JANUARY 14, 2019 | PLANNING & COMMISSION HEARING MINUTES

I. **CALL TO ORDER**

   PRESENT: Ansotegui, Gibson, Gillespie, Stead, Paschke
   ABSENT: Stevens

II. **MINUTES ACCEPTANCE**

   1. Planning and Zoning Commission Minutes - Commission Meeting - Dec 3, 2018 6:00 PM
   2. Planning and Zoning Commission Minutes - Commission Meeting - Dec 10, 2018 6:00 PM

III. **CREATION OF CONSENT AGENDA**

IV. **NEW BUSINESS**

   A. **PUD15-00017 & CFH15-00037 / The Reserve at Deer Valley, LLC / TIME EXTENSION**

      8134 N. Pierce Park Lane / A conditional use permit and hillside development permit for a planned residential development comprised of 96 detached single-family homes on approximately 90 acres within the R-1A (Single Family Residential) zone. Brent Moore

      Consent

      RESULT: APPROVED [4 TO 0]
      MOVER: Tamara Ansotegui, Commissioner
      SECONDER: Meredith Stead, Commissioner
      AYES: Tamara Ansotegui, Douglas Gibson, Milt Gillespie, Meredith Stead
      ABSTAIN: Claire Paschke
      ABSENT: Jennifer Stevens

   1. **CAR18-00022 / Trout Architects**

      901 N. 27th Street / Rezone of 1.76 acres from R-2 (Medium Density Residential) and R-3D (Multi-Family Residential with Design Review) to C-1D/DA (Neighborhood Commercial with Design Review and Development Agreement) Brent Moore
Mr. Chair, Commissioners. Before you is an application for a mixed use planned development comprised of 69 residential units and 7000 square feet of commercial space on 1.76 acres, located at 901 N. 27th Street. A rezone from R-2 and R-3D to C-1D is also included. And this item was originally before the Commission on November 5th, where it was deferred until tonight due to concerns the original design was not compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

So in response to concerns raised by the Commission, the applicant has made the following changes to the original plan - the height of the building has been reduced from four to three stories. And as such the building now meets the height requirement of the zone, and no longer requires a height exception. The step-down design along the north and west ends of the building has been eliminated. And these changes have resulted in the commercial area being reduced from 9000 to 7000 square feet, and the number of residential units decreasing from 70 to 69.

So here’s the revised site plan. The yellow areas show the portions of the first floor which will be reserved for commercial use. And the orange areas designate live/work units. So the revised plan includes five additional live/work units on the west end of the building allocated over here which were originally designated commercial in the original plan. Here is the revised landscape plan. It is relatively unchanged from the original plan with the exception that rooftop patios will no longer be provided. Resident access to the roof will no longer be included as part of the revised plan.

And the parking lot that will remain the same as in the original plan, and include 107 spaces, 13 on-street spaces will also be provided along Stewart Avenue. And while the commission originally expressed some concern regarding the size of the parking lot, the planning team finds it will generally be hidden from public view as it will be screened from 27th Street and Stewart Avenue by the building. And will be buffered from the residential properties to the west by a six-foot tall cedar fence and a landscape strip planted with trees.

And while the parking plan currently exceeds the amount of spaces required, the applicant notes that if a restaurant, coffee shop, or tavern were to occupy a portion of the building, the amount of on-street parking required would increase as these uses require more parking than standard commercial uses. Additionally, the additional on-site parking will help to limit the potential of on-street parking associated with the development from spilling into the residential neighborhood.

So here are the revised building elevations. The building will be broken up by a combination of flat and pitched roof segments separated by open pedestrian connections on the first floor. And the final building design would need to be approved by the design review committee through a separate application. And here’s an aerial perspective showing how the revised three-story building will relate to the surrounding area.
And here's a perspective looking north from the corner of 27th Street and Stewart Avenue which shows the plaza that will be provided on the southeast corner of the site. And here's a perspective from Stewart Avenue looking east towards 27th Street. And while comments have been received by residents concerned about the density of the development, the planning team finds the density to be justified by the site’s proximity to transit service along State Street, it’s proximity to Esther Simplot Park, and it’s being only approximately one mile from downtown.

The planning team finds the development to be compatible with the 30th Street area master plan as it designates the site as a neighborhood commercial center, and calls for commercial uses to be located on a site that will be within walking and biking distance of residents.

So in conclusion, the planning team finds the revised plans to have adequately addressed the concerns raised by the Commission at their November 5th hearing. And recommends approval of the application. And this concludes my presentation.

**Chairman Gillespie:** Thanks Brent, appreciate it. Is the applicant ready? It's your turn. Normally we punch up ten minutes and see how you're doing, and if you need more time we'll let it roll.

**APPLICANT**

**Rex Nielson (2411 N. 25th Street):** Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, my name is Rex Nielson. I live at 2411 N. 25th Street in Boise. Actually, it’s gone from 70 units to 65 units, but on our application on November 5th, which was deferred till today was originally going to be four stories because of what happened across the street. But we are now at three stories. After hearing what the neighbors said at the November 5th meeting, I asked Rae, president of the West End Neighborhood Association to arrange a meeting with the neighbors to discuss the project.

From that meeting, and two more subsequent meetings, we arrived at a three-story project that we now propose. Some of the neighbors wanted flat roofs, some wanted gable roofs. They all like the awnings. Quality windows were requested. They wanted depth to the facade. Some wanted a more defined building separation. So this is how we ended up with what we’re proposing today. Thank you.

**Commissioner Gibson:** Thank you.

**Steve Trout (2504 W. Kootenai Street):** Steve Trout, for the architects, for Rex. We’re at 2504 W. Kootenai, 83705. I'm going to take from where Brent left off and Rex left off a little bit, and push a little deeper into it. So we did redesign the building quite a bit, as you will see. We’ll start with the site plan. We still have the alley which was widened at 20-feet as requested by ACHD. We’re also getting most of our access to the site from the alley which is actually part of the 30th Street master plan.
30th Street master plan also addresses that they don’t want any access from 27th, so we’re also using Jordan Street, which is also an ACHD request. So we’ve met those requirements. Rex talked a little bit about the passage through the building. This slide shows where those passageways are which allows the people form the parking lot to approach the commercial storefronts to gain access to that active side of the building from the parking lot. I’ll talk a little bit more about how this works with the elevations here in a little bit.

So per Boise City zoning, we have over 70 bicycle parks planned, or parking spots for bicycles. So we’ve covered that quite adequately. One thing within the 30th Street master plan is the activity zone at 27th and Stewart. So that remains the same as in our last proposal. It’s a big area that the restaurants can come out to, or the coffee shops can come out to. And we’ll get into that a little bit deeper too.

The master plan calls for a continuous front on 27th and Stewart. Taken with a grain of salt a continuous front needs to have some variability to it. But we do meet the continuous front on Stewart and 27th. We have included the street trees, that’s also within the 30th Street master plan and requested by the City. We’ll also be adding the grates that go with it, planters, benches, and things like that that CCDC will be talking to us about. And then Brent talked about the landscaping in the back. That pretty much remains the same, and we’ve covered it pretty well, I believe. I think we’re good there.

Commercial, again 30th Street master plan, we have residential multi-family residential above commercial zone. So we’ve met that condition in the master plan. We’ve tucked the parking behind the building - the new urbanism that we’re all doing these days - another condition of the 30th Street master plan. There have been some comments concerning the distance of the building to the street, how wide that is. This slide we’ve developed to show that on Stewart Street we’re about 25 feet from the curb to the face of the building.

Some of the letters you have, I think refer to the distance of the setback. For some reason we have a large ACHD right of way that we’re able to use at that time which we will use. That will be pretty good. This slide also shows the size of the corner setback. It’s about 65-feet deep off of Stewart, and 42-feet deep off of 27th. And then a little finer point, the distance between the building and the curb on 27th is 17 feet. It wanders a little bit in there, but it’s about 17 feet.

This slide shows what we perceived the courtyard to be. We’ve got some awnings. The planner is subject to what the restaurant might want. But it’s an image of what we’re trying to project in the activity zone at that corner. The dispersion of our functions in here, this slide gets to that, and we’ll go into it a little deeper. So the first floor we have live/work on the corners which are in ochre. We also have a little red which is the garage which are nine parking spots.
Second floor we have residential which are in blue. And then again the ochre is the live/work. The live/work are actually a two-story function. The first floor is commercial, you step up into the residential from the back side. We have a total of 65 units which we'll make correct in the record, which is 24 one-bedroom right now, 32 two-bedroom. And we're counting the nine live/work within that 65 to make a finer point on that. It's pink on that slide.

So we have nine garages on the first floor - private garages, about 7000 square feet of yellow commercial space, which is pulled to the active corner there. Again the live/work two stories, nine units. We have 24 single-bed units which are dispersed through out in the blue there or purple. And then 32 units which are in the blue in this one. And again, that same slide Brent showed you earlier.

We do have 107 parking spaces. We haven’t taken the discount given for mass transit or anything, given that we will like Brent said, probably have some issues of parking or restaurant uses/tavern uses. They are all full-sized parking stalls. We don’t have any compact stalls. We have a full complement of handicapped stalls/accessible stalls. And then moving on to the elevations. So we’ve lowered the roof and the parapet to 35 feet which is compliant with the C-1D and also the R-2 zone.

We’ve also removed the rooftop gardens from that. So we don’t have any elevators going up to the fourth floor. I think we’re at 57 feet last time at the top - somewhere in that zone. We talked about the public passageways a little earlier, this slide shows where those public passageways are which allows us to break the facade into five different massings per se, not counting the hinge point. So that makes the buildings a little smaller, and you can see we’ve tried to articulate the building differently as you go down the street.

The storefronts which we’ll look at a little closer when we get to the renderings are based off historical referencing of typical storefronts where we have a wainscot at the bottom, a tall window in the middle, awning - probably a canvas awning in our case, and a transom above that. So very similar to what we would typically see in the historic downtown or in older buildings.

The other thing we’ve done on this one that wasn’t so apparent on the last one is the vertical and horizontal undulations or the push and pull of the facade. So we don’t have a flat facade. It will wander. You’ll step into an alcove to go to the commercial zones. There are little undulations that make it much more interesting. We’ve also added some gables to it which references the residential neighborhood. We also have a flat parapet cobbled brick building which mimics or references at least the corner building in Hyde Park on 13th there.

And again some slides of the entry from Stewart Avenue showing the activity there. It shows the awnings, the wainscot underneath the storefront, and the transom window above. The next slide shows the
undulation that we’re pulling with the building to give it some relief, some depth, some shadow. Another look from 27th towards Stewart. In the foreground is a typical live/work unit. They’re treated somewhere between a residential facade and a commercial facade that could go either way. We wanted to give whoever is using that that opportunity to use that. And the background you can see the depth that we’ve implied the shadow and the depth to the commercial storefronts.

On my last slide here is another look at the passageway on Stewart Street where the young lady is about ready to go into that little alley or little passage. The breezeway above that connects the second and third floor are held back to give that much more dramatic appeal. It won’t be part of the facade per se. And with that we move on. Thank you.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you, sir. So that’s it. I got it. So, questions for the applicant or staff from the Commission. And I’ll start with one while Commissioner Gibson loads. So Brent, on packet page 212, this I think a page from the November 5th hearing, it shows that the building complied with all the setback and parking requirements for the zone. I assume that the new building continues to comply with all the setback and parking requirements for the zone.

Brent Moore (City of Boise): Mr. Chair, that’s correct. The only change to building or parking setback was the western end of the building got five feet closer to the west, but it still complies with the setback - exceeds the setback requirement by 10 feet, so everything still complies.

Chairman Gillespie: And Brent, the new design does comply with the basic height restrictions of the zone?

Brent Moore (City of Boise): Mr. Chair, that’s correct. Height exception is no longer required, the height of the building meets the current and proposed height requirement.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you very much.

Commissioner Gibson: Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Gillespie: Commissioner Gibson.

Commissioner Gibson: Question for staff. Based upon the size of the commercial component of this development, are you going to be reviewing or will DRB review a signage package? I didn’t see one in our application and I wanted to confirm how that’s going to be handled.

Brent Moore (City of Boise): Mr. Chair, Commissioner Gibson, that would be through a separate application. They would submit a sign application - we’d review it at that point.

Commissioner Gibson: Follow up. I understand the mechanics of the package, but how are to be guaranteed that the signage components
for each one of the individual commercial uses is consistently themed, scaled, colored, material - those types of issues that you would not normally have unless you had six or seven different commercial elements coming together?

**Brent Moore (City of Boise):** Mr. Chair, Commissioner Gibson. That could be a condition, potentially as a design view, that the signage all matches a certain style, but generally sign permits are approved on a case-by-case basis, or the applicant can request a master sign program for the entire site and have them approved all at once.

**Commissioner Gibson:** Thank you.

**Chairman Gillespie:** Any further questions?

**Commissioner Gibson:** Mr. Chairman.

**Chairman Gillespie:** Commissioner Gibson.

**Commissioner Gibson:** I do have a couple of questions for the applicant, Mr. Trout. First question is specific to - and I know this more of a demographics question, why no three or four-bedroom units included as part of the development? Why just ones and twos?

**Steve Trout (2504 W. Kootenai Street):** It wasn't requested by our client is the short answer. So, the demographics of what they're thinking of hasn't come to the surface on that that they would request a three or four-bedroom. And affordability is what I'm -

**Commissioner Gibson:** Understood that. Then a follow up question about the - it appears from your site plan that there are two trash enclosures that are located near the parking garage island?

**Steve Trout (2504 W. Kootenai Street):** That is correct. And I believe from our last conversation, Commissioner Gibson, we talked about the adequacy of trash enclosure. So we took a little more time and worked that out, relative to that question. So the difference between the two, one’s the commercial and one’s residential. So you’ll see more residential recycling buckets and three-yard dumpsters which are indicative of the scale of the apartment unit. The other one is indicative of a smaller sale commercial unit. So that one’s commercial, one’s residential.

**Commissioner Gibson:** Mr. Chairman.

**Chairman Gillespie:** Please.

**Commissioner Gibson:** So a follow up then to the trash question, have you pulled any local brokers for commercial developments on a maximum travel distance from say a restaurant or a shop in order to get the debris to a dumpster?
Steve Trout (2504 W. Kootenai Street): We didn’t pull any local brokers, we used our experience from the past and looked around from our neighborhood at what they’re having to do there. It is approaching a good distance for the commercial, that is true, but it was an easy left over space I’ll admit that.

