I. **CALL TO ORDER**

PRESENT: Squyres, Blanchard, Mohr, Stevens, Gillespie, Bratnober, Stead, Schafer

ABSENT: Finfrock

II. **MINUTES APPROVAL**

1. Planning and Zoning Commission Minutes – March 2, 2020
2. Planning and Zoning Commission Minutes – March 9, 2020

III. **CONSENT AGENDA**

A. **CUP17-00093 & CVA17-00076 / Broad Street Properties, LLC**
   **TIME EXTENSION**
   406 S. 5th Street
   Conditional use permit for a height exception and to allow ground floor retail in a 9-story, approximately 120’ tall mixed use building proposed in an R-ODD (Residential Office with Downtown Design Review) zone. The building is to be connected over the Broad Street right-of-way to a proposed 11-story mixed use building. A variance to reduce the building setbacks is included.
   Leon Letson

   **RESULT:** APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]

   **MOWER:** Bob Schafer, Co-Chair
   **SECONDER:** Milt Gillespie, Commissioner
   **AYES:** Squyres, Blanchard, Mohr, Stevens, Gillespie, Bratnober, Stead, Schafer
   **ABSENT:** Janelle Finfrock

   **UNANIMOUS APPROVAL TO PLACE ON CONSENT**
   **ALL IN FAVOR, MOTION CARRIED**
CITY OF BOISE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

IN RE: )
CUP17-00093 / BROAD STREET PROPERTIES, )
LLC )
and )
CVA17-00076 / BROAD STREET PROPERTIES, )
LLC )
406 South 5th Street )
_________________________________________ )
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INTRODUCTION

CHAIRMAN STEAD: And then the first item for consideration is Item A, which is CUP17-93 and CVA17-76, Broad Street Properties. This is a time extension at 406 South 5th Street for a conditional-use permit for a height exception.

Is the Applicant present? If you're present virtually, please virtually raise your hand.

Okay. I do not see that the Applicant is present at the meeting. Is there -- oh, wait. I am sorry. I am seeing now a hand raised.

Mr. Sheldon, is -- are you in agreement with the terms and conditions of the staff report? To the -- thank you -- for the time extension?

JOHN SHELDON: Sorry. I'm a little new to Zoom.

Yes, we are.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Great.

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

N/A

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

CHAIRMAN STEAD: And is there anybody present to testify in opposition of this item tonight? Please virtually raise your hand or do so in person here.
Okay. Seeing no hands raised. We will place Item A on the consent agenda.

REBUTTAL
N/A

MOTIONS
N/A

ROLL CALL
N/A

(End transcription at 0:08:33 of audio file.)
1. **PUD20-00017 / Shawn Overmier**
   2316 S Phillippi St
   Conditional use permit for a planned residential development comprised of 3 contiguous duplexes on 0.45 acres in a R-2 (Medium Density Residential) zone. Nicolette Womack

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT:</th>
<th>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVER:</td>
<td>Bob Schafer, Co-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER:</td>
<td>Milt Gillespie, Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYES:</td>
<td>Squyres, Blanchard, Mohr, Stevens, Gillespie, Bratnober, Stead, Schafer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSENT:</td>
<td>Janelle Finfrock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UNANIMOUS APPROVAL TO PLACE ON CONSENT**

**ALL IN FAVOR, MOTION CARRIED**
CITY OF BOISE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

IN RE: )
PUD20-00017 / SHAWN OVERMIER )
2316 South Phillippi Street )
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INTRODUCTION

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Next item for consideration is Item No. 1, PUD20-17, Shawn Overmier at 2316 South Phillippi Street, a conditional-use permit for a planned residential development.

Is the Applicant present tonight? Please virtually raise your hand or -- there we go. Perfect.

And are you in agreement with the staff report?

SHAWN OVERMIER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Great.

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

N/A

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

Okay. Seeing none. We will place No. 1 onto the consent agenda.

REBUTTAL

N/A

MOTIONS

N/A

ROLL CALL
N/A

(End transcription at 0:09:20 of audio file.)

-o0o-
2. **SOS20-00014 / Caldera Capital, LLC**
2405 E Warm Springs Ave
Waiver to the Subdivision Ordinance for curb and gutter on 0.49 acres in a R-1C (Single Family Residential) zone. David Moser

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT:</th>
<th>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVER:</td>
<td>Bob Schafer, Co-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER:</td>
<td>Milt Gillespie, Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYES:</td>
<td>Squyres, Blanchard, Mohr, Stevens, Gillespie, Bratnober, Stead, Schafer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSENT:</td>
<td>Janelle Finfrock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UNANIMOUS APPROVAL TO PLACE ON CONSENT**

**ALL IN FAVOR, MOTION CARRIED**
CITY OF BOISE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

IN RE: 
SOS20-00014 / CALDERA CAPITAL, LLC 
2405 East Warm Springs Avenue

TRANSCRIPT OF RECORDED PUBLIC HEARING
MondAy, JUNE 8, 2020

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:
MEREDITH STEAD, CHAIR
BOB SCHAFER, CO-CHAIR
ASHLEY FORD-SQUYRES
CHRISTOPHER BLANCHARD
JENNIFER MOHR
JENNIFER STEVENS
MILT GILLESPIE
JIM BRATNOBER

TRANSCRIBED BY:
VICTORIA HILLES
(Begin transcription at 0:9:20 of audio file.)

INTRODUCTION

CHAIRMAN STEAD: The next item for consideration is Item No. 2, SOS20-14, Caldera Capital, LLC, at 2405 East Warm Springs Avenue. This is a waiver to the Subdivision Ordinance.

Is the Applicant present?

Great. I see a hand virtually.

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

KERRY CALVERLEY: Yes, I am.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Great. She is in agreement.

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

N/A

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

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

Okay. Seeing none. We will place Item 2 on the consent agenda.

REBUTTAL

N/A

MOTIONS

N/A

ROLL CALL
N/A

(End transcription at 0:10:03 of audio file.)
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IV. NEW BUSINESS

B. SUB20-00008 / Haystack Subdivision No. 1
3006 S Wise Way
Preliminary and Final Plat for a multi-family residential subdivision comprised of one common and two buildable lots on 10.69 acres in a SP-01 (Harris Ranch Specific Plan District) zone. Nicolette Womack

| RESULT:   | APPROVED [UNANIMOUS] |
| MOVER:    | Milt Gillespie, Commissioner |
| SECONDER: | Bob Schafer, Co-Chair |
| AYES:     | Squyres, Blanchard, Mohr, Stevens, Gillespie, Bratnober, Stead, Schafer |
| ABSENT:   | Janelle Finfrock |

ALL IN FAVOR, MOTION CARRIED
CITY OF BOISE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

IN RE: )
SUB20-00008 / HAYSTACK SUBDIVISION )
NO. 1 )
3006 South Wise Way )

________________________________________
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INTRODUCTION

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay. Great. So the first item then that we will address is Item B. This is SUB20-8, Haystack Subdivision No. 1 at 3006 South Wise Way.

And we'll first hear from staff. So, Ms. Womack, please.

NICOLETTE WOMACK: Madam Chair, Commissioners, the first item on tonight's agenda is a request for a preliminary and final plat on 10.69 acres in an SP-01 zone. The residential subdivision is comprised of one common and two buildable lots. The proposed lots comply with the dimensional standards of the SP-01 zone and the Harris Ranch Specific Plan.

The Harris Ranch Specific Plan designates the site as mixed-use commercial and high-density residential. The proposed street layout matches the circulation plan for the area. All of the buildings will be required to comply with the dimensional requirements of the SP-01 zone and will require Design Review approval prior to receiving building permits.

The lot layout of the Western Block 2 will
comply with these block prototypes, which show a large mixed-use block with several configuration possibilities, including office, commercial, a storage unit facility, and/or apartment and condominium buildings.

The proposed lot layout of the Eastern Block 1 will comply with these block prototypes, which show a Village Center block with neighborhood retail, commercial, or residential on the first floor and office or residential above.

The Applicant proposes to extend Wise Way, Haystack Street, Trailwood Way, and Old Hickory Way. Future roundabouts at Wise Way, and Old Hickory Way's intersections with Warm Springs will be constructed once traffic counts warrant construction.

Eventually, and if warranted, the Specific Plan has Warm Springs Ave planned as a four-lane, arterial roadway with two-lane-wide roundabouts at each intersection. However, it was determined that no improvements to Warm Springs Ave or the intersections would be needed at this time.

ACHD required additional right-of-way be dedicated to accommodate the future construction of these dual-lane roundabouts. As mentioned in the project report, Barber Valley Neighborhood Association
and several neighbors have concerns with the expansion of Warm Springs to four lanes. SUB19-56, referenced, was approved at City Council on June 2nd, 2020. Direction was given to staff to research the process in which the Specific Plan could be amended to reduce Warm Springs Ave from five lanes to three lanes.

Currently the closest north-south pedestrian connection, shown with the yellow stars here, across Warm Springs Ave is the rapid flashing beacon at the entrance to Marrianne Williams Park, 217 feet to the west of this site. An additional RRFB has been approved to the east at Millbrook Way.

As covered in the late correspondence, the Applicant has proposed an RRFB at Old Hickory Way and Warm Springs Ave, which was not reviewed by ACHD. Similar to the efforts on Warm Springs, the Applicant will continue to work with ACHD to undertake the appropriate warrant study and attempt to gain permission to put an RRFB at Old Hickory Way and Warm Springs Ave within an ACHD right-of-way. This will place RRFBs at all future roundabouts, creating consistent spacing and streetscape along Warm Springs.

Regarding the neighbors, school capacity, and bicycle route concerns, the Boise School District reviewed the project with no concerns.
At this time only a preliminary and final plat is before the Commission in order to create the proposed lots and to continue to extend right-of-way.

The use and density of the site has been established by the adopted Harris Ranch Specific Plan. As the future school site within Harris Ranch is planned out, safe routes to school will further prioritize these efforts and will -- and continue this effort specifically to accommodate school children.

As conditioned the planning team recommends approval of the application with conditions.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you, Ms. Womack.

So next we'll hear from the Applicant, and we'll start with ten minutes.

HETHE CLARK: Hello there. Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yes.

HETHE CLARK: Okay.

You've got Hethe Clark representing the Applicant, and I'm hoping to be able to share my screen.

THE CLERK: Hethe, one moment while we change your role.

HETHE CLARK: Yep.
All right. Thanks, everyone.

For the record, Hethe Clark, 251 East Front Street in Boise, representing the Applicant.

This is the Haystacks Subdivision No. 1. And as we start tonight, I thought it might be helpful to give a little bit of background about the project. I know that not all of the Commissioners have been around Harris Ranch as much, and so I thought it might be a little bit helpful to describe where we are in the process and kind of how we got here.

So Harris Ranch, of course, is Boise city's first Specific Plan District. Back in 2007 Harris Ranch was approved after years of charettes and public hearings and discussions and compromises, and we're now 13 years into the project.

As a Specific Plan it operates with its own zoning code. So this is a depiction from our SP-01 manual, which shows the entire development with each block shaded according to the type of use that's permitted. The first several years of the project were focused north of East Parkcenter. We are now moved south, and the project that is up before you tonight is on these two blocks that I've indicated.

This is a highly interconnected community that prizes bike and ped connectivity. This map shows
in red paved bike lanes throughout the project or the inner areas of the grid. We'll see many local streets with 15-foot urban sidewalks to provide safe pedestrian and bike connectivity. The project overall is ringed by pathways, concrete walks, and the Greenbelt.

So with regard to the application that's actually before you, as Nicolette mentioned, this is a preliminary and final plat application for the two lots on 10.69 acres. I want to be clear that this does fully conform with SP-01. This is not a new proposal for new units. This is within the units that were approved with -- for SP-01 back in 2007. ACHD, the City, schools, they all approved SP-01 with that specified number of units, and this does not represent a change.

And I'll conclude just by saying that the Applicant's in full agreement with the terms and conditions of the staff report. We also want to say that we appreciate the interaction that we continue to have with Barber Valley Neighborhood Association and their support. And I'd be happy to answer any questions you might have at this time.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you, Mr. Clark.

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
CHAIRMAN STEAD: Next we'll move to the neighborhood association.

Do we have a representative from Barber Valley here to speak on this tonight?

I see John Mooney. Okay. Great.

Just one moment while we upgrade you.

JOHN MOONEY: Madam Chair, Commissioners, can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yes.

JOHN MOONEY: Great. I think Nicolette has our short slide deck.

For the record, this is John Mooney, Barber Valley Neighborhood Association, 7153 East Highland Valley Road.

And as you saw in our late correspondence, we're in full support. And as Hethe said, this is a very collaborative effort between the Applicant and the neighborhood. So I just want to take the opportunity to kind of run through a few of the neighborhood perspectives that Hethe didn't cover.

The next slide, please.

Thanks.

The point here is SE7's a school, which isn't obviously in your purview tonight. The Village Center is the TC8 and 9, and the mixed-use, commercial
is the purples there in the middle. So SW12 and 13 are big, big chunks of Harris Ranch, and we're real excited about this. SE5, down the right-hand corner, we testified before you in April and hoped to make the points that we were finally able to make at Council last week.

Next slide.

And that was regarding the Amendment 7, which was adopted last year. Unfortunately we missed a lot of things in that, the neighborhood association did. And we probably would have been a little bit more interested in looking at -- re-looking at the bicycle facilities in particular. But what also came out of that, and the Applicant is great about dealing with this, is we really want to tackle the Master Street Map and the future of Warm Springs, which also is not in the scope of this, but we've been scratching our heads throughout this process as -- how do we interact with this and get another amendment to the Specific Plan?

As you can see on this slide, it's a two-lane parkway with dual-lane roundabouts, which we believe is going to be big problem for the neighborhood down the road. As the bullets in the bottom left show, we had strong neighborhood support
to change this to a single-lane parkway with single-lane roundabouts. And that resulted in a number of letters to City Council for the hearing last week, which then resulted, as you saw in the late correspondence, with direction from Council to staff to begin this process.

Next slide, please.

We support this, obviously. And second bullet there is just kind of why we're going over this again with you, as we don't know any other way to kind of tackle -- how do we start an amendment from out of the public if we see something that needs attention?

We believe the two-lane parkway, the dual-lane, will adversely impact the connectivity to and from this subdivision, as well as, obviously, the Harris Ranch Town Center. The single-lane parkway will greatly benefit all of the vulnerable road users, because it'll ease the crossing of Warm Springs in the future and, obviously, also support the connectivity goals and the Comp Plan.

Next slide.

We do remain a little bit concerned about lack of bike facilities within the interior grid, as Mr. Clark just said. The streetscapes are outstanding in the interior grid, but what they do is
they -- basically, they're wide sidewalks, and so
they're kind of either asking a bicyclist that's
coming off the Greenbelt or through one of those
traffic circles into the Town Center -- you're
basically asking a bicyclist to then, in that yellow
highlighted area, either ride on the road with
sharrows -- share the lane with a vehicle -- or ride
on a sidewalk, which in best practices and at the risk
of kind of throwing new ideas into a great plan,
that's not optimum, and we just continue to be a bit
concerned about that. As you can see, there's a --
the bike lanes are going to come off of those two
traffic circles and be an issue.

The cross-section -- next slide -- for
that highlighted area -- as you can see, there's an
11-foot traffic lane, 8 feet of parking, and then a
wide sidewalk. So as I said before, a bicyclist
that's going to go down that street from this
subdivision to get to the Town Center or the new
school is going to be either in the vehicle lane,
11-foot vehicle lane, or on the sidewalk.

Next slide.

So our request is obviously approve this
plat and please continue to emphasize the need for an
amendment, because, obviously, the work's not been
done yet, and until it's done, it's going to be an outstanding concern of the neighborhood.

Next slide or next bullet, I think.

I think that's it.

We talked about this already. Next bullet.

I think that's the end of it.

Many thanks. Because that late correspondence, we were unaware of the fact that the Applicant also volunteered to put this RRFB in at Hickory Way and Warm Springs, and that's outstanding.

We are -- there is a kind of a disconnect. The Wise Way crossing is an RFB, a red flasher, brings traffic to a stop, whereas Hickory and Millbrook, the next two turn circles, roundabouts, will be RRFBs, which is flashing yellow lights. So there is kind of a traffic question there until we maybe need to solve down the road.

I think that's it. Next slide, Nicolette.

I think that's -- there we go.

Thank you. John Mooney from Barber Valley Neighborhood Association.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you, Mr. Mooney.

Next we'll move on to questions from the Commission for the Applicant, the staff, or the
neighborhood association.

COMMISSIONER SCHAFER: Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Schafer.

COMMISSIONER SCHAFER: Just a quick question for staff.

Nicolette, is there any motion you need from us regarding RRFB and work with ACHD and/or the double roundabout discussion that's ongoing?

NICOLETTE WOMACK: Madam Chair, Commissioner Schafer, a motion is not needed, but it would -- if you think it has merit, I would include it in your deliberation.

COMMISSIONER SCHAFER: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Madam Chairman.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Gillespie.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Well, with that incitement to speak from Nicolette, I will simply put on the record a dropping -- you know, putting Warm Springs on a diet through there, which is what I think the BVNA wants to do, it seems like an idea really, really worth considering. I think it's going from four lanes to three, and presumably using that extra space to create dedicated bike lanes is, I think, a great idea. And I hope that SP-01 can be amended to enable that or that ACHD just does it on their own.
I'm never sure which comes first.

I'm not sure what kind of deliberations we need on the rapid, flashing beacon light. I don't have -- I'm sort of agnostic as to whether it flashes yellow or red. I'll defer to people who understand that better, but I think we do want to have really great pedestrian connectivity through those roundabouts. And if they were two-lane roundabouts instead of three and if they have the right pedestrian signals instead of the wrong ones, that's better.

So I'm on the record there, Nicolette, for supporting those initiatives. But I'm not hearing that it requires a change of any motion or, you know, any change in our findings.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Do you have any questions for the staff or the Applicant?

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: No. I guess --

CHAIRMAN STEAD: [Unintelligible].

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: -- a question for BVNA, for John, and for Nicolette is, you know, is that a sufficient set of deliberations on the record for you, even if they're in the wrong place, which I often do, according to my wife?

NICOLETTE WOMACK: Madam Chair, Commissioner Gillespie, I believe that's sufficient.
COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Thank you so much.

Sorry about that, Madam Chairman.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Do we have any additional questions from the Commission?

Okay. Seeing none.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

CHAIRMAN STEAD: We also don't have anybody signed up from the public to speak on this issue.

If there's anybody -- first I'll ask, is there anybody here in the room tonight that would like to speak to this issue?

Okay. Seeing none.

Then my next question will be for everybody attending virtually. Please virtually raise your hand if you'd like to speak to this issue.

Okay. Seeing none.

REBUTTAL

CHAIRMAN STEAD: We will move to a five-minute rebuttal from the Applicant.

Mr. Clark again, please.

