not to make decisions for the current resident of  
5 the home. These are decisions we make that last  
6 forever.

7                   And in addition what stuck with me when  
8 reading the application was some details about the Big  
9 Sky Neighborhood Plan. I'm looking at Blueprint Boise  
10 on page 340 of 384 pages. It says the Big Sky  
11 Neighborhood Plan is to preserve the large lots and  
12 open character of the neighborhood and to retain the  
13 rural personality of this unique location.

14                   And so, to me, kind of trying to cram  
15 everything up right on the sidewalk just isn't  
16 conducive with that -- with really that statement of  
17 the open character of the neighborhood and trying to  
18 maintain a rural personality, to be infringing like  
19 that on the sidewalk and the street when there's such  
20 a big lot behind you.

21                   And I recognize and appreciate the  
22 character of your lot, but I hope that there will be  
23 another way to work things out.

24                   Do we have any other comments from the  
25 Commission before we vote?

1                   Okay. Great.

2 ROLL CALL

3                   CHAIRMAN STEAD: I'll ask the clerk then to  
4 please call the vote.

5                   THE CLERK: Stead.

6                   CHAIRMAN STEAD: Aye.

7                   THE CLERK: Schafer.

8                   CO-CHAIRMAN SCHAFFER: Aye.

9                   THE CLERK: Squyres.

10                  COMMISSIONER SQUYRES: Aye.

11                  THE CLERK: Blanchard.

12                  COMMISSIONER BLANCHARD: Aye.

13                  THE CLERK: Mohr.

14                  COMMISSIONER MOHR: Aye.

15                  THE CLERK: Gillespie.

16                  COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Aye.

17                  THE CLERK: Finfrock.

18                  COMMISSIONER FINFROCK: Aye.

19                  THE CLERK: All in favor. Motion carries.

20                  (End transcription at 1:12:45 of audio  
21 file.)

22   -o0o-

23

24

25

\*7. **CAR20-00020 / KM Engineering**  
10881 W Florence Dr  
Modification to a Development Agreement on 2.95 acres in a R-2D/DA (Medium Density Residential within Design Review and Development Agreement) zone. *David Moser*

**PUD20-00046 / KM Engineering**  
10881 W Florence Dr  
Conditional use permit for a planned residential development comprised of 40 multi-family units on 2.95 acres in a R-2D/DA (Medium Density Residential with Design Review and Development Agreement) zone. *David Moser*

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>APPROVED PUD20-00046 and RECOMMENDED APPROVAL CAR20-00020 [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Milt Gillespie, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	Ashley Squyres, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Squyres, Blanchard, Mohr, Gillespie, Finfrock, Stead, Schafer <b>ALL IN FAVOR, MOTION CARRIED</b>

#### IV. ADJOURNMENT

CITY OF BOISE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

IN RE: )  
CAR20-00020 / KM ENGINEERING )  
and )  
PUD20-00046 / KM ENGINEERING )  
10881 West Florence Drive )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

TRANSCRIPT OF RECORDED PUBLIC HEARING

MONDAY, JANUARY 4, 2021

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

MEREDITH STEAD, CHAIR

BOB SCHAFFER, CO-CHAIR

ASHLEY SQUYRES

CHRISTOPHER BLANCHARD

JENNIFER MOHR

MILT GILLESPIE

JANELLE FINFROCK

TRANSCRIBED BY:

VICTORIA HILLES

1 (Begin transcription at 1:20:08 of audio  
2 file.)

3 INTRODUCTION

4 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay. So we are up to Item  
5 No. 7. This is CAR20-20 from KM Engineering. You are  
6 up, Mr. Moser.

7 DAVID MOSER: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of  
8 the Commission. Give me a moment while I share the  
9 screen again.

10 The applicant is requesting a Development  
11 Agreement modification and a conditional-use permit  
12 for a planned residential development comprised of  
13 40 units on approximately 2.9 acres located at 10881  
14 West Florence Drive in an R-2D/DA zone. That's a  
15 Medium-Density Residential zoning with a -- with  
16 Design Review, and there's a Development Agreement  
17 attached to it.

18 The Development Agreement modification is  
19 to remove a condition of -- a condition from the  
20 original 2008 DA, which includes removing the  
21 10-unit-per-acre limitation on density and for the DA  
22 to reference the new conceptual site plan.

23 As you can see here on the aerial  
24 photograph, the subject property is surrounded by  
25 residential neighborhood -- neighborhoods, which

1 includes a single-family residential neighborhood to  
2 the east and the south and a -- multi-family  
3 residential developments to the north and west.  
4 There's also a large manufactured home community to  
5 the southwest of the site.

6 As noted, the applicant is requesting a DA  
7 modification to remove a condition from the original  
8 DA. Please understand that this is not a rezone, and  
9 the property will remain R-2D/DA zone. And the  
10 applicant is only requesting to remove the limitation  
11 on the density, which is a cap on that -- which -- a  
12 cap, which limits the site to 10 units an acre.