Commissioner Gibson: Then one last question.

Chairman Gillespie: Please.

Commissioner Gibson: One of the exhibits that you showed tonight made reference to the four passageways or the breezeways to get commercial. The 27th and the corner appear to have an encumbered access, but the two westerly ones that are on the Stewart appear to have a conflict with a parking stall. How would you address that if there’s a big SUV parked in the way and somebody’s trying to get their bike to the back of the development?

Steve Trout (2504 W. Kootenai Street): There’s a sidewalk in the back there that you would have to get around. But the bike should be on the front. We may have to take a look at that.

Commissioner Gibson: That was just something I noticed because you had pointed out specifically that you had four connectivity points through the building, but two of the four could possibly be an obstruction.

Steve Trout (2504 W. Kootenai Street): Right. I think our accessible zones are at those breezeways, because we’re trying to use the aisle - the accessible aisle as part of that access point so you don’t have to walk around it. We may have shifted overnight.

Commissioner Gibson: I’ll go back and look at the site then. Thank you.

Chairman Gillespie: Any further questions for the applicant or staff? Hearing none, the next person up is the neighborhood association, in that case it’s the West End Neighborhood Association. Welcome!

WEST END NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

Rae Brooks (2600 W. Pleasanton Avenue): Thank you. My name is Rae Brooks, and I’m the president of the West End Neighborhood Association. As you’ve heard since the November 5th hearing when a decision on this project was deferred, we’ve met with the developer twice at his request to provide input on the new design. In order to hear their concerns he specifically wanted to meet with the five people who testified against the project at the last hearing.

Many of the suggestions that arose at those meetings were incorporated into the new drawings we’ve seen tonight, including varying roof lines, a more traditional facade, and design changes to make different parts of the building look more separated. We happen to have an architect on
our board who provided her professional assessment of the changes. She thinks the differing roof lines help break up the building. The windows are better proportioned, and the use of materials is much improved. And of course, the number of stories has been decreased from four to three.

We were all concerned that the project respect the character of our neighborhood and these changes were made with that goal in mind. So to recap, here is the neighborhood involvement we’ve had in this project which I think would be considered an unusually large amount. An initial neighborhood meeting in late September as required by the CD. Thereafter I met with the developer and architects. The developer then attended our October board meeting where we discussed the project and were able to ask questions. Then we had the first hearing on November 5th.

After the hearing the developer met twice with the five people who had spoken against the project, with board members, and with me. I then met again with the developer and architects to ensure all suggestions and concerns from those meetings were transmitted to the architects. The developer provided us with a new set of drawings, and last Tuesday we reviewed them at a board meeting specially scheduled ahead of tonight’s hearing.

In addition, there were 17 members at our board meeting last week when we often have no guests. Despite the attendance, I worry a bit about whether we really have the pulse of the neighborhood on this issue. There are about 3200 adults who live in the West End. We have a mailing list of 170. That’s just over 5% of all the adults who live in the West End. So that’s 94% who we haven’t heard from. The five West End members who spoke against the project at the November hearing are 2.9% of our members and less than two-tenths of 1% of the adults in our neighborhood.

While I’m trying to represent them, I also have to try to represent the other 165 members we have, and the 3000 other plus adults in our neighborhood. Technically, our neighbor association even represents the developer. Our bylaw states that property owners are eligible to join. And he owns six houses in our neighborhood, and is one of the 170 people on our mailing list.

Just a few last numbers. The 17 guests at our board meeting last week represent just a tenth of our membership. And the discussion included some people who had not previously been involved in any of our discussions or meetings or work on Chausse Swan. Of course, we heard many different views at that meeting. My task tonight is to represent all those views.

So here goes. At least two long-term residents that we’ve heard from don’t want the neighborhood to change. We can all sympathize with the desire for things to remain the same. But that really gives us nowhere to go as the 30th Street master plan for our neighborhood does call for
controlled development, and property owners have the right to build on their property subject to approvals.

Nor is this view shared by all long time residents. I’ve made a point of getting out to talk with people in the neighborhood, and a couple of people who’ve lived here for decades told me they’re looking forward to the changes. One who lives near the corner of 27th and Pleasanton said she was ready for a convenience store and a parking lot on her corner. I told her that the master plan makes it unlikely she would get either at that particular location.

And of course despite some not desiring it, the neighborhood has already changed. I was struck reading the master plan how the West End was touted as being a neighborhood of affordable housing. The plan was only published six years ago, but I wouldn’t say we’re known for affordable housing anymore. A house on Jefferson sold last summer for $625,000 cash, a record high for our neighborhood. Another one on Woodlawn is currently listed at just under 600,000.

All homeowners in the West End have seen their home values increase substantially just in the past two years. Which brings us to another point, one of our board members is a renter. During our discussion on Chausse Swan at last week’s board meeting, he asked the audience of about 25 people how many were renters. Not a single hand went up. A stunned silence followed. It was blaringly obvious that this was and had been all along a discussion by homeowners representing only homeowners interests and points of view.

I’ve since tried to track down a figure for the percentage of renters in our neighborhood. The master plan cites the 2006 figure of 30.4% of homes being owner occupied, which means almost 70% of people were renting at that time. I couldn’t find an up to date figure, but by looking at the percentages of different types of housing in the West End we can say that the percentage of renters is still substantial - perhaps 50% or higher. So we have a lot of renters, and we hadn’t represented their interest at all.

Back in 2012, residents involved in creating the master plan wanted - and this is a quote “more choice in housing types, as many who now rent would like to stay in the neighborhood but cannot necessarily afford to purchase a single-family residence.” With rising home prices that sentiment from renters would only be stronger today. Of course the rent on apartments or the cost of a condo will have gone up too, but would still be proportionately cheaper than a single-family home.

The rise in home values is even shutting out young professionals from the West End housing market, even though the neighborhood would have been an affordable choice for them even a couple of years ago. Maybe projects like Chausse Swan can allow more middle class people to stay or to make their homes in the West End. Instead of having to live in suburbia depending on cars to get anywhere, they would be able to bike or walk
to work or to the park. The master plan does support creating more compact mixed use transit oriented developments.

At our board meeting, last week an audience member said that diversity makes for strong neighborhoods. During our discussion about Chausse Swan our vice president made the point that we happen to have a lot of low income housing in our neighborhood. This project, he said, could help balance out the low-income housing with more middle class housing, that would contribute to the diversity of our neighborhood, he suggested, and make it stronger.

Another member said we have to face the fact that Boise is going to grow. We can try to have input to shape the growth but our neighborhood will continue to change. Our own West End neighborhood was created during a period of explosive growth in Boise. As one of our board members pointed out, all of us in the West End live on former farmland. In the early 1900s when the David Family Dairy Farm was being subdivided into the residential lots, that foreign part of the West End, there were no doubt neighbors in the North End who lamented the loss of farmland to newcomers and worried about traffic congestion from all those extra horses in the streets.

But with Boise’s population almost tripling from 1900 to 1910, the West End subdivision went ahead anyway to the future benefit of all its residents a century later. Sometimes it’s valuable to take a long term view. I happened to be in a big eastern city this weekend with homes chock-a-block into narrow lots, ten-story condo buildings, residential high rises outside farflung subway stations, and was struck by how young our city is.

Another member at our board meeting last week reiterated that this location at 27th and Stewart is the right place for this development. The master plan outlined how this particular corner would become the neighborhood commercial area that residents said they wanted. The rezoning will allow small restaurants, coffee shops, maybe a pub, a barber shop. If the area isn’t rezoned it’s current mix of zoning would allow 52 residential units to be built up to 35 feet high on the small part that is zoned R-2, and up to 45 feet high on the larger part that is R-3D. All within the current setback and height requirements.

But without the rezoning we won’t get any commercial. Commercial uses are not allowed in the current zoning. So we rezone and get our neighborhood commercial, or the zoning stays the same and we only get condos or apartments as high as four stories tall in the larger R-3 zoning. Another member pointed out that this time we had a developer who took the time to meet with us and incorporated some of our design suggestions into the drawing under consideration tonight.

If we have to go through this again, he said, we might not get a developer who will even talk to us. Other members at the meeting supported even more commercial space. The master plan envisions up to 24,000 square feet of commercial space, but says that the market should
help determine the appropriate amount of commercial space. We would have 8000 square feet between the two developments at 27th and Stewart, almost all of it provided by Chausse Swan.

The approved development across Stewart provides only 1000 square feet of commercial space. One member wondered if the small commercial spaces at Chausse Swan would be economically viable, and mentioned his experiences with similar developments before he moves to Boise from Seattle. Others objected to the density of the housing, citing the call for medium-density housing in the master plan. Others of us are fine with higher-density housing as a way to allow more people to live in a walkable, bikeable neighborhood.

And I should also point out that the master plan refers to one of its key goals as wanting to create incentive programs that allow increased residential densities of up to 45 units per acre in four areas of our neighborhood, including the 27th and Stewart area. So they were obviously thinking along those lines too. But going back to the objections about density from some people. For them it ties into worries about increased traffic, although the construction of Whitewater Park Blvd was intended to be the public commitment that preceded private investment.

In other words, build a new road such as Whitewater Park Blvd at public cost so the area can handle more traffic. Then someone will step up and build a housing whose residents will use that road. I was also struck in reading the master plan how the writers were so clear about how their plan was intended to be used. They encouraged owners of development property in the neighborhood to use the vision, themes, and goals of the plan as a “starting point” in developing “strong market-driven plans for use of their properties. These plans are intended to inspire and guide, rather than regulate property owners’ development options.”

So the master plan was intended to be a guide, not a blueprint. It laid out an ideal vision but then recognized that “some aspects may be easier to achieve than others, and some may prove to be unobtainable.” The ideal vision they provided, they said, is intended to inspire best efforts. I think that over the past two months that we, as a neighborhood association, have given our best efforts to seeking input on this project and I’ve tried to convey tonight the varying opinions I’ve heard expressed. Thank you.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you so much, Ms. Brooks, that was really good and I really liked it. And it is a poignant reminder that representative democracy is really hard. And because you’re lucky, I’m not going to start quoting Socrates or his student, Plato, about what they thought about it. I will instead move on to the sign-up sheet. So we have five people on the sign-up sheet, starting with Clyde Rasmussen and then Cortney, then Lauren, then Margie, then Marcia. Welcome.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY
Clyde Rasmussen (PO Box 2352 Boise, ID 83701): I’m Clyde Rasmussen. And I’m with Keller Williams Realty Boise. My notes - people have covered some of this, but first and foremost, when I work in real estate, recently with all the media coverage with the West End, people say to me show me the West End, I want to see the West End. So I go down there and we have an abandoned building, Jerry’s Market, and we have the Whitewater Park.

And I think this project will give the West End identifiable vibrant center. Here it is, as we would go to Hyde Park we can see a vibrant center, activities, things going on. Number two, affordable housing - I’ll keep this in brief - a lot of people, younger people, coming to town are asking for smaller residences. And the idea of a three or four-bedroom unit in this complex is possibly something that could be marketed.

But I think right now there’s a lot of demand for people coming into Boise, they want to be downtown. And a lot of them are not large families or anything like that. And they’re looking for a one bedroom. And I think we really have a shortage on that based on my experience in real estate. And number three, this offers street level commercial retail space that’s going to attract traffic, yes. But it’s also going to attract pedestrians from the park, cyclists, people like that - a lot of walk-in traffic. That’s it. Thank you.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you, Mr. Rasmussen. The next person is Cortney Nielson, followed by Lauren Pennisi. Welcome, Ms. Nielson.

Cortney Nielson | Daughter of Applicant (4705 W. Kendall Street): Hello. My name is Cortney Nielson. I’m Rex Nielson’s daughter. And I’m a huge advocate for this plan. I think it’s beautiful. I think it’s passionate. Everybody is from somewhere, and my dad just happens to be from Boise. And he’s put a lot of thought into this. He’s got a lot of passion for the project, especially to name it after Chausse Swan, which was something historical. Something that was here preserved earlier.

So, I’m just excited. I think it’s exciting to bring such excitement to the West End. And I lived at 2712 Stewart for nine years. And when Jerry’s Market left it was sad and we lost that niche, and we didn’t have anywhere to go. So, you have down to go down to the corporate Family Dollar or something. But losing Jerry’s Market was just a sad day. And I think that with this passionate project you can bring some passion back to the West End instead of looking at some abandoned buildings and whatnot.

But traffic is inevitable, growth is inevitable, change is inevitable. So let’s embrace it and move forward.

Chairman Gillespie: Ms. Nielson, before you go, will you advocate your name and address into the microphone?

Cortney Nielson | Daughter of Applicant (4705 W. Kendall Street): Yes, absolutely. Cortney Nielson, 4705 W. Kendall Street, Boise ID.
Chairman Gillespie: Thank you, Ms. Nielson. Next person is Lauren Pennisi, followed by Margie Twitchell. Welcome Ms. Pennisi.

Lauren Pennisi (2411 Pleasanton Avenue): I'm Lauren Pennisi. And I live at 2411 Pleasanton Avenue in Boise, Idaho. I have lived in this neighborhood since 1990. And it is a wonderful neighborhood. I am in favor of adhering to the master plan regarding the concept, designs, and density. And the other theme that I think I would like to emphasize that was in the master plan is the integrity of the neighborhood. And there are several places in the master plan where that is repeatedly referred to as an important theme.

And that is one of my concerns with this project is that I don't think it could do a better job. And there are the concept designs on pages 155 and, more to the point, 156, that give that Hyde Park look, that historical feel. On page ten it says that the project should be respectful and compatible with the existing neighborhood character. Page 14, village-like commercial district. Page 16, the distinct identity and sense of place from natural setting history public spaces.

Page 28, Hyde Park style neighborhood commercial district. Page 20 - I mean I could go on, but those are some of the repeated references to the plan and how this should look and the feel. Page 36, historic preservation is often overlooked as a component of neighborhood stability and revitalization. So that's my other concern, this is a very big project. I look at the Jefferson Street condos - while it's a much smaller scale, but I look at that as a three-story building, brand new - so here it is jammed in with other single-family houses.