HETHE CLARK: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Just briefly with regard to the flasher, you know, our intent is to request a rectangular rapid-flashing beacon, the yellow type. We think that that's going to have more likelihood of success. And
so that's the direction that we're planning to go there.

With regard to the Warm Springs bypass, we -- you know, we've been talking to BVNA about that for quite a while at this point. And we, you know, appreciate the work they've done on that. We look forward to continuing to engage in that. That is a separate process from what we're doing tonight, and so I think that Commissioner Gillespie's description of the P and Z's intent that this should be something to explore further, I think that's adequate and appropriate that it was processed that way.

With that, I'm happy to answer any other questions you might have.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you.

MOTIONS

CHAIRMAN STEAD: At this point we'll close the public portion of the hearing, and the item is before the Commission.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Madam Chairman.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Gillespie.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: I hope I'm on the right one. I'm a little confused. It's very disorienting this way.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: It is very weird.
COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: I move that we approve SUB20-08 -- or we recommend approval to the City Council of SUP -- B20-08 with all the terms and conditions in the staff report.

COMMISSIONER SCHAFER: I will second.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay. We have a motion from Gillespie and a second from Commissioner Schafer. Is there further discussion?

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Madam Chairman.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Gillespie.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: I request that all of my verbose comments that were in the questions section be moved to this point here.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Noted.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Any further discussion?

COMMISSIONER SCHAFER: Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Schafer.

COMMISSIONER SCHAFER: I think the staff report adequately sums up the project in the application. I'm in full support, and I will second Commissioner Gillespie's previous comments in regards to the RRFBs. Whichever color is most appropriate, we'll leave that to the experts.

And also I'm in support of an additional
study of reducing Warm Springs down to a single-lane at the roundabouts as well.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Any further discussion?

ROLL CALL

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay. Will the clerk please call the vote.

THE CLERK: Stead.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Aye.

THE CLERK: Schafer.

COMMISSIONER SCHAFER: Aye.

THE CLERK: Squyres.

COMMISSIONER SQUYRES: Aye.

THE CLERK: Blanchard.

COMMISSIONER BLANCHARD: Aye.

THE CLERK: Mohr.

COMMISSIONER MOHR: Aye.

THE CLERK: Stevens.

COMMISSIONER STEVENS: Aye.

THE CLERK: Gillespie.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Aye.

THE CLERK: Bratnober.

COMMISSIONER BRATNOBER: Aye.

THE CLERK: All in favor. Motion carries.

(End transcription at 0:32:16 of audio file.)
3. **PUD20-00016 / Elder LLC**

1011 S Orchard St

Conditional use permit for a planned residential development comprised of 8 multifamily units on 0.3 acres in a L-OD (Limited Office with Design Review) zone. Leon Letson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULT:</th>
<th>APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOVER:</td>
<td>Milt Gillespie, Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECONDER:</td>
<td>Bob Schafer, Co-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYES:</td>
<td>Squyres, Blanchard, Mohr, Stevens, Gillespie, Bratnober, Stead, Schafer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSENT:</td>
<td>Janelle Finchrock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ALL IN FAVOR, MOTION CARRIED**
CITY OF BOISE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

IN RE:                      )
PUD20-00016 / ELDER LLC )
1011 South Orchard Street )
                        )

TRANSCRIPT OF RECORDED PUBLIC HEARING

MONDAY, JUNE 8, 2020

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:
MEREDITH STEAD, CHAIR
BOB SCHAFER, CO-CHAIR
ASHLEY FORD-SQUYRES
CHRISTOPHER BLANCHARD
JENNIFER MOHR
JENNIFER STEVENS
MILT GILLESPIE
JIM BRATNOBER

TRANSCRIBED BY:
VICTORIA HILLES
INTRODUCTION

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay. So moving on to Item No. 3. This is PUD20-16, Elder LLC at 1011 South Orchard Street. This is a conditional-use permit for a planned residential development.

And we'll first hear from Mr. Letson.

Maybe not, actually. We'll hear from staff.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, no.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Oh.

LEON LETSON: Hi, Madam Chair, [unintelligible].

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Mr. Letson, you're up.

LEON LETSON: Mr. Letson here, and I apologize for the pandemic beard. I think that was done last week, too, by my coworker Kevin Holmes, but I'm going to share my screen and we'll get started. So here we go.

All right. Let me know when you can see it.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yes. We can see it.

LEON LETSON: Okay. All right.

Good evening, Madam Chair and Members of the Commission. The item before you is an eight-unit, multi-family, planned-unit development located at 1110
South Orchard Street in an L-OD zone located on the west side of Orchard Street, between Kootenai Street and Camas. Uses in the surrounding area include varying densities of residential to the north and east and offices and parking lots to the south and west. Cassia Park is located one-quarter of a mile to the northeast. Transit stops exist at the intersection of Orchard and Kootenai as pictured here.

The project consists of an eight-unit, multi-family building arranged in a townhome style. All required setbacks have been met or exceeded. Each unit has an oversized single-car garage and parking available on the driveway apron in front of the garage. Private patios and balconies provide the 100 square feet of open space required for PUDs of this size. This project will be accessed via Orchard Street.

As a recommended condition of approval, a cross-access agreement with the office building to the south must be approved by the City and recorded prior to the issuance of any construction permits. And I'll highlight this cross-access drive here. Off of Orchard Street, in fact, if we go back and look at the larger aerial, there's access around the building to allow exiting onto Kootenai Street, as well. So the
nature of that agreement will be to have access along
the entire rear of the building, which will better
accommodate emergency service and solid waste pickup.

All reviewing agencies and departments
approve the project with standard conditions and, to
this point, no comments were received from the public.

In conclusion, the planning team
recommends approval of PUD20-16 with the attached
conditions.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you, Mr. Letson.

Next we'll hear from the Applicant, and
we'll start with ten minutes.

LEON LETSON: Madam Chair, the Applicant is
present. I'm not sure if they need to use my slides.
We've already talked about coordinating that. So just
as a heads-up.

THE CLERK: Can the Applicant virtually raise
their hand, please?

There we go.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Go ahead, please, Applicant.

And please start with your name and address.

RENEE RAYMES: Yeah. This is Renee Raymes.
Address is 11844 Chinden Ridge in Boise, Idaho 83714.
And I'm a commercial broker for [unintelligible].
Oh. Sorry. I guess I was getting some feedback there. I'm a — we're in agreement with Leon Letson's conditions and cross-access [unintelligible]. We worked hard on them. [Unintelligible] and [unintelligible] Leon to set a [unintelligible] condition on the alleyway and then — we feel that this is a good project for the area due to the fact that there's a lot of office and there's subdivisions right around there. So as [unintelligible] --

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Renee, I'm sorry to interrupt. We're having a difficult time hearing you. Is there anything you can do to adjust that, the sound, a little bit?

RENEE RAYMES: Is this better?
CHAIRMAN STEAD: A little bit. It's still very quiet. The feedback is gone.

RENEE RAYMES: That's better. Let me see. Is this any better?
CHAIRMAN STEAD: No. It sounds like maybe you're far from the microphone? Could that be?

RENEE RAYMES: Here. Let's see.
The CLERK: Renee, do you maybe have the video on in the background that needs to be muted?

RENEE RAYMES: Is this any better for you?
CHAIRMAN STEAD: We'll have to make do. It's
okay. It's pretty quiet. Just try to speak up if you can.

RENEE RAYMES: Okay. Sorry about that. I thought I had a dial-in line, but I'm going to attempt to [unintelligible] with the microphone.

THE CLERK: Renee, we need -- we might need you to --

RENEE RAYMES: ...[unintelligible] with Leon and this cross-access agreement --

THE CLERK: Renee, can -- we might need you to call in rather than -- on your phone -- rather than whatever device you're on right now. The feedback in the Council chambers is pretty bad.

RENEE RAYMES: I'm not sure what the number is to dial in.

THE CLERK: A phone number would have been on the e-mail when you registered for the Zoom meeting this afternoon --

RENEE RAYMES: Okay.

THE CLERK: -- or the evening.

RENEE RAYMES: Let me get that.

THE CLERK: Yeah. The same place where you found that link tonight to log in.

LEON LETSON: Madam Chair, this is Leon Letson.

For the benefit of the Commission, I think
the online listeners are having an easier time with
Ms. Raymes than you are. So far she's confirmed that
she's in agreement with staff's recommendation and
conditions.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Madam Chairman.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Gillespie.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: So this is a question
for Leon. This is Commissioner Gillespie.

Leon, if you can communicate with her or
vice versa, is that all she wants to say, or does she
have anything to add to her agreement?

LEON LETSON: What I've heard and through
conversations prior to the hearing, they are in
support of what we have recommended. [Unintelligible]
she wanted to make a point of stating they've been
working hard on the project, as well. And if -- I'll
pause to allow Ms. Raymes to clarify any points if
that's necessary, but, again, they are --

CHAIRMAN STEAD: I know we'll want to get her
squared away before -- because we have some questions
that was going to be put on the record.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: So, Renee, do you -- will you
be able to call in on a phone?
RENEE RAYMES: I'm not seeing the phone number on the e-mail.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay. Bear with us, please. One moment. We're pulling it up here.

So okay. In the meantime we're going to just move on to the public testimony, and we'll come back to Renee in the rebuttal, hopefully on a different device.

THE CLERK: Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yeah.

THE CLERK: If there are any questions from the Commissioners before we do public testimony.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you. Yeah.

So are there -- do we have questions from the Commission for the staff or the Applicant?

COMMISSIONER BLANCHARD: Madam Chair, I have a question for staff.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Blanchard.

COMMISSIONER BLANCHARD: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Leon, do we have any kind of correspondence from the neighbor directly to the north? I missed that.

LEON LETSON: Yeah, Madam Chair, Commissioners. To this point there has been no public comment of any kind, so the person in attendance is the first person
COMMISSIONER BLANCHARD: Okay.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Any further questions from the Commission?

COMMISSIONER SCHAFER: Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Schafer.

COMMISSIONER SCHAFER: This is a question for staff.

Leon, is this next headed for Design Review? What's the next step in the process?

LEON LETSON: Yeah, Madam Chair, Commissioner Schafer. Yes. Design Review is the next stop for this project. We've yet to apply. There have been numerous conversations with the Applicant about Design Review requirements. They had spoken to Design Review. So there will be some update [unintelligible] used to a certain extent. But yes, they have coordinated with Design Review and that will be the next stop for the project.

COMMISSIONER SCHAFER: Okay. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER BLANCHARD: And, Madam Chair, just a quick, additional question for staff.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Sure, Commissioner Blanchard.

COMMISSIONER BLANCHARD: Leon, is that going to require additional public noticing?
LEON LETSON: Madam Chair, I may defer to my manager here about staff-level Design Reviews. I believe there will be notification associated with the staff-level approval. This would be a staff-level approval in the event that the Commission approves the PUD proposed tonight.

So, Céline, if you're with me, I believe we do notice for staff-level Design Reviews.

THE CLERK: Madam Chair, Commissioner Blanchard, we do not notice for staff-level Design Reviews.

Sorry. You caught me off guard, Leon.

I'm trying to still help Renee call in.

LEON LETSON: Sorry, folks.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Any further questions from the Commission?

COMMISSIONER BLANCHARD: Thank you, both.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay. And seeing none.

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Before -- I just wanted -- quickly, before we move on to the public comment, I just wanted to check to see if we had any representative from the Central Bench Neighborhood Association here tonight. If you are online, please virtually raise your hand.

Okay. Seeing none.
Public Testimony

Chairman Stead: And we don't have anybody on the sign-up list. Please -- anybody that would like to testify, please virtually raise your hand or please come on up to the podium.

Robbie Robinson: I have a couple of questions about that --

Chairman Stead: Please start with your name and address.

Robbie Robinson: Okay.

Chairman Stead: Thank you.

Robbie Robinson: Leave this on?

Chairman Stead: You'll have three minutes.

Robbie Robinson: Now if you can take that off --

Chairman Stead: You can take it off.

Robbie Robinson: Okay. Yeah.

Chairman Stead: I'll put mine on.

[Unintelligible].

Robbie Robinson: My name is Robbie, R-o-b-b-i-e, Robinson, R-o-b-b-i-n-s-o-n, and I live at 1009 South Orchard Street. And I also run a photography and video business out of my home, occupational.

My biggest questions are this, that alley
between that property -- it's a two-story
building -- that's an alley that provides driveway to
the back of that property. Are they going to improve
that alley so they can make it a street and the
vehicles to be able to go in and out of that?

The other thing is the traffic flow right
there. You've got a light on that corner of Orchard
and Kootenai, and sometimes it can be a hassle getting
in and out.

So those are my biggest concerns, and
like, right now there's -- I use part of that property
to turn around and to get in and out, but it's a
double driveway there. And if they would allow them
me to, I would pour the cement to make that a double
area there for my customers to park in and out, even
though it's on that piece of property, if they don't
mind.

That's all.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you [unintelligible].
ROBBIE ROBINSON: Mm–hmm.
CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you so much.

Is there anybody else here or online that
would like to testify on this item tonight? Please
come on up or virtually raise your hand.

Okay. Seeing none.
REBUTTAL

CHAIRMAN STEAD: It looks like -- do we have Renee on the phone now?

Okay. So we'll move on to rebuttal for -- from the Applicant for five minutes, please.

RENEE RAYMES: Can you hear me okay now?

CHAIRMAN STEAD: That's great. Thank you.

RENEE RAYMES: Sorry about that.

So as I was saying before, that we have worked hard on this site. And in response to the request for the alleyway, we are improving that and there should be flow through there to come in and out like Leon had mentioned.

Regarding the emergency vehicles -- and we've kind of created an area for the party to the north where we've given them a little bit more room and, you know, we're not encumbering their space either, but we did send out the neighborhood notices also as requested, so they were informed of the hearing and, you know, what we're doing.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Are you done?

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you.

MOTIONS

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

    COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Madam Chairman.

    CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Gillespie.

    COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: I move that we approve
PUD20-16 with all the terms and conditions of the
staff report.

    COMMISSIONER SCHAFER: I'll second.

    CHAIRMAN STEAD: Second from Commissioner
Schafer.

    So we have a motion on the table to
approve PUD20-16.

    Is there any discussion?

    COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Madam Chairman.

    CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Gillespie.

    COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: As we knew -- know from
many recent hearings and from reading the paper, we
really need to add housing units, especially in that
part of the city. I strongly support the project. I
think it's a good addition to that part of Orchard
Street. And it sounds like the Applicant has done a
good job of working with the neighbors to improve the
access or maintain the access for everybody.

    CHAIRMAN STEAD: Any further discussion?

    Okay. Seeing none.

    ROLL CALL
CHAIRMAN STEAD: Will the clerk please call the vote.

THE CLERK: Stead.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Aye.

THE CLERK: Schafer.

COMMISSIONER SCHAFER: Aye.

THE CLERK: Squyres.

COMMISSIONER SQUYRES: Aye.

THE CLERK: Blanchard.

COMMISSIONER BLANCHARD: Aye.

THE CLERK: Mohr.

COMMISSIONER MOHR: Aye.

THE CLERK: Stevens.

COMMISSIONER STEVENS: Aye.

THE CLERK: Gillespie.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Aye.

THE CLERK: Bratnober.

COMMISSIONER BRATNOBER: Aye.

THE CLERK: All in favor. Motion carries.

(End transcription at 0:48:12 of audio file.)
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INTRODUCTION

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay. So we are moving on to Item No. 4. This is CAR20-5 and PUD20-13, Southpoint, LLC, at 9933 and 10151 West Victory Road.

First we will hear from staff. So the floor is yours, Mr. Holmes, and lovely to see you in person.

KEVIN HOLMES: Yes. It's not pulling up.

All right. Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission.

Before you is a request for the annexation of 19.6 acres located at 9933 and 10151 West Victory Road with an R-1B single-family, residential zoning; a conditional-use permit for an 18.5-acre planned residential development comprised of 67 single-family homes; and a preliminary plat comprised of 67 buildable lots and 6 common lots is included. The property shown here in red is located on the southwest corner of the intersection of Victory Road and Mitchell Street in Southwest Boise.

The property is located within the Boise City Area of Impact and has a Large Lot Land Use designation. Across Victory Road to the north lies
neighborhoods zoned R-1B, and to the east is a smaller
neighborhood with an R-1A zoning designation.
Properties to the south and west remain within Ada
County with a Southwest Community Residential zoning.

   All surrounding properties consist of
a -- of single-family, residential neighborhoods of
varying levels of density. As you can see here, lots
to the north generally are in the 7,000 to 10,000
square foot range. To the west are half-acre lots
which then increase in size as you leave areas annexed
into the city to the south and east, where properties
generally are around an acre. There are two existing
homes identified here in orange which are proposed to
be demolished, while the existing home in the
southwest corner is proposed to remain and be
incorporated into the new development.

   The proposed subdivision is accessed off
Mitchell Street with pedestrian and emergency
connections out to Victory Road and has a density of
3.61 units per acre, below the 4.8 units per acre
allowed in the R-1B zone. As you can see on the plat
here, smaller lots are proposed along Victory Road and
generally increase in size towards the south and west.

   This table here at the bottom shows the
Dimensional Standards associated with the requested
R-1B zoning and then what the Applicant is proposing with their PUD application. As you can see, minimum lot areas and widths, as well as interior and rear setbacks are all requested to be reduced. The 14 homes along the southern boundary, shown here highlighted in blue, are all requested -- excuse me -- are proposed to retain the typical Dimensional Standards of the R-1B zone, except for reduced interior side setbacks of 15 feet.

Okay. The planning team is generally supportive of these overall reductions with one recommended condition of approval to limit any homes built on the 14 southern lots to a single-story if they do utilize less than the 10-foot interior side setbacks typical of the R-1B zone. This would retain building patterns more consistent with the Large Lot Land Use designation, as well as to provide an appropriate transition to the neighborhood to the south.

The primary amenity provided to the subdivision, besides drought-tolerant plantings, is this central common lot, which is just a bit less than an acre in size and situated around an existing, open pond. Proposed improvements include a gravel walking path, seating areas, and a boulder play area. This
amenity does a good job in preserving existing, natural features and provides for a shared, open space for residents, both items which are called for in the Large Lot Land Use designation.

We do recommend that, to improve and increase the usability of this amenity, a couple modifications be made. These include reconfiguring the layout of the lot to include an ADA-accessible walking path on both the east and west sides of the pond to create a walkable loop for residents, potentially along lines of which shown here in red. It is recommended that this path will be buffered on either side by a minimum of 8 feet of clearance between the pond and any property lines to allow for the planting of additional trees or preferably the retention of existing trees.

So speaking of trees, as you can see in this aerial, the property does have a significant number of mature trees on it. While no Tree Mitigation Plan has been submitted, the Applicant has provided a breakdown of how many trees they anticipate removing with this development, as well as how many new trees will be planted.

So first I'd like to point out that the Applicant has agreed to retain the trees along the
southern property line to buffer the existing homes from this new development. This is fully supported by the planning team as -- and is an included condition of approval. Another recommended condition of approval that will increase the number of new trees is detaching the internal sidewalks within the development. This should add an estimated 70 or so new trees, as well as having the added benefit of increased pedestrian safety.