13 The request would be to allow the property  
14 to be developed as per the density of the R-2 zone.  
15 Also the applicant requests the DA to be -- to  
16 reference the new conceptual site plan and to  
17 basically upgrade the exhibits attached to it.  
18 Essentially it's -- really what he wants to do is to  
19 strike this one line out of the DA right here.

20 In short the intent of the existing DA  
21 from 2008 was for the site to provide a transition  
22 between the large lot, single-family development  
23 adjacent to the east along Florence Drive and the  
24 multi-family developments to the west.

25 In 2008 the Comprehensive Plan identified

1 the surrounding neighborhood as Low-Density  
2 Residential, about four units an acre, on the Land Use  
3 Designation Map. The Comprehensive Plan now  
4 identifies the surrounding area, including the subject  
5 property, as Compact on the Land Use Designation Map,  
6 which anticipates a residential development with  
7 densities ranging up to 15 units an acre.

8 As such, the proposed 13-and-a-half units  
9 per acre is consistent with the current Comprehensive  
10 Plan, and it's below the 14-and-a-half units per acre,  
11 which is the max allowed under the R-2 zone.

12 In addition areas of stability and change  
13 identified within the Comprehensive Plan anticipate  
14 the subject property and the surrounding area will  
15 experience some infill and redevelopment.

16 I finally would like to note that the  
17 draft DA received by the Planning and Zoning  
18 Commission in the late correspondence memo is not the  
19 final document. The planning team will continue to  
20 work with the legal department, housing and community  
21 development, and the applicant on the document's  
22 language before it is heard before City Council, in  
23 particular the language that  
24 references -- affordable-housing component will need  
25 to be reconsidered.

1           In short the DA does not really need to  
2 reference the affordable-housing component, and it  
3 does not need to be included in the DA.

4           Also in support of the DA modification, as  
5 you can see on the Land Use Map, as I said before, the  
6 subject property and the whole surrounding area is  
7 designated as Compact, which anticipates 15 units an  
8 acre, and -- sorry. And --

9           CHAIRMAN STEAD: We're all getting an Amber  
10 Alert.

11          DAVID MOSER: Okay. That's what that is. I was  
12 trying to figure -- what that was. So sorry.

13          Back to -- and there's Commercial Land Use  
14 zoning up along Fairview. And this is the Zoning Map.  
15 As you can see, the adjacent projects to the west and  
16 to the north are zoned R-2 and R-3. So R-2's that  
17 Medium density, and then the R-3 is Multi-Family  
18 residence -- Residential density. So the proposed  
19 project is actually compatible with those adjacent  
20 zones.

21          The proposal includes the construction of  
22 seven multi-family buildings comprised of six 3-story,  
23 6-unit buildings and one 2-story, 4-unit building for  
24 a total of 40 units. Vehicle access will be provided  
25 via a service drive that connects Florence Drive to

1 the east and to the proposed public street of Bonanza.  
2 So essentially it's -- this service drive here will  
3 provide the connection.

4 In addition Bonanza Street will provide  
5 connectivity between Florence on the west side down to  
6 Irving, and Bonanza will be a -- will be dedicated as  
7 public right-of-way in Phase 2 of the project.

8 The project also complies and  
9 exceeds -- and exceeds all required perimeter  
10 setbacks, which includes a 30-foot setback along each  
11 property line here adjacent to the single-family; it  
12 complies to the height requirements, which is 35 feet  
13 to midline or roof; the parking standards, and it  
14 provides all the amenities.

15 In addition this is an appropriate area  
16 for multi-family, since it is near major commercial  
17 corridors, such as Fairview and Five Mile. And also  
18 the Bus Route 16 runs along Five Mile, which is a  
19 little over an eighth-of-a-mile from the site to the  
20 east.

21 It complies with all the required findings  
22 and commenting agencies so they can approve  
23 it -- can -- I'm sorry -- the project can be approved  
24 with conditions, although ACHD will restrict on-street  
25 parking along Florence to ensure the Fire Department

1 has access to the site.

2           Finally the planning team is recommending  
3 a walking path along the north side of the property to  
4 provide more of a direct pedestrian connection through  
5 the property. However the applicant has concerns with  
6 that -- with this pathway location, because it would  
7 potentially impact the private open space associated  
8 with the residents of this building.

9           The applicant is also proposing to provide  
10 affordable housing, income-restricted units, on the  
11 east side of the site, and the number of units are  
12 actually listed below. Only -- of the 28 units on the  
13 east side, only 3 will be market rate. The rest will  
14 be at varying levels of income-restricted, from  
15 60-percent below, to 50, to 40 [unintelligible].  
16 They're all providing affordable income.

17           In addition the applicant will provide a  
18 variety of social services for the residents of the  
19 project.

20           The planning team did receive a letter  
21 of -- a letter from a neighbor expressing concerns  
22 with the project. These concerns generally fell into  
23 the areas of traffic impacts, compatibility, and the  
24 on-street parking along Florence.

