



**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
CITY OF MOUNTAIN HOME, ELMORE COUNTY, IDAHO**

April 19, 2021
6:00 PM

ESTABLISH A QUORUM

Chairperson Topher Wallaert noted there was a quorum present and called the April 5, 2021, Regular Meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission to order. Attending were Planning and Zoning Commission Members, Topher Wallaert, Nancy Brletic, Mark Sauerwald, Deedee Devol, William Roeder, Travis Eikeness and James Eskridge.

Staff members attending were Community Development Director Brock Cherry, Administrative Assistant Brenda Ellis and Public Works Director Richard Urquidi.

MINUTES

*April 5, 2021

Commission Member James Eskridge made a motion to approve the minutes for the Regular Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting held on April 5, 2021. Commission Member Billy Roeder seconded the motion. Vote is as follows: Commission Member Brletic; aye, Commission Member Devol; aye, Commission Member Sauerwald; aye, Commission Member Roeder; aye, Commission Member Eikeness; aye and Commission Member Eskridge; aye. Motion passed by a unanimous vote.

RECOGNIZING PERSONS NOT ON THE AGENDA - None

PUBLIC HEARING AND ACTION

*Action Item-Discussion/Decision and request to sign.

A request by James Prather for a Conditional Use Permit to erect a 50' Off-Premise sign, to be located on lots 1 & 2, Block 2, replat K-mart subdivision #1. (PZ21-0017)

Community Development Director, Brock Cherry, gave the Staff Report.

Mr. Prather represents the development occurring on City View Drive. A Conditional Use Permit was approved two years ago, but has expired. The Conditional Use Permit will allow up to a 50' tall, 400 sq. ft. Off-Premise sign on lots 1 and 2, block 2, of the replat of Kmart Subdivision No. 1. The image attached show a 32' sign which will allow some leeway for design considerations. This is a multi-tenant sign for the businesses within the overall development. The Code allows for him to ask for this and the Comprehensive Plan recognizes that signage is ancillary for different types of commercial development. Staff sees no issues.

Mr. Prather believes this is an on-premise sign. Off-premise would require ITD approval. This is on premise sign contained within the eight lots.

Public Hearing Opened
Public Hearing Closed

Commission Member Nancy Brletic made a motion that the Planning & Zoning Commission recommends to the City Council, that the request by James Prather for a Conditional Use Permit to erect a 50' On-premise Sign, to be located on lots 1 and 2, Block 2, Replat of Kmart Subdivision No. 1, be approved. Commission Member Mark Sauerwald seconded the motion. Vote is as follows: Commission Member Brletic; aye, Commission Member Devol; aye, Commission Member Sauerwald; aye, Commission Member Roeder; aye, Commission Member Eikeness; aye and Commission Member Eskridge; aye. Motion passed by a unanimous vote.

*Action Item-Discussion/Decision and request to sign.

A request by Leap Housing Solutions to annex and zone to R-4 a parcel of land approximately 8.39 acres located on the East side of South 5th West Street, South of West 12th South Street, and East of Chucker Circle. (RP03S06E365540) (PZ21-0016)

Community Development Director, Brock Cherry, gave the Staff Report.

This is a request to annex and zone property on South 5th West Street, south of West 12th Street and east of Chucker Circle. The annexation is asking for a zoning designation of R-4. The Future Land Use Map does show this location and the surrounding area as residential. There is a mix of R-4 and R-3 zoning districts around this location. Based on the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance, staff has no issue regarding this application and recommends zoning to the R-4 designation.

The applicant, Bart Cochran, CEO of Leap Housing Solutions, came forward and gave a background on the application and the Organization. Leap is a non-profit, affordable housing provider, providing housing solutions for those with a median income of approximately of \$49,000. HUD identifies Mountain Home as a Difficult to Develop Area (DDA), a definition based on highland construction and utility costs in comparison to the area median income. A particular challenge here is there are virtually no rental units available, and there are rapidly increasing housing prices and inventory is down 73%. Most homes are north of \$400,000. As a mission based organization the goal is to solve housing challenges across the state.