As detailed in the project report, the total number of trees is proposed to increase over the number of existing trees now on the property. So to verify these numbers, a recommended condition of approval includes the submittal of a Tree Mitigation Plan for review and approval prior to the issuance of any grading permits. You notice this condition was inadvertently left out of the project report. So if you agree that it is appropriate here, you will have to include it in any motion this evening.

The planning team has received a significant number of comments on this project since it was originally submitted in February. In general, these comments focused on the density of the development, impacts to local roadways, and effects to the irrigation and drainage facilities on the site, as
well as the preservation of rural, open space and the
two potentially historic buildings. These items were
all included in your project packet and late
correspondence, and I'm sure you'll hear about them
more in depth from those in attendance this evening.

In conclusion, as detailed in the project
report and highlighted in this presentation, the
planning team finds the Applicant's proposal to be
consistent with the standards of approval, including
the Development Code, Blueprint Boise, and
requirements of all reviewing agencies and
departments. As such, the planning team recommends
approval of the applications with conditions.

For your reference here, I've included
that recommended condition related to the tree
mitigation as well.

For PUDs, the Commission is the
decision-making body, and for annexations and
subdivision, it is the recommending body to City
Council.

Thank you, and I'll stand for any
questions.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you, Mr. Holmes.

Next we'll move on to the Applicant. If
we can first have the Applicant virtually raise their
hand.

Oh. We have got you all queued up. Hi again, Mr. Clark.

HETHE CLARK: Hi.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Please go ahead, and we'll start with ten minutes.

HETHE CLARK: Hi, everybody. I hope you missed me over the last ten minutes.

So Hethe Clark, 251 East Front Street, representing the Applicant and the Conger Group.

I'm going to turn on the screen share here and walk through our project. So has everyone got the screen up?

Great. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yes. Thank you.

HETHE CLARK: So we're here tonight to talk about the proposed Music community, which we would like to develop on 20 acres located at Victory Road and Mitchell. The community will include 67 residential units for a density of 3.61 units per acre.

While all required connectivity is provided, there are no stubs to this property, and that's something that will come up again later as we continue this conversation. That means that there are
no through roads. It largely functions independently.

Another item that I want to point out and that we'll come back to through the course of the project or the discussion tonight is the pond in the center area of the project that Kevin described to you.

I want to talk about a couple of highlights and then circle back on some items that have been raised by members of the public. So first we'll talk about some of the design themes. This is very much not a cookie-cutter-type subdivision. There's been a lot of thought put into that through the course of conversations with the seller, which includes the Dunkley family, and as you can imagine, that's where the name of the project comes from. In addition we've talked about -- I'll talk about some of the amenities, talk about the transition that's been proposed here, and then we'll talk about the trees as Kevin mentioned.

So first let's look at the theme of the project. The project will have a distinct look to it. One of our sellers -- again, the Dunkleys -- will be residing here and will be remaining in their own -- in their existing home, so there's a lot of thought that's been put into what this neighborhood's going to
look like while they continue to live there. We identified with them what they would like to see -- and that is a condition of our sale -- is a requirement that the product have this modern, farmhouse-type of look. One thing I'll point out, and this was an error in the application materials: There is no three-story product that's proposed. It is only two-story product. But this gives you an idea of what the project will look like through its development.

Next, with regard to community amenities, we do have 12.9 percent landscaped open space. Common areas are going to use drought-tolerant plantings and water-conserving sprinkler design. The type of sprinkler design that we use will result in 30 to 40 percent less water use. A major element of the project is the retention of the existing pond. We are in agreement with staff's condition, with regard to the pond, and we will add the pathway on the west side as staff has indicated. And then finally we do have a shade structure that will be included, as well as climbing boulders. So nice amenities for the future residents.

Now, this is infill development. And with infill, there are always challenges. In this case, we're dealing with older subdivisions on the south,
more recent subdivisions on the north, and a location
that's on the edge of two Comprehensive Plan
designations: Large Lot and Suburban.

So as Kevin mentioned, we do -- we did try
to lay out our largest lots on the south side of the
project with the goal of aligning the lot lines. And
then we increased the density to the north as you
reach up to the Victory minor arterial and the
boundary of the Large Lot and Suburban Comprehensive
Plan designations.

The choice of zoning R-1B is part of that
overall transition plan. As staff has mentioned, R-1B
is a permitted zone within the Large Lot designation.
It also matches the zoning designation to the property
immediately to the north. We're, again, talking about
property, also, that is on a significant
transportation corridor. So we think that the choice
of an R-1B designation and the density which is within
R-1B is appropriate.

I do want to continue this transition
discussion with some talk about the southern boundary.
We've given that a great deal of thought. That
southern boundary has a subdivision that's from the
late 1960s. We are not subject to the CC&Rs for that
project that restricts the lot sizes there.
This picture helps illustrate a couple of things: One, those houses are about 175 feet from our southern boundary; in addition, several of those homes are two-story. The zoning back there is RSW, which means they have a 25-foot rear setback. Ours is larger with a 30-foot rear setback.

As Kevin mentioned, in order to make that transition continue to work, we are proposing to keep this line of trees in place. So we think we've done a pretty admirable job of trying to transition from this County RSW subdivision into this City of Boise subdivision that meets the City's goals.

With regard to trees, we have engaged an arborist to review the trees based on what we've seen so far. We expect to be able to maintain more than 200 of the existing trees. As was mentioned, the trees on the southern boundary are also intended to remain, and that's also true of the trees around the pond where it's possible. In addition to that -- as you know, life -- trees have a definite lifespan. In order to bring in the new generation as it were, we will be planting our -- a number of new trees. The staff report cited a number of 297. That does not include new tree plantings in the backyards. That is only -- that only includes trees within the front
yards and in common areas.

   So let's talk about some of the concerns
   in the neighbor testimony. I -- what we saw was a lot
   of conversation about density, and I think I've tried
   to address that already with regard to the discussions
   about transition. The other items that we saw were
   concerns about transportation and traffic and
   conversation about retaining or documenting some of
   the existing homes.

   So with regard to traffic, ACHD has
   reviewed and approved this project. They looked at
   some of the neighbor concerns, and for example,
   determined that there was no signal warrant at Victory
   Road and Mitchell Street. And I also point out that
   the Applicant did not request and was not granted an
   approach onto Victory Road, the minor arterial. The
   only access which is appropriate is at Mitchell. In
   addition, the Applicant's required -- agreed to the
   required mitigation, including dedication of
   right-of-way along Victory and the addition of a
   left-turn lane from Mitchell Street to Victory Road.
   So we believe that the traffic concerns have been
   addressed per the ACHD report.

   With regard to the existing homes on the
   site, we are working with both sellers regarding
existing homes, so the Dunkley home is going to remain. The family's going to stay there, too.

With regard to the other homes, what we're talking about is the two structures that are up closer to Victory Road. Those homes are unique, but they're not historic, and we're unable to retain them for sale to third parties. The reasoning for that is that they are not built to current energy or electrical codes and there are structural deficiencies in those buildings.

With that said, the story of those buildings is important, and we're taking steps to honor that. The seller of that property continues to have ties to the family that built those homes, and we have an agreement with the seller to work on an interpretive plaque to be developed on the pond pathway to hopefully honor some of that. And then in addition, we are in agreement with the staff's condition to allow the Idaho State Historical Preservation -- or Idaho State Historical Society to come in and to document the buildings.

So with that, I'll wrap up.

There is one item that we would like the Planning and Zoning Commission to review in connection with the proposed staff conditions. As I mentioned
early on, this is an infill project. It does not have stubs from neighboring properties. We've provided all the connectivity that we can, and we meet the City's connectivity standards on that front, but to be clear, this is not a through situation. The only traffic coming into this project is going to be residents. We wouldn't ask this in a through situation, but in this case, we think that 5-feet, attached sidewalks are appropriate. It permits the homeowners to have larger rear yards, in other words, it -- requiring detached doesn't, in our view, have a real safety impact, and it comes at the cost of taking away what could be an additional 8 feet in each family's backyard.

So with that, I'd be happy to stand for questions. We do request approval with the single change to Condition 4, and happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you, Mr. Clark.

NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Before we go to questions from the Commission, we'll hear from the neighborhood association. In this case that's the SWACA.

Please start with your name and address, and we'll start with ten minutes.

MARISA KEITH: My name is Marisa Keith. I'm the
president of the Southwest Ada County Alliance Neighborhood Association, and I'm at 3279 South Cloverdale Road in Boise. Madam Chair, Commissioners, thank you for serving on this committee and being here tonight.

SWACA would first like to have on record that we object to this meeting format where not everyone has an opportunity to come to City hall in person and be present at the hearing. If not able to participate on Zoom, some people have been restricted to written comment only if they are concerned with venturing down to City Hall for health reasons during this pandemic.

So SWACA is requesting the following should this development be approved: We would like the zoning to be R-1A with minimum lot sizes of 20,000 square feet. This area is designated as a Large Lot on the Future Land Use Map. According to Blueprint Boise, Large Lot should feature homes on lots ranging from a half to one acre in size, typically one or two units per acre. At the very least, the majority of lots in this development should have a fourth of an acre or 10,890 square feet to comply with the Southwest Comprehensive Plan 1.7, which discusses transition to quarter-acre lots abutting existing
Large Lot developments.

Southwest Boise has thousands of small lots that have been approved and not yet built. This developer has at least 83 of these small lots already approved within a few miles of here. A few newer subdivisions provide transitional lot sizes and fewer, still, offer large lots, which is a desired feature for many people. SWACA maintains that larger lot sizes will be more compatible with the surrounding neighborhoods than will this current plat.

The trees, we would like the -- to preserve as many existing trees as possible, as stated on page 38 of the Southwest Community Comprehensive Plan. Removing almost all of these trees will significantly impact the tree canopy in Southwest Boise, it will destroy bird and wildlife habitat, reduce shade, increase temperature, and remove soil stabilization providing -- provided by root systems.

Although the developer has agreed to plant two trees per lot, most of the 150 or so mature trees are to be removed, and they should be replaced with trees of substantial size. A lot of HOAs in the area require at least 3-inch-caliper trees in their common areas.

Additionally, the staff states that the
trees along the south property line will not be
removed by the developer. However, there needs to be
some sort of protection so that the new homeowners
will not remove those trees once they move into the
new homes. The condition needs to have -- needs to
transfer to the new homeowners somehow and it needs to
be enforceable.

The laterals, NAs in other areas of Boise
have spent a lot of time in public hearings speaking
about the importance of keeping laterals daylighted.
Boise is spending time and money to open up waterways
that were buried long ago. Laterals create
microclimates for living things, watering holes for
wildlife, preserve the agricultural history of the
area, and maintain the rural characteristics of
Southwest Boise, which is discussed in depth in
Blueprint Boise. SWACA requests that the laterals
remain open.

As for the historic houses, the two houses
currently at 9933 are unique and historic to Southwest
Boise. Obviously not as old as houses in other parts
of town, but Southwest Boise has seen a lot of erasing
of our history over the last few years with the
demolition of barns, original farmhouses, tiling of
laterals, and bulldozing of farmlands. Southwest
Boise will never see the level of historic significance, at least in age, as other parts of town if we continue to allow our unique, original properties to be torn down at the current rate.

These two houses were built by twin sisters, Eileen Schrier and Elaine Allen, with architect brothers Art, Noel, and Lyle Cook. They were built using locally sourced building materials, some of which the sisters collected themselves. I included several articles about that in the letter that SWACA provided.

These houses do not enjoy any historical preservation since they are not in historical district. However, that doesn't mean that something cannot be done to protect and preserve them and incorporate them into the current development, particularly with the question of annexation and rezone.

The current owner has expressed to SWACA that saving the houses would financially impact how much money he could make off the land sale. SWACA was told by another neighbor that he would rather see the houses burn to the ground before they were -- they stay.

A few developers that have built
subdivisions in SWACA have kept the original houses, designed new subdivisions around them, fixed them up, refurbished them, added on if needed, and sold them. It can be done if there is a will and there's a desire to do it. I put examples of those farmhouses in our letter also.

Boise City Council has set a precedent of protecting housings that are not within historic districts when they passed an emergency ordinance in the summer of 2018 to prevent the demolition of a house on the corner of Main and 2nd. We are asking for the same consideration for the history of Southwest Boise.

The remainder of my time I am going to give to my board member, Jill Longhurst.

JILL LONGHURST: Thank you, Committee. I appreciate your time and I appreciate your willingness to consider our concerns about this. We all recognize that Boise has some unique character. We hear about the Foothills, we hear about Hyde Park, we hear about the Greenbelt, but those of us who live in Southwest Boise consider that our own little gem, and we don't talk about it because we like it the way it is. There is a beautiful part of this community that is unique. It is agricultural in nature, and those of us who live
there treasure that unique aspect of it.

Before I go any further, though, as a matter of housekeeping, I heard the developer say that he'd made a mistake in the application and he is now withdrawing his language about having three-story homes, and I wanted to make sure that the record was clear on that, that he is, in fact, withdrawing that request for three-story homes that was in the application.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: We can't answer questions at this time, but please put it on the record --

JILL LONGHURST: [Unintelligible] --

CHAIRMAN STEAD: -- and hopefully it'll be addressed later on.

JILL longhurst: -- for the record. Because that would be a shame for him to make that representation to you now and then come back later and say it was in my original application. I think that the homeowners there would take a lot of comfort in knowing that was actually made.

We have a brief PowerPoint that I'd like to talk about. Do you know how to start it as a PowerPoint?

Can I assist, Mr. Holmes, for just a -- there you go.
Can you give it a click.

So this started out with when we started as a neighborhood group meeting and talking about our concerns about this.

Can you [unintelligible] more.

And we were talking about what their actual requests were and --

Mr. Holmes, I'm sorry. You're going to have to click a little faster through this. This part was originally set up for me to talk through it.

And again, we are concerned about the public hearing on this. They're looking for, basically, a planned community --

CHAIRMAN STEAD: [Unintelligible] be on the mic.

JILL LONGHURST: Sorry,

-- planned community variances, they wanted a change in zoning, and they wanted annexation to Boise from what is, at this point, an Ada County property with a significant number of homes for the property.

To start with, I am concerned about the public hearing. Mr. Dunkley, who obviously has an interest in being here, as well as myself, as a board member, were both here and we walked around the entirety of the building trying to find our way in.
If these two people who have a concerned and very focused interest in being here today couldn't find their way in until a period of time had passed -- concerns me that other people who have an interest can't also be here and make record as public -- to a public hearing and open meeting format.

There is a provision within the Boise City Code that would allow you, without further notice, to continue this, and I'm asking the Court -- excuse me, the Committee to do this at this time so that people who do have an interest -- and we know that there are a lot of people who have concerns. We have a very large petition that has been signed -- have an opportunity to be heard on this, and they don't have to worry about their health risks or technology that they don't have access to or the ability to handle, and so I'm asking the Court -- or the Committee to consider that as well.

Here is the other part that I'd like you to actually take a specific consideration of: You are a quasi-judicial entity, as I understand that having practiced law for 30 years. This means you can make factual findings. I looked through the Boise City Code, and I found that they have already made factual findings on behalf of the City of Boise regarding
mature trees, and I cited these just because it's easy reference for you.

Okay. Next.

They talked about "establishing and maintaining the maximum amount of canopy coverage provided by trees for their functions as identified," as part of this. And part of this that I thought was really relevant is that, the development practice, we're to "encourage site and utility planning, building and development practices to prevent indiscriminate removal or destruction of trees, and avoid unnecessary disturbance to trees within the city and its area of impact."

Next.

This Comprehensive Plan is to "implement the goals and objectives of the City Comprehensive Plan," relating to the trees.

And finally there were findings -- and I'm sorry that apparently I've got "A" mixed up -- aesthetic value, protection costs, property values, air and water quality, reduction of adverse impacts, and wildlife.

For example, all of us who live as I do along this the northern border of Roan Meadows, we look out over their trees all the time, including my
own very large maple tree. There are birds of prey flying through there, we see fox, there was a wild turkey on my front porch recently, we have peacocks that are on the land at this time, skunk, there are -- there is one of our neighbors looking at a heron, a blue heron rookery issue that's concerning this property, we have a tremendous amount of wildlife.

The reduction of all these trees, not just the ones along the southern border of this property, has an impact on the entirety -- excuse me -- on the entirety of this area here. And I think that there has been no study and no consideration of that. And as a member of the boards that's already -- excuse me -- the Chairman of the board has already told you, there is no protection for any of us. If the developer doesn't remove them, there's no way to keep us from doing that. For me, personally, I have concerns about this because I know of an existing erosion issue that is not being addressed by any of the plans.

Right now this is the proposed development here.

Can you -- one more. One more.

If you look here, the two green lines
there show there are irrigation lines that currently are active. There were active as late as last Thursday, for my own line was running. My neighbor and I -- my property is the one with the red lines near it. That -- our water runs uphill.

[Unintelligible] do our flood irrigation.

There is a group -- a grove of trees, as you can see there, that were planted for soil stabilization. It keeps the water because this is on a grade running downhill toward the property that's proposed. It keeps it from running away. There are a number of these trees that are planted along laterals and other places with very developed root systems, developed canopies that are meant there to keep the soil stable. I have not seen anything that is going to tell us what exactly is going to go on when my property lets the water go over onto their side. There has been no identification of what the irrigation problem is, how they're going to mitigate that, or what the big concern is.

If you look where the red arrows are -- sorry. I have to turn my head so I can see that.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Sorry. We need you on the mic again --
JILL LONGHURST:  Sorry.

CHAIRMAN STEAD:  -- just so it's captured for record. And if you can throw your name and address in there, too, for the record.

JILL LONGHURST:  I'm Jill Longhurst, 9900 Roan Meadows.

If you look -- my property, after flood irrigation, goes downhill. It goes onto my neighbor's property, which is on Roan Meadows. Mr. Arrien's [phonetic] property, which is part of the subject of this land, also goes to the neighbor's property and goes off to another lateral and goes down. There's already been litigation, we've attained counsel, we've had problems with this because the neighbor has modified where the lateral goes in, where the water egresses. And there has been erosion issues that have been greatly concerning to Mr. Arrien and to myself. That matter has not been addressed.

If you look to the side -- this is Google Maps. This is nothing that any one of you couldn't do -- Mr. Landon's [phonetic] property is flooding. He attributes it to several things. There has been a hydrologist study related to this. One of the suggestions is that the Diamante Subdivision, which is directly across Mitchell from here, was not properly
drained as it comes down Mitchell, and that's causing the flooding issue. I don't how this Committee could say that this is not going to create adverse property problems to all of the Roan Meadows people whom -- we already see that this is going on.