25           To address these concerns, I would note

1 that there is capacity on the adjacent roadways to  
2 support the project, and the project density is  
3 compatible with the surrounding properties adjacent to  
4 the north and to the west. It is also compatible with  
5 the development that is anticipated to occur in the  
6 surrounding neighborhood given the zoning and the  
7 Comprehensive Land Use designations.

8 The on-street parking along Florence will  
9 be restricted to provide clear Fire access to the  
10 project. However the houses along Florence Drive  
11 provide off-street parking within garages and then  
12 have guest parking along their -- within their  
13 driveway apron.

14 In summary, the planning team recommends  
15 approval of the PUD and the Development Agreement  
16 modification. Motions needed is to approve the PUD  
17 and a recommendation for the DA modification to  
18 Council.

19 Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you, Mr. Moser.

21 We'll next hear from the applicant.

22 Please start with your name and address,  
23 and you'll have 10 -- we'll start with 10 minutes.

24 STEPHANIE HOPKINS: Hi. I don't know if you can  
25 hear me. Stephanie Hopkins with KM Engineering at

1 9233 West State, Boise, 83714.

2 Let me pull up my presentation really  
3 quick so I can share it with you guys.

4 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Great.

5 STEPHANIE HOPKINS: Hopefully you can all see  
6 that.

7 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yes.

8 STEPHANIE HOPKINS: Okay. Great.

9 Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the  
10 Commission, for having me here tonight. David did a  
11 wonderful job summarizing our request. I'll try  
12 to -- try my best to avoid repeating him too much, but  
13 we're excited to be here tonight to talk about the  
14 Celebration Acres project.

15 It's -- we're requesting a rezone, which  
16 is really a vehicle to modify the existing Development  
17 Agreement on the property, to remove the density cap  
18 as David mentioned, and to update the conceptual  
19 development plan that's attached to that agreement.  
20 And then we're also proposing the planned-unit  
21 development to include a phasing plan and then an  
22 amenity package.

23 We have met with City staff, ACHD, and  
24 neighbors a few times in preparing this application  
25 and feel that it's consistent with what the City

1 wants, as consistent as it can be with what neighbors  
2 want to see in the area. And it's complying with all  
3 the conditions of approval that have been put forth so  
4 far.

5 As David mentioned, the property's located  
6 southwest of Fairview and Five Mile Road. It's  
7 approximately 2.95 acres. It's an undeveloped infill  
8 piece. As you can see, it's adjacent to multi-family,  
9 which is located to the northwest and the northeast  
10 and single-family to the south and east, as well as a  
11 manufactured home community to the south.

12 It's currently zoned R-2D -- with a  
13 Development Agreement. It's adjacent to R-2D, which  
14 is the Medium Density Residential, and then R-3D,  
15 which is to the north, Multi-Family Residential, and a  
16 mix of residential zones to the south and east that  
17 primarily includes Single-Family Residential as well  
18 as Commercial designations to the north.

19 We are located near a major transportation  
20 corridor of Fairview and Five Mile and -- both  
21 arterial roadways -- and transit options, as well as  
22 existing commercial development, employment  
23 opportunities, existing services, and a fairly  
24 well-developed area.

25 So a little bit of history on this site.

1 This property's initially annexed and zoned to the  
2 City in 1999. It was rezoned to the R-2D with the  
3 Development Agreement in 2007. At that time, the  
4 Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map was also  
5 modified, but as David mentioned that's since been  
6 updated. It's now Compact.

7 The DA we are proposing to modify is the  
8 result of that decision in 2007. It currently limits  
9 the development to 10 dwelling units an acre, which  
10 would be about 29 dwellings. And we're asking to  
11 increase that density to allow for a density that's  
12 consistent with the R-2D district.

13 As you can see, this is an overview of  
14 what it looks like kind of now. It's blurry, but  
15 there's been considerable development since 2007 to  
16 the west. There's a multi-family development that was  
17 constructed and then also -- to the east -- northeast.  
18 Just to give you an idea, our property's outlined in  
19 red, and then you can see that there's industrial and  
20 single-family uses to the west as well as undeveloped  
21 land to the east, which has now been filled in.

22 So the Comprehensive Plan designates this  
23 area as Compact. We are requesting a zoning -- or our  
24 zoning designation's in line with that, and our  
25 density's in line with that, as well. We're actually

1 below the maximum target density for the Compact area,  
2 which is 50 dwelling units an acre. We're at 13.5  
3 dwellings units an acre. And we're also below the  
4 maximum density allowed in the R-2 district, which is  
5 the 14.5 dwelling units an acre.

6 We are fulfilling multiple Comprehensive  
7 Plan goals and the intent of the Comprehensive Plan by  
8 building a connected community, infilling an area that  
9 has previously been undeveloped and has kind of  
10 created a void in between developments, adding  
11 higher-density infill within this area of the West  
12 Bench Planning Area, and providing a mix of housing  
13 opportunities to provide an affordable housing  
14 component that's badly needed in Boise right now.

15 So we are requesting, as mentioned, to  
16 modify the Development Agreement. This is our  
17 original concept plan. As you can see, it was  
18 initially shown with eight residential buildings, four  
19 of which were four-plex buildings and four of which  
20 were three-plex buildings. There was one central  
21 drive that went from Florence, through the site, and  
22 then connected Florence Drive and Irving Court on the  
23 east part of the property.