And it doesn't look so great across the street, next to the other buildings. It really sticks out. And so I try to envision what this three-story complex of 70 units is going to look like in our neighborhood, the houses across the street. It's very different, it's going to stand out. While it may give a center to the West End, it also is not necessarily fitting with the character of style and integrity of the neighborhood.

The other points that I noticed were the references to medium density. This project is not medium density. The number of units well exceeds that. The building forms and placement should give feel of a village center similar to Hyde Park commercial district. So I feel that looking at these concept designs were a little bit off the mark there. I understand that there - oh, I'm over. Thank you.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you, Ms. Pennisi. Appreciate it. The next person is Margie Twitchell, followed by Marcia Franklin. Welcome Ms. Twitchell.

Margie Twitchell (2107 W. Jefferson Street): Hi, Margie Twitchell, 2107 W. Jefferson Street, Boise. I feel that the amount of units proposed for this project is not in line with the 30th Street master plan for medium density. And that the number of units just too many. 27th, Stewart, and Jordan is a
neighborhood area, and it’s not like State Street, Fairview, or Downtown that can handle larger densities.

I’m just concerned with the extra traffic and on-street parking will overflow into the surrounding neighborhood streets and degrade the neighborhoods. Another concern I have is with the high density of 65 to 69 units now, for this area will set up a precedent for future developers to try to come in and put larger complexes with even more units. And put more pressure on the surrounding area. Thank you.

**Chairman Gillespie:** Thank you, Ms. Twitchell, I appreciate it. The last person on the sign-up sheet is Ms. Franklin. Welcome back.

**Marcia Franklin (2521 W. Stewart Avenue):** Thank you. I’m Marcia Franklin and I live at 2521 W. Stewart Avenue, which is a block away from the proposed development. While the building has been lowered from four stories to three, that merely brings it into alignment with the 30th Street master plan which calls for a buildings to be two to three stories in height. It’s not a compromise, this is compliance.

Also, virtually, the same amount of units are going to be built. Instead of 70 there will be what we thought were 69, I guess 65. As a result the building still does not comply with the plan’s requirement of medium density for this corridor. According to the current mixed zoning of the property, 52 units would be allowed, and that’s already nearly double what medium density would normally be on a parcel this size. Sixty-five units is definitely not medium density.

Plus, there will be 7000 square feet of retail. In addition to the height and density limitations, the master plan calls for, as you’ve heard, a Hyde Park-like feel for 27th Street. That wasn’t mentioned in the staff report. This large unbroken structure definitely does not reflect that goal. Because the developer wants to pay for only one elevator, the building is still comprised of two long walls extending down 27th and then down Stewart.

He does now have a few small openings on the first floor, essentially passage ways to a parking lot. And there were a few changes in the roof lines. Those do not mitigate the fact that this is still one very large structure. This will not engender a Hyde Park-like feel. There is no comparable building in Hyde Park. When these types of abrogations of an existing plan are allowed, they set a precedent for future developments to also violate the plan.

For example, the Whitewater Station project was approved at a higher density than allowed by the 30th Street plan. Now we have an even larger development asking to do the same. If this is allowed to occur what will the rest of the area eventually look like? I actually agree with the need for higher density of housing in Boise, and that’s already happening less than a mile away on Fairview. And it will happen on State Street. That’s appropriate.
Those corridors are not already full of single-family homes in an intimate neighborhood. The two new developments at Stewart and 27th will put 97 housing units in one small area. That density of housing will permanently change the feel of our neighborhood in my view, in a negative way. In the end what good is a plan if it’s not followed? The 30th Street plan was approved in 2012. If in only six years it’s no longer in keeping with the goals of the residents, then the plan should be changed. It shouldn’t be violated.

There are other ways of designing this complex that would be more in keeping with the neighborhood, for instance, breaking up the buildings into a mix of rentals and townhomes. And including green space which is also called for in the plan. Or lowering the units to the allowable 52. Yes, it might cost more money, but when we’re creating the first large development in this neighborhood - a gateway if you will - and one that will be here for at least 100 years, we owe it to ourselves and future residents to be more mindful about what we’re doing, including following the master plan. Thank you.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you, Ms. Franklin. That wraps up the sign-up sheets, and now we go to open mic. So is there anybody else who wishes to testify tonight on this matter? So, she got up before you did but you’re next.

Emma Rasmussen (1904 E. Spring Meadows): Hi, my name’s Emma Rasmussen. I’m at 1904 E. Spring Meadow Lane in Boise 83706.

Chairman Gillespie: Welcome, Ms. Rasmussen. Thanks. Just let me remind you, when you’re done just have a seat and fill out that little white slip that’s supposed to be right there. Thank you.

Emma Rasmussen (1904 E. Spring Meadows): I have a lot written but I’m going to just say verbatim the 30th Street master plan specifically addresses residents’ desire for a village-like district that would be people-friendly and neighborhood gathering place. It specifically states 27th Street and Stewart Avenue. The master plan focuses on shaping future development and enlivening the existing residential neighborhoods.

This could be very beneficial to the area, especially in light of Whitewater Park and that there is an additional Whitewater Park - in today’s paper, that they’re adding on. It’s going to be a huge draw, it’s one of the biggest things in the country. And density is density. And Boise is changing and growing. And right now Beverly Hills is buying Boise apartments in Southeast Boise, 278 units. They’re renovating them. It’s in River Run. It’s not going to bring down people’s values, if anything, it’s a Beverly Hills firm building it. Taxes are going to go up but so are property values.

There’s a lot of young people that want to be able to walk and bike places, and take buses places, and not have all these cars here and cars there, and driving to Meridian, and driving to Nampa, and driving to
Caldwell. And spending an hour going to work, and an hour coming back. If you read over the 30th Street master plan there’s a lot of underutilized area. And Forbes says that Boise is one of the fastest growing places in the nation.

And so the housing has to come from somewhere, and Boise has a lot to offer. And a lot of people want to be here. And if you’re 21 or 22 years old you cannot afford - unless you’re driving to Caldwell. And I guess that’s all I have to say.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you, Ms. Rasmussen. Who’s next? So is there anyone else after this gentleman? Why doesn’t everyone who wants to testify line up or order yourselves somewhere in these front rows, wherever you want, and we’ll just go bang, bang, bang. And again, I’ll just remind everyone to fill out the slip and hand it in. Please.

Alex Meregaglia (2600 W. Pleasanton Avenue): Good evening, I’m Alex Meregaglia. I live at 2600 W. Pleasanton Avenue, Boise 83702. I am the treasurer and an elected board member of the West End Neighborhood Association. But I’m here tonight as a private citizen in full support of this project. I’m also a renter in this neighborhood, and I see and recognize the need for more higher density housing to grow and to adapt, for the neighborhood to grow and to adapt to how Boise, at large, is changing.

I do not qualify for low-income housing, but at the same time I cannot afford a 400 or higher thousand dollar home which is quickly becoming the going rate for several of the houses in this area. Higher density housing like this project will allow more people to enjoy the amenities of our neighborhood, like Esther Simplot Park, or the ability to bike downtown for those who work downtown.

Again, like the rest of Boise the West End neighborhood is a rapidly changing area. Increasing the density in small specific areas of the neighborhood will allow the neighborhood to welcome more people in a similar situation to mine. This development fits within the master plan. The aspirations of the master plan is tasteful in its aesthetics and takes into account the financial reality of many residents within its boundaries. Thank you.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you, Alex, appreciate it. Who’s next?

John Wagner (1019 N. 30th Street): My name is John Wagner. And I’m at 1019 N. 30th Street. I’m about three blocks away from this development. I’m actually the guy that just moved from Seattle. I’ve been here about three years. I really enjoy the neighborhood. One thing that I do support about this is I do support higher density development.

Looking at the master plan and being in the area, I think we really have an opportunity to make the crown jewel of the neighborhood on this corner. That said, I think it’s pivotal that we have enough large commercial space to out in anchor tenants, such as a grocery store.
Currently I only have the option to walk either way down the highway that is known as State Street, about a half-a-mile to get to an Albertsons. It would be nice to have something on that corner that I could walk to to get fresh produce.

Currently the size of those units will only support something that might sell beer, cigarettes, or lotto tickets which I’m sure nobody wants. But maybe. So I think it’s really important that we make sure that the commercial space is there, that we can get some anchor tenants, put in a small library - whatever that is. The only other issue that I have with this development is that without measuring it it looks to me like the majority of that site is becoming a parking lot.

With that said, the 27th Street and 30th Street master plans talk about transit-oriented development. I would argue that this is actually the antithesis of transit-oriented development and this just supports single-occupancy vehicles. As a quick suggestion, something that would be great for the neighborhood would be something like undergrounding the parking lot.

And I know that comes at a great expense, but if we did that we could put something like a plaza up there. Something that the restaurants could face, have outdoor seating, something similar to that. That we could all enjoy as a neighborhood rather than a parking lot. And that’s all I got.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you, John. Who’s next?

Jill Osborn (1021 Shoshone Street): My name is Jill Osborn. I live at 1021 Shoshone Street, Boise 83705. And I’ll fill out one of these. I was interested. I noted the realtors - the comments on the need for one to two-bedroom units which are at a premium these days. And I felt confirmed in my informal observation as a Boise resident that we have a lot of young people moving into this community.

And I’ve noticed and have been very pleased that many of those young people prefer bicycles to cars, don’t even own cars, and are looking for more mass transit. So, I guess I just want to emphasize that that I’m sure you all know. We’ve got a lot of young people moving in here that need this kind of housing. The Whitewater Park which of course is nearby, is also pulling more of those people to this area. And they want these kinds of living options.

I’m a historic preservationist by profession, so I understand neighborhoods wanting to maintain their neighborhood feel. And I know - I don’t remember how long ago this was, but Rex Nielson was actually awarded an Orchid Award from Preservation Idaho for preservation sensitive new construction. So, I know he is sensitive to that. I don’t think he would put up a tall skinny in the middle of a single-family neighborhood.

So, that might be it. I understand the transportation concerns as well, but again, I would point to a lot of young people who are not even buying
cars these days, which I find really amazing and admirable. And the fact that 27th Street has already been widened and the traffic pattern changed to accommodate the increased population that’s coming to that area. That’s all I have.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you, Jill. Please fill out a slip. Who’s next? Welcome.

Cheryl Griebenow (2608 W. Stewart Avenue): I’m Cheryl Griebenow. I live at 2608 W. Stewart. I have written comments in your report. I just wanted to reiterate that this density is not suitable for this neighborhood. That’s all I have.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you, Cheryl.

Cheryl Griebenow (2608 W. Stewart Avenue): I was going to say I don’t want the commercial zoning to be approved.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you. Is there anyone else who’d like to testify tonight? So everybody hand in your slips before you go to Claire [Pashki 01:20:17] at the far right. And the applicant now has five minutes for rebuttal.

APPLICANT REBUTTAL

Steve Trout (2504 W. Kootenai Street): Thank you. Steve Trout, Trout Architects, 2504 W. Kootenai. I’ll try to get most of the comments. I’ll start first with the density. So there is the project across the street, we’ll call it Jerry’s Market. That currently has 38-plus units per acre. We’re asking for 36. So already there’s a precedent set for a higher denser use on this project by our neighbors from across the street. Concerning the 30th Street area master plan, there are a few different ways to read the density on here. It does refer to medium density from time to time, it also refers to 45 feet to 35 feet three-story Hyde Park. There isn’t a whole lot of three-story Hyde Park. So we read that as a character, as an image, not as a strict architectural guideline of one story, multiple historic buildings lined up in a row which is very expensive, very hard to do, and hardly ever completed correctly. We tend to call it Disneyland in our approach when we’re demeaning about that if it’s not carried out correctly.

I think our project will meet the needs and goals of the community. We would like to see a grocery store in there. I’ve always been advocating for small groceries like the old days, too. We’ll have to see how that plays out. We do have another round of review which is called design review. Which we will be getting into the weeds even further than tonight on what the aesthetics of the building is. But I believe the density is appropriate for the neighborhood. It’s already been established as an acceptable standard for the neighborhood.
And so the three story across the street, the density across the street we are just continuing that use. I think we'll just leave it at that and if you have any questions.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you very much, Steve. With that the matter is before the Commission. So we are recommending on the rezone and final on the PUD. We can handle it in one motion or two, whatever your preference is.

Commissioner Gibson: Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Gillespie: Commissioner Gibson.

Commissioner Gibson: I'm going to recommend to City Council CAR18-00022 for approval, and then PUD18-00040 with the conditions noted in the staff report for approval by P&Z.

Commissioner Gibson: Thank you very much. Is there a second?

Commissioner Stead: I second.

Chairman Gillespie: So we have a motion to approve both the CAR and the PUD by Commissioner Gibson, seconded by Commissioner Stead. Is there any discussion on the motion?

Commissioner Gibson: Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Gillespie: Commissioner Gibson.

Commissioner Gibson: As the maker of the motion I’d like to thank the applicant for their due diligence. I’d also like to thank the advocacy of the West End Neighborhood. It sounds like it was a fairly comprehensive process. When we did this original deferral two months ago, give or take, I didn’t expect to have a quality product like this come back. You still have the bones of the original concept, but I will tell you that from an aesthetics point of view, even before DRB gets an opportunity to beat you with a stick, I think it’s going to be a quality product.

While some of the testimony was going on tonight, I was rapidly going through the 30th Street master plan and trying to get my arms around that concept of the 27th and Stewart. And I’m of a firm conviction that I believe that the project meets the intent. It will be a focal point. It will provide for community amenities and such things as coffee shops and bodegas, and what would be an appropriate response in this area.

On the downside I’m not thrilled with the parking lot. I wholly agree with some of the other testimony that we should be less traffic-centric and I think that codification of a more appropriate response to zip cars and ridesharing opportunities should be an option for developers that would possibly pursue more open space on a project in lieu of less or not filling up an area with parking lot in general. That’s the comments.
Chairman Gillespie: Thank you, Commissioner Gibson. Any further comments?

Commissioner Stead: Mr. Chair.

Chairman Gillespie: Commissioner Stead.

Commissioner Stead: First, I agree with Commissioner Gibson’s note on the parking lot. It would have been nice to see some kind of shared amenity for the residents or the community. But I do appreciate the effort and the thought put into the design so that it’s a better fit to the neighborhood. And I’m glad to see the live/work spaces. I think providing diversity in the housing options is an important element of the comprehensive plan.