So I was looking through the requirements of Idaho code. It said the irrigation system must be approved by the City Council or by the Planning and Zoning Committee. I -- this isn't -- there are remedies if it wasn't done in time, but it doesn't say "If you feel like it." It basically said we need to have clarification and details in order for us to approve that. I haven't seen anything that allows me to make a decision or to retain somebody to make a decision on my behalf who's expert that this isn't going to cause problems for me, the way this has been proposed.

The City Code itself talks about, "All natural drainage courses shall be left undisturbed or be improved in a manner that will improve the hydraulics." I haven't seen anything other than, "We're going to take care of that." I think we, as neighbors to this property, have a right to know -- how are we going to address this? Will this actually be an improvement or is this going to be
something that's going to be, "We're going to spend as little money as possible, we're going to get this resolved, we're going to get a lot of people in these houses, and we're going to move." I think we have know -- the ability to know, and this Council can require an easement under the Boise City Code that would prevent this from becoming a future problem and allow us to retain the farmers' laterals to keep them open or whatever you need to do relating to that.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you. That's your time.

JILL LONGHURST: Okay.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you.

So now we will move on to questions from the Commission for the neighborhood, the staff, or the Applicant, please.

COMMISSIONER SQUYRES: Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Squyres.

COMMISSIONER SQUYRES: Hi. This question is for staff.

Kevin, can you talk to the irrigation issue and when that review will happen with the City so that way the neighbors have some sort of clue as to what that timing might be.

KEVIN HOLMES: Yes, Madam Chair, Commissioner Squyres.
So the irrigation requirements are reviewed under the Boise Project Border Control, and so we do have a letter that is included in the project report as a condition that they have to follow all of their requirements. And it does state that all drainage and existing irrigation facilities do have to be maintained, and if an easement needs to be put in place, it needs to be put in place. So from staff's perspective that should cover some of those concerns.

COMMISSIONER SQUYRES: Follow-up, Mr. --

follow-up, Madam Chairman.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yeah, Commissioner Squyres, please.

COMMISSIONER SQUYRES: So, Kevin, that would occur typically with the final plat?

KEVIN HOLMES: Madam Chair, Commissioner Squyres, yes. It would occur through both of the platting processes.

COMMISSIONER SQUYRES: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Madam Chairman.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Gillespie.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Just a follow-up on Commissioner Squyres' question.

So would -- so obviously the grading of the site has -- is very important for the drainage and
irrigation plan. So -- this is just a procedural question: So does the City have to approve and deal with these issues before or after the issuance of a grading permit? Because how do they do it if they don't have a grading permit, I guess is my question?

KEVIN HOLMES: Madam chair, Commissioner Gillespie, it's my understanding that after the preliminary plat, the process would be approved. They would submit for grading or drainage -- or permits related to grading and drainage at that point in time, both City staff would review it, as well as irrigation facility entities.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Great. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BRATNOBER: Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Bratnober.

COMMISSIONER BRATNOBER: Another question on irrigation.

As I understand it, there is some level of approval that is needed from whoever the responsible person is, which is defined as this company, water uses association, water right holder, et cetera.

Do you know if this has been done, Kevin?

KEVIN HOLMES: Madam Chair, Commissioner Bratnober, typically these things are done after the preliminary plat has been approved. The Applicant
will then submit any plans for review to the, you
know, for example, lateral associations for the review
and approval.

COMMISSIONER BRATNOBER: So that would happen
before any planned-unit development, subdivision, and,
you know, those kinds of things happen -- or
applications happen?

KEVIN HOLMES: Correct. That would happen
before a final plat and/or any construction permits
are issued.

COMMISSIONER BRATNOBER: Okay.

Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Bratnober.

COMMISSIONER BRATNOBER: I have another set of
questions on it -- a different topic.

So as I look at the lot sizes and compare
them to the surroundings, at the north you have some
that are -- what is it -- 7 to 10,000 -- actually it's
closer to 8,000 is the minimum, as I've done some
checking on those -- and then half-acre south.

I'm trying to understand. We have an R-1B
zoning proposal, but if you look at a substantial
number of those lots, their sizes and some of the
setbacks really tend to approximate what you'd see in
an R-1C subdivision.
So I'm wondering if there's a -- I don't know -- a structural reason or something why those units have to be packed that densely, basically contrary to the surroundings, short of, "Well, we need -- we want to accommodate this many units." I'm curious as to why they're not going with something that at least comes in at the 9,000 square foot R-1B specification and the associated setbacks.

HETHE CLARK: Madam Chair, this is Hethe Clark, again, 251 East Front Street.

So the thought process there, Commissioner Bratnober, really focuses a lot on the fact that this is not in the middle of Large Lot in a sea of half-acre, one-acre lots. There are some larger lots on the south in an older subdivision, but this is a project that is truly -- it is at the intersection of the Large Lot and the Suburban densities, right along Victory Road, and the lots immediately across the street are very similar in size here. So the idea was to have a project that is infill that does try to transition away from the larger lots on the south to the arterial and the other -- the smaller lots on the north.

COMMISSIONER BRATNOBER: Thank you, Mr. Clark.

Madam Chair.
CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Bratnober.

COMMISSIONER BRATNOBER: But as I look at it, the proposal for many of those lots is 5,000 square feet, whereas you look to the north, I believe there are some that come in around 7,900, but most of them are above 8,000. So there's not really a match in that regard. You're going from approximately 8,000 -- 8 to 10,000 -- let's say 7 to 10,000 down to 5 and then back up to very large lots. That does not seem to jive.

Thank you.

HETHE CLARK: Madam Chair, Commissioner Bratnober, I think what you're describing north of Victory Road is essentially what we're talking about here as well. Those lots get larger as they move away from Victory Road. They get smaller as they get closer to the transportation corridors, and we're trying to accomplish the same thing.

COMMISSIONER BRATNOBER: Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Bratnober.

COMMISSIONER BRATNOBER: Understood. But when I did checking on those lots, they came in pretty close to 8,000 feet, and many of them were over 8,000 feet so -- and those are the lots close to -- I -- what is it? Victory Road there. So I just want that to be
noted.

    Thank you.

    COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Madam Chairman.

    CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Gillespie.

    COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: So just to follow up on what Jim is talking about, I guess the simplest way to phrase it for the City, just to answer Kevin, is, you know, they've asked for R-1B zoning. I think R-1B zoning is appropriate. It's a good transition match. So then the question, I think, Jim is trying to get to is, why don't we just stick to the R-1B zoning requirements for lot size for all the lots in this subdivision, which would make -- you know, which would probably reduce somewhat some of the -- it would reduce the number of lots because the lots in the very center of it are, you know, not conforming to the R-1B street frontage and -- I don't know. I don't know the dimensional standard.

    But you get the point is, why don't you we just stick with, "Okay. You can have all R-1B zoning for the whole property, but you have to stick to the R-1B setback and size requirements." What's the City's -- why is it in the public interest not to do that, I guess?

    KEVIN HOLMES: Madam Chair, Commissioner
Gillespie, while that certainly would be within your discretion, the ability to retain some of the -- for example, the open pond feature in the middle with open space is part of the PUD request, which goes along with those reduced Dimensional Standards.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: So -- for Commissioner Bratnober and everybody, so --

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Gillespie.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Thank you.

What I think -- what Kevin is really trying to say is, in this case, the answer is the public interest is being served, and we're trading some smaller lots to preserve that pond because -- and the trees and -- you know, and whatever else. So that's the public interest weighing that's being done here. Because as I understand the law, Kevin, I mean, the Applicant would be within their rights to eliminate that pond and, you know, all the trees. They -- I mean, there's no requirement that they keep those amenities. Those amenities are there in order to compensate for having these substandard R-1B lots. If that -- that's the trade-off, Jim, that I think is being made.

HETHE CLARK: Madam Chair.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: But does City agree
with that? Let me just see.

KEVIN HOLMES: Madam Chair, Commissioner Gillespie, that -- I would agree with those statements. Yes.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Stevens.

COMMISSIONER STEVENS: Thank you. A couple of things.

Just to -- and, Kevin, I'm going to ask you to confirm this, but just because -- even if the Commission decides to zone the whole thing R-1B and maintain the Dimensional Standards doesn't mean that the Applicant can just wholesale wipe out that pond. We still -- they still have to meet -- because they're being annexed because there's also an annexation and a rezone. And they also need to meet a set of findings for that. So I don't want us -- I mean, correct me if I'm wrong. Am I right, Kevin?

KEVIN HOLMES: Commission -- Madam Chair, Commissioner Stevens, you are correct. Yes. There are other applications that would have those --

COMMISSIONER STEVENS: Okay.

So I just -- I don't want anybody on the Commission to think that we -- you know, we saved the pond by doing what's in front of us today or we lose the pond. I think it's not that black and white.
And then I guess, at a very basic level, I just wanted to confirm for the record, Kevin, that -- in our Comp Plan, I wanted to have you tell us what Large Lot means. I know that the neighborhood association told us from their reading of the Comp Plan, but I just wanted to confirm that, for the record, so can you tell us what Large Lot means in that designation in the Comp Plan for this property.

KEVIN HOLMES: Madam Chair, Commissioner Stevens. There's -- I thought -- you know, a whole table that goes into the standards that go along with Large Lot. I think, in the case of an annexation like this one, one of the first things that we look at is the zonings that are appropriate that go along with it, one of which is the R -- the requested R-1B zoning designation.

COMMISSIONER STEVENS: So just to clarify and confirm then, a 9,000-square-foot lot, as is defined in R-1B, does qualify under what's called "Large Lot," because it is one of the zones that's permitted in that Large Lot designation, correct?

KEVIN HOLMES: Madam Chair, Commissioner Stevens, you are correct.

COMMISSIONER STEVENS: Okay.

Madam Chair.
CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER STEVENS: May I pursue a different line of questioning?

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Please.

COMMISSIONER STEVENS: Okay. This is also for staff.

Kevin, with regard to the sidewalks, if we do follow staff's recommendation and require detached sidewalks, won't that inherently reduce the size of the lots even further?

KEVIN HOLMES: Madam Chair, Commissioner Stevens, it does have the potential to do that, but the right-of-way width could increase. On the other hand, the sidewalks could be included within an easement along the right-of-way, as well.

COMMISSIONER STEVENS: Okay.

And, Madam Chair, I don't -- I may as well get through a few of them, since I'm on, if that's okay with you.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yes, please, Commissioner Stevens.

COMMISSIONER STEVENS: Okay. I wanted to ask about a couple of other things.

I just wanted to understand with regard to traffic and get this on record. Right now Victory
Road is already beyond what ACHD considers to be acceptable. Is the reason that they and the City are recommending approval of this because there is no egress onto -- ingress or egress onto Victory Road from this, since we're really only looking at Mitchell? And if so, then why does Victory show up in our table and why are we looking at that?

KEVIN HOLMES: Madam Chair, Commissioner

Stevens, I don't want to speak for ACHD, but I can try to interpret what I've also read in their staff report. The Mitchell Street access is -- it's, you know, the only access that ACHD will allow. And we do look at Victory because it will be impacted. And they mentioned in their staff report, ACHD does, that Victory is already overcapacity, as you said, but it is within their policies that this would have a low enough amount of impact during the peak traffic time that they are allowed to approve it.

And now while they don't say this directly in their project report, it is worth noting that Victory is planned on being widened in the relative near future within the 2021 to 2025 timeframe, and then at that point in time, it will become a five-lane with a turn lane. So four lanes, turn lane, and bike lanes, as well. So that could have some impact into
why they feel comfortable approving this under their policies.

COMMISSIONER STEVENS: Okay.

So totally unfair question to you, because you probably -- you may not know the answer, but is ACHD on track right now with the COVID and everything? Has anything changed in their Capital Improvement Plan? And again, totally unfair question to you, because you don't work for them, but maybe you know.

KEVIN HOLMES: Madam Chair, Commissioner Stevens, I personally have not heard any disruptions. In fact, some of their projects have been moving forward a little bit quicker because there is less traffic to deal with as they do their work.

COMMISSIONER STEVENS: Okay. Okay.

And then, Madam Chair, I just have one other line of questioning if -- but I'm happy to let somebody else go first if --

CHAIRMAN STEAD: That's okay, Commissioner Stevens, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER STEVENS: Okay.

With regard to the addition of a condition for a Tree Mitigation Plan, I was just hoping that you, Kevin, could explain what would be -- how staff would look at that and what the findings are that
would permit approval of that. So, like, when staff
looks at a Tree Mitigation Plan, what are they looking
at to say "Yes" or "No"?

KEVIN HOLMES: Madam Chair, Commissioner

Stevens, typically when we look at a Tree Mitigation
Plan, we'll look at caliper inches. And in this case,
I think we know -- and there is no requirement with
these applications to match caliper inches to caliper
inches. In this case, we've reviewed the information
that the Applicant has provided to us for the
estimated amount of trees to be removed and the
estimated amount of new trees, and it sounds like that
that equation has actually gotten better just in the
time that we packaged this report and today. So from
our perspective, we would look at any Tree Mitigation
Plan that came through and just kind of use that as a
trust [unintelligible] or [unintelligible] mechanism
for the information that we already have.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you.

I actually have a quick tree question if I
can scoot it in.

Can we speak specifically to the idea of
requiring homeowners to keep the trees on the
property? Is that something that has -- you in your
recolletion has been done before or is something
that's within our jurisdiction?

KEVIN HOLMES: Madam Chair, I've never run across anything where we've been able to, as a municipality, to restrict a homeowner's ability to trim their own trees on their private property. Theoretically something like that could be included in CC&Rs, for example, but that would be a little bit outside the purview, even though we do typically review what goes into a CC&R.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SCHAFER: Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Schafer.

COMMISSIONER SCHAFER: Just a point of clarification with staff, too, on the Tree Mitigation Plan.

In addition to caliper inches, which is certainly part of the study, you also take a look at species, health, and if there are any historic or significant trees on the property that are worth saving; is that correct?

KEVIN HOLMES: Madam Chair, Commissioner Schafer, that is correct. Yes.

COMMISSIONER SCHAFER: Okay. Thanks.

And I -- Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Schafer.
COMMISSIONER SCHAFER: Just one other follow-up point.

Earlier on in the conversation regarding the irrigation, I think there might have been some confusion regarding the Applicant and whether or not they've already spoken with some of the appropriate agencies, and there is correspondence. So I just want the record to be clear that the Applicant has spoken with Nampa-Meridian Irrigation District in regards to the lateral on the property. So that conversation has already begun, correct?

KEVIN HOLMES: Madam Chair, Commissioner Schafer, they have -- yes. There is correspondence in there with Nampa-Meridian Irrigation District, even though they are solely responsible for the farmer's lateral, which is in that northern part of that property.

COMMISSIONER SCHAFER: Okay. Okay. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER BRATNOBER: Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Bratnober.

COMMISSIONER BRATNOBER: Thank you.

So thanks to Commissioner Gillespie and Commissioner Stevens for accurately summarizing what I was going to say or what I was trying to say.

So with respect to the Signal Warrant
Analysis -- this is for Kevin. I noticed that that was done in 2017, and a lot has gone by and plus we're talking about a fairly significant development going in. Is it your feeling that that's valid and up to date in terms of the signal needs? It's -- let's see. It's the Victory Road and Mitchell analysis.

KEVIN HOLMES: Madam Chair, Commissioner

Bratnober, I don't really feel comfortable questioning the ACHD staff and their expertise with regards to their staff report.

COMMISSIONER BRATNOBER: Okay, but they gave no indication that this should be updated or anything like that.

Thank you.

KEVIN HOLMES: Madam Chair, Commissioner

Bratnober, no.

HETHE CLARK: Madam Chair, I might be able to add something to that.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yes. Please go ahead,

Mr. Clark.

HETHE CLARK: And without also -- like Kevin, I'm loath to speak for ACHD, but the report does indicate that that was revisited again in 2018 with regard to a pedestrian crossing at the intersection, and ACHD indicated that they will continue to monitor
that. So I'm comfortable with -- you know, we want to see an intersection that functions for our residents. You know, we're -- that's not something that we look at lightly, and so we're confident in the steps that ACHD has taken on that front.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Madam Chairman.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Gillespie.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: A question for the folks from the neighborhood association, for Marisa and Jill.

I'll wait until you -- so you both testified that the simple numbers -- the density itself you didn't think was compatible or that would create a hardship and that you both wanted -- or that Jill wanted an R-1A zone and a 20,000-square-feet minimum. What exactly is the hardship or the difficulty of having R-1B lots or the lot size that they proposed? I'm not -- I don't quite understand. How does that adversely affect the neighbors, having more houses on that piece of property?

JILL LONGHURST: Mr. Commissioner, are you addressing that to me or to Marisa?

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Either one of you.

MARIISA KEITH: Both of us?

I'll -- I can state my opinion, and you
can state yours.

I think that there are a number of reasons for that. One is just an increase in the number of people that are coming to a neighborhood that's traditionally been rural, more kids in the schools, more cars on the streets. It's not an area that is walkable. It's not bikable. Everybody's going to be driving a car.

The other issue is when you have -- go from one backyard neighbor or two backyard neighbors, in this case, the Dunkley house and Mr. Arrien's house, and now all of a sudden you have 14 back neighbors, it does cause some issues as far as privacy. And these are still rural areas. They are farming areas. They have ag animals, they have roosters, they have cows, they butcher on their property, and having the -- an increase of people that perhaps are not used to that sort of thing or not as tolerant of that can cause difficulties for the people that live there.

I myself have had phone calls from people asking when the neighborhood association is going to get rid of the cows in the subdivision next door -- or next door to a subdivision out in the Area of Impact because they don't like the flies that the cows bring
to the neighborhood. And so it does -- there is -- it does cause friction that way.

Do you have any further reply?

JILL LONGHURST: Additionally I would say those of us --

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Sorry. If you can just start with your name again.

JILL LONGHURST: I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: [Unintelligible].

JILL LONGHURST: Jill Longhurst again.

Ms. Shaw [phonetic] and I have both -- have had horses while we've been on these properties. A number of those places have had horses, and we're asking to abut to three different neighbors that have these tiny, tiny lots. When you say that they're -- they are similar nature, they're not. Those are significantly smaller lots than even those on the other side, which are in Boise City in the Carolina Place Subdivision. They're smaller than the Diamante lot that was only recently approved by the City, and they're smaller than everything that we're talking about going toward the south and to the west. So we're talking about, essentially, three houses to the back of my one lot and my narrow, long acreage lot.
In addition to that, I have for more than 20 years turned onto Mitchell Street and then right onto Victory to get to work. I am now at the point where I am waiting for four or five or six cars to find a way to get to Victory, which is overflowing and flooded, and you're asking, between my house on Roan Meadows and Victory Road, for another 67, 68 homes, which could be two homes with cars or teenagers or whomever else drives. So there could be much more than two or three cars per home already getting there before me. I'm already having struggles to get onto Victory, and you're asking to add that many additional lots.

That density is just simply not sufficient for this area. This is a much more densely populated area, and it does not fairly compare when you say they're similarly sized. They're not.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STEVENS: Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Stevens.

COMMISSIONER STEVENS: This is another question for Kevin.