24 We're now proposing six residential unit  
25 buildings and one community -- or I'm sorry -- seven

1 buildings and one community center. We're proposing  
2 six 6-unit buildings, which are on the periphery of  
3 the site here, and then one four-plex building, which  
4 is the 2-story building here, for 40 units overall.

5 30 of those are going to be 2-bedroom  
6 units, six 3-bedroom units, and four 4-bedroom units.  
7 So we're really hoping to increase the kind of housing  
8 and the type of unit that's available in this area  
9 with those different housing -- or those different  
10 unit types.

11 Just to provide you some context -- this  
12 is obviously not to scale, but just to show kind of  
13 how the streets are now proposed to connect with  
14 existing streets. We're proposing Bonanza Street,  
15 which will be a drive aisle connecting Florence Way  
16 [phonetic] to Irving Court, and then a private road  
17 that'll connect from Florence Drive on the east part  
18 of the site to the interior, which is the parking  
19 area. So that will be the bulk of parking for the  
20 project.

21 So overall we're proposing three points of  
22 access, which will really connect this whole area and  
23 kind of add to the circulation that's existing here.

24 So we're proposing six 6-unit buildings  
25 overall on the peripheral side, as mentioned. These

1 will all be 3 stories a-piece. And then one four-plex  
2 building, which is going to be 2 stories. The  
3 community center will be 1 story and will include some  
4 communal meeting space, desks, and computers for folks  
5 that maybe don't have those in their homes.

6 We are meeting or exceeding the building  
7 and parking setbacks throughout the site. And we'll  
8 be installing vinyl fencing on all of the boundaries.  
9 We're going to be replacing a fence that needs some  
10 repair on the south boundary, and otherwise just  
11 adding fencing where it's needed.

12 We're providing a clubhouse, playground,  
13 and open space throughout, as you -- as mentioned, the  
14 community center's centrally located here. We'll  
15 provide a tot lot for children to come play that's  
16 also centrally located. And then there's some kind of  
17 smaller open space areas located throughout the site  
18 for folks to go kick a soccer ball around or hang out.

19 We are exceeding the required number of  
20 parking spaces. We are providing 62, and 58 are  
21 required.

22 This is our landscape plan. It's been  
23 modified since we initially submitted the application  
24 to include the changed electrical units that'll be  
25 included. So our HVAC is actually going to be on the

1 ground now instead of within the wall units, and as  
2 such, we've provided some screening there, as required  
3 by Code. And then we've also relocated the trash  
4 enclosure on the west part of the site, per Public  
5 Works' recommendation and request.

6           So otherwise we are providing a little  
7 over 1 acre of total open space, which is about  
8 35 percent of the total site. I think Code requires  
9 10 percent, so we're exceeding that requirement. And  
10 as mentioned, we are trying to provide some kind of  
11 vegetated, green space for residents throughout the  
12 development.

13           As David mentioned, we are proposing to  
14 phase this project. That's part of our planned-unit  
15 development request. The first phase will include  
16 five buildings -- five residential buildings and one  
17 community -- the community center. And in the second  
18 phase, we will be including the last two buildings,  
19 both of which are six-plexes. And then we will be  
20 dedicating Bonanza Street, which is this roadway here,  
21 to ACHD.

22           In the first phase, we will be  
23 constructing everything to ACHD's standards. So this  
24 road will actually be installed as a public  
25 right-of-way, but will be dedicated with the second

1 phase.

2           These are just examples of the residential  
3 building elevations. We're proposing a variety of  
4 building materials: The board and batten siding, we  
5 have stone veneer, and then various color schemes that  
6 we're proposing. Most of the buildings are 3-story,  
7 so they will vary with finishes on the front and rear.  
8 And then color schemes change throughout. And this is  
9 our four-plex building that we're proposing, which is  
10 on the north part of the site.

11           We have designed these to try to be as  
12 consistent as possible with existing development to  
13 make sure they're complementing what's already in the  
14 area, while being kind of unique and different, too.

15           So the clubhouse is going to be located  
16 there, and this is what it's proposed to look like.  
17 It'll have similar building materials, a little bit  
18 different color scheme, but it's a 1-story building  
19 that's proposed to be fairly open for folks to easily  
20 use it.

21           So as David mentioned, we are requesting  
22 to modify Condition 3 in the site-specific conditions  
23 approval. We are showing our revised site plan with  
24 the pedestrian pathway on the north side of our drive  
25 aisle and then kind of going south to -- adjacent to

1 the buildings. We think that this central location  
2 will really work better for residents and will make it  
3 easier for folks to circulate through the site rather  
4 than --

5 THE CLERK: Time.

6 STEPHANIE HOPKINS: -- through private open  
7 space and the rear of some buildings. So this is the  
8 proposal that we're making for the revision to that  
9 modification -- or that condition.