I appreciate the historical context from the neighborhood. I think that was really helpful. And I think it makes me happy to see the neighborhood and the developers working so closely together. I think our meetings would be a lot shorter if we saw that more often.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you, Commissioner Stead. Any further comments? So let me just throw out one very quickly, then we’ll - Commissioner Gibson raised a really interesting issue for the City and the notion of master sign and sign format and commonality. I think that cuts both ways. Sometimes you see that and it looks great, but when the sign design isn’t good and there’s a lot of bad signs it’s worse. So it’s a tough - it’s not easy one way or the other for me to figure out do you just want to let 15 flowers bloom or make everyone plant crocuses. I’m just not sure, but it’s an interesting problem for the DRB. With that we have a motion to basically approve both. Will the clerk please call the roll.

Clerk: Stead?

Commissioner Stead: Aye.

Clerk: Gillespie?

Chairman Gillespie: Aye.

Clerk: Gibson?

Commissioner Gibson: Aye.

Clerk: Ansotegui?

Commissioner Ansotegui: Aye.

Clerk: All in favor, motion carries.
**RESULT:** APPROVED [4 TO 0]
**MOVER:** Douglas Gibson, Commissioner
**SECONDER:** Meredith Stead, Commissioner
**AYES:** Tamara Ansotegui, Douglas Gibson, Milt Gillespie, Meredith Stead
**ABSTAIN:** Claire Paschke
**ABSENT:** Jennifer Stevens

1a. **PUD18-00040 / Trout Architects**
901 N. 27th Street / Conditional use permit for a mixed-use planned development comprised of 70 residential units and approximately 9,000 square feet of commercial space on a 1.76-acre site located in a proposed C-1D/DA (Neighborhood Commercial with Design Review and Development Agreement) zone. A request for a height exception is also included. Brent Moore

**RESULT:** APPROVED [4 TO 0]
**MOVER:** Douglas Gibson, Commissioner
**SECONDER:** Meredith Stead, Commissioner
**AYES:** Tamara Ansotegui, Douglas Gibson, Milt Gillespie, Meredith Stead
**ABSTAIN:** Claire Paschke
**ABSENT:** Jennifer Stevens

2. **CAR18-00028 / RR Building Specialties**
2393 N. Wildwood Street / Rezone of 1.13 acres from A-1 (Open Land) to R-1C (Single Family Residential-8 units/acre) zone. Céline Acord

**Céline Acord (City of Boise):** Commissioners, before you tonight is a development proposal located at 2393 N. Wildwood Street. The site is central to the square mile block of Five Mile and Cloverdale and Fairview and Ustick in the West Bench planning area. The site is currently zoned A-1 and the applicant is requesting to rezone to R-1C. As you can see on the zoning map, R-1C almost completely surrounds the site except for a few remnant parcels zoned R-1A. The R-1C zone is an allowable zone within the suburban land use designation and would seem to be the most complementary implementing zone.

The associated plan development is for nine units. And just to clarify, north is oriented to the right on this slide. There is an existing single family house which will remain on a separate lot. And then two fourplexes are proposed on a separate lot in the rear. This is all accessed from a service drive located out on the eastern side of the property. And due to the length of the drive, a turnaround is required for the fire department.

Amenities provided onsite include a half basketball court, a picnic area, and each unit also has private open space. And Redwood Park is within walking distance from the site. A parking reduction is also included in the request. Each unit of the fourplex provides a driveway apron up to an attached one-car garage. And the single family home is proposed with
service parking in the rear for a total of 10 legal off-street parking spaces. But 15 are required for the project with at least one being an ADA space. Per code, legal off-street parking can not occur within the 20-foot setback, or in this case, the driveway apron, shown with the red dashed line on the screen. However, with the planned development process, internal setbacks can be waived. And in all practicality, tenants will likely park in the driveway apron anyways. So while the project technically requires a parking reduction, in an everyday sense it will be providing a total of 19 spaces. That's two for each unit plus the ADA space.

Conditions of approval have been included to ensure that the building footprints are adjusted to provide a 20-foot deep parking space on the apron and that vehicles do not overhang into the sidewalk. The last note about parking is for those two southern spots at the end of the drive. These are encroaching into perimeter setbacks and are not allowed as proposed. The fourplexes are designed to give an appearance of four attached townhomes with a front porch, awning, and single-car garages. The designs show two different building materials and include windows on the elevations. This will not be reviewed by the design review team. So the planning team has recommended added conditions to enhance the exterior facade further by requiring modulation and the use of additional exterior materials such as a stone product to help break up the blank walls. Other conditions of approval have been included to increase the amount of landscaping proposed.

The site is mostly undeveloped and will undoubtedly be a change for the adjacent properties. But it’s important to note that the R-1C has five-foot side setbacks and 15-foot rear setbacks. Since this is a multi-family development, 15-foot setbacks are required on all sides. You can see on the east side that existing rear setbacks will be adjacent to a service drive. To the south, a side setback of five feet will be adjacent to the property’s 15-foot setback.

And to the west, again, side setbacks of five feet will be adjacent to the project’s 15-foot setbacks. Overall, the request complies with the comprehensive plan in the development code. The planning team recommends approval with the attached conditions for the rezone and the PUD and the motions needed tonight are listed on the screen. Thank you.

**Chairman Gillespie:** Thank you Ms. Acord. Is the applicant ready? We put 10 minutes on the clock and we’ll see how we’re rolling.

**APPLICANT**

Ryan Rodriguez (2393 N. Wildwood Street): I think I’ll be more brief than that hopefully. So -

**Chairman Gillespie:** That’s all right, whatever you need.

**Ryan Rodriguez (2393 N. Wildwood Street):** Good evening, my name is Ryan Rodriguez. This is my wife, Gina. We are the owners of 2393 N. Wildwood Boise, Idaho 83713. And we will be presenting as a team. She’ll be handling the rebuttal. First off, I’d like to thank you as a Commission for giving us the opportunity to present this evening. I’d like to thank Celine for all the hard work that she’s put into her report. Just to get started, a little bit about us, we are lifelong Idahoans. We feel strongly that Boise is the best community to live
in, not just in Idaho, but anywhere for that matter. Part of that is we are fortunate here in Boise to have diversity. We have diversity of people and diverse opportunities for our children.

And while there are many factors of why we chose to live here, those were the main factors of why we live here and why we’ve chosen to raise our family here and make it our home. We do have experience with the rental market here in Boise and have also remodeled distressed properties in a manner that we can be proud of. Not just for us, but also for the people that move in to them. After purchasing this property at 2393 Wildwood, we did have multiple meetings with Planning and Zoning to determine the most responsible manner in which to develop it. And that is what we’re presenting to you tonight.

We are requesting a rezone, as mentioned by Celine, from A-1 to R-1C. The rezone will allow for more density while still maintaining a compatible density to adjacent properties. It’s also important to note that the site is completely surrounded by R-1C zoned property and it would make sense that this property would also match the zoning around it.

We are requesting a PUD of two fourplex units and one single family residence. These are low density multi-family buildings. While technically fourplexes, they have the appearance of attached townhomes with individual front doors, porches, garages, and private backyards. I spoke about diversity earlier, and that’s what this PUD offers. It offers diversified housing options, including one four-bedroom two-bath home on a single level, seven two-story three-bedroom two-and-a-half-bath units, and one single story three-bedroom two-bath unit. And to be quite honest, this property needs attention. It needs developed, it needs beautified. It’s currently an eyesore and has many safety hazards present. And I’ll just have Gina bring up a few pictures. On it right now is a dilapidated shed that can almost, as a builder, I can guarantee it wasn’t built to code and is a danger. This was, if anybody wants to go for a dip later on, here’s the swimming pool for you. Obviously a safety hazard and needs to be taken care of.

There’s also overgrown vegetation and dead trees and weeds throughout the whole property. It’s also very important to note that the proposed PUD is below maximum height allowed, density, and compatible with the surrounding homes. And we have to the - a couple adjacent properties, just showing that there are in fact two story homes near and adjacent to here.

Now we are requesting a parking variance for this PUD. We did look - and the reason we’re doing that, we did look at proposing this in a different manner where we pushed up against the setbacks as much as possible in all directions. But we didn’t want to do that. And I might just have Gina bring up the site plan, yeah. We felt that it was important to try to create as much open space, not only for our tenants, but also between these structures and our neighbors. And we wanted to try to respect that.

And so, with that, because we wanted to make the single level unit that I spoke about earlier, the single story three-bedroom two-bath unit, which is in unit B. You can see unit B has a slightly different footprint than unit A. That is because of that single level unit. We had the opportunity to push the remaining three units in unit B back to that setback to the west, but we thought this would give more open space to the neighbors to the
west.

So, by doing that, that shrunk those aprons in front of unit B from 20 feet to 15 and a half feet. And that is the reason for our request for the parking variance. So as laid out in Celine’s report, we know that there are conditions that have been placed on it. And as a team we are in full agreement with those conditions. And with that, I am wrapped up.

Chairman Gillespie: Okay, questions for the city staff or the applicant? So I have a quick one for Celine. So, I was just a little bit confused by the last bit of his testimony. Can you just - so the staff report, as written, is that what he’s supporting? Or is he asking us to change one of the conditions?

Céline Acord (City of Boise): Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, I believe he is in agreement with the staff report and conditions.

Chairman Gillespie: Okay, thank you very much. That’s helpful. Okay, any additional questions for city staff, I’m kind of stalling here, or the applicant?

Commissioner Gibson: Mr. Chair.

Chairman Gillespie: Commissioner Gibson.

Commissioner Gibson: A question for the applicant. The site plan that you have shows, we’ll call it a hammerhead turnaround, if you will. How do you intend to deal with the required radius on the inside corners for each of those edges, if you will? It’s not shown so I’m assuming that somebody at the fire department has said that you can do a hammerhead without a radius?

Ryan Rodriguez (2393 N. Wildwood Street): Yes, we - I believe that was in the report as far as the letter from Ron. Again, you have that there.

Chairman Gillespie: Celine.

Céline Acord (City of Boise): Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Gibson, the fire department did comment. It’s on page 52 in your packet. Comment number four mentions the turning radius for fire apparatus access roads and the inside turning radius of 28 feet. The applicant will have to abide by those conditions and show those details during building permit phase.

Commissioner Gibson: Okay, thank you.

Chairman Gillespie: Any further questions for the applicant or staff? And I’ll just wait just a second while everyone thinks about that. Okay, thank you very much, appreciate it. Okay, so the neighborhood association is West Valley. Is there a representative from the West Valley neighborhood association here tonight?

Male: They would not attend.

Chairman Gillespie: I’m sorry, pardon?

Male: They would not attend.

NO NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

Chairman Gillespie: Okay, all right, so we are to the signup sheet. So I have two people signed up for this item, we’re on item 2 and 2A. The first person is Sandy and then Robert, welcome.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Sandy Gutches (2186 n. Springland Avenue): Thank you. My name’s Sandy Gutches and I have been a homeowner in Shamrock West subdivision since 1999. And there’s a lot of discussion about how things are changing and we have to accept change. And I just want to quickly tell you that in 1999 I could stand in my front yard and never hear a sound
from Fairview Avenue, no traffic sounds at all. There was no Lowes on Eagle Road. And that was the first big store that went in over there. There was no real business on Eagle Road to speak of. There was no Village at Fairview and Eagle Road. There was no bike corridor, there was no twist and turn for me to take when I want to go to Fairview Avenue from my home and turn left. I cannot do that anymore. And I can assure that most of the people in my neighborhood will do about anything to avoid Fairview and Eagle Road now because of the traffic. And it’s not unlike any place else in Boise, the population has changed a lot and businesses and subdivisions and our west end, Eagle Road and Fairview area has just been overwhelmed by traffic. Well 20 years later, here we are. And we’re - possibility of more change in our area. We have a good neighborhood. We have a good group of people.

I was on the Homeowners Association board for several years. I just resigned in October. And I can tell you that one of the biggest issues that we’ve had that caused angst in our neighborhood has been parking. Parking, parking, parking on Shamrock, on Poppy, on Springland. It’s a problem all over because people just don’t have one car anymore. I might be the only one in the neighborhood that does, I don’t know. But anyway, it continues to be a problem. And I see there could be a potential problem with this new development to impact on us. We want to retain our property values. We want to retain single family homes in our neighborhood. We have worked hard all of us, on the HOA and in our neighborhoods to have a good neighborhood. People complying with our covenants and having a neighborhood that we can be proud of. When I was still working, I worked for almost all of my 36 years’ career in safety. And all of that time with the Bureau of Land Management. When I retired, I was the Chief of Safety and Health in Washington DC. The point of that simply being that I understand what a public safety issue is. And that’s the biggest point that I want to make in my three minutes of time. Wildwood, as you saw in the previous slide, Wildwood has a big curve right where this development is being proposed. We already have two roads egressing onto that. And this is where the school kids get off the bus. There’s no sidewalks, there’s no safeguards - we’ve already had one fatality in the area. And I just ask you to take consideration of risk management when you make your decision.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you very much, Sandy, I appreciate it. The next person is Robert Nelson. Welcome Mr. Nelson.

Robert Nelson (11214 W. Poppy Street): I’m Robert Nelson. I’m at 11214 W. Poppy Street. I’m just to the west side of this. We’re not opposed to the property next to us being developed. In fact, we’ve kind of expected it and look forward to it. One of the things that attracted us to our home is that there were no two story homes overlooking our backyard or our side yard. We value our privacy and love being outside. Over the last 16 years we’ve turned it into an oasis. And we’re very comfortable in our backyard. Because of the size of this property that he wants to develop, we would have expected to see four or five single family homes built on it. Recently, just around the corner on Wildwood there, there’s some duplexes that were built. Those duplexes there on that side, they’re
attractive and they fit in real well with our neighborhood. As the most immediate neighbor to this new development, we have two concerns. The first being a direct impact to the privacy that we have in our yard. If you notice on the plan, he’s put trees in along the fence line. However, there are no trees protecting my backyard or my neighbor’s backyard. Instead, there’s a 25-foot section right there, right next to my house, where he wants to put a water retention pond. That’s my next concern. I don’t understand why he needs the retention pond right on the fence line eight feet from my house.

I have three vents to underneath my house right there. What’s going to happen if that overflows? What I’m asking is that he could drain the water from these homes out toward Wildwood instead of putting them in a pond right there by my house.