I wanted to go back to the lot size -- Large Lot designation, and ask if we, as a Commission, approve a subdivision whose lots are
almost half that size, do we still comply with the Comp Plan?

KEVIN HOLMES: Madam Chair, Commissioner Stevens, in many ways we still do. The Comp Plan is a guiding document, and we do have the PUD process on the books to make exceptions for what, maybe, you would find in the Comp Plan or Dimensional Standards and Code. So it stands to reason that the PUD process is the appropriate manner to which -- if you were going to go against the guidance -- maybe not go against, but deviate from the guidance of the Comprehensive Plan, this is the appropriate manner to do so.

HETHE CLARK: Madam Chair, could I add to that?

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yes. Go ahead, Mr. Clark.

HETHE CLARK: And Madam Chair and Commissioner Stevens, the -- just the points that I would emphasize there is an R-1B is certainly -- it's explicitly an approved zone within the Large Lot designation, and you can get up to 4.8 units per acre within R-1B. We're at 3.61. The -- and I do want to emphasize that the PUD process, and I was going to jump in earlier, and maybe I'll just make this point now -- that the PUD process is, by definition, there to allow for some
creativity to preserve or to create different
amenities that might not be able to be preserved
otherwise. So in this case, the use of the PUD allows
us to move those lots around and allow for
preservation of that pond and create another amenity
while we're still in, I think, substantial conformance
with the lot sizes to our north. So just a couple
extra thoughts there.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Madam Chairman.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Gillespie.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Just -- so -- just back
onto the lot size.

So all that -- there's 14 lots along the
southern boundary; is that correct?

KEVIN HOLMES: That -- Madam Chair, Commissioner
Gillespie, that is correct.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: And do each of those
lots conform to the RnB -- R-1B size requirements?

KEVIN HOLMES: Madam Chair, Commissioner
Gillespie, they do except for in one regard, which
would be the requested interior side setbacks, which
depending on -- there's an added -- recommended added
condition in there that if the homes built on those 14
lots utilize less than the 10-foot interior side
setback that is typical of R-1B, that they be limited
to one story in height. The original -- the Applicant
originally asked for all homes to -- regardless of
story size, to be able to utilize the reduced
five-foot setback.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SCHAFER: Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Schafer.

COMMISSIONER SCHAFER: This may be a question --

I'm going to throw this question at the Applicant.

Along that same area you're proposing to
keep the existing trees along that southern boundary
line, do you have an estimate on the height of those
existing trees?

HETHE CLARK: Madam Chair, Commissioner Schafer,
I don't have an exact height, but let me -- I have a
slide that I used in my presentation that might help
illustrate that, so let me pull that up.

So they are not insignificant. This is
the overhead using Google Earth looking at about a
45-degree angle back at the shops at -- many of which
are two-way -- or excuse me, two stories. So they're
fairly significant trees. As part of our study we
will be looking at, you know, ensuring that we can
make sure that those remain healthy. You know, a lot
of them trees throughout the project, you know, may be
meeting -- nearing the end of their lifecycle, but we
expect to preserve those.

And let's see. You know, with -- I think
it would be good for me to just jump in real quick on
that issue of private CC&R and requiring
individuals -- individual homeowners to maintain. I
think that would be pretty difficult. We can -- I
personally draft CC&Rs all over the valley. I've
never seen an example of a CC&R that said that someone
can't cut down a tree if it's diseased or aged, and so
I see that as being difficult, but this Applicant is
committed to preserving those trees on that south
boundary line.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Madam Chairman.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Gillespie.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Hethe, just to
follow-up on that, just sort of to brainstorm.

What about -- is it possible or would you
consider putting, like, a 10- or 15-foot landscape
buffer, that buffer where those trees are into a
common lot that the HOA would then maintain so that
you've got it -- you know, that those trees in the --
were in a long, narrow common lot across the -- I
don't know if you can see me, Hethe, so I'm just doing
this throughout the -- you know, so that the trees, in
a sense, became an amenity or, you know, like the HOA
common area that they maintain. So then the CC&Rs
could provide for the, you know, the ongoing
maintenance of that buffer, which I think is pretty
important to some of those folks to the south.

    HETHE CLARK: Mr. Chair -- or Madam Chair,
Commissioner Gillespie, you know, certainly open to
considering the various alternatives, as we're just
kind of spit-balling right now. Some of the things
that I can see as being -- having a -- being difficult
to overcome would be that -- you know, how wide would
that common lot be in order to make sure that it can
be, you know, patrolled safely and maintained by the
HOA. And then you're shrinking up the lots at that
point on the other side of them so, you know -- and
then we've got 30-yard -- 30-foot rear yard setbacks
as well, so that's shrinking those lots pretty
significantly.

    And if we're thinking about transitions,
you know, granted I see that -- your point that that
does have -- serve a dual purpose as also being a
transition, but it would generally shrink up those
lots pretty significantly, and, I think, create some
maintenance headache for HOA because those are large
trees. If they have to be felled, that's a pretty narrow area to do it in.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Yeah. Mm-hmm.

That's...

COMMISSIONER STEVENS: Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Oh, Commissioner Stevens.

COMMISSIONER STEVENS: Hi. I had a question for Hethe and Mr. Conger.

There has been a lot of discussion about laterals in the valley over the last several years. And the, you know -- there's definitely a move by, not just Boise but kind of all over the country, to daylight these facilities that have been buried for, you know, over 100 years. And I'm just curious, I mean -- you know, the location of this particular lateral is obviously right smack through the middle of several of the lots that you have platted, but I'm just wondering if you and/or the Applicant has given any thought to how you might keep some of it daylighted. I don't know that you can keep the whole thing daylighted and keep the -- keep, you know, a subdivision there, but have you considered any of that when you read the concerns of the neighbors? You know, what kind of discussions happened offline that you can share with us when you talked about that?
HETHE CLARK: Sure. Thank you for the question, Commissioner Stevens.

So I have prepared -- we prepared a slide because we have been thinking about this issue. So the slide that you have on your screen, the area that has the red hashing is the portion of the farmer's lateral that is already tilled or covered up. It was covered up on this property within the last five or ten years; is that right? So the area that would be covered up is the area only here on the Dunkley property on the west side, so it's only about 400 feet. It is not daylighted, you know, it obviously -- I think it goes back across Victory at that point and it is covered as well.

So, you know, we get -- and I understand where you're coming from, Commissioner Stevens. The thought process was, you know, the best way to have that type of amenity was to preserve the pond. The pond is not fed by the lateral. It's fed by drainage. It's fed by other surface rights, so we're confident that we can do that. And we would intend to go with that approach to address the concern that you raised.

COMMISSIONER SCHAFER: Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Schafer.

COMMISSIONER SCHAFER: This is for the
Applicant, Hethe, to follow up on that line of questioning.

The neighborhood association brought up several concerns regarding grades and drainage along that south property line as well. Can you give us some insight into conversations you've had regarding to the -- regarding those problems and how you guys intend to address some of those issues.

HETHE CLARK: Madam Chair, Commissioner Schafer, so as you're probably aware, you know, with regard -- when we do any of these projects -- and when I say "we" I mean anyone in the development community -- there is a requirement of a grading and drainage plan that has to be done and usually that starts -- that process, the grading process, can start after a pre-plat. We will have to go through and specifically look at any of those issues, and I expect that, you know, based on the fact that this has probably not been engineered before, that any of those issues will be addressed through that process. And we -- you know, we work regularly with Public Works on that, and we expect that that will be taken care of.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Any final questions from the Commission?

PUBLIC TESTIMONY
CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay. We will now move on to
the public testimony.

A couple of housekeeping items for people
here in person: There are wipes up here, so feel free
to wipe down the podium if you'd like to. You're also
welcome to remove your mask while you're speaking if
that's helpful for you.

And then we'll start with everybody in
this room that would like to speak before we move on
to the virtual attendees. For everybody, please start
with your name and address and each person will have
three minutes.

We'll start first with -- I'll read the
first three or four people and so if we can keep it
moving with the people in the room -- either move up
to one of the front seats if you're not -- so we can
keep things moving along.

So first up will be Julianne and then
Misty Daniels and then Tracy and then Ted Price.

JULIANNE SHAW: Thank you, Madam Chairman,
Commissioners. My name is Julianne Shaw. I live at
9950 West Roan Meadows Drive.

The one thing that we need to be aware of
with the trees -- we all love the trees -- is that
they're fed by an irrigation lateral -- well, ditch.
I guess it's just a surface ditch. That needs to continue. If the waters stop, the trees will die. We have parallel surface ditches on the north side and the south side of that fence line and that tree line, so that's something. And I mean, yes, retain the trees, but don't stop the water or there's no point.

Another thing I would like to point out is I've been working with Idaho Fish and Game in regards to the wildlife there. It's not -- that area's not designated as a great blue heron rookery, but we've had great blue herons there for 30 years. Beautiful. Watch them come in over that tree line.

Also the tree line is a landmark for the airport. When -- in 1990 when the Blue Angels were here, they used that tree line as a landmark to turn and land. It's pretty cool to see them come over those trees.

Okay. The single-level homes suggested on the 14 southern lots is backward. They can build a three-story or a four-story or whatever the heck they want to if they're farther than 10 feet from the property line. If they're less than 10 feet from the property line, they have to be a single story. It's kind of written backwards; it's not cognitive.

The point being that all the surrounding
areas have single-level, ranch-like development. They were made for ranchettes to be able to have your cow. We still have folks who have cows back there, and they're butchered back there. So you've got to keep in mind the agricultural aspect and the residential aspect. And it's not that we don't want people coming and enjoying that area. We do, but we don't want them getting upset because somebody butchered their cow in the backyard. That's part of that integration.

I thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you.

Next is Misty Daniels followed by Tracy Price.

MISTY DANIELS: Good evening, Madam Commissioner, Commissioners. First of all, Misty Daniels. I live at 9957 Roan Meadows Drive, and I want to thank you all for hearing our comments tonight. I destroyed my notes because everyone's talked about everything I wanted to talk about, but I did notice some key points that I just wanted to bring out.

A little introduction of myself: My husband and I have lived here for 22 years. We moved here from a big city -- asphalt, concrete, buildings, stagnant heat, that's what happens when you take out
all of the open water and put in asphalt and concrete.

        Sorry.

We moved to Boise because it is one of the most popular cities to live in in the nation because of its diversity, and that's what brought my husband and I here: Its diversity in activities, climates, and housing options. We have the beautiful North End to downtown Boise, southeast Boise, and the semi-rural and rural areas. The diversity is precisely what brings new families to our great city. We need to work to keep Boise's properties diverse.

        The developer states in his application under "Justification" that "Boise is changing rapidly and this area has a need for additional housing. With that in mind, the proximity to services makes this prime -- this area prime for single-family, residential development." I do agree that Boise is growing, and it's continuing to grow. However, it is the responsibility of the citizens of Idaho and the Planning and Zoning Commission to mindfully review the growth.

        Currently there are many lots, as stated previously, that are not built on, sitting empty. I think we need to start building on the empty lots, instead of continuing to approve the demolition of
these beautiful lots that we have.

We need to start focusing on smart growth
for Boise, including a range of housing opportunities
for our current and new residents. We have a lot of
diversity in our neighborhoods, including, as I said,
the North End, southeast Boise, and our semi-rural and
rural areas. It is important that we keep the
diversity of Idaho available for those who are moving
here for exactly that reason.

The application reads and -- the
application read "3.7 houses per acre." I believe the
gentleman stated it was 3.61 houses per acre, but if
you actually base the number of houses on the lot
sizes and not the streets, the common areas, the
sidewalks, you are actually looking at 5.5 houses per
acre.

If you look at the overhead map shown of
the density of that area as has been a concern, I
think, brought up with many questions from the
Commissioners, you can see that it does not transition
well. Victory Road plays a great segue into the more
dense areas across Victory --

THE CLERK: Time.

MISTY DANIELS: -- as opposed to the semi-rural
area on the other side of Victory.
CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you so much.

MISTY DANIELS: Thank you very much. Have a good night.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Next we have Tracy Price followed by Ted Price and then Darrin Daniels.

TRACY PRICE: Okay. You got your pictures up there?

My name is Tracy Price, and I'm at 9901 West Roan Meadows Drive. And, Madam Chair and Commissioners, I want you to know that I've agreed with what's already been said by my neighbors and also SWACA. I would like to address how this new subdivision will adversely affect my semi-rural lifestyle.

Not too long ago I witnessed the birth of a foal, and there's a video if we can get to the video that says "Foal Video." And there's pictures of various different animals and the lifestyle of where we currently live at. I also raise a beef cow every year, and the mobile butcher comes to get the steer each fall.

I love this unique area because of the rural lifestyle within the city county limits. I see all sorts of wildlife including ducks, geese, turkeys, blue herons, rabbits, and even skunks. My neighbors
even have horses, pigs, burros, and other animals, goats included. I love seeing my neighbors ride the horses down our street, but that has decreased significantly with the increase of traffic and the high-density neighborhoods going in around us.

I would also like to address traffic concerns — and I think there's some pictures there of traffic — that would adversely affect me because of the proposed increased-density housing, since I live on Roan Meadows Drive. With increasing density, as proposed by the Music Subdivision, it would greatly increase the traffic on Mitchell to get to the congested Victory Road. Traffic on Mitchell increased when Arabian Way connected to Mitchell Street and then the Diamante Subdivision. And there's the photos of the traffic, so like 5:00, 6:00 p.m.

This new subdivision would only increase the traffic further. And I'm specifically concerned by what Daryl Degrange [phonetic] stated in the project report, which is that in order for those who -- that need to make a left-hand turn to go onto westbound on Victory Road, the drivers would need to divert off of Mitchell Street and travel down Roan Meadows to get to Five Mile, creating as much as 300 vehicles in a ten-hour period, which would greatly
affect my lifestyle.

ACHD also -- when I called and talked to them about getting a study, they said that since the subdivision was, like, under 100 homes, they did not designate needing to check that, but they also included the other three, the subdivisions that went in. They were all under 100 homes, so there's not been a recent study done with the cumulative effect of all those subdivisions.

Finally I'd like to address inconsistencies within the Music Subdivision proposal and in the project report that would affect my lifestyle, because the homes may not be similar or compatible. They state that the type of homes would be compatible for the area, but they are comparing the homes all the way across the large, high-traffic road of Victory, not the areas closest to the impact, and they are affected by -- that are affected by the proposed subdivision. To me, compatible means similar and of same mind. When Music Subdivision mentions that they will be providing a housing type that currently doesn't exist and one- to three-story homes, this is not compatible to our area.

Our homes are all single level, split entry, or two levels, which may include a basement.
And I've got pictures of homes as well in the area.

THE CLERK: Time.

TRACY PRICE: In the newest subdivision Diamante [unintelligible] --

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you. I'm sorry.

TRACY PRICE: [Unintelligible].

CHAIRMAN STEAD: That's the end of your time.

TRACY PRICE: All right.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Next we have Ted price followed by Darrin Daniels.

TED PRICE: Thank you.

My name is Ted Price. I live at 9901 Roan Meadows Drive.

The only concerns I have has been the trees and the stabilizing effect that the root systems are -- maintain there. If you look at those trees, those trees are not random. Those were put in there in a very specific pattern, and it's my opinion -- I don't -- I wasn't there -- I wasn't involved in the layout, but those trees were put in with a specific pattern in mind that is not random whatsoever.

And I just want to emphasize, while all is -- all works fine normally under these irrigation systems, I've lived there long enough to know that, in the spring in particular, sometimes you get more
water, sometimes you get less. And I just am concerned that that water is going to end up creating an impact to somebody and something that is not under a normal condition.

One other thing I just want to go on record of saying is several years ago, at the corner of Mitchell and Victory, on this property there was a significant amount of infill brought in. And while this is fine for the -- it maintains the property flat where it's currently at -- and I haven't ever measured that vertical height, but I'm assuming it's 7 to 10 feet of vertical infill. And I'm sure it's unconsolidated. I'm sure there's organic material underneath it. And while it's fine for cows, I just want to say it's probably not so fine to build on without at least addressing the stabilization of the soil.

And I just want to go on record in saying 3.61 units per acre, that's 12,000 square feet per unit -- per acre -- or excuse me -- 12,000 square feet per unit, not 7,000 or 6,000 or whatever the numbers were this evening.

That's all I have. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you.

DARRIN DANIELS: Hello, Commissioners. My name
is Darrin Daniels. I live at 9957 West Roan Meadows. And I agree with all the previous concerns that have been brought to us, and I also bring one other concern that reaches personally to me, as having worked for a large utility company here in the area. I do not express their views or opinions right now. These are mine alone. I had to throw that out there.

Anyways being a first responder for that, not just police, fire, but utility first response -- traffic is terrible. With ACHD reviewing and looking and saying project -- you know, this project's not going to affect traffic. These projects, are they accumulating all these together and looking at the real impact, as in Mrs. Price's pictures shown?

I've experienced that for almost 20 years, seeing that, watching this town grow, especially this area. This area cannot handle a lot of small -- large subdivisions, large number of houses, without some infrastructure in better shape, better roads.

There -- and as far as I know, there is not even a five-year plan yet on widening that section of Victory yet. There is discussion, but there's no preliminary plans, not within a five-year timeline, as far as the utility company that I work for knows of.
Also I -- I'm totally having a brain freeze. So much has been said I just want to make sure I cover the other.

But that is my largest concern here with that impact for first responders and stuff like that. And I would say that growth is coming, yes. Those should be half-acre lots, no smaller than that. Diamante Subdivision has three accesses to it. It does not greatly impact this -- not a lot, a little, but not a lot. You put in 67 homes, one egress and entrance, you are going to impact that area greatly, and it's not going to be handled. So I ask that you Commissioners please ponder on that one very thoroughly before making your decision.

Thank you. Have a good night.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you, Mr. Daniels.

Before -- I think -- is there anybody else here in person that would like to speak tonight? Please just come on up then, yeah. Go ahead, everybody that would like to. Yeah. One at a time.

And -- oh, you. I'm sorry. It's hard with all the masks. You spoke with the --

MARISA KEITH: I spoke for the neighborhood association, but I'd like to take three minutes just
for my personal testimony.

    CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yeah. That's fine. Please go ahead.

    MARISA KEITH: Thank you. Marisa Keith, 3279 South Cloverdale, Boise.

    Yesterday -- well, Sunday. I don't know what today is -- Sunday, I spent the day driving around SWACA to take inventory of the plats that had been approved and built for a project that another neighborhood association is working on with the Statesman. We included the Falcon Crest, which is in Kuna, because all of those houses that they approved out there are going to come into Boise. Nobody goes to Kuna. We counted 5,200 lots that had been approved out in Southwest Boise, and we counted between 100 and 200 houses built. It's not an issue of lots not being available, it's an issue of the houses not being built in a timely manner.

    As far as for the easement of the trees, I really do think it's just lip service. The developer's plan for these neighbors -- if he's trying to get the development approved based on saving those trees and he has no actual plan to protect those trees once he is out of that subdivision and moved on to the next, then it's kind of a waste of time to even
discuss it at this point. There needs to be some sort
of easement. There needs to be some sort of
protection to make sure that those trees are there for
the long term.