10 So we really do believe that our  
11 development's consistent with the City's vision, the  
12 Comprehensive Plan, and that it's going to be  
13 providing additional residential opportunities in  
14 infill area that's close to existing development,  
15 services, transit opportunities, commercial, and  
16 employment opportunities. And we'll be providing an  
17 affordable housing option that's just really not as  
18 readily available as it maybe should be in Boise  
19 overall, but especially this area.

20 We're complying with the dimensional  
21 standards of the R-2 zone and really do believe this  
22 density and this project is going to be appropriate  
23 and compatible with what's already existing.

24 So we're in agreement with the staff  
25 report and the recommended conditions of approval with

1 the exception of the request we're making to modify  
2 Condition 3.

3 And I believe a couple of our clients are  
4 on the line, too, that can maybe speak to the  
5 affordable housing component of the project. If  
6 anyone has specific questions there, I'd be more than  
7 happy to have them ping in.

8 Otherwise I will stand for any questions.

9 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you, Ms. Hopkins.

10 NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

11 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Before we get to questions, I'm  
12 just going to check to see.

13 Do we have a designated representative  
14 from the neighborhood association present, somebody  
15 who's here to speak on behalf of the neighborhood?

16 If so, please virtually raise your hand.

17 I do see a hand up from Mr. Jay.

18 Can -- Jay, are you here to represent the  
19 neighborhood association?

20 CÉLINE ACORD: Madam Chair, there is no  
21 neighborhood association [unintelligible] --

22 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Unintelligible].

23 CÉLINE ACORD: -- project.

24 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Oh, great. Okay.

25 So, Jay, hang tight.

1           We will go to questions from the  
2 Commission, and then we'll get to public testimony,  
3 where everybody will have a chance to speak that would  
4 like to speak.

5           So questions from the Commission?

6           And I guess while everybody's gathering  
7 their thoughts, I'll start with a quick question.

8           I'm wondering, Ms. Hopkins, can you please  
9 just talk a little bit more about the modification  
10 that you'd like to see.

11          Can we see that picture again.

12          And would you -- the City's proposing the  
13 sidewalk stay along the road, and you're proposing it  
14 doesn't. And so can we maybe hear from Ms. -- well,  
15 actually let's maybe start with Mr. Moser, I think, to  
16 hear why that doesn't -- that proposal doesn't work  
17 for the City and then maybe from Ms. Hopkins again if  
18 there's anything to discuss there.

19          DAVID MOSER: Thank you. Madam Chair, Members  
20 of the Commission, what the City's condition  
21 is -- would require is essentially taking this  
22 sidewalk that they have shown along the north and then  
23 extending it straight across the north property line  
24 as -- to connect to Bonsai [sic] -- or -- so providing  
25 almost a straight connection from Florence to

1 Florence. So the -- so the applicant -- or the  
2 neighbors wouldn't have to walk through the  
3 parking-lot area and follow that sort of more  
4 meandering route to get to Florence. So just  
5 providing that more direct pedestrian connection.  
6 That's essentially what the City's requirement is.

7 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you.

8 DAVID MOSER: [Unintelligible] extend that  
9 sidewalk.

10 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Sorry. Thanks, Mr. Moser.  
11 That makes sense to me.

12 And then, Ms. Hopkins, you would prefer  
13 the meandering, just because of the community aspect  
14 of it; is that why?

15 STEPHANIE HOPKINS: Thank you. Yes, Madam  
16 Chair. We would prefer that the path be constructed  
17 the way we've depicted here just so that it doesn't go  
18 basically through people's private kind of open space  
19 area.

20 We want that to be preserved and open for  
21 folks if they want to have, you know, things that  
22 would be otherwise encumbered by a path.

23 So --

24 CHAIRMAN STEAD: [Unintelligible].

25 STEPHANIE HOPKINS: And we also do believe that

1 it would be a more direct route for folks, too, if  
2 they're, I think for the most part, going from their  
3 home, to car, or to maybe the tot lot or the community  
4 center.

5 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay. Thank you.

6 Can I see maybe a picture of  
7 Florence -- like -- does -- is there a road that runs  
8 alongside that property on that north side?

9 STEPHANIE HOPKINS: I don't -- [unintelligible].  
10 Let me see if I can --

11 DAVID MOSER: I believe it's a multi-family  
12 development along to the north.

13 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: [Unintelligible]  
14 houses.

15 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay.

16 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Woah. Go back. Yeah.

17 STEPHANIE HOPKINS: Oh, shoot. Sorry. I'm  
18 just -- I'm going to --

19 CHAIRMAN STEAD: No. Yeah, that's perfect, but  
20 it's --

21 STEPHANIE HOPKINS: That one work okay?

22 CHAIRMAN STEAD: -- [unintelligible] right? Is  
23 that --

24 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: There's a row of  
25 houses.

1 CHAIRMAN STEAD: There's a row of houses.

2 DAVID MOSER: Or carports maybe.

3 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner  
4 Gillespie and then Mr. Moser.

5 Okay. Sorry.

6 Any other questions from the Commission?

7 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Madam Chairman.

8 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Gillespie.