Mary Overstreet came forward as a member of Leap Housing Solutions to speak. The site was chosen because of its attributes; it's flat and has great proximity to City Services and access points. The hope is to provide affordable work force housing. The mission is to provide dignified housing. This site is in the design development stage, striving for high quality, energy efficient construction.

Public Hearing Opened

Jonathan Owen of 760 SW Panner Street came forward, inquired what type of housing was planned and what studies were done.

Hayden Dunn of 1685 Peregrine Street came forward, inquired if the housing was intended for refugee housing or local homebuyers.

Public Hearing Closed

The applicant answered, "It is not intended for refugee housing, it is open to everybody, per Federal Fair Housing Act Laws. The only restriction may be a certain income level or below.

There was discussion regarding expected rental cost and if utilities were included.

Commission Member James Eskridge made a motion to approve the annex and zone a parcel of land that is approximately 8.39 acres located on the East side of South 5th West Street, South of West 12th South Street and East of Chucker Circle. Commission Member Deedee Devol seconded the motion. Vote is as follows: Commission Member Brletic; aye, Commission Member Devol; aye, Commission Member Sauerwald; aye, Commission Member Roeder; aye, Commission Member Eikeness; aye and Commission Member Eskridge; aye. Motion passed by a unanimous vote.

*Action Item-Discussion/Decision and request to sign.

A request by Viper Investments to Annex and Zone R-3 PUD three parcels of land. Parcels are located South of I-84, North of East 17th North, West of North 10th East and East of North 6th East Street. (RP03S06E242455, RP03S06E242460, RP03S06E244200) (PZ21-0005)

Chairperson Topher Wallaert gave a brief directional on the hearing and how it is structured for time, per person.

Community Development Director, Brock Cherry, gave the Staff Report.

Mr. Cherry clarified that the annexation and the PUD are very interconnected. There is approximately 47.49 acres of land. The land has been historically vacant. The developer is proposing a housing development, of 238, single family detached homes. They propose a mix of lot sizes, from 3,400 to 16,000 square feet. The average lot size is 5,000 square feet. The PUD fosters and promotes a variety of appropriate land use combinations in a preplanned development pattern, to encourage a creative approach in land development, to retain and conserve natural land and topographic features, to promote greater land use of street scape and pedestrian oriented aesthetics, to promote and create efficient use of open spaces, to create flexibility and variety in the location of improvements on lots, and provide flexibility in development standards. The intent of the PUD is to bring forth different housing options that will add value to the needs that we have. Staff has reviewed the applicant's submittal and believes that it is creative and conserves green space. The Comprehensive Plan is very specific when it comes to housing. Housing is integral to a successful economic community. It is important to provide housing for people here. The approval of a PUD shall be based on the following standards: proposed usage shall not be detrimental to any surrounding uses, nor shall they be detrimental to the health, safety and welfare of the public. There have been multiple studies and reviewed by multiple staff members to ensure it is safe. A TIS study was conducted and the findings state that the current infrastructure is efficient for what is being proposed. Any variation from the underlying zoning district development requirements must be warranted by the design and amenities incorporated in the conceptual development plan. The development is in proximity to Legacy Park. The applicant has proposed to construct a 10' asphalt pathway, along 10th Street to access the existing pathway. Greystone Park should have some value added to it by adding benches and a pathway connection to the Cul de Sac. Staff has deemed that this application meets the standards set within the zoning ordinance and satisfies the mission of our Comprehensive Plan.

Jane Suggs came forward representing the applicant, Trilogy Development.