I spend a whole lot of my time down at
ACHD, spend, like, hours of my life there every week,
just following along on what they're doing. And I
have spoken with an old employee there several times.
He calls -- he has said that the people at ACHD refer
to Southwest Boise as "Death by a Thousand Cuts." And
what he means by that is that they -- developers put
in all of these small subdivisions that never meet the
criteria for a traffic impact study, never meet the
criteria for mitigation. And before you know it, it's
just snowballed, and now we have 5,200 houses approved
out there. And we have no sidewalks. We have
two-lane roads. I live on Cloverdale. That road was
supposed to be widened to five lanes five years ago,
and they're -- it's not even in the five-year plan for
the section that I am on.

Right now ACHD is considering not even
taking their 3 percent for their next budget. They're
contemplating a 0 percent increase that will impact
their CIP. It will impact their five-year work plan.
They don't know exactly how much that will affect it,
but there are several people over there screaming that
they don't even have money to put in sidewalks,
pedestrian crossings, other community projects, and so
just take that into consideration when you are
deliberating tonight.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you.

Sir, come on up, please.

MARK DUNKLEY: I am Mark Dunkley, 10151 West
Victory Road. I'm one of the sellers of the property
to be happened. I have lived here since 1958, in
which 34,000 people lived here then. Currently we
have over 250,000 here in Boise. Change is constant,
and great things -- I'd rather live here now than back
in 1958 when I came, because of the population
increase. Good things happen.

I am selling my property because I have a
bad heart, I'm tired of taking care of cows and
pastures, and I want a break. And so -- but I do want
to stay in there because I love the area. I love what
the developer has done in keeping the pond. No one
here enjoys the pond because it's private. The pond
will be enjoyed by the public. The common areas will
be enjoyed by the public. People will enjoy walking
in a neighborhood that is secluded.
And I think they're just great. The integrity of the trees in the south will help keep the privacy of those people in the south. The lots are larger. The lots generally are only one and one-and-a-half lots per person there. Everyone will enjoy the property.

The irrigation concerns -- my property is the lowest portion of all the properties. The lateral that goes through my property has never been flooded in the 16 years that I have been here. The problem with Jill's property is just on the southeast corner with just two properties there. It is not the whole property; it's just that little portion. My property -- there is no problem with the laterals.

There is no wildlife on my lateral. When that goes dry in October, nothing's there. It's all in the pond. All the wildlife stays with the pond. So you keep the pond, you develop that, you have some great things that happen there and people can enjoy.

Traffic with ACHD. Since Mitchell is a collateral it has a possibility max of 425 VP H per day, I guess or however they [unintelligible], with addition of the additional subdivision that brings it only up to about 110 VPH in the maximum traffic volumes. People have been complaining about traffic
in Boise for the last 30 years, and so there's no difference between now and 30 or 40 years ago.

I apologize to my neighbors for getting old and having a heart problem and wanting to stay alive.

I do have one problem -- the historical building is not very historical if you've been in that home. I have been in there many times. There is nothing great about that home to be preserved.

Also as far as Jills's comment on walking around there, I think we were here a half-an-hour before and 20 minutes before we were able to get in here, so I think there's no problem with having this as being a public meeting.

The only problem I have is the fence. And I'm not a part of the --

THE CLERK: Time.

MARK DUNKLEY: -- developer. I have nothing to do with him. I want to stay in here.

And also the fence. They have predicted a vinyl --

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you, sir.

MARK DUNKLEY: -- fence.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: That's it -- that's the end of your time.
MARK DUNKLEY: Okay. Sorry.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you.

MARK DUNKLEY: If you want to ask me about the vinyl fence, I'll tell you.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you.

Okay. Great.

JILL LONGHURST: Thank you.

Mr. Holmes, I had a part of my PowerPoint that had a picture that showed the lot sizes as they exist now across the street. Could you pull that back up, please.

KEVIN HOLMES: [Unintelligible] for you.

JILL LONGHURST: Again, it's Jill Longhurst, and I'm at 9900 Roan Meadows -- West Roan Meadows, I guess. That's something they're making us add. I never said "West" before.

While Mr. Holmes pulls that up, I just wanted to make a few comments. When I heard Mr. Holmes reference one of the Commissioner's questions about -- he thought that there would be within 2021 through 2025 changes to Victory, that was a surprise to me. My group of neighbors and I had contacted ACHD, and it was our understanding that we were looking at seven to ten years before there would be any legitimate thing.
As to the size -- could you go to -- keep going down. More, more, more, more. Thank you.

More.

Right there, where your cursor is, if you can do that. Yes. That'd be great. And click on that one please.

Actually go up two. There you go. Sorry.

I just wanted to talk about the home size.

The homes here are significantly smaller, what's proposed, and this was the original proposal. If you look across the street to the Carolina Place, those are much smaller. The developer's comments about that this is all within the size and that those houses get smaller as they get toward Victory is not accurate.

That's an accurate assessment of what the properties look like, and I think that this is a relevant visual aid for all of us to understand what we're talking about.

There was a comment that was made to Mr. Holmes a minute ago about whether or not this proposal was within the Comprehensive Plan. And his response was, "If we're going to go against the Comprehensive Plan, this is an appropriate way to go."

My question is why are we going against the Comprehensive Plan? We are not without homes. We are
not without development properties. There is no need
to do so. And I -- I would strongly urge you to
require us not to look at this as something to go
against the Comprehensive Plan but to stay within it
so that we can have a nice transition between the
homes. It's accurate -- actually fair one.

And my final comment would be that when
we're talking about this planned community
development -- "we're going to save the pond" -- I
think that that's sort of talking about the "emperor's
new clothes". As one of the Commissioners pointed
out, this pond isn't going away. There's a lot of
things that would have to happen before this pond
would go away. They're stuck with the pond.

So really what they're talking about is
putting a path around the pond and putting the pond in
a much smaller area than it is and then putting some
rocks out. And in order for you to say that this is
part of a planned community development, it has to
have some benefit. And all -- as far as I can tell,
it's boulders. And I don't know what size it is, but
I was joking with my daughter about the size of
boulder we have. I have yet to hear a single person
say, "The perfect subdivision is the one with some
climbing rocks in it, a few boulders for the kids to
go sit on." That is not a benefit. That is adding nothing to this particular area, so there is no reason to pretend that this is some major benefit and they need these zoning variances.

So I would ask the Commission to deny them. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you.

Is there anybody else here that we have not heard from that would like to speak tonight?

Okay. So moving on to the virtual attendance. If you are -- if you have joined us virtually and you'd like to speak on this item tonight, please virtually raise your hand.

And we will just start at the top and work our way down. So first I see Cynthia Rasavage.

CYNTIAH RASAVAGE: It's Cynthia Rasavage.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you.


I'm -- I am opposed to the traffic, the density of the property itself. I'm at the other end of Mitchell at the very end. In 2018 it was a dead end street, and because of SouthCreek going in, they did put it through, but it will end at our house.
ACHD just took it off of their five-year plan about it
going from Arabian Drive to Amity. It will never go
through.

I'm -- not only do I care about how many
more cars are going to go in front of my house, I'm
concerned about Mitchell itself. In the five-year
plan that ACHD has, there is no plan at all for them
doing any improvements. Currently it has no curbs, no
gutters, no sidewalks. So the children that have to
wait on the school bus have to wait in the middle of
the street at 7:00 a.m. during the winter. And
there's no street light and it's very dangerous and
we're going to add more cars coming up through there.

We have a 20-mile-per-hour speed limit.
People are tailgating me all the time because I do
follow the 20 miles per hour, because you never know
who's walking in the middle of the street. We have a
lot of people walking their dogs, their children.
They have children coming to school to Amity
Elementary -- are -- they use that path coming down
Mitchell.

I'm not opposed to the new development.
I'm opposed to how many houses are going in there.

Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you.
Next we'll hear from Barbara Crump, please.

Barbara, do we have you there?

BARBARA CRUMP: Yes.

My name is Barbara Crump, 3921 South Mitchell Street. Thank you, Madam Chair and Committee.

The traffic and congestion is a major issue. Just last week I was, as Cynthia mentioned, tailgated going 20 miles an hour. The car pulling off of Victory onto South Mitchell was ten car lengths behind me, as I'm doing 20 miles an hour, before he came up right behind me -- was so angry and frustrated he passed.

When we chose our home we had already fallen in love with the neighborhood before we chose it, as we were looking for a house on Arabian. The speed limit there is 25 miles an hour. All these neighborhoods that are being built that are new are 25 miles an hour. So they're coming onto South Mitchell, which is not a subdivision. It's semi-rural. And I have not seen them easily transition into driving through a semi-rural neighborhood where we enjoy people riding their horses, people walking down the street, as well as all
the kids going to and from school.

We find a lot of traffic. Moms and dads driving their children down South Mitchell, dropping their kids off at the back -- school, and then driving back down South Mitchell. I can't believe that all these people moving into this new subdivision would turn out onto South Mitchell and go straight to Victory. They would also increase the traffic. And I don't know any mention of the speed limit, on what this neighborhood is going to have.

Basically I have no problem against the subdivision going in. Yes, the state is growing. People want to move in here. We have to provide housing. And it appears to be a very thoughtful and considerate plan. However if you came and walked our neighborhood, it is nowhere near compatible with the neighborhood. We're semi-rural. And even if you go across Victory, you've got a neighborhood that is not nearly as congested as what they're proposing.

Yes, we have animals and cows, and we like it that way. And I chose this neighborhood specifically because when I moved to Idaho I wanted to be in a neighborhood that -- this state has this wonderful selection that you can live downtown urban or you can live in the county and have a semi-rural
neighborhood.

I really feel this would negatively impact this whole area, as well as property values, as well as safety.

THE CLERK: Time.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you, Ms. Crump.

BARBARA CRUMP: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Next we'll hear from Linda Raine.

LINDA RAIN: Can you hear me okay?

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yes. Thank you.

LINDA RAIN: I want to say I definitely agree with what Cynthia said about the traffic and the speed limit, and also what Barbara said. We live at 3600 South Mitchell Street, so we live right at the top of the hill. And you can't see when somebody is stopped on the side of the road. You can't see to get around them safely because your vision is blocked. So I don't know if anybody's taken that into consideration. The speed limit since the SouthCreek Subdivision went in has been ridiculous. The sheriff comes out every now and then, and I say, "Wait five minutes. You'll get two speeders." It is -- it's really bad, really bad.

Also I'd like to see half-acre lots to go
along with what Diamante Subdivision is doing. We fought that subdivision as well and used the Boise Comprehensive Plan to do it, and they put in half-acre lots, and I would also like to see that.

As far as the only entrance to and from this subdivision is going to be on Mitchell, what happens when a fire engine needs to get in there and an ambulance? Are they allowed to only have one entrance to and from and into a subdivision as for safety?

Also Mitchell is two lanes. So when you go down at the end of Mitchell to turn onto Victory, you can only turn either right or left of course. There is a center turn lane that is going to increase accidents because I mean -- right now, like Jill said, you wait five or six minutes just to get out there onto Mitchell -- I mean, onto Victory.

Also since we've lived here, since 2005, they've changed the time -- what -- when they're going to widen Victory I don't even know how many times. And the last I heard also -- I think someone mentioned -- is there is no plan to widen Victory. So what do we do in the meantime?

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you, Ms. Raine.
Next we'll hear from Todd Merritt.

LINDA RAINE: Okay.

TODD MERRITT: Hello. Can you hear me okay?

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yes.

TODD MERRITT: Okay. My name's Todd Merritt. I live at 9682 West Roan Meadows Court. I'm the president of the HOA for the Diamante Subdivision.

My wife and I looked for homes for over a year. The Diamante Subdivision is a new subdivision. My home is ten months old. We were thrilled to find a place in Boise where we could build a new home and have space in between the houses, absolutely thrilled.

The Music Subdivision, the problem I have with it is the density. They seem to want to identify with the neighborhood to the north of them, which is on the other side of Victory Road, which is just the most significant divider. The neighbors that are the most adjacent to that neighborhood are to the west and the south and the east, and the smallest lots are half-acre. They go one acre, some of them, or even larger. So I do not believe that R-1 B is an appropriate designation. I think it should be R-1A so that it is aligned with the neighborhood that it is in, not the one that's across the street on Victory.

The neighborhood here, people have shops,
they have animals, it's very rural. And we were very
happy to find a neighborhood that wasn't jam packed
with the houses so close together that you can almost
jump from one to the other.

And that's it.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you, Mr. Merritt.

Next we'll hear from Dustin Patterson.

DUSTIN PATTERSON: Yes. Hello and thank you,
Madam Chair. My name is Dustin Patterson, and I live
at 9651 West Roan Meadows Court, also in the Diamante
Subdivision.

I agree with what has been said already by
my neighbors and, as a lifetime resident of Southwest
Boise, I am also just very concerned about the traffic
increase and the proposed density of the homes in the
new Music Subdivision.

Really comparing that proposal to the
neighborhoods that are in the area, I think that you'd
be best suited to compare it to my neighborhood, the
Diamante one. And I echo what Todd said, we bought
out here specifically because they had half-acre lots
and we had some more space to stretch out. I think
that that would be a lot better comparison than the
neighborhood that you find to the north.

So once again I just echo all the concerns
that have already been mentioned this evening, and I
just hope that you consider the concerns of the
homeowners. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you, Mr. Patterson.

Next is Richard Llewellyn.

RICHARD LLEWELLYN: Richard Llewellyn, 9170 Hill
Road.

Am I coming through?

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yes.

RICHARD LLEWELLYN: Great. Thank you.

So lots of excellent questions, I think, from Planning and Zoning Commission. And I'd like to, you know, commend you for all of your great questions, great insights, and great questions and points from the neighborhood.

And it really strikes me how different this proceeding is from the earlier one, in the Haystacks Subdivision in Barber Valley, where the neighborhood had a chance to really work out and hash out the issues with the developer. And now the main point of contention is what color should the pedestrian beacon be.

I don't hear about any pedestrian beacons being installed here, even though we all know that out in this part of the hinterlands of Boise, pedestrian
concerns, traffic concerns are really front and center.

So Elaine Clegg, President Council Pro Tem, has often -- evokes the process that was used to bring people together, neighborhood concerns and developers, to come up with Barber Valley Plans. And I think that's why now we are only hearing about what color is the -- should the pedestrian beacon be. And you saw all those great pathways: cycling pathways, pedestrian pathways, open spaces in that part of town.

Why is it so different? You know, why is it so different out in Southwest Boise? I -- is it the people are different? You know, is it just worth less in some way?

I don't know. I don't think we really think any of those things. I think it's just history, and I think we've come to accept that people in certain parts of Boise, just those neighborhoods, don't deserve, on some level, the same amount of care and handling from -- during the whole process. So despite all of your very good questions and your attention now, I just feel it's a little too late. I wish that so many of these issues could have been brought up between the neighborhood and the developer with Boise planning staff really upholding the
livability components of Boise Blueprint for this area of town.

What are some of those? That issue brought up again by Planning and Zoning Commissioners, as well as neighborhoods, about the laterals and those trees. Yes. If you -- it's not just burying the laterals. You're also piping them, meaning 84 you're never -- you no longer get the ground water recharged. Yes, those trees will die. That pond may not continue to be full of water either in the winter unless you pump water to it.

You know, having grown up in similar country myself -- yeah, this is what we have here. You know, we have these laterals, we have these semi-riparian kinds of proxies with our irrigation systems. It's what makes these areas livable to us. You know, it represents a lot more. So I really hope you continue to listen and strive to preserve those elements.

THE CLERK: Time.

RICHARD LLEWELLYN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you, Mr. Llewellyn.

Next up is Milena Hickey.

MILENA HICKEY: ...[unintelligible]. Can you hear me?
CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yes.

MILENA HICKEY: All right. Hi, everybody.

So I'm at 3185 South Linda Vista Avenue, also in the Diamante neighborhood.

I agree with a lot that has been said. My backyard is exactly on Mitchell. I'm concerned about, not just the building part when they start building, the dust and the pollution and everything that comes from that -- obviously progress has to be made, and a lot of points have been made that are very good. My main concern is the only entrance into that neighborhood, into that new neighborhood, and the density of the houses there.

My husband happens to be a fireman, and it was said about access to those homes -- I know there's another access to it. And it shouldn't be a problem, but let's say there's a fire -- well, I mean they're so close together right now. That is a problem.

If those people want to get out in a rush, you're going to have a major problem trying to get everybody out on one street, even if there is another egress road to Victory or to other places. That's one point.

The second point is if we ever get out of the lockdown and people go back to school -- and
traffic is what it is. It's already a lot more than
it was. I agree with those people saying there is a
lot of traffic going, and specifically going
from -- going into Victory.

There is a downhill road and it ices up in
the winter. And people -- I mean, you're going to
have accidents there if people are not aware of that.

Also a lot of people are going to cut
through our Diamante neighborhood to get over to the
other side and just do a quick -- you know get home,
cutting home, shortcut. And I think there could be
some big potential for accidents with children in our
neighborhood. So -- and that's the part -- besides, I
will miss the peacock.

So that's my five cents to it.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you, Ms. Hickey.

Next, we have Kevin Spiegel.

KEVIN SPIEGEL: Hi. Can you hear me okay?

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yes.

KEVIN SPIEGEL: Great. Thank you.

Hi. I'm Kevin Spiegel. 9990 Roan Meadows
Drive. I've got my wife here as well. We just logged
in together, so I guess I'm speaking for the two of us
if that's okay.

And I just wanted to kind of echo what
everybody else has brought up as concerns so far. I just -- I also wanted to read a couple things off of the -- excuse me -- the Blueprint for Boise about Southwest and the neighborhood character.

And two points here: Point One is to "Encourage the use of public parks and other open-space areas as community farms and gardens to preserve the rural and agricultural heritage of the Southwest," which -- I don't think there's anything about agriculture in this new subdivision. There's also, "Promote the continuation of existing agriculture in the Southwest and look for opportunities to expand urban agriculture in new developments. And lastly, "Open fencing and other design features shall be used to the greatest extent feasible to retain the semi-rural character of the Southwest."

And this really brings up that idea of what the Southwest feels like. And I believe it was Mr. Gillespie who was asking how the houses not right next to those of us on Roan Meadows, how those being on smaller lots would impact us, and it really comes to down to that feel, that semi-rural character that the Southwest currently has, and it sounds like everybody who's testified here would like it to
continue having.

And again just to kind of reemphasize that point that R-1B is supposed to have 9,000-square-feet lots or larger. And I counted up all the lots that don't meet that in this subdivision, and it's 47 of them, which is more than half or two-thirds of the lots that don't even meet the designation for R-1B. So I don't see how you could -- how you can even say that it's an R-1B designation, but two-thirds of the lots don't even meet the requirements for that. So I think we really need to say it's R-1C, which doesn't fit into the Large Lot use, or the lots need to be increased in their size to actually meet that R-1B designation.