9 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: So question for the  
10 applicant, Ms. Hopkins.

11 Ms. Hopkins, your proposed sidewalk route  
12 kind of [unintelligible] right down through the  
13 parking lot in front of other people's houses or  
14 buildings. I don't understand how taking the public  
15 right down through the parking lot and by everybody's  
16 cars is a great idea, as opposed to just straight  
17 across.

18 In terms of preserving people's privacy,  
19 I'm just not sure how having the public  
20 [unintelligible], you know, encouraged to walk through  
21 a private parking area is a great idea.

22 STEPHANIE HOPKINS: Sure, Madam Chair,  
23 Mr. Gillespie. I think the primary reason that our  
24 client wants to direct traffic through the parking lot  
25 and through the development rather than through the

1 green space is that we believe that most of the people  
2 that will be trafficking this pathway will be  
3 residents of the development.

4           So for the most part, I think the way that  
5 it may function is that folks are going to go into  
6 their home and then maybe use that pathway to walk  
7 either south or west. Or if maybe someone's walking  
8 from Building G, which is on the far west side, and  
9 wants to go to the bus stop or something, they'll  
10 probably use the internal path and then go along  
11 Irving rather than maybe through the green space.

12           My understanding is that they just really  
13 want to preserve that to keep it as open as possible,  
14 so that it's more usable, rather than having a  
15 concrete path kind of go through the center of it.

16           So we may -- I think Jay that was trying  
17 to ping in earlier may have a little bit better of an  
18 explanation, too. If he speaks later, he might be  
19 able to speak to that a little bit better.

20           COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Thank you.

21           STEPHANIE HOPKINS: Thank you.

22           COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Madam Chairman, I have  
23 one more question if no one else does.

24           CHAIRMAN STEAD: Please, Commissioner Gillespie.

25           COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: So this is a question

1 for David.

2 David, what I'm seeing on the left, it  
3 says "DA Modification Request". When did the City  
4 actually get that final picture and layout? Was it  
5 last Friday? Because I was just a little bit confused  
6 about when we actually had the proposed plan for the  
7 PUD and the buildings and the layout.

8 DAVID MOSER: Madam Chair, Commissioner  
9 Gillespie, the site -- the actual, final revised site  
10 plan came in and the DA came in last week after the  
11 packet came, too. And it was submitted as late  
12 correspondence, although the only change from the  
13 revised is essentially extending the sidewalk up along  
14 the -- what is it? -- west side of the parking lot  
15 back over to Florence, making that  
16 connection -- sidewalk connection, and then there was  
17 some additional changes to accommodate Public Works  
18 solid waste backup requirements on the trash  
19 enclosure.

20 There -- I don't think there was any major  
21 significant change in the site plan per se, but --

22 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: [Unintelligible].

23 DAVID MOSER: -- there might have been some  
24 changes.

25 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Madam Chairman.

1 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Gillespie.

2 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: So, David, I guess my  
3 question is how long is the -- did the public get a  
4 really good opportunity to respond to something close  
5 to what we're looking at tonight?

6 DAVID MOSER: Yes.

7 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Okay.

8 DAVID MOSER: This plan is essentially the same  
9 as the plan that's been uploaded and available to the  
10 public from the beginning --

11 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Okay.

12 DAVID MOSER: -- just with the slight  
13 modification to the sidewalk --

14 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Okay.

15 DAVID MOSER: -- along -- up on Florence and  
16 some slight adjustment for -- to the trash enclosure  
17 location.

18 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Okay. Thank you.

19 CO-CHAIRMAN SCHAFER: Madam Chair.

20 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Schafer.

21 CO-CHAIRMAN SCHAFER: Question for David.

22 And, David, just to follow up on that.  
23 And then the next step in this process -- the public  
24 will have another opportunity to see this again  
25 through Design Review; is that correct?

1           DAVID MOSER: This will require Design Review.  
2 I don't know if this is a staff-level -- actually it  
3 might be Commission, given the number of units. And  
4 this will have to go on to Council for the DA  
5 modification, as well.

6           CO-CHAIRMAN SCHAFER: Great. Thanks.

7           COMMISSIONER MOHR: Madam Chair.

8           CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Mohr.

9           COMMISSIONER MOHR: I had a question about the  
10 Fire access and the no parking.

11                   So if I understand it, the Fire -- the no  
12 parking on the Fire access is related to the width of  
13 the street?

14                   I know some of the comments that we read  
15 were regarding that no parking due to -- due to that.  
16 Is that -- my understanding is, due to the width of  
17 the street, the -- there should already be no parking  
18 along the street; is that correct or is that kind of  
19 due to this development?

20           DAVID MOSER: It's -- it's -- I believe  
21 it's -- it's the Highway District that required it,  
22 and I believe it's due to the width of that -- of  
23 Florence Drive. I think Florence Drive is 33 -- let's  
24 see here -- [unintelligible] it's 33 -- I'd have to  
25 double check the specifics on it, but I believe it

1 is -- it is related to the width of the street along  
2 Florence and trying to provide that clear Fire access.