Jane is with Gem State Planning. The parcels are surrounded by subdivisions. This project is close to the park and the pathways. Greystone Park is to the north. The plan provides much needed housing. Today there are only nine houses on the market; many are in the \$400,000 plus price range. The project plans for 238 new single family detached homes that equal just under six dwelling units per acre. There are larger lots adjacent to the existing larger lots on the west side. There are 7000-8000 sq. ft. lots along the south side, similar to Bel Air No.1. There are standard 5000-6000 sq. ft. lots in the interior and along 10th Street, and in the interior there are some 3400 sq. ft. lots. Those are 36' wide. Some are 36'x95'. There is a two car garage and a door way and 2-story home, two bedroom, two bath, three bedroom, two bath homes. The price ranges could be \$300,000, for these smaller homes. These smaller homes are in the later phases. Construction will start on the south side and move north with the phasing. Construction costs have gone up \$24,000 so it is hard to say what the price point will be. The PUD will allow for 5' side yard setbacks,

20' on the front, and 15' rear yard setbacks. This does meet the Comprehensive Plan requirements for residential use. This is adjacent to R-2 and R-3 properties. The functional classification map shows which street are local, collector and arterial streets. This map shows that 6th and 10th Street are collector streets expected to carry more traffic. This project ties in east and west to those collector streets. The TIS shows those streets to operate at A and B levels of service and that does not really change. This property does not have water rights. The plan does not create huge green lush open spaces in the property, due to the expense of irrigation. This project is adjacent to the Greystone Park, which there is an agreement to improve it and it is accessible to Legacy Park. There is a central area with trees and picnic tables for a gathering place. There is access north and south and east and west to connect to that open space. There will be cluster mailboxes close to those pathways. There are hundreds of Airforce families living in other places because there is not enough housing here. Low water use planting will be encouraged through CC&R's. The PUD is a great opportunity to mix up the housing. This area is dominated by single family residential. This is a preliminary plan; there will be a lot of checks and balances. We may lose lots to storm water management because of the rock.

Public Hearing Opened

Mitch Egusquiza came forward to speak. He had sent in a letter prior to the hearing. His concern was the traffic coming into 5th Street that leads to Union Street, then to McMurtrey Street. He would like to know the traffic flow and load on those roadways impacted. Everyone North and West of the walking path take Canyon Creek/McMurtrey and was concerned how much traffic is going by these houses already. 6th and 10th will be impacted. The study shows there could be 2000-3000 cars per day going through there with peak time on top of that. With a 238 project development, and reducing some lots to 3400 square feet it just doesn't make since as an R-3 zone which is a 6500 sq. ft. minimum lot size. He was unsure if the Airforce kids could afford a \$500,000 home. This is a nice neighborhood, this decision will make a significant impact on this community for a long time, why reduce the size? He was concerned about the smaller roads. Robert Zurfluh yielded his time for Mr. Egusquiza to speak an additional three minutes. There was concern regarding the impact on the Hospital and the amount of beds available. What type of emergencies can we expect with another 500 to 700 people coming into the community? The questions need to be answered. It is great idea to a certain point, if done right. It is important to look beyond 6th and 10th Street for the traffic load.

Charles Faircloth came forward to speak. He lives on North 5th Street. The smallest zoning designation is R-4, with a minimum 5000 sq. ft., the R-3 has a standard size of 6500 sq. ft., and the developer is proposing a minimum of 3420 sq. ft.. They are also requesting a no minimum square footage of the homes being built and feels it's unacceptable. Mr. Cherry spoke about high density areas requiring a further setback, but yet this development requires only 20 feet. There will be no parking for any recreational vehicles. He doesn't feel the airmen can afford these homes. He feels even though the yards are reduced the occupants of those homes will use far more water then what it takes to water 6500 sq. ft. with a home taking up 50% of that space. He feels that by requesting an exemption to lot sizes in the North end isn't the way to fix the housing shortage. He does not think that the residents of the North end should accept a variance to the R-3 Zoning so the developer can maximize profits by squeezing in as many homes as possible into an area. He was also concerned if the Hospital and School District could accommodate this increase.