And then my last one -- just about the traffic as well. And I know we've spoken a lot about how it will impact Victory, but I'm just as concerned about how it will impact Mitchell. You know, we've got two kids. They're 6 and 8 right now, and they walk to school, to Amity Elementary -- well, when school is in session. And the amount of traffic that this could cause on Mitchell -- I'd just be worried for their safety as they're trying to walk to school. There's no sidewalk. There's no improvement. It's -- you know, it's not a super wide road. It's
not marked. It's --

THE CLERK: Time.

KEVIN SPIEGEL: -- it's just a concern that I could -- that I have for my children.

Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you, Mr. Spiegel.

Next we have William Martin.

WILLIAM MARTIN: All right. Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN STEAD: ... [unintelligible] going off of this.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Yes. Say yes.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yes.

WILLIAM MARTIN: Okay.

I just wanted to -- I agree with what has been said primarily regarding the density and how many new homes and the effect that's going to have on traffic. Thank you.

THE CLERK: William, can you give us your name and address for the record, please. Thank you.


CHAIRMAN STEAD: Go ahead, William.

WILLIAM MARTIN: I already spoke. You didn't hear anything?

THE CLERK: [Unintelligible].
COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: [Unintelligible].

CHAIRMAN STEAD: We got your name and address.

WILLIAM MARTIN: Okay.

Well, I just agree with the density concerns and the effect that it's going to have on traffic.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Great. Thank you.

Next we have Elena Cardwell.

ELENA CARDWELL: Hello. Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yes.

ELENA CARDWELL: Okay. Perfect.

Hello, everybody. My name is Elena Cardwell. I live on 3083 South Linda Vista Place, also in Diamante Subdivision.

And just like many of my neighbors before, I just wanted to point out that we purchased the home a year ago also after a long search for a larger lot in the city of Boise, where we're not feeling congested and squeezed together so we'll love where we are. And my backyard will be actually directly behind -- well, directly across Mitchell from Music Subdivision. So we are literally -- backyard is facing Victory and Mitchell intersection, and the amount of traffic is a huge, huge concern for us.
We're basically looking at -- what -- roughly 60 homes. Everybody will have two to four cars, so I cannot even imagine the 180 cars coming in and out everyday, going to work and daycare and school. So that is our main point and main concern. And I will -- I agree with everything that's been said before.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you.

We'll next hear from Raymond Anderson.

Just give us one second, please.

Okay. Please go ahead, Mr. Anderson.

RAYMOND ANDERSON: Can you hear me okay?

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yes.

RAYMOND ANDERSON: My name is Raymond Anderson. I'm on 9602 West Wright Street. I've been here with my family for 16 years. Just to give you a little idea --

CHAIRMAN STEAD: You're a little quiet.

RAYMOND ANDERSON: Can you hear me better now?

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yes.

RAYMOND ANDERSON: Okay.

I've been here at 9602 West Wright Street for 16 years just to give you an idea --

CHAIRMAN STEAD: I'm sorry, Mr. Anderson. We're
still having -- it's still a little too quiet.

RAYMOND ANDERSON: Okay. Is that better?

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yes.

RAYMOND ANDERSON: Okay.

In the last 16 years, just to give you an idea of what goes on here south of this area, I've had 38 head of beef cattle through this small two acres that I have. So I've been contributing to the flies in the area. I will agree with Mr. Dunkley that there's really nothing historic about the houses. I've been in them. They're nice, but I don't see them as historical.

The big problem --

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Sorry, Mr. Anderson. We seem to have lost you again. Can you get closer to the microphone?

RAYMOND ANDERSON: Okay. How about now?

CHAIRMAN STEAD: It's still a little muted.

RAYMOND ANDERSON: Okay. Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yes.

RAYMOND ANDERSON: Okay.

With the rest of the group, the traffic is a big problem. In addition my street, Mitchell, Roan Meadows and Diamante are going to be clogged with traffic. The -- also it's going to put a lot of
pressure on Maple Grove. The roads have not been
prepared for the amount of traffic that's going to
come through here.

    And I agree with many of the people who
have spoken today that one-half-acre lots is the
smallest they should be here in this plan.

    Thank you.

    CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you, Mr. Anderson.

    Next we have Steve Hamblet.

    STEVE HAMBLET: Hi. Can you hear me?

    CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yes, [unintelligible].

    STEVE HAMBLET: Okay.

    I'm Steve Hamblet. I've got my wife
Rebecca [phonetic] with me. We live at 3217 South
Linda Vista Avenue in the Diamante Subdivision.

    And like our other neighbors in here, we
were looking for more space to be able to, you know,
not have our neighbors on top of us. So I mean,
our -- we share those concerns that everybody else has
expressed so far, but it's mostly just the density of
that subdivision that kind of concerns us.

    And consequently I think a lot of the
traffic will end up diverting through our subdivision
to get out to Victory. I mean it's -- we get a lot of
people speeding through here already. I mean, I know
there's been complaints about Roan Meadows too, but I mean, we've got some small children in here now, and they continually have people blowing past our house, trying to get around that corner at Victory and Mitchell. So it's just -- I think it's just going to exaggerate it if we have, you know, another 67 homes right across the street here.

I'm not -- we're not opposed to the subdivision, but it's just the density that concerns us.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you, Mr. Hamblet.

We have quite a few people who didn't raise their hands, but I have their names on this sheet. So if you still would like to speak, please virtually raise your hand. I will go down this list and call out names, but we'd like to see that virtual hand raised.

So first on this list I have Alison Haws.

Alison, would you like to speak?

Okay. Oh.

ALISON HAWS: Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN STEAD: We can.

ALISON HAWS: I agree with everything that's been said so far. I was glad to see that the trees
have been addressed.

We are at 9980 West Roan Meadows Drive.

And like everyone else we bought here because of the location and the rural feel of not being on top of our neighbors. And the privacy is huge, so I'm glad to see that they're planning on keeping those trees.

But safety and having that one entrance into so many homes with so many extra cars and, you know, family members. And mostly, you know, you're going to get a lot of teenagers driving in and out of there, too. Fire issues. I just agree with everyone so far.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you.

Next is Chester Ball.

Chester, did you still want to speak tonight?

Please go ahead and start -- for everybody, please remember to start with your name and address.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: [Unintelligible].

CHAIRMAN STEAD: I mean, they're not.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: [Unintelligible] if they don't raise their hand, you should just [unintelligible].
CHAIRMAN STEAD: Chester, did you want to speak tonight?

Okay. I'm going to take the silence as forfeiting the opportunity to speak on this item.

THE CLERK: Madam Chair, I might just add that phone number and webinar ID to the chat so if anyone cannot participate --

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay. We're going to add the telephone number and meeting ID to the chat. If you aren't there on public -- you're having any audio difficulties, please feel free to go ahead and call in. And then if you can virtually raise your hand, we'll know that you want to speak.

Next on the list I have is Frances Smith. Do we have a Frances Smith that would like to speak tonight?

Okay. I'm going to keep moving.

Glenda Jenkins.

If you're on the phone, go ahead and press "star, nine" to virtually raise your hand, if you were waiting on that.

So after Glenda Jenkins -- oh, we have one hand up.

Okay. Go ahead, Monica.

MONICA KNIGHT: Okay. Can you hear me okay?
CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yes. Please start with your name and address.

MONICA KNIGHT: Okay. My name is Monica Knight, and my address is 9504 Bienapfl Drive.

My husband and I have lived in that home for almost 15 years now, and we've seen the traffic really increase. It's a -- we have a hard time getting out on Maple Grove. We use Mitchell a lot to get out of the subdivision, and it's gotten a lot heavier as more and more subdivisions have come in around our acre lots.

My biggest concern is the traffic going up Mitchell and the children that walk to school on that road. I feel like it's going to be dangerous for them.

I'm also a little concerned that the school is also already pretty full. Amity Elementary has four classes per grade and over 30 students per class. And 67 new homes going in will heavily affect the already overflowing school of Amity Elementary.

So I don't oppose the subdivision, but I would like to see a lower density and closer to half-size acres.

Thank you.

Did you want to say anything?
CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you.

Next on the list is Karen Darrington. Do we have a Karen that would like to speak tonight?

Oh, okay. Great. We do have a Karen Darrington.

KAREN DARRINGTON: Am I here now?

CHAIRMAN STEAD: You are. Please start with your name and address.

KAREN DARRINGTON: Karen Darrington, 9290 West Lyle Street, and we've lived here for 27 years. Our street is a dead-end street.

And several years ago a developer bought 12 acres at the end of our street and wanted to put in 40-something houses with only one entrance and that was Lyle Street. And we went through the process through Boise City and Ada County Commissioners, and it's been a long process, but I would like to say that the developer has just put in three 3-acre homes -- actually four, four 3-acre homes in those 12 acres that he originally wanted to put 40 on.

And the Boise Comprehensive Plan, the City Council back then -- this has been almost ten years ago we've been through this process. And they definitely wanted less density. They suggested half-acre to 1-acre lots. And it's been a long time
coming, but there are people out there who want larger acreages. And our street, which is just down the road from Mitchell, it's been very -- we've been very happy to see that the density is smaller, because we can't get out onto Maple Grove from our street, and you're going to have a heck of a lot more people trying to get out onto Mitchell in the morning --

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you. That's your time.

KAREN DARRINGTON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you, Karen.

KAREN DARRINGTON: Mm–hmm.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: So remaining on the list -- if I call your name and you would still like to speak tonight, please virtually raise your hand. That can be done through the program or if you're on the phone, you can press star, nine.

So the names I have remaining are Kurt Sager [phonetic], Megan Armstrong, Melissa Shane, Randall Shane [phonetic], and Steven Hickey [phonetic].

So, Kurt -- do we have -- I'm not seeing any new hands go up. But do we have -- oh, wait. There's one.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: [Unintelligible].

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay. We have one on the
phone.

Let's please go ahead -- please start with your name and address.

GLENDA JENKINS: Glenda Jenkins. We live at 3172 Black Hills Drive.

And I agree with everything that's been said against the current plan. The density is too high, it should be half-acre lots. And we have lived at our house since 1983, and we've seen the traffic just explode, and we are worried about the cars having a problem getting out on Mitchell to Victory and dealing with that intersection, and so coming down Roan Meadows and coming past our house on Black Hills to get out to Victory, and it's just not going to be a safe situation.

So, really, the density is the key to maintaining the rural feel of this area.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you, Ms. Jenkins.

GLENDA JENKINS: Thank you. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay. So I'm still not seeing any new virtual hands.

Oh. There's one.

Please go ahead, Michele.

MICHELE LINSKY: Hi there. My -- can you hear me?
CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yes.

MICHELE LINSKY: Okay. My name is Michele Linsky [phonetic]. I live at 3080 South Linda Vista Place.

My husband and I -- we actually -- we purchased the original home from the Diamante lot. And so I know that the original home could be purchased if it were put up for sale. I know it's possible.

I'm disappointed with Mr. Gillespie. He kind of shrugged at the current zoning that's listed and kind of wanted to waver from that.

I do agree with my neighbors. I want to especially address the school issue. All of the schools, Amity Elementary, West Junior High School that Amity feeds into, and Borah High School that both of those feed into are some of the highest populated schools in the city of Boise.

And that -- just to state that the average lot size listed is not accurate.

So thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you.

So if you would -- last call. If you'd like to speak on this item tonight, please virtually raise your hand.
THE CLERK: Madam Chair, we might just go down this attendee list --

CHAIRMAN STEAD: One more time.

THE CLERK: -- and call in on everyone that we haven't heard from yet.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay.

Do we have Kurt Sager?

THE CLERK: I don't see him on the list.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay. Oh. Okay.

Megan Armstrong.

THE CLERK: And I don't see her on the list either.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: We've got the Shanes, Melissa Shane.

She is on the call.

THE CLERK: She is on. Let me just unmute her.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Hi, Melissa. Did you want to speak tonight?

THE CLERK: Just in case folks at home don't have the ability to see the chat, the phone number you can call in on -- give you a second to grab that pen -- is 888-475-4499. And the webinar ID is 985-8581-4025. So again that phone number is 888-475-4499, and then it will ask you for a webinar ID, which is 985-8581-4025.
CHAIRMAN STEAD: I also have Randall Shane on my list, but I don't see him on the call.
   And then Steven Hickey.
   Oh.

THE CLERK: Might've --

CHAIRMAN STEAD: We had a hand for a moment. I didn't see who it is.

THE CLERK: Oh, there we go.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: There it is. Hickey.

MILENA HICKEY: Actually Steven Hickey -- this is Milena Hickey. He went to work.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay.

MILENA HICKEY: I just wanted to say that he wanted to speak, but he can't right now, and he agrees with a lot that was said.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay, but if he's not here then --

MILENA HICKEY: There's also -- yes. And there's also two people [unintelligible] I know, they couldn't because of -- they didn't have access.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay. Thank you, Milena.

Okay. So then Chester Ball [sic].

He is on the list. Do you see him?

Ballm.

CHESTER BALLM: I'm here now.
CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay. Great.

CHESTER BALLM: Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yes. Please start with your name and address.

CHESTER BALLM: This is Chester Ballm. I am at 9647 West Burnett Drive.

Again the reason why I live in Diamante Subdivision -- I also -- one of the reasons why we purchased here was the fact that, again, we're not on top of our neighbors. We've got space to breathe and live.

And the fact that I have two small children that are going to be going to school up and down Mitchell and some of the other areas -- and we're adding all this traffic.

And one egress out of that neighborhood -- we have three here in Diamante. And even that, we have speeders come down and running down through here, so you're just going to increase our traffic through our neighborhood, because they're going to try to get around Victory and Mitchell or any of the other egresses to get to those neighborhoods.

So...

And I agree with everything that's been presented for the density of the housing. I mean, I
understand that progress has to be made. I get that.
But that many houses in that small of an acreage is
just too much for this side of the -- this -- I mean,
we bought it because it had a rural feel, and that's
what we want to keep.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you, Mr. Ball [sic].

THE CLERK: Madam Chair, we do have someone on
the phone. I'm going to allow them to speak.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Great.

BETTY BERMENSOLO: Hello.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yes. We can hear you. Please
start with your name and address.

BETTY BERMENSOLO: Yes.

My name is Betty Bermensolo, and I live at
1970 Canonero Way in Boise, and I'm approximately a
mile from the property.

I'm sorry. I haven't -- I didn't know
that I'd be back in time to follow the meeting,
but -- I wanted to add that for years developers have
used transitional lot sizes more effectively than this
developer has. In other words I live in a 5-acre
subdivision and against me is Boulder Creek and Pepper
Hills. And up against our 5-acre parcels, they put 1
acre and then half-acre. No problems with
accommodating the number of people that are coming to Boise and looking for diversity and looking for something that they might not find in other parts of Boise. And it's -- it really is a limited availability of the kind of privacy and rural feeling that could be offered by Boise.

But, you know, the developers have to look at that, and certainly the easiest way to do this is to put larger lots against existing Large Lot developments. And I think that there certainly is an opportunity in subdivisions -- and certainly the Music Subdivision is one where this could decrease the density. It would certainly afford people coming to this area for the same reasons that a lot of people have come to this area. They're looking for more room. And those lots would be very, very desirable.

So I hope the City looks at the possibility of holding onto a jewel in the Southwest rather than letting it go for the highest density.

The zoning as I understand it means that you can go from one to eight or one to five. You can start one lot in that zone. You don't have to go to the highest allowed density for that zone.

So there's lots of options that the Commission has that I think need to be thought about
tonight, and I would certainly appreciate a very
cautious decision when you look at approving this
subdivision as it stands.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you.

Okay. So we still have a few names on our
list.

We are going to take a quick five-minute
break and we reconvene at quarter-after. And
hopefully that will give a couple of the people that
have had hard time connecting the opportunity to
close. And we will be back at it shortly.

THE CLERK: For anyone listening at home again,
that number is 888-475-4499. The webinar ID is
985-8581-4025.

(Recess taken from 3:11:48 of 3:17:10 of
audio file.)

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay. We're going to start up
again now.

I'm going to call -- we will call one more
time on people who have signed up that we have not
heard from yet that we know are on the line. And we,
as a Commission, are particularly interested in any
new information outside of the traffic and density
comments that we've heard.

So we will try -- we want to try
first -- we'll start with Frances Smith. Do we have a
Frances Smith on the line?

I do not see that.

Okay. Kurt Sager.

What about Megan Armstrong?

Melissa Shane.

THE CLERK: Madam Chair, there are also a few
other attendees that weren't on our advance sign-up
sheet.

Abby Losinski.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Abby, if you'd like to speak
tonight, please go ahead. We can hear you now.

ABBY LOSINSKI: Okay. Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN STEAD: We can hear you. Please start
with your name and address, and you'll have three
minutes.

ABBY LOSINSKI: Okay.

Abigail [phonetic] Losinski. 9665 West
Roan Meadows Court, Boise, Idaho. I'm also in the
Diamante Subdivision, and I just would like to agree
with what everybody said about the density concerns
and overloading the schools and the traffic, and all
those things are very concerning.

I also have two little children, and I don't want them driving through our subdivision to try to avoid traffic, because that would be unsafe for our children.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you.

If there's anybody new that has joined the call that would like to speak tonight, please virtually raise your hand.

THE CLERK: Madam Chair, the other person that I see is Andrew Odom.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Andrew, would you like to testify on this item tonight?

Okay. Not hearing from Andrew.

THE CLERK: Madam Chair, I believe that's everyone --

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay.

THE CLERK: -- on the attendee list and the sign-up sheet.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Great.

THE CLERK: I think we can do last call.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay.

So this is the official last call. If you'd like to testify on this item tonight, please
vastly raise your hand.

Okay. Seeing none.

REBUTTAL

CHAIRMAN STEAD: We will move to the Applicant for a five-minute rebuttal.

HETHE CLARK: Thank you, Madam Chair.

So in terms of rebuttal -- again Hethe Clark, 251 East Front Street.

I'll try to hit a couple of items and then wrap up, I think, on the items that were of most -- that we heard the most about.

So with regard to the 3 story question, we did make the representation on the record. That is a commitment. And if folks are more comfortable with that being a condition of approval, we're more than happy to include that.

With regard to emergency access, we have provided all required accesses to meet Code. There is a dual-use emergency access onto Victory road.

With regard to trees, as I mentioned, it appears that we will be able to preserve over 200 trees on this site. That's not a number that I say very often in connection with any application. In addition to that there's at least 300 new trees that will be planted. Trees of course will be on irrigated
common areas, so -- or within irrigated portions of lots.

Now with regard to the question of what happens after the developer leaves, trees are very expensive to take down. You know, landowners are not going to take those down willy-nilly unless they have to. You know, one thing that is -- we were talking about it while we were listening to the testimony -- that, you know, maybe -- it might be something that we could explore is having a provision in the CC&Rs that speaks to mature trees being removed only if an arborist notes that they're at their end of life or deceased. That's something that we could include in CC&Rs and I think would be something that could be functional. I don't think anything beyond that would be functional. I think folks should be able to take care of their lawns and their landscape.