The West Bank’s planning policy states this. Should the infill and redevelopment occur in these or other locations it should be consistent with the design principles contained in this comprehensive plan to ensure compatibility with the single-family character of surrounding homes and adjacent neighborhoods. Considerations specific to the West Bank include limits on overall lock coverage for infill development to protect the more open character provided by the area’s larger lot sizes.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you Robert. I appreciate it. Is there anyone - so that wraps up the signup sheet. Come forward. So, if anyone else would like to testify, why don’t you move on up to the front row if you’d like to testify. And I’ll just remind you to give your name and address for the record and then fill out the slip. You got it.

Whitney Sanchez (11227 W. Glenn Ellyn Drive): My name is Whitney Sanchez and I live at 11227 W. Glenn Ellyn Drive. I actually share the property line with Robert that will mainly be sharing the vast bulk of the west side piece of the development. And I hear a lot of things of how this is described as appropriate and complementary to the area. And if you look at the aerial view, to me, is I see a lot of single family homes, one roof, not multi-dwellings.

I realize it’s not a huge, dense development. They are fourplexes. But they aren’t appropriate for our neighborhood. And I’ve lived all over Boise as a young college student. And we moved to this area to start our family so that I could live in a less dense, single family neighborhood.

And that curve, as I think Sandy mentioned, is a very dangerous curve. And that is where the kiddos sit and wait for the bus. And with the traffic we already have now it’s already dangerous. Now add in a dense population of people and they’re parking and then coming in and out, not only endangering them, but then our kiddos. I just - and also if you look at the view of the two-story home that was given on the east side of the one or two homes that are there, that’s not even, to my knowledge, our HOA.

And all those homes in this loop that are directly affected, the only one that is two story is on the - actually there’s two of them and they are on the absolute end of the street. So, we do have a lot of privacy. And by building these two-level homes, people will stare in the backyard at my kids while they’re swimming. And I don’t know who these people are. And I know my neighbors and, like I said, I would like to keep it as quaint and simple as possible. They did develop in that front lot there across from
Glenn Ellyn, like Robert said, beautiful duplexes, all single level, some of them single family homes. And it is a dense area. But it was done very tastefully.

And I would like to see that area developed as well. It is an eyesore, I get that. And, like Robert said, I expected to see it developed and I appreciate the fact that somebody’s interested in it. Just to be done on a slightly smaller scale would be appropriate. Thank you.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you Whitney, I appreciate it. So please, is there anyone else after this gentleman who would like to testify tonight? Okay, please.

Kevin Stoffers (11353 W. Poppy Street): My name is Kevin Stoffers, I live at 11353 W. Poppy Street -

Chairman Gillespie: Welcome, Kevin.

Kevin Stoffers (11353 W. Poppy Street): Very close to development. I feel like it is a blind corner there. I do not walk at night there because of the traffic there. Making a right or left-hand turn out of that driveway would create a problem for anybody. They would have to do it fast, I would say, so they would not get hit. I don’t see any on-street parking for anybody on Wildwood or Ellyn Drive really. If they were to park, they would park near that driveway. And that is not a safe place to park. And that would just add to the congestion of people pulling out of there. That is my biggest concern is the safety of that right there. And I think that needs to get addressed a little closer.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you Kevin, appreciate it. Is there anyone else who would like to testify tonight? Okay, hearing none, the applicant has up to five minutes for rebuttal and I would - well, come on up - just remind everyone if you did testify and you didn’t sign the signup sheet, please pass your white slips in to Claire with your name and address. Thank you.

APPLICANT REBUTTAL

Gina Rodriguez (2393 N. Wildwood Street): Okay, so I think first and foremost, traffic and lots of concerns about the corner. With the improvement of the property that we are required by the ACHD, they have lined out conditions and requirements for us in the development which I feel, even though we can’t slow down how fast people are driving, it will improve the corner to the best of our ability. We’re going to pull up a picture. You can kind of see the obstructions.

There’s the stop sign - oh, there it is. Yeah, there’s the stop sign. That’s the front of the property, and then the car. So once all of the dead and overgrown landscaping has been removed and cleaned up there will be a lot better visibility. And plus, there will be a full sidewalk installed in that area as well.

Talking about just the overall comprehensive plan and development, we felt that this development does a really good job of following along with the comprehensive plan that has been set out in Blueprint Boise. With that being said, infill, because we do realize that there is a major need for density, but infill that enhances established characters of the neighborhood. And a couple of things to comment for the neighbor who’s concerned about, well, the privacy issues. So also, conditional, we do have some more landscaping planned which was set out by Celine in
our conditions for those backyard spaces and trees. And then also the water detention area. So, that will be -

Chairman Gillespie: Could you point that out on the slides? Celine, could we point out this water detention pond so everyone has a real clear idea where that is? Where is that? That’s where I thought it was.

Gina Rodriguez (2393 N. Wildwood Street): Yes, and so ultimately it will be designed by a civil engineer and we will be following suit to all of the specifications that he’s lined out to us. And this is not necessarily - this is not planned to be a pond. It’s not an open water pond. It is, let’s see, I wrote down the exact terminology. Can you tell me again? Oh, it is a surface retention area. So, it would not - and that’s obviously for storms. But it would be designed by a civil engineer so that we would know exactly what was required to hold all of the surface water from that property in an appropriate area. And I think that’s all I have.

Chairman Gillespie: All right, thank you very much. So, the matter is before the commission. So, we are recommending on the rezone and final on the PUD. You may take them in one or two motions at your preference. While you guys are loading, I have just a quick point of information for the City. Just to be clear, so the proposed density conforms with the requested R-1C zone?

Céline Acord (City of Boise): Mr. Chairman, yes, that is correct.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you.

Commissioner Gibson: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question of staff without opening up public testimony?

Chairman Gillespie: Well, we'll give it a shot and see where we land.

Commissioner Gibson: Question for Celine then. So, I’m clear on - what would the parking be required without the variance or without the request?

Céline Acord (City of Boise): Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Gibson, the project with the two fourplexes and the single-family home is 15 spaces.

Chairman Gillespie: Why don’t you pull up that red slide to add the - there you go.

Céline Acord (City of Boise): Currently they are providing 10 legal off street parking spaces because of the 20-foot setback from the service drive.

Commissioner Gibson: Okay, thank you.

Chairman Gillespie: You’re done. Okay, the matter’s back before the commission.

Commissioner Gibson: Mr. Chairman I’m just going to throw out some thoughts.

Chairman Gillespie: Please.

Commissioner Gibson: Not necessarily looking for a motion. The reason I asked Celine the question about the parking was I, during the testimony, was kind of picking apart the guts of building unit type B and the setback from the west property line, which kind of forces the issue of there not being a driveway in front of that unit type. Dimensions looks like it’s about 15 feet and change, so that’s not even a full driveway. So I wanted to know what made unit type B so special that it would want to be forced up front. And I poked around the guts of the south portion of unit B and it’s the largest unit and it’s got a significant area, got a second story, or the opportunity for a second story area that’s a bonus room.
And I'll just kind of leave it at that. And I see the programming and the design of unit B as something that, with thoughtful design intention, could be done in such a manner that they wouldn’t have to have substandard parking in the driveway. If it was one or even two it might be easier to overlook. But when you have two and three bedroom units you can assume that it’s going to be a mom and a dad working and a kid going to Centennial and his friends. And suddenly you have no parking. So that’s my first concern. I won’t approve this project or vote to approve it based upon just the fact that they’re kind of shooting themselves in the foot on not even providing the minimum parking standard. And then secondly, my dad lives on Poppy off of Wildwood and I go by there every day. I accept the adjacent owners’ complaints about no longer being able to go left at Fairview. I think that’s a total pain. But I think that that is a very dangerous intersection.

And what concerns me is that none of the graphics or site plans presented by the applicant show a true right hand turn out onto Wildwood. In essence, if you look at the newer development, Lafayette, that came in to the east of there, they have what I would consider an ACHD minimum turning radius for both the east and the west sides of the access road. I don’t believe that this access road, as currently proposed, is of a sufficient size, design, or configuration that it is a safe and/or would be acceptable to an engineer.

Chairman Gillespie: A quick question for you, Commissioner Gibson. So there’s the road, so are you saying where it intersects Wildwood, it’s kind of on that diagonal, are you saying it’s not wide enough or - I didn’t quite get that.

Commissioner Gibson: So looking at the graphic as presented, if you go to the west where you see Lafayette Place, that’s more like a standard city. You’ve got your ramps and you’ve got a radius on both the east and the west portion of that drive. So if you’re on the access road and you want to go towards Fairview, that is, if you want to make a right onto Wildwood Street, you would pull out into Wildwood and would be across the center line of Wildwood in order to make a turn to go eastbound -

Chairman Gillespie: Because it’s such an acute angle.

Commissioner Gibson: Because it’s an acute angle.

Chairman Gillespie: Okay, I got it.

Commissioner Gibson: And it’s a blind corner to begin with for individuals driving southbound onto Wildwood.

Chairman Gillespie: May I suggest that perhaps you would like to defer and direct the applicant to correct these deficiencies and come back later? Or you could make a motion to deny.

Commissioner Gibson: Can I check -

Chairman Gillespie: Commissioner Gibson.

Commissioner Gibson: Mr. Chairman, would the applicant be willing to defer at a later date?

Chairman Gillespie: Let me ask the applicant. Would you be willing to defer for, say, what, four to eight weeks? As soon as we can get you back
on the agenda and you can get the work done, in order to address a couple of concerns which, I think, are going to come out in conversation? 

_Gina Rodriguez (2393 N. Wildwood Street):_ Yeah, so I have one question because ACHD has reviewed the project and gave us a pretty substantial [inaudible 02:04:50].

_Chairman Gillespie:_ I understand. So, her comment, let me just put it on the record, was that ACHD has reviewed that and she’s, I think, wondering what’s the status of the ACHD review if we’re up here asking all these questions about that. And so, the City has discretion, and we have discretion here, to consider any of those issues. And the ACHD’s findings aren’t binding on us.

And so, in terms of safety and radiuses and spacing and parking, that’s, I think, what we’re going to talk about here in a few minutes. I just wanted to ask, again, this is the general question, and you can change your mind after you hear us go through more detail, but would you be amenable to a deferral if that’s the way the commission wanted to go? All right, thanks. So the applicant is amenable. So, if we do defer, again, we do have to be as clear as we can on what we would be looking for in that deferral process.

_Commissioner Gibson:_ Mr. Chairman.

_Chairman Gillespie:_ Commissioner Gibson.

_Commissioner Gibson:_ I’ll make a motion to defer CAR18-00028 and PUD18-00049 to the next available planning and zoning hearing.

_Chairman Gillespie:_ Not greater than 60 days.

_Commissioner Gibson:_ Not greater than 60 days out.

_Céline Acord (City of Boise):_ Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Gibson, I would recommend February 11th.

_Chairman Gillespie:_ So why don’t we just call that in the motion?

_Commissioner Gibson:_ As modified.

_Chairman Gillespie:_ Okay so we have a motion to defer item 2 to February 11th. Is there a second?

_Commissioner Stead:_ Second.

_Chairman Gillespie:_ Okay, so now discussion time. While Doug is getting his thoughts together, I’ll just add my thoughts and things I’d like to see. One, I think we need to work much harder to get to 15 legal spaces somehow. If we get to 15 legal spaces that solves, in my mind, a lot of problems. Two, I do think that turn is pretty acute but I would be willing to listen to smart people who say that, as you’ve done it now, it’s not a problem.

But I would like to hear specific something about that. I agree with Commissioner Gibson, if you look just down the street and see where Lafayette comes in, it looks a lot different there than what you’ve proposed. And it does look safer to me. Maybe there’s a way to tweak the angle of the road, articulate it, I don’t know. That’s what I’ve got. Anybody else want to throw in their two cents?

_Commissioner Gibson:_ Mr. Chairman.

_Chairman Gillespie:_ Commissioner Gibson.
Commissioner Gibson: So you would include the direction to the applicant that they meet the minimum parking requirements in whatever manner necessary relative to the building?

Chairman Gillespie: Yeah, I’m really interested in just meeting the bare language of the zone and the code. And especially in an area where parking does look tight to me and we’ve had testimony to that effect.

Commissioner Gibson: Then, Mr. Chairman, I would also request that the applicant provide the mentioned engineering plan showing that the Boise City Fire Department turning radius, as requested, is actually feasible as noted.

Chairman Gillespie: Okay.

Commissioner Gibson: And then one final.

Chairman Gillespie: Commissioner Gibson.

Commissioner Gibson: That the applicant work with an arborist or landscape architect to provide comprehensive and appropriate screening of landscaping at the western property line continuous from both the north to the south portion thereof.

Chairman Gillespie: Got it. Thank you, Commissioner Gibson. Any other comments on the deferral motion? All right, hearing none we have a motion to defer until February 11th items 2 and 2A. Will the clerk please call the roll?

Clerk: Stead.

Commissioner Stead: Aye.

Clerk: Gillespie.

Chairman Gillespie: Aye.

Clerk: Gibson.

Commissioner Gibson: Aye.

Clerk: Ansotegui.

Commissioner Ansotegui: Aye.

Clerk: Motion to defer carries.

Deferred to February 11, 2019

RESULT: TABLED [4 TO 0]  
MOVER: Douglas Gibson, Commissioner  
SECONDER: Meredith Stead, Commissioner  
AYES: Tamara Ansotegui, Douglas Gibson, Milt Gillespie, Meredith Stead  
ABSTAIN: Claire Paschke  
ABSENT: Jennifer Stevens

2a. **PUD18-00049 / RR Building Specialties**

2393 N. Wildwood Street / Conditional use permit for a planned residential development comprised of 9 units on 1.13 acres located in a proposed R-1C (Single Family Residential) zone A parking reduction is also included. Céline Acord

Deferred to February 11, 2019
RESULT: TABLED [UNANIMOUS]  
MOVER: Douglas Gibson, Commissioner  
SECONDER: Meredith Stead, Commissioner  
AYES: Ansotegui, Gibson, Gillespie, Stead, Paschke  
ABSENT: Jennifer Stevens

3. **CUP18-00091 & CVA18-00072 / Rocky Mountain Management & Development, LLC**  
7350 W. Victory Road / Conditional use permit to construct an approximately 6,300 square foot medical office on a 0.78-acre site located in an M-1D (Light Industrial with Design Review) zone. A variance to encroach into the front setback is also included. Jeff Lowe  

**APPLICANT**  
Matthew Witt | Rocky Mountain Management & Development, LLC (350 N. 9th Street)  
David Blogget | R and E Architects (199 N. Capitol Blvd.)  