3 COMMISSIONER MOHR: Madam Chair.

4 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Mohr.

5 COMMISSIONER MOHR: Just a quick follow-up.

6 So it's not, in fact, due to the  
7 development? It should be restricted as is due to the  
8 width of the street and not because of this  
9 development specifically?

10 DAVID MOSER: It's not currently restricted  
11 at -- point, because there's -- it's a dead-end road.  
12 So with this development, it puts that additional  
13 traffic --

14 COMMISSIONER MOHR: Okay. Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay.

16 PUBLIC TESTIMONY

17 CHAIRMAN STEAD: So next we will -- hang on one  
18 second -- sorry.

19 Next we'll move on to our sign-up sheet,  
20 and we actually do have somebody signed up, but I  
21 don't see them on the line.

22 I have Christopher Cockrell signed up.

23 If you're in attendance tonight, please  
24 virtually raise your hand.

25 And then not seeing him.

1           We'll move on to anybody else. So if you  
2 are on the line tonight and you would like to testify  
3 on this item, please virtually raise your hand.

4           If anybody would like to testify on this  
5 item tonight, please virtually raise the hand, and  
6 we'll just go down the line.

7           We'll start with Jay.

8           Just give us a second to un-mute you, and  
9 then we'd love to hear what you have to say. Please  
10 start with your name and address, and you'll have  
11 three minutes.

12           And Jay, you can go ahead and un-mute and  
13 turn on your camera if you'd like, whenever you're  
14 ready.

15           JAY FRANCIS: Hey. Good evening, everybody.  
16 Madam Chairman and all the Commissioners, can you guys  
17 hear me okay?

18           CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yes.

19           JAY FRANCIS: Okay. Perfect. I was wanting to  
20 testify as a developer along with El-Ada. I respect  
21 the community nonprofit in the area.

22           We felt that the reason not to connect the  
23 sidewalk was just simply most of its services and  
24 transportation services are going to be on Five Mile.  
25 And we felt, like the KM Engineering, that most of the

1 folks are going to be coming through the  
2 property -- are actually going to be residents, and so  
3 there wasn't a real need.

4 If someone really needed to get to the  
5 other side, there's a way to go through there. But  
6 looking at and surveying the residence, we thought  
7 that Five Mile was the way to go in terms of that.

8 So that's why -- I just wanted to speak on  
9 that issue.

10 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you so much.

11 I'm sorry. We should -- we could have had  
12 you speak with Ms. Hopkins as part of the applicant  
13 team, but we're glad to have that perspective  
14 nonetheless. Thank you for that information.

15 JAY FRANCIS: Okay. Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay. Is there anybody else  
17 that wanted to speak on this item tonight?

18 Please virtually raise your hand.

19 Last call.

20 CÉLINE ACORD: Madam Chair, we do still have  
21 some attendees online. I'm not sure if they're part  
22 of the applicant team or if they just don't want to  
23 speak tonight --

24 CHAIRMAN STEAD: I see that.

25 CÉLINE ACORD: -- and would love to hang out

1 with us.

2 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay. If you don't know  
3 how -- yeah, I don't know. I don't know how else to  
4 call it, but we'd love to hear from you if you're on  
5 the line and hoping to speak to the Commission tonight  
6 on Item No. 7.

7 CÉLINE ACORD: No.

8 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay. Seeing none. I'm going  
9 to move on.

10 REBUTTAL

11 CHAIRMAN STEAD: And so the -- sorry. The  
12 public portion of the hearing is now closed, and the  
13 item is before the Commission.

14 Oh, we need a rebuttal. I'm so sorry.

15 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: No adverse testimony,  
16 Madam Chairman.

17 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yeah, there's no testimony, so  
18 perhaps you still have something to add or maybe not.

19 Do you want to waive your rebuttal?

20 You'd have five minutes if there's more to  
21 add, Ms. Hopkins.

22 STEPHANIE HOPKINS: I thank you, Madam Chair. I  
23 think -- I guess in closing, thank you for the time,  
24 and we appreciate all of staff's coordination on this  
25 and getting it kind of ready to present to you guys

1 and ready to construct or -- we're excited about this  
2 project, and we think it'll be a really great addition  
3 to this part of Boise and to Boise as a whole.

4 So with that, we respectfully request for  
5 your favorable recommendation and approval of the PUD  
6 and recommendation of the DA modification.

7 And with that, I guess I'll close. Thank  
8 you.

9 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you, Ms. Hopkins.

10 MOTIONS

11 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay. So now it's closed, and  
12 the item is before the Commission. And I am open for  
13 a motion.

14 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Madam Chairman.

15 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Gillespie.

16 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Well, I'll go ahead.

17 Can you hear me?

18 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yes.

19 CO-CHAIRMAN SCHAFFER: Yep.

20 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Okay. Good.

21 I move that we recommend approval of  
22 CAR20-20 and approve PUD-0046 [sic] with all the terms  
23 and conditions in the staff report, including the  
24 northern straight-shot sidewalk connecting the two  
25 ends of Florence.