With regard to the pond, there was some pretty -- kind of direct testimony suggesting that we're stuck with it. Just for reference there used to be three ponds out there. The current landowner has already filled two. There is no requirement that we keep that pond. And Mr. Dunkley was exactly correct. You know, that pond was previously a private amenity. It wasn't something that the public had access to.
This is now something that the public will have access to through the trail system that we are proposing. And you know, we think that's a great amenity, and -- to go back to the PUD topic -- that is something that the PUD allows us to provide.

With regard to traffic, we will be dedicating additional right-of-way along Victory Road and building a left-turn lane on Mitchell. And then I'll just also point out that the -- you know, this is ACHD's staff report. ACHD does have Victory on its CIP for between 2021 and 2025. And again they have approved the project.

With regard to the R-1B zoning. Again R-1B is an approved zone within the Large Lot category of Blueprint Boise. We agree with staff that this zoning designation is appropriate for property that is at the intersection of a Suburban and Large Lot categories on -- in Blueprint Boise and is on a significant transportation corridor. Even with the PUD that's proposed we remain within the R-1B density range.

Now I'll just point out now Mrs. Bermensolo had indicated that it was appropriate to go from 5 acres to 1 acre lots in the development that she was pointing to on the outer periphery.
Proportionally we are not that extreme, and we don't create even that much contrast. Our lots on the southern boundary are larger than what that proportion would dictate.

So let me just end with one note. I've heard the term "smart growth" used a couple of times during the course of this evening. There's been a lot of discussion about, you know, "We should go to half-acre lots and that should be the end of it."

But I think it begs the question of what is smart growth? You know, smart growth is infill. Smart growth is development near transportation corridors. It's development near existing City services with densities that a City can efficiently serve. Half-acre lots on a significant transportation corridor is not smart growth. So I will just leave it at that.

You know, we think that we have addressed the requirements for this application under City Code, we think we've proposed something that appropriately transitions, and we would ask for a recommendation of approval. If it's not the Commission's intent to recommend approval, we would ask for clear direction on the items that we could do in order to gain that recommendation for approval.
And I'm happy to stand for any last questions.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you, Mr. Clark.

MOTIONS

CHAIRMAN STEAD: At this point we will close the public portion of the hearing, and the item is before the Commission.

COMMISSIONER SCHAFER: Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Schafer.

COMMISSIONER SCHAFER: All right. I'll get this party started and see where we're heading.

I'm going recommend approval of CAR20-5 and SUB20-9 and approve PUD20-13 with the terms and conditions in the staff report as written with the following modifications: I'd like to add a condition that the Applicant submit a Tree Mitigation Plan for the proposed project, and I'd like to remove Condition No. 4 requiring detached sidewalks.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: I'll second that to get the conversation going.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: A second from Commissioner Gillespie.

Discussion.

COMMISSIONER SCHAFER: Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Schafer.
COMMISSIONER SCHAFER: Lots of good points this evening both for and against. Obviously by my motion, I'm tending towards approval. I do feel that the R-1B zoning is appropriate for this property, as we are in a transition between Ada County and the city of Boise. I feel like the Applicant has addressed the transition between lot sizes pretty effectively, large lots on the south boundary buffering to those larger properties to the south, and then in general, I think, matching the lot sizes across Victory to the north.

There's quite a bit of, obviously, testimony in regards to the buffering or the feel of the development, and we spent a lot -- quite a bit of time discussing the buffer on the south side of the site, but what was neglected was the fact that there are going to be 30-foot landscape buffers along Mitchell and Victory Roads. In addition to that, along Mitchell, you're also going to get a sidewalk, a detached sidewalk, with curb and gutter, so I think that the connectivity issue has been dealt with the with by the Applicant.

I think that, as you look at the site now, with the exception of the large trees on the south property line, there are really no trees at all or landscape along Mitchell or Victory Road. So my view
is that, even though there are going to be potentially
60 homes -- 67 homes in this development, there's also
going to be a 30-foot landscape buffer separating
those homes from the street and from the neighboring
subdivisions.

So to me I feel like that's exactly why we
have landscape buffers, so an occasion like this,
where we're replacing farmland, more agrarian uses,
with development -- those landscape buffers help to
protect the neighboring properties, correct? So I do
want to make that point.

Secondarily, you know, the Applicant spoke
to this towards the end of testimony that, you know,
Fire access has been dealt with. They are providing
the required emergency access points into the site.

And I do agree with the Applicant that the
pond currently is a piece of private property. And
now you're going to have a subdivision with sidewalks
and connectivity to that pond that allow neighbors in
neighboring subdivisions to walk into that
neighborhood and through that common open area. So I
do agree with Applicant in that instance.

I think that also -- the only other point
I'll make right now is that I think that this is a
good opportunity for downsizing. We heard a lot of
testimony from neighbors that love this neighborhood, okay? And a lot of those neighbors love this neighborhood because they live on half-acre lots or one acre lots. So what happens 10, 20, 30, 40 years down the road? They want to stay in the neighborhood, but they can't maintain their property anymore. Well, this would be a great example of something that you could buy to stay in the neighborhood that you love but have less to care for. So I think there's an opportunity here to share this strong neighborhood with another population that maybe doesn't want the large lots.

So those are my two cents. I'd love to hear what my fellow Commissioners have to say.

COMMISSIONER BRATNOBER: Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Bratnober.

COMMISSIONER BRATNOBER: Yeah.

So I'm opposing this development primarily because of where we are with respect to zoning. The density and the setbacks do not conform to an R-1B zoning that's desired. We've heard most of the people get up and object to that as the primary issue.

The lot sizes are significantly smaller than those of the R-1B developments to the north by probably about 37 percent. And I really can't see a
good reason for those choices except to just jam more
units into this property. Trading off the pond as an
amenity in return for the excessive density is not a
quid pro quo that we should entertain. There's no
guarantee how long that pond's going to stick around
anyway, as was made very clear by the Applicant and by
Mr. Dunkley.

Furthermore, the proposal does not conform
to the Comprehensive Plan. And so while that's
occasionally or often viewed as, "It's just a
guideline" -- in this case we've got an application
that goes against the both the Code and the Comp Plan,
and that makes it untenable.

I've heard many, many of the neighbors
support a subdivision here, a subdivision that
respects the surrounding neighborhoods and the
character of the area. I also support a subdivision
here that conforms to the minimum of 9,000-square-foot
lot sizes, puts a reasonable number of lots in there.

This plan does not do that and should not be approved.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Madam Chairman.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Gillespie.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: So -- boy, this is a
tough one. Let me just run through my thinking. I'm
not sure where I stand with your leave.
So when we really get down to it, the issue here is traffic and also sort of this amorphous issue of there's just too much density. And when you try and drill down on what exactly people are worried about, like what is the actual adverse impact of that density, we heard things like privacy, we heard things like concern about neighbors not -- or complaining about animals, we heard concern about safety of children, we heard concern about, you know, irrigation and drainage. Some of those concerns don't go away if we reduce the density, right?

So, you know, if we put this all R-1A or R-1B and made them conform to those zoning requirements, there would still be big changes on this property one way or the other with respect to some of the wildlife issues and just the idea that there's 18 open acres, right? That's going to go away either way.

So the question I'm struggling with is what's the marginal adverse impact of the extra 20 or 25 houses that go in in the middle of this thing, because along that southern boundary, the Applicant's right. I mean, they're going to be 9 -- there are currently 9 lots to the south, and he is proposing 14 lots facing those 9. So that's a ratio of 1.55 new
lots facing the 9 old lots. So it's hard for me to understand that in and of itself creates a big transition issue.

So I'm struggling to figure exactly what the difference is in terms of adverse impact between, let's say, the 67 that they proposed and if we made them go back and stick to the R-1B lot sizes, it would go down to 40, say. I'm just guessing. But does that 40 really mitigate the concerns the neighbors had or do they still have the same concerns?

So I'm struggling with that. I'd like to hear other folks' thinking.

COMMISSIONER STEVENS: Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Stevens.

COMMISSIONER STEVENS: So I'm struggling with a lot of the same things and particularly -- actually before I start, I want to compliment staff and Madam Chair. You guys had a rough night just in terms of managing the phone calls, the chat, the e-mails, the, you know, the attendees on Zoom, the people in person, so I just want to compliment you and say that you've done a really great job.

And I want to respond to the people in the neighborhood by saying that I think -- since people were able to attend by telephone, I think this has
been open to the public, and I'm very comfortable with moving forward. So I just wanted to put that on the record, as well as complimenting staff and our Chair.

With regard to the lot sizes, you know, we -- I struggle with this, too, and I think Commissioner Gillespie's done a really good job of sort of laying that question out there of, like, "Well, so let's bring it down to 40 -- whatever the number would be if we just kept a straight R-1B."

And as always happens, almost always, when we talk about a PUD application, we're talking about what would ultimately result, most likely, in a cookie -- what is a truly cookie cutter subdivision.

So we wouldn't have the type of transition, you know, that relates to and talks to the context of what's around it. We wouldn't most likely have, you know, a path going through it, because it is -- the PUD process is all about this tradeoff between -- you get a little extra density so that you create amenities.

And it is more than -- I'm going to respectfully disagree with the neighborhood person who said, "It's just boulders." It's not just boulders. There is a pond there. There's -- the condition of approval requires a path around the pond, an
accessible path.

So I just -- I think we are dealing with a common problem that we constantly deal with here when we deal with a PUD, which is what is that tradeoff. Well, the tradeoff for density is to have what really amounts to a nicer subdivision. And we were to plat this in a normal R-1B and we just stuck a grid on top of it and didn't have the meandering path and didn't have some of the other things that come with what's in front of us tonight, I think we'd actually end up with fewer trees and, you know, some other problems, and we certainly wouldn't have the pond.

So, you know, I look at the location here, and I look at the aerial photos that are in the staff report. And I appreciate Commissioner Bratnober's calculations of 37 percent, but I also then go back to, "Well, so let's just -- let's make it a one to one ratio," and what are we -- what do we get for that? And I'm not sure that reducing it by that amount -- reducing those -- that percentage difference by that amount is really going to get us what we really are going for.

So I think I'm going to support the motion. I'm pleased that the maker of the motion, Commissioner Schafer, removed the detached sidewalks.
I would be concerned that by putting detached sidewalks and requiring that in this subdivision that we'd reduce the size of the lots even further, so I'm pleased with that and I support that in this particular case. It's not something I'd normally support, but I want to just point out that I think, in this case, it makes sense.

And I also think that, you know, it is in the ACHD staff report that the Capital Improvement Plan includes widening Victory by 2025. And so, you know, by the time this actually gets built out, if in fact it goes that direction, we are going to have a more accommodating roadway for the neighborhood.

So I'm reluctant on this one. I'm of course reluctant to lose those historic houses. And I'll just say, for the record, that it -- being a historic house does not make a beautiful house. Some -- a lot of people think that, that it's that things that are not beautiful are not worth saving, but that's not actually how assessing a historic house works. And so I really appreciate staff requiring and putting in the conditions that the State Historic Preservation Office will be permitted to record this. And that -- just so everybody knows -- that's on this -- on our Commission, that's actually going to
come out of the developer's pocket. The SHIPO does not pay for that, so that's something the developer's going to have to pay for, to hire somebody to meet that condition. And so I appreciate that they're doing that. I think it's awesome, the stuff that the neighborhood put in our packet. I found it really interesting of course, as a historian, but also -- I do think that there's value in those houses, and I'm really glad they're going to be recorded,, if in fact they get demolished.

So I think I am going to be supporting the motion, and I thank everyone for their time tonight.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Yeah.

Milt is waving feverishly at the screen in hopes that some of our other Commissioners chime in.

COMMISSIONER BLANCHARD: Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Blanchard.

COMMISSIONER BLANCHARD: All righty. I didn't want to step on my other Commissioners, but I want to thank everybody who came out tonight in whatever setting you came out, whether it was the City Hall or whether it was the call-in or participating virtually.

But just to cut to the chase, I will be supporting the motion. I'm really not wedded to the separated sidewalks one way or the other. It's
probably not something that's really needed within a subdivision with this type of access.

But just to cover a couple of points -- and Commissioner Gillespie really touched on the most important one, which is -- it -- just overwhelmingly my sense is that the neighbors' first preference would be to have nothing happen at all. Second preference would be to have it half-acre lots, which is, just to be frank, in this day and age, in anything that's in the city of Boise's area of impact -- I just cannot see half-acre lots being zoned in the cards, especially in an area like this.

I think even if we were to say, "Okay. Well, then we're going to make every lot in here R-1B and make it conform to that," I don't think they would be happy either. So I just cannot see not allowing this project to go forward in its current manner, just because I think at that point we're just -- we're still going to end up with people having all the exact same concerns.

That said, I'm not at all concerned with the traffic heading south, because Mitchell doesn't go through, so that's not something that I believe is a problem.

I think it's highly unlikely that there's
going to be any cut-through traffic through Diamante, looking at the way that is set up. You would have to exit this proposed subdivision, make one, two, three, four, hard 90-degree turns to cut through that neighborhood, and I can't see anybody doing that, frankly. That just doesn't -- and I'm very sensitive to traffic. I live on the Borah cut-through street. We have 2,000 cars a day. Our family's lived in this house for 29 years, and we're finally getting speed bumps on our streets, after 29 years, to slow down the Borah speedsters. So I get traffic concerns and I get children safety concerns.

I don't see any concerns on that southern side. You've got, one, with the buffer of trees; two -- the houses that are on West Roan Meadows Drive are set to the front of their lots closest to West Roan Meadows drive, and so you're going to have with the backyard setbacks proposed in this proposed subdivision here, I mean, you're going to have these huge buffers. So I just can't see -- I can't see privacy as being, frankly, much of a concern there.

So anyways, that about covers what I had to talk about. So I'll be supporting the motion, and I thank everybody for turning up and bringing up your concerns.
CHAIRMAN STEAD: Any other comments from the Commission?

COMMISSIONER MOHR: Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Mohr.

COMMISSIONER MOHR: I'd just like to say, as well, just the way that the developers approach this with those larger lots kind of on that southern border, keeping that, the existing house, on the large lot, the -- and the pond, as well. Some of those things, they kind of help -- help it feel more like the surrounding neighborhood, while still getting a little bit more density.

But by, you know -- even though some of the dimensions might resemble an R-1C zone, by zoning it as R-1B, they're still limiting that density to a 4.8 units per acre, instead of the 8 units per acre that would be required -- that would be allowed under an R-1C zone. So by placing it R-1B -- and maybe it's smaller lots to resemble -- you're still limiting your density. You're still kind of -- help alleviating some of those concerns, in addition to some of those larger lots that are on the -- on that southern border, too.

So I'll be supporting the motion because of those efforts to kind of help alleviate but also
help transition those larger lots that are existing to
the south to the city of Boise and to some of that
development to the north, as well.

COMMISSIONER SQUYRES: Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Commissioner Squyres.

COMMISSIONER SQUYRES: I will be supporting the
motion, as well. I would like to thank the developer
particularly for what he has agreed to do along the
southern boundary with the lot sizes, the setbacks,
the home heights, the trees, working with the
irrigation. I think this is a well thought-out plan.

The only thing that I wish that we could
potentially move forward with is the detached
sidewalks. I will always advocate for detached
sidewalks. They can be placed within an easement
within the yards so it would not reduce the yard size,
but that is not a deal-breaker for me. I just like
the look of them versus attached.

But I will be supporting the motion. I do
appreciate the neighbors' concerns, but this is the
Area of Impact. It is growing, and I think the
developer has done an adequate job in transition.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Thank you.

And I will lastly -- well, are there any
further comments from the Commission before I add my
own?

COMMISSIONER BRATNOBER: Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Oh, Commissioner Bratnober.

COMMISSIONER BRATNOBER: Yeah.

So just to kind of put a cap on my
statements -- it's not like we're talking about small
differences in lot sizes. We're talking about 9,000
to 5,000. Now my belief was that we've got things
written in the Code and the Comprehensive Plan to
guide us. I've heard discussion that, "Well, gee. If
we expand the lot sizes, it's going to make it worse."
I -- that one totally baffles me. That's beyond my
chem there.

And I haven't heard a compelling -- I've
heard people ask, "Gee. How is -- how are smaller lot
sizes going to material affect your life?" Well, it's
character of the neighborhood. Comp Plan relies
heavily on defining characters of neighborhoods.

The other question that hasn't been asked
nearly enough is, "Gee. If you went with something
that actually conformed to R-1B, things would be
hunky-dory." It's a compromise.

Yes, the neighbors would love to see
half-acre lots. Sorry, that's not where we are right
now as a City, okay?

And obviously the developer would like to get as many of those lots in there as possible.

Mr. Clark said he'd like to understand if we didn't like it -- or in this case, me, I guess -- if we didn't like it, what should he do differently? And that's easy. That's very straightforward. Re-plat it as something that conforms to R-1B. Not asking for moving mountains here. But we've got -- I think Commissioner Gillespie said it was about 47 lots or so, give or take. Okay. Over 40 lots that are -- significantly differ from R-1B. And that's what the change would be. That would be the change we'd ask of Mr. Clark and the developer.

But I -- I'm pretty disappointed that we're looking at going for something which deviates so significantly and has been categorically identified by the neighbors as a problem. So those are my final words on the topic except the vote.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Okay. Thank you.

So just to add my own thoughts here, I do also want to thank staff. This is -- in my couple of years of experience on the Commission, this has been our most successful meeting -- phone, e-mail, online, and in person. And I will be supporting the motion.
I think as the developer mentioned, this is smart growth. We aren't having to extend services, and we are fulfilling the City's Grow Our Housing Initiative with this plan. We need to offer housing options in every neighborhood, big lots, small lots. I think that we are -- we're getting towards providing options.

And there is a traffic plan from ACHD. And the School District and the Fire Departments have both said that this works, and we have to trust our professional experts.

I think with that, we can call for the vote. So we have a motion to recommend approval for CAR20-5, also for SUB20-9, and a motion to approve PUD20-13 with the added conditions of approval of a Tree Mitigation Plan for the project and to remove Condition No. 4 on the detached sidewalks.

ROLL CALL

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Can the clerk please call the vote.

THE CLERK: Stead.

CHAIRMAN STEAD: Aye.

THE CLERK: Schafer.

COMMISSIONER SCHAFER: Aye.

THE CLERK: Squyres.
COMMISSIONER SQUYRES: Aye.

THE CLERK: Blanchard.

COMMISSIONER BLANCHARD: Aye.

THE CLERK: Mohr.

COMMISSIONER MOHR: Aye.

THE CLERK: Stevens.

COMMISSIONER STEVENS: Aye.

THE CLERK: Gillespie.

COMMISSIONER GILLESPIE: Aye.

THE CLERK: Bratnober.

COMMISSIONER BRATNOBER: Nay.

THE CLERK: Seven in favor. One opposed.

Motion carries.

(End transcription at 3:52:44 of audio file.)
V. ADJOURNMENT