**NO NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION**  
**NO PUBLIC TESTIMONY**  
**NO APPLICANT REBUTTAL**  
Commissioner Ansotegui moved approval striking condition #4 and condition #5  
Commissioner Gibson seconded  
Approved

RESULT: APPROVED [4 TO 0]  
MOVER: Tamara Ansotegui, Commissioner  
SECONDER: Douglas Gibson, Commissioner  
AYES: Tamara Ansotegui, Douglas Gibson, Milt Gillespie, Meredith Stead  
ABSTAIN: Claire Paschke  
ABSENT: Jennifer Stevens

4. **CPA18-00008 / City of Boise**  
Comprehensive plan text amendment to amend goals and policies and adopt the East End Neighborhood Plan by reference in Blueprint Boise. Kathleen Lacey  

Chairman Gillespie: Now we’re going to take up those two deferrals, four and five. So the order that I’d like to do these, just to be precise, is we’ll call the City first just to say a very brief summary of what the underlying application is, and the rationale for the deferral. Yes. And the rationale for the deferral. Then we’ll go to in the case of item four, we’ll go to EENA and EENA can come forward and state their views just on the deferral, not on the underlying plan amendment. Then we’ll open up the discussion to anybody from the public who wishes to discuss the deferral only -
just the request to defer. And finally, if there is any public discussion, we’ll give EENA and the city if they’d like, a chance to rebut that discussion. After that the commission will deliberate as to just the deferral. So again that deferral is to February 11th - what it says here. So, Ms. Lacey?

Kathleen Lacey (City of Boise): (Thank you Mr. Commissioner, commissioners. The city is bringing forth a request to defer CPA18-00008 to adopt the East End Neighborhood Plan into the comprehensive plan. We have made this request because we’ve had some inquiries and requests basically for some additional interchange exchange between St. Luke’s primarily and the residents. So given the fact that this information came in or this request came in over the past couple of weeks, we are requesting a deferral to February 11th.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you, Ms. Lacey. Can you hold on one second? So I’ve been informed by staff that this - to the commission - that I just need a motion and a vote from the commissioners to alter the agenda to hear items four and five at this time.

Kathleen Lacey (City of Boise): Mr. Commissioner if I might?

Chairman Gillespie: Please.

Kathleen Lacey (City of Boise): We’re not asking to defer item number five. The Central Bench Plan we are asking would proceed for hearing.

Chairman Gillespie: Okay.

Kathleen Lacey (City of Boise): Thank you.

Chairman Gillespie: So I’d just like a motion to hear item four, that deferral, out of order.

Commissioner Stead: Mr. Chair?

Chairman Gillespie: Please.

Commissioner Stead: I’d like to make a motion to hear item four out of order.

Chairman Gillespie: - at this time. Thank you.

Commissioner Gibson: Second.
Chairman Gillespie: We have a motion to hear item four at this time. Is there any discussion? Will the clerk please call the roll?

Clerk: Stead.

Commissioner Stead: Aye.

Clerk: Gillespie.

Chairman Gillespie: Aye.

Clerk: Gibson.

Commissioner Gibson: Aye.

Clerk: Ansotegui.

Commissioner Ansotegui: Aye.

Clerk: All in favor, motion carries.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you Ms. Lacey, so please - so that’s it. Alright, thank you Kathleen. So EENA, please step up.

EAST END NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

Brittney Sigliano (403 N. Mobley Drive): Good evening, commissioners. Brittney Sigliano, 403 N. Mobley Drive, Boise, East End Neighborhood Association President. We are requesting that this not be deferred to the February 11th hearing. We are requesting that it does be heard tonight. We are quite pleased with the extensive amount of outreach that the neighborhood did and feel that we have addressed every concern and we are ready to move forward with this, so we ask that this be heard this evening and not deferred.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you very much Ms. Brittney. The last one is tough. Okay, so I’m going to look on the sign-up sheet first. So this is item four, so again, this isn’t an item - this isn’t a hearing about the underlying item at this time. This is just - we’re just considering the deferral so I’ll just work straight through this sign-up sheet. So the first person is Theresa McLeod followed by Jane Suggs.

Theresa McLeod (190 E. Bannock Street): Good evening Commissioner. My name is Theresa McLeod. I’m at 190 E. Bannock, Boise, Idaho, 83712. On behalf of St. Luke’s, I requested this deferral
and I support staff’s recommendation for the deferral for the purpose that St. Luke’s has been going through a community engagement assessment since the spring of 2018.

We recognize in order to make the most out of our downtown master plan, we have a lot of work to do to rebuild trust in the neighborhood, so we hired an outside consultant and conducted interviews with 26 different stakeholders, including the EENA - Brittney - the EENA chair, Deanna Smith, members of city council, the mayor, members of planning and development services, expressing our desire to understand what we did well and what we didn’t do well and how we could become a better neighbor incorporating some of this into a plan, simultaneously that neighborhood was going through their neighborhood plan and we were not aware of it in order to try to find some opportunities where we can find common ground and blend our plans together.

So our request for deferral is again trying to be respectful of the neighborhood’s work that they put into this - not to defer it for any more than a length of one month. We just received a copy of the plan one month again - December 14th from the City of Boise. Thank you.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you Theresa. Okay, Ms. Suggs.

Jane Suggs (200 Louisa Street): Good evening Commissioners, Jane Suggs. I live at 200 Louisa Street. I’m on the board of the East End Neighborhood Association and also was participating in the development of the East End Neighborhood Association plan. I just want to bring your attention to page 376 in your package, which is part of our staff report which says the plan was developed with extensive public engagement that included postcard mailings to residents and it goes on for several paragraphs about the outreach. We don’t feel that there’s any need to continue any more outreach.

Yes, if St. Luke’s has their own plan and they are talking about what they could do better, that’s a separate plan. There’s nothing in our plan which impacts their plan and there’s nothing of their plan that impacts the neighborhood plan. We have a desire to move this forward so that when we have our spring meeting, we can celebrate the completion of our plan and adoption into your comprehensive plan. It’s hard to understand how St. Luke’s isn’t aware because of all of our outreach, but we definitely would like to move this forward tonight so that we can move on with our process as was scheduled. Thank you. I’ll stand for questions.
Chairman Gillespie: Thank you Ms. Suggs. Okay, so that’s it for the sign up sheet. Is there anyone else who wishes to testify tonight on the question of the deferral? Please.

Deanna Smith (1208 E. Jefferson Street): Good evening, commissioners. Deanna Smith. My address is 1208 E. Jefferson Street. I serve on the EENA Board as well and also served on the committee and my comment to the deferral request is two things - Jane already said this, but I think it’s important to understand that not only does our plan not negatively or positively impact St. Luke’s master plan, but that was already adopted and we moved forward with our neighborhood plan knowing that - with clear direction from staff that in no way could this impact that plan. So we don’t understand that portion of the deferral request.

And I guess I would just say it is a bit of a surprise to learn that they were unaware of this. I find that hard to believe. And we really chose intentionally to not call one individual entity in our neighborhood out uniquely to engage. Our approach was to try to really do a neighborhood plan that engaged everyone and St. Luke’s was an equal opportunity entity in that effort. I would encourage you that if you do do the deferral, that you only limit it to a month.

We attempted some years ago in 2004 as the neighborhood association - we have a very outdated neighborhood plan and we attempted to create a new plan in 2004 and we didn’t quite get to the end because it turns out we didn’t have enough funding to engage a consultant for as long as we needed, so this is a very long waiting needed update to our plan and I would urge you not to delay it at all, but if you do, for no more than a month. Thank you.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you. Is there anyone else who wishes to testify tonight on the question of the deferral? Okay, hearing - alright.

Melissa Pratt (1409 Warm Springs Avenue): Melissa Pratt. I live at 1409 Warm Springs and I'm President of the Warm Springs Historic District Association. I was asked to participate in this planning committee and I did want to give a shoutout. Staff was fabulous and there was a ton of outreach. We had a professional planning group that supported us. Lots of Facebook. Lots of next door. Lots of signs posted in the neighborhood. There’s no way employees could not have been aware of this in this area and I’m sad to see it be deferred. I felt like we did a really good job of reaching out.
Chairman Gillespie: Okay. Melissa, could you please sign that little sheet? And Deanna, I hate to trouble you, but I also need you to sign those little sheets and you guys can just sit down there and do them wherever you want. We just need you to hand that up so we can get you on the record. Is there anyone else who wishes to testify tonight on the question of the deferral? Okay. Hearing none, I’m going to ask both the City to talk about why they’d like a deferral and Brittney, if you’d like to say a few words too, that’d be fine, but if the City has any rebuttal to what you’ve heard or would like to restate your reasons for deferral, now would be a good time.

Kathleen Lacey (City of Boise): Mr. Chair, Commissioners, we feel that it is appropriate to move ahead and defer. We hate to see that happen, but on the other hand, it does respect St. Luke’s request for a little further conversation. I would like to echo Melissa’s comments about the amount of time and effort the committee has put into this. This is two years of labor and I think the commission can really understand why the neighborhood association would like to see this adopted, but we’re comfortable with the request for deferral.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you, Ms. Lacey. Okay Brittney just a few minutes or seconds or whatever you’d like to say, but -

Brittney Sigliano (403 N. Mobley Drive): I’ll keep it quick. Again, we would like to see this move forward. We have our neighborhood association annual meeting coming up and this is something that we announced two years ago at that meeting and what better way to wrap it up then again at this meeting by presenting a fully adopted plan. As we were on track for, except for with this request a couple of weeks ago, it’s disheartening that - we’ve had over 19 days, two literature drops, and monthly notices of our agenda, which this has been on for the last two years.

So the - we didn’t know about it is hard to believe because we have had so much outreach about this and we would not reach out to one individual plan - or one individual entity or person. This was a neighborhood plan, and as Deanna mentioned, it was a plan for everyone to have equal opportunity and equal say, and as far as our neighborhood has been aware, their voices were heard, incorporated into the plan. So to defer it for one entity is troublesome for us to say the least.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you Brittney. Okay, so with that, the matter is before the commission. We can certainly ask questions of
the city staff or EENA if you have specific questions - they can try and answer. If we do ask a bunch of different questions, we’ll have to re-open it up for public comment. That’s fine too. But otherwise, really the matter is before you, so we have a request to defer it to February 11th. What’s your pleasure?

While you guys think, let me just give a little bit of perspective. With respect to the code and the criteria, really we have pretty broad discretion here to defer or not defer if we wish. The code doesn’t really give concrete criteria, so it’s kind of whatever you think is in the best interest of the city and the folks here. So I would add that. I would also add that having sat up here for seven years, we have an unusual case where the applicant, namely the city, has requested a deferral and one of the parties, which is in some sense, a co-applicant, EENA, doesn’t want to do it. So it’s a rather unusual situation, but as far as I know, we’ve never refused a deferral when one of the major parties of the application has requested one. And in this case, I would point out the request is only until - to defer it until February 11th. So with that in mind, why don’t you guys let us know what you want to do.

**Commissioner Stead:** Mr. Chair?

**Chairman Gillespie:** Commissioner Stead.

**Commissioner Stead:** I would like to make a motion to approve the request to defer to February 11th.

**Chairman Gillespie:** So we have a motion to defer until February 11th. Is there a second?

**Commissioner Ansotegui:** Second.

**Chairman Gillespie:** So we have a second from Commissioner Ansotegui. Is there any discussion?

**Commissioner Stead:** Mr. Chair?

**Chairman Gillespie:** Commissioner Stead.

**Commissioner Stead:** I just - my note that I had written down - I haven’t been on the commission for seven years, but it seems that it’s in the - that it’s typical for us to uphold the request of the applicant and in this case, I see City of Boise as the applicant and if it’s their request to defer, I’m not sure I’m seeing a reason why not.
Chairman Gillespie: Thank you. Alright, any further discussion? Okay, so we have a motion to defer item four until February 11th. Will the clerk please call the roll?

Clerk: Stead?

Commissioner Stead: Aye.

Clerk: Gillespie?

Chairman Gillespie: Aye.

Clerk: Gibson.

Commissioner Gibson: Aye.

Clerk: Ansotegui?

Commissioner Ansotegui: Aye.

Clerk: Motion to defer carries.

Deferred to February 11, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT:</th>
<th>TABLED [4 TO 0]</th>
<th>Next: 2/11/2019 6:00 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVER:</td>
<td>Meredith Stead, Commissioner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER:</td>
<td>Douglas Gibson, Commissioner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYES:</td>
<td>Tamara Ansotegui, Douglas Gibson, Milt Gillespie, Meredith Stead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSTAIN:</td>
<td>Claire Paschke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSENT:</td>
<td>Jennifer Stevens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. CPA18-00009 / City of Boise

Comprehensive plan text amendment to amend goals and policies and adopt the Central Bench Neighborhood Plan by reference in Blueprint Boise. Kathleen Lacey

Chairman Gillespie: This is CPA18-00009. Miss Lacey, welcome back.

Kathleen Lacey (City of Boise): Thank you, Mr. Chair, and commissioners. While the PowerPoint is coming up, I wanted to introduce to the commission, please, the three members of the committee from the Central Bench Neighborhood Association who have worked assiduously for two years.

Chairman Gillespie: The camera’s over there, so wave into the camera. Hey.
Kathleen Lacey (City of Boise): So on my far left, Randy Johnson, who’s also the president of the Central Bench Neighborhood Association. Andrea Eaborn, and then Brian Parker, who have just been stalwarts on this plan. So we are going to do the staff report a little bit differently than normally. I will handle the first six slides, and then the Central Bench Neighborhood Association members will handle slides 7 through 12. They will also be speaking on behalf of the association during the public testimony period.

So, our request for you tonight, and our recommendation is that the commission will approve CPA18-00009 to adopt the Central Bench Neighborhood plan by reference into the comprehensive plan.