1 COMMISSIONER SQUYRES: Second.

2 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Great. We have a second from  
3 Commissioner Squyres.

4 Is there any discussion?

5 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Madam Chairman.

6 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Gillespie.

7 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: First of all, let me  
8 commend Ms. Hopkins and her team. I'm really happy to  
9 see this kind of product in this part of the city, and  
10 I'm amazed there wasn't more public comment or  
11 opposition, but hey, so be it.

12 I think -- on the sidewalk I think you  
13 need both that straight-shot across, because what  
14 we're trying to encourage is we're trying to connect  
15 those two ends of Florence for the people who live on  
16 both sides of Florence, so that they can walk through,  
17 and we can create a more connected neighborhood.

18 I just don't think a 5-foot -- 5-foot  
19 sidewalk at ground level is, you know, going to be  
20 detrimental to the usefulness of that green space; you  
21 know? You could -- you can berm it, you can meander  
22 it, it can be interesting, but the whole point is to  
23 connect those two ends of Florence for other people,  
24 not just the people who want to access the services on  
25 the site.

1           So I think you've got a great product.  
2           And I think that ability to connect it by sidewalk is  
3           really nice. So there you go.

4           COMMISSIONER SQUYRES: Madam Chair.

5           CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Squyres.

6           COMMISSIONER SQUYRES: I'm just really excited  
7           to see this project; you know? When we listened to  
8           the Housing Density Ordinance [sic] a couple of  
9           meetings ago -- you know, this is exactly what we were  
10          hearing is needed, you know, in that 30-to-60-percent  
11          range AMI.

12          So I think the DA modification makes  
13          sense -- it -- based on the development patterns in  
14          the area and the change of the Comprehensive Plan. So  
15          I think absolutely we should make that recommendation  
16          to Council.

17          I think, you know, the interconnectivity  
18          for the area is great. It's close to transit, it's  
19          close to commercial, employment. I just think that  
20          this is the perfect place for this project and just  
21          want to commend the applicant for a great project.

22          Look forward to it.

23          CO-CHAIRMAN SCHAFFER: Madam Chair.

24          CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Schaffer.

25          CO-CHAIRMAN SCHAFFER: I'm in favor of the

1 motion. Strongly in favor of the motion. I think  
2 it's a great project. I'm going to second all the  
3 comments by Commissioner Gillespie and Commissioner  
4 Squyres.

5 I agree about the walking path. I think  
6 when we take a step back, we're looking at  
7 connectivity, you know, for the whole area, not just  
8 the site. So it makes total sense to me to have that  
9 connection running, you know, across the property,  
10 connecting Florence Street.

11 And then I just want to commend the design  
12 team on their efforts here. I think the site plan is  
13 an improvement over the previous iteration that was in  
14 the DA.

15 And, you know, I think it's a good lesson  
16 that if you want to get a project, you know, approved,  
17 meet or exceed the setbacks, meet or exceed the  
18 parking requirements, meet or exceed the  
19 bicycle-parking requirements. And they've done all of  
20 that here. And I think the zoning is absolutely  
21 appropriate for the area.

22 So I look forward to seeing this  
23 development become a reality. Nice job.

24 COMMISSIONER BLANCHARD: Madam Chair.

25 CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Blanchard.

1           COMMISSIONER BLANCHARD: I'm also in support of  
2 the motion, because I think it's probably the easiest  
3 way to just get this thing moving forward.

4           I'm kind of half of one, six of the other  
5 on the sidewalk, but I do want to commend Stephanie on  
6 the project. It's -- I'd be very interested to  
7 sidebar on this at some point and find out what kind  
8 of capital stack you used to be able to make these  
9 rents work. And I'd also like to know more  
10 about -- it sounds like what they're talking about is  
11 wraparound services here for the residents.

12           And so I think this is something that we  
13 really don't have very much of in Boise. I think it's  
14 a great spot for it. And I think this could be a  
15 really good object lesson for other developments  
16 around the city if that is indeed what they're  
17 providing. So good job.

18           CHAIRMAN STEAD: Great. Okay. We have a motion  
19 on the table to recommend approval for CAR20-20 and to  
20 approve PUD20-46 at 10881 West Florence Drive.

21 ROLL CALL

22           CHAIRMAN STEAD: Will the clerk please call the  
23 vote.

24           THE CLERK: Stead.

25           CHAIRMAN STEAD: Aye.

1 THE CLERK: Schafer.

2 CO-CHAIRMAN SCHAFFER: Aye.

3 THE CLERK: Squyres.

4 COMMISSIONER SQUYRES: Aye.

5 THE CLERK: Blanchard.

6 COMMISSIONER BLANCHARD: Aye.

7 THE CLERK: Mohr.

8 COMMISSIONER MOHR: Aye.

9 THE CLERK: Gillespie.

10 COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Aye.

11 THE CLERK: Finfrock.

12 COMMISSIONER FINFROCK: Aye.

13 THE CLERK: All in favor. Motion carries.

14 (End transcription at 1:59:00 of audio  
15 file.)

16 -o0o-

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25