Most of the commissioners are new, so I wanted to give you a really brief background on the city’s neighborhood planning program. The neighborhood planning program was initiated in 1994, the same year that the Boise City Council started, or funded the Neighborhood Reinvestment Grant Program, which is now known as the Neighborhood Investment Program, which has put in millions of dollars to the city’s neighborhoods since that time.

And my role as neighborhood planner is to liaison with 34 neighborhood associations. Between 1999 and 2013, our program, working with the neighborhood associations approved, or recommended to the commission and council, and were approved 17 neighborhood plans. In 2016, we updated our neighborhood plan template to get a more streamlined plan, and to really focus on action items coming out of our neighborhood plans.

The purpose of the neighborhood plans is to augment Blueprint Boise with neighborhood-specific policies, to engage the neighborhoods with the residents, businesses, and nonprofits who live there, create the vision for the neighborhood, and develop an action plan.

We’re proposing several changes, or several modifications to Blueprint Boise policies CEA 3.10 - oh, and excuse me, these are just brief summaries. I obviously have not reproduced for you all of the policies. But let’s see, could you help me back again, since Celine, I just hit the wrong thing.

So, let me back up. Neighborhood cultural planning. Two years ago, the city hired its first neighborhood cultural planner. And since that time, she’s been engaged in preparing a cultural planning template for neighborhoods. The first neighborhood plan was the 30th Street Neighborhood Cultural Arts Plan, which was produced in 2013, and has provided a fantastic example. So, what we did in Blueprint Boise was to include a policy that addresses specifically, neighborhood cultural planning.

Also, CBCCN, we are looking at adding to the discussion of Orchard Street. We’re asking that it be designated as a mixed-use overlay district
from Alpine Street to Overland. This absolutely complies with the mixed-use designation along that corridor. The neighborhood wanted to focus on high quality pedestrian uses and connectivity in the activity center, so that is addressed as well as connectivity improvements throughout the neighborhood. And again, more connectivity improvements.

Citywide design standards and guidelines are mentioned specifically in this neighborhood plan to assure that those are considered very carefully as activity centers are designed, and as new development occurs in the mixed-use districts. The committee was very focused on placemaking, and activity centers, and wants to engage overtime with the property owners, and businesses, and activity centers to develop plazas, and engage in pop-up art, or food truck events to really help develop a sense of community, or further the sense of community in the neighborhood.

And then finally in terms of connectivity, Alpine Street, as you know, parallels the Union Pacific railroad track, and it is the desire of the neighborhood to work with Union Pacific, the city, Ada County Highway District, COMPASS, etcetera, to work over time to achieve a rail to trail pathway adjacent to the rail corridor.

And then finally, they are adding new policies to improve neighborhood safety, and strengthen neighborhood identity and heritage. And then the last change would be to describe the Central Bench plan in the planning related documents in the Central Bench planning area section of Blueprint Boise.

And now I am going to turn it over to the neighborhood. I thought I’d get through the dry material, and let them jump into the fun, more fun aspects. Randy. Plus, they’re so excited about this.

Chairman Gillespie: Yeah, I can tell. We’re a fun bunch up here.

CENTRAL BENCH NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

Andrea Eaborn (1023 S. Abbey Lane): Okay, so as you can see on your left -

Chairman Gillespie: So can you just give us your name and address for the record please?

Andrea Eaborn (1023 S. Abbey Lane): Yes, Andrea Eaborn, vice president of the Central Bench Neighborhood Association, 1023 South Abbey Lane, Boise, 83705.

Okay, so as you can see, the Central Bench Neighborhood is nestled between Alpine, Curtis, Overland, and Roosevelt. We have amenities such as the library at Hillcrest, which is one of the most heavily traffic libraries in the city. We have a newly dedicated Franklin Park, which we are very excited about. Cassia Park, which is this beautiful giant park just in the middle of the neighborhood, you’d never even know it was there. We
love it. We have canals throughout that provide a little bit of nature, and remind us of the rich history of farming in the area.

We also have a rich mixture of small local diverse businesses throughout, along with the major shopping centers, such as Fred Meyer, and Albertson’s. Our greatest asset is of course, our wonderful residents who love the neighborhood. And Randy is going to talk to you a little bit about demographics.

**Randy Johnson (5502 W. Anna Street):** My name is Randy Johnson, 5502 West Anna Street, Boise, 83705. I am the president of the Central Bench Neighborhood Association.

So along with just getting an inventory of what is within our neighborhood, we were also able to dive down into the demographics into our neighborhood, and some things are really great to be able to know who we are representing. This graphic you see up here was produced by city staff. And it represents what our neighborhood is, who’s in our neighborhood.

What really drove home to me some of the most important parts of knowing not only what is in our neighborhood, but who, is we see that the overall picture of the City of Boise to our own neighborhood. We have 4,715 residents in 2,615 households. Many of our residents have a median household income of 28,000, which is nearly half of the citywide Boise average. So that really has informed us to what we’re looking at.

And also, I’ll address this more in our testimony. But looking at 53% of households are one-vehicle households, and 11% of our neighbors have no access to a vehicle help me frame just how fine of a point the feedback that we collected back from our neighbors, and residents within our neighborhood on issues like bike ped lanes, and access to public transportation.

**Andrea Eaborn (1023 S. Abbey Lane):** Alright, I’m going to talk a little bit about the outreach that we conducted for this.

**Chairman Gillespie:** Just - so quick note for the guys in the sky. So this is Andrea again talking.

**Andrea Eaborn (1023 S. Abbey Lane):** Yeah. We’re swapping back and forth. We didn’t realize we’d have to be announcing. Okay, so about two years ago, we sent a mailer to every address in the neighborhood including businesses, and that just let them know that we were conducting a survey. The survey was open for about a month. We got about 114 respondents. And then we also gathered input at various community events such as our quarterly meetings, and then our national night-out event.

**Randy Johnson (5502 W. Anna Street):** Randy Johnson, again. And so throughout the plan when we gathered the information through the
timeline being able to grab information from our neighbors, one of the things that we were able to put together was this word bubble that you see above us there. And it really frames what our neighbors think of where our little piece of home is on the Central Bench. You’ll see in big bold, they’re essential, close to everything, friendly, and obviously, we love our parks.

From the survey, we also collected comments on what neighbors have asked us to reserve (preserve?) and improve, which fits perfect with our neighborhood vision, which is to inspire, and connect our neighbors through collaboration and activism to ensure the Central Bench Neighborhood is the most livable neighborhood in Boise.

And from these comments, we were able to take all the comments, the 100 plus comments we got, and place them into four different categories. Land use and development, neighborhood character, connectivity, and building site and design. And being able to take those four, and then being able to apply not only the comments, being able to sort them into an easy readable way, but also to make an action plan based on those four categories.

**Andrea Eaborn (1023 S. Abbey Lane):** Alright, this is Andrea Eaborn again. So one of the most exciting aspects for the neighborhood plan is that we were able to take the input that we were given, and we are able to compile this prioritized list of projects that we will be using to inform Neighborhood Reinvestment Program grant applications in the future, and other such projects. And we’ll also be able to point to this as what we would like to see as priorities in our neighborhood.

**Chairman Gillespie:** Andrea, real quick. What’s the L thingy in the Hillcrest Country Club above the green asterisk? Is that a library?

**Andrea Eaborn (1023 S. Abbey Lane):** Right at Orchard and Overland?

**Chairman Gillespie:** Yeah, that’s just it. From the Hillcrest Shopping Center, I think there’s a symbol that I can’t figure out what it is.

**Andrea Eaborn (1023 S. Abbey Lane):** Oh, that is by the Hillcrest Shopping Center. I don’t think that the green asterisk’s right on the corner. Is that what you’re talking about?

**Chairman Gillespie:** No, the L thing, the L above it. Or the blue box.

**Randy Johnson (5502 W. Anna Street):** While they’re looking at it, I’ll just look this up.

**Andrea Eaborn (1023 S. Abbey Lane):** Oh, okay. Yeah, that’s the library.
Randy Johnson (5502 W. Anna Street): So with that, we concur with the staff to the Central Bench Neighborhood Association recommends approval of CPA18-00009 to adopt the Central Bench Neighborhood plan by referencing to Blueprint Boise. Thank you.

Chairman Gillespie: Alright. Thank you very much. Good job.

So first of all, any questions for city staff or the Central Bench Neighborhood Association, kind of the applicant. Alright. Hearing none, so I’m going to say the Central Bench Neighborhood Association just testified, so we’ll go to the signup sheet. The only two people to sign up on the signup sheet was Randy. So, Randy you’ve testified. So, is there anyone else here tonight who wishes to testify on CPA18-00009? Please, come forward, give your -

Kathleen Lacey (City of Boise): And Mr. Chairman, if I might interject again. The previous comments were actually as part of the staff report, and Central Bench Neighborhood Association would like to actually give formal testimony as well.

Chairman Gillespie: Okay, so you get to sit back down for a second. Okay, so let me call over the mic, the Central Bench Neighborhood Association.

CENTRAL BENCH NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

Randy Johnson (5502 W. Anna Street): Hi, I am Randy Johnson, 5502 West Anna Street, Boise, 83705. I am the president of the Central Bench Neighborhood Association. Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, the Central Bench Neighborhood Association is thrilled to have, after several years of hard work, come before you for your consideration of our Central Bench Neighborhood Association Neighborhood Plan.

The Central Bench Neighborhood Association became aware of the need for a neighborhood plan in 2015 when we were confronted with a proposed development of the former Franklin School site, which was the development proposed to be a gas station. Our neighborhood was distraught with the Boise School District’s decision to tear down the historical Franklin School instead of renovating it.

Franklin School served as the Central Bench community gathering place for over 100 years, and so as this proposed gas station started to become a reality, our neighbors came out in force to argue that a gas station was not in line with what was envisioned for our neighborhood, and especially the historical and community relevant site.

As we begun organizing around this development, we realized that even though the City of Boise had the citywide comprehensive plan in Blueprint Boise, the Central Bench Neighborhood Association was the only neighborhood on the Boise Bench without a specific neighborhood plan. A plan which originates at the neighborhood level, and clearly articulates
in detail what makes our neighborhood unique, and how we can build a
goal of keeping the Central Bench Neighborhood the most livable
neighborhood in Boise now and well into the future.

In 2016, the Central Bench Neighborhood Association applied for, and
was awarded a grant to begin process of the neighborhood plan under
the city’s Neighborhood Reinvestment Grant program, where with the
help and direction of incredible city staff, and the team and Agnew::Beck
Consulting Firm, we were off and running with the product you have
before you today.

Throughout the last several years, we have been working continuously on
this plan. On page eight, you can see our public outreach timeline. The
timeline shows just how far and wide we sought feedback from our
neighbors, and how well the neighborhood responded to this effort to
formulate a neighborhood plan to call our own. We received feedback
from our neighbors as we stood in front of the Fred Meyer, the Albertson’s
at our national night out. We provided online surveys, and we even were
part of a block party hosted by a local Bench business.

And before I get into the comments on what we collected from the
neighbors, I want to frame who we are on the Central Bench. You’ll find
on page 15 an incredible demographic information fact sheet created
by city staff that we showed you earlier. Of the 2,615 households, you can
see that we are a younger neighborhood looking to create and maintain
a positive environment for us and our young families.

Though many of whom are in our neighborhood have a household
income that is nearly half of the City of Boise’s average, this diversity and
youthfulness is also reflected in the makeup of our all-volunteered
neighborhood board. As 53% of our households have one vehicle, and
11% of our neighbors have no access to - they have access to one
vehicle, and 11% of our neighbors have no access to a vehicle, it helped
me frame again, how fine of the points a lot of these comments that we
have collected are.

Throughout this process, the CBNA board has become more confident
and empowered to who we represent, and how we approach our path
going forward. I was also fascinated, but not surprised to see just how
proud we are to call the Central Bench home. From a neighborhood
survey we created a word bubble, and that’s on page 20, from what I like
most, and my neighborhood is - as you can see, we are central to
everything, we are diverse, friendly, and we love our parks. And that’s
what makes us, I think, unique.

From the survey, we also collected comments on what neighbors have
asked us to preserve and improve, which fits perfectly with our
neighborhood vision, which is inspire and connect our neighbor through
collaboration and activism to ensure the Central Bench neighborhood is
the most livable neighborhood in Boise.
From these comments, we’re able to consolidate them into four categories. And I listed them again, but I want to read a little bit about what these mean. One is land use and development. Where we maintain and support diversity of businesses, expand a mix of housing options, and create walkable neighborhood activity centers. Neighborhood character. Where we improve safety and strengthen our sense of neighborhood identity and heritage. Connectivity. Where we improve bike and pedestrian circulation within the neighborhood, and connection to the neighborhood activity centers, and other areas of Boise. Site and building design. Where we support infill, new development and redevelopment with building and site design elements that integrate into, and complement the existing neighborhood structure and character.

Within these four categories, we’ve been able to fit and prioritize action items proposed by the neighbors, and other organizations like the City of Boise and ACHD. These proposed projects have allowed us to give a nod to the orchards and farmlands of the past, to plan for the growth we are experiencing now, and to prepare for the future.

During the process of identifying our action plan, as one would expect, we have had considerable enthusiasm for certain actions, and opposition to others. One of our most celebrated action items that proposed was to create covered bus stops on our high-use public bus routes along the Orchard corridor, which I’m happy to report the CBNA has already begun work on. And we have coordinated with Valley Regional Transit, and the City of Boise to try to make these happen.

One of our most contentious action items has been the Cassia bikeway, which would connect Cassia Park to a comprehensive north, south, east, west bike pedestrian route at the heart of our neighborhood. The CBNA has been working steadily on this action item since 2014 in coordination with the city, ACHD, and the canal companies. Though this action is currently in a holding pattern, as the ACHD, the city, and the canal companies work to alleviate concerns from surrounding neighbors that stemmed from getting comments from this plan.

Having diverse and often competing voices have allowed us as a neighborhood to grow and challenge how we operate going forward. I would emphasize that nothing in this plan is a mandate, it is a recommendation to you and to City Council to adopt an update to the comprehensive plan, which itself is a guiding document to be based in land use decisions and budgeting.

I also want to take a minute to thank the over 100 neighbors who took part in the process. I want to thank the board members, both past and present, Andrea Eaborn, Brian Parker, Alexis Malcolm, Candice Hopkins, Gigi Ferreira, Katie Miller, [Brian Dufas 03:03:56], Dick Anderson, Lisa Theobald and Sandy Jensen. But I also need to acknowledge the City of Boise’s planning team. Specially Kathleen Lacey, Tom Laws, Andrea Tuning, Brent Moore, and Nicolette Womack. Without all of whom, this project would not have been the incredible plan it is today.
This neighborhood plan is more than ink and paper. To us, this plan represents a living embodiment of who we are as a neighborhood. Through this plan, we have built the diverse community who can agree and disagree with certain aspects of our growth, but in the end, we all have our compass pointed in the same direction, as we strive to make the Central Bench neighborhood unique and the most livable neighborhood in Boise.

We believe this plan achieves that goal, and I ask you to recommend approval of the Central Bench Neighborhood plan. Thank you.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you, Randy. Appreciate it. Okay, so Randy was the only person on the signup sheet. Is there anyone else who would like to testify on item five tonight? Please. So, you got to sign in on the little sheet.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Kayme Backstrom (4421 W. Albion Street): Hi, I’m Kayme Backstrom, 4421 West Albion Street, Boise, ID 83705. I am here to say that I am in favor of this plan, and in particularly the pathways, the bike and ped pathways through Cassia Park. Thank you very much for your time.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you Kayme. Please, so if you can give Claire that when you’ve got it filled out, that would be great. Or me or anyone. Okay, so is there anyone else who wishes to testify tonight? Okay.

Brian Parker (4421 W. Albion Street): Hi. Brian Parker, 4421 West Albion Street. Thank you for this. I just wanted to voice my approval for this, and I wanted to thank all the neighbors who give all the input, and really worked with us, and it’s a rare thing to find a neighborhood that people recognize that there are challenges, and that change is coming, and that they seek to find sustainable solutions that are outside of their own self-interest. And so, I’d like to commend my neighbors on that. Thank you.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you, Mr. Parker. Is there anyone else who’d like to testify, and Brian can you fill out - you got it, good. Okay, is there anyone else who’d like to testify tonight on item five? Okay, seeing none, normally the applicant, which in this case would be Kathleen, would get five minutes for rebuttal, and wondering if you might wave that.

NO APPLICANT REBUTTAL

Kathleen Lacey (City of Boise): I’m happy to waive it, Mr. Chairman. But it did want to mention that Kayme and Brian are celebrating their second wedding anniversary here tonight.

Chairman Gillespie: Well, that’s something to talk about. How’s it going? How’s that conditional use permit? Just kidding. Okay, in all seriousness. So the matter is before the commission. This is item five, it’s a comprehensive
plan text amendment. We are recommending bodies to the council. So, what’s your pleasure?

Commissioner Stead: Mr. Chair.

Chairman Gillespie: Commissioner Stead.

Commissioner Stead: I would like to recommend approval, or recommend the recommendation for approval.

Chairman Gillespie: Right, so we have a motion to recommend approval, the City Council’s CPA-18-00009, is there a second?

Commissioner Gibson: Second.

Chairman Gillespie: We have a second by Commissioner Gibson. Is there any further discussion? Alright. Hearing none, will the Clerk please call the roll.

Clerk: Gillespie.

Commissioner Gillespie: Aye.

Clerk: Gibson.

Commissioner Gibson: Aye.

Clerk: Ansotegui.

Commissioner Ansotegui: Aye.

Clerk: All in favor, motion carries.

Chairman Gillespie: Right.

RESULT: APPROVED [4 TO 0]
MOVER: Meredith Stead, Commissioner
SECONDER: Douglas Gibson, Commissioner
AYES: Tamara Ansotegui, Douglas Gibson, Milt Gillespie, Meredith Stead
ABSTAIN: Claire Paschke
ABSENT: Jennifer Stevens

6. CUP18-00088 & CVA18-00078 / Hutchison Smith Architects
3434 N. Bogus Basin Road / Conditional use permit to construct a new elementary school on a 10.19-acre site located in an A-1 (Open Land) zone. A variance is included for the parking lot to encroach into the front setback. David Moser

APPLICANT
Don Hutchison | Hutchison Smith Architects (270 N. 27th Street)
HIGHLANDS NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
Tom Secord (525 Balmoral Road)
PUBLIC TESTIMONY
Dave Rucklos (547 E Balmoral Road)
Martha Chalfant (410 E. Hearthstone Road)
Stephanie Hanson (877 Chardie Road)
APPLICANT REBUTTAL
Dan Thompson | Thompson Engineers (181 E. 5th Street, Garden City)

Commissioner Gibson moved approval with modifications to conditions
Commissioner Stead seconded

RESULT: APPROVED [4 TO 0]
MOVER: Douglas Gibson, Commissioner
SECONDER: Meredith Stead, Commissioner
AYES: Tamara Ansotegui, Douglas Gibson, Milt Gillespie, Meredith Stead
ABSTAIN: Claire Paschke
ABSENT: Jennifer Stevens

7. CUP18-00085 & CVA18-00079 / Lindy Riebe
1409 N. 13th Street / Special exception to convert a residential home to an office on .15 acres located in an R-1CH (Single Family Residential with Historic District Overlay) zone. A parking reduction and variance for the parking lot to encroach into the side and rear setbacks. David Moser

Consent

RESULT: APPROVED [4 TO 0]
MOVER: Tamara Ansotegui, Commissioner
SECONDER: Meredith Stead, Commissioner
AYES: Tamara Ansotegui, Douglas Gibson, Milt Gillespie, Meredith Stead
ABSTAIN: Claire Paschke
ABSENT: Jennifer Stevens

8. PUD18-00044 & CVA18-00074 / JLJ, Inc.
5357 N. Collister Drive / Conditional use permit for a planned residential development comprised of 10 detached single family homes on 6.07 acres in an R-1A (Single Family Residential) zone. Also included are variances for an 8’ retaining wall in the front setback and a reduction to rear setbacks from 30’ to 15’ along the eastern boundary of the development. Leon Letson

Chairman Gillespie: So while everyone’s leaving, we have a little problem that we have a couple people here who are going to have to wait a really long time to testify on 8, 8A and 8B, which we would then
presumably defer. So I was thinking with the commission’s approval, and we’re going to need a motion. Can we take up the testimony for the deferral associated with 8A and 8B and 8 at this time? And I need a motion to do that.

**Commissioner Gibson:** Mr. Chairman.

**Chairman Gillespie:** Commissioner Gibson.

**Commissioner Gibson:** I’m going to move that we take testimony on items 8, 8A, 8B.

**Commissioner Ansotegui:** Second.

**Chairman Gillespie:** So we have the motion to pick up item 8 at this time. Is there any discussion? Will the clerk please call the roll?

**Clerk:** Stead.

**Commissioner Stead:** Aye.

**Clerk:** Gillespie.

**Chairman Gillespie:** Aye.

**Clerk:** Gibson.

**Commissioner Gibson:** Aye.

**Clerk:** Ansotegui.

**Commissioner Ansotegui:** Aye.

**Clerk:** All in favor, motion carries.

**Chairman Gillespie:** So what I’m going to do is call up item 8 but James and Cody, I don’t think we need the City to give a preface. What I’d like to do is just call up the people who would like to - now this, again, this is if you cannot come back on February 4th, okay? So we’re going to hear this item on February 4th and maybe during that hearing you’ll learn something. But if you want to testify now and you can’t come back on February 4th, this is your chance. We’re just going to call you up, you’re going to testify, you’re going to put your name and address into the record. If you testify tonight, you can’t then testify again on February 4th, okay? So with that in mind, who would like to testify tonight on 8, 8A, or 8B who cannot come back on February 4th? Please come forward. Just give us your name and address. Make sure you fill out a slip.

**PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

**Diane McConnaughey (4315 Castlebar Court):** I’m on the sign up.

**Chairman Gillespie:** Okay, so then you just tell me which one you are. I bet you’re Diane.

**Diane McConnaughey (4315 Castlebar Court):** Yeah. Diane McConnaughey, 4315 Castlebar Court.

**Chairman Gillespie:** Welcome Diane.

**Diane McConnaughey (4315 Castlebar Court):** Hi. And thank you for letting me testify now instead of later.

**Chairman Gillespie:** Yeah, it’s like two hours.

**Diane McConnaughey (4315 Castlebar Court):** Yeah. My one concern is the increased traffic more development brings to Hill Road, and is it really designed for that? I think the dog bone at 36th and Hill was done well, it really helps get traffic flowing through there. And I would hope there would be consideration for Collister and State. And I understand there is, but I’m not sure what that is or when it would happen. And then to perhaps have a CHD post “Do not block intersecting roads.” I’m off of Edward Street, Edwards and Tamarack kind of make a horseshoe right there, and it’s often hard to get out.
Chairman Gillespie: Alright. Thank you, Diane. Appreciate it. Is there anyone else who wishes to testify tonight who cannot come back for our February 4th meeting? Okay. So I’m going to say we’re done with that. Thank you very much. We’re now going to move onto item two and I look forward to hearing from Ms. Acord. Hold on. Stop. Oh yes, that’s right. So let me then just say this. So now we’re going to take up the motion to defer. I assume that the applicant is in agreement and the City’s in agreement. Is there anyone else who wishes to testify on this item tonight? Okay. So we would need a motion from the commission.

MOTION TO DEFER
Commissioner Ansotegui: Mr. Chairman.
Chairman Gillespie: Commissioner Ansotegui.
Commissioner Ansotegui: I move to defer item 8, 8A, 8B to February 4th.
Chairman Gillespie: Thank you so much.
Commissioner Gibson: Second.
Chairman Gillespie: Second by Commissioner Gibson. Motion by Commissioner Ansotegui. So this is a motion to defer 8, 8A, 8B to February 4th. Is there any discussion on the motion? Hearing none, will the clerk please call the roll?
Clerk: Stead.
Commissioner Stead: Aye.
Clerk: Gillespie.
Chairman Gillespie: Aye.
Clerk: Gibson.
Commissioner Gibson: Aye.
Clerk: Ansotegui.
Commissioner Ansotegui: Aye.
Clerk: All in favor, motion carries.
Deferred to February 4, 2019

RESULT: TABLED [4 TO 0]  Next: 2/4/2019 6:00 PM
MOVER: Tamara Ansotegui, Commissioner
SECONDER: Douglas Gibson, Commissioner
AYES: Tamara Ansotegui, Douglas Gibson, Milt Gillespie, Meredith Stead
ABSTAIN: Claire Paschke
ABSENT: Jennifer Stevens

8a. CFH18-00107 / JLJ, Inc.
5357 N. Collister Drive / Hillside development permit for the grading associated with a residential subdivision comprised of 10 buildable and 3 common lots on 6.07 acres in an R-1A (Single Family Residential) zone. Leon Letson
Deferred to February 4, 2019
8b. **SUB18-00058 / Polecat Gulch Lofts**  
5357 N. Collister Drive / Preliminary plat for a residential subdivision comprised of 10 buildable and 3 common lots on 6.07 acres in an R-1A (Single Family Residential) zone. Leon Letson  
Deferred to February 4, 2019

9. **PUD18-00048 / T-O Engineers**  
2825 W. Canal Street / Conditional use permit for a planned residential development comprised of 27 townhomes on 1.93 acres located in a R-2 (Medium Density Residential) zone. Leon Letson  
Consent

9a. **SUB18-00065 / Bradbury Townhomes Subdivision**  
2825 W. Canal Street / Preliminary plat for a residential subdivision comprised of 27 buildable and 1 common lots on 1.93 acres located in an R-2 (Medium Density Residential) zone. Leon Letson  
Consent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT:</th>
<th>MOVER: Tamara Ansotegui, Commissioner</th>
<th>SECONDER: Douglas Gibson, Commissioner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AYES:</td>
<td>Tamara Ansotegui, Douglas Gibson, Milt Gillespie, Meredith Stead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSTAIN:</td>
<td>Claire Paschke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSENT:</td>
<td>Jennifer Stevens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT:</th>
<th>MOVER: Tamara Ansotegui, Commissioner</th>
<th>SECONDER: Meredith Stead, Commissioner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AYES:</td>
<td>Tamara Ansotegui, Douglas Gibson, Milt Gillespie, Meredith Stead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSTAIN:</td>
<td>Claire Paschke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSENT:</td>
<td>Jennifer Stevens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT:</th>
<th>MOVER: Tamara Ansotegui, Commissioner</th>
<th>SECONDER: Meredith Stead, Commissioner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AYES:</td>
<td>Tamara Ansotegui, Douglas Gibson, Milt Gillespie, Meredith Stead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSTAIN:</td>
<td>Claire Paschke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSENT:</td>
<td>Jennifer Stevens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. **CUP18-00092 / Lamar Outdoor Advertising**
4319 W. State Street / Conditional use permit for an off-premise advertising sign (billboard) located in a C-2D (General Commercial with Design Review) zone. Nicolette Womack

**RESULT:** WITHDRAWN

11. **CUP18-00093 / Lamar Outdoor Advertising**
2902 S. Beverly Street / Conditional use permit for an off-premise advertising sign (billboard) located in an M-1D (Light Industrial with Design Review) zone. Nicolette Womack

Consent

**RESULT:** APPROVED [4 TO 0]

MOVER: Tamara Ansotegui, Commissioner
SECONDER: Meredith Stead, Commissioner
AYES: Tamara Ansotegui, Douglas Gibson, Milt Gillespie, Meredith Stead
ABSTAIN: Claire Paschke
ABSENT: Jennifer Stevens

12. **CUP18-00094 / Lamar Outdoor Advertising**
8417 W. Fairview Avenue / Conditional use permit for an off-premise advertising sign (billboard) located in a C-2D (General Commercial with Design Review) zone. Nicolette Womack

**APPLICANT**
DuWayne Miller (2250 Empire Way)

**NO NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION**

**NO PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

**NO APPLICANT REBUTTAL**
Commissioner Gibson moved approval to include the 39-foot proposed application and delete condition 2 and addition of a new condition preventing EMD’s.
Commissioner Ansotegui seconded.
RESULT: APPROVED [4 TO 0]
MOVER: Douglas Gibson, Commissioner
SECONDER: Tamara Ansotegui, Commissioner
AYES: Tamara Ansotegui, Douglas Gibson, Milt Gillespie, Meredith Stead
ABSTAIN: Claire Paschke
ABSENT: Jennifer Stevens

V. ADJOURNMENT