Karen Riley came forward to speak. She was concerned with the traffic. She has a disabled husband in a wheelchair. That area is a speedway already. The sidewalks are not ADA accessible due to lack of accessibility ramps. It will be more dangerous with the extra traffic. She would like to see an on-ramp to access the Interstate. She feels there should be more parks added to that subdivision, and that this is being rushed into something where the lots are extremely small and will cram as many people in as possible. It seems it is poorly planned.

Maria Costa-Boyer came forward to speak. She was concerned with the schools and the lack of funding for a new high school. There will be no room for all these school children. The traffic is already an issue, especially with speeding. The notice process should be greater than 300' from the development. This is not a time to keep that on the back burner our kids will keep falling behind. She feels the developer should have to pay for a ramp up and over, as well as speed bumps or round-a-bouts.

Liberty Trausch came forward to speak. She agrees with everything else, but feels that health care needs to be addressed as there is not enough in Mountain Home to support extra people. The wait times are long. She is concerned with the health issues regarding the displacement of the whistle pigs. When digging begins there will be whistle pig feces and urine in the air.

Rex Hunziker came forward to speak. He spoke regarding the TIS. North 6th East is already a major thoroughfare and there is excessive speeding. He would like more information on the TIS.

Terri Manduca came forward to speak. Terri is a realtor and works for the School District. She is excited for development, but feels we need to be responsible and thoughtful in our development. We are going from an R-3 Zoning designation to a PUD that allows for some big difference especially regarding lot size, lot coverage, and minimum Street frontage. The minimum square footage on a ground level is 1100 square foot in an R-3 and 1350 in a two-story, there is no minimum square foot. She wanted to know how many are single family homes and how many are detached townhomes. Will these dwellings have attached garages? Will there be detached garages in the smaller units? Will there be private backyards with fences or will there be common backyards in the smaller units? Density is important. We live in the high desert and water is an issue. There is a real need for housing, and would like to know if the set backs are safe for fire safety? Are the streets sufficient for fire truck access if there is parking on both sides of the road? She worries by allowing the PUD we have not been thoughtful and prefer it stay R-3.

Linda Bennett came forward to speak. She feels the consideration for the lots on south and west side of the property matching the adjoining neighborhoods should also include the housing on 10th Street as well. The 200 lots on the inside are way too small and they should lose a few lots to increase the footage. Water cannot be ignored. When the Industrial Park is completed how much water will they be taking? There was a rumor that field was a hazardous dump site and she would like to know what environmental issues are out there. There is concern about the HOA.

Becky Garvey came forward to speak. She read in a previously submitted letter. Density was a concern, due to traffic. The subdivision will impact their home values. The impact on the schools and infrastructure should be thought about in the long term. She would like to see the denial of the PUD that allows for zoning variances.

Connie Clark came forward to speak. As a realtor she is concerned about the older folks. Single Story homes should be considered more because of the stairs.

Christina Drake came forward to speak. As a realtor she sees a lot of developers putting up parameters of who can purchase properties, as no investors please. There are airman that can afford up to the \$500,00 price. Idaho has the highest BAH and feels that the comment that they can't is not accurate.

Josh Martinez came forward to speak. His concern is the traffic. Union and 15th Street will also be impacted. He would like to see the TIS extended further out. Speeding is an issue.

Public Hearing Closed

Jane Suggs came back for rebuttal questions. There is a challenge to balance affordable housing and yet limit the number of lots which makes houses more expensive. Should the number of lots be reduced the homes there will be more expensive. There will be more traffic, and the collector streets are supposed to be carrying that traffic. The 10' pathway will be installed and all intersections will have ADA ramps for accessibility. The City sends information to the schools and we get feedback from the schools if they choose to respond. There has been no input from the hospitals as they were not notified. This is not a standard subdivision, this provides for a mix of housing opportunities. This promotes low water use as a responsible thing to do where there are no water rights. This is close to parks and we will improve a park just north of the subdivision via the walking path. Regarding the streets, 36' is a standard width for most other jurisdictions. The hope is the HOA will not cost a fortune. It does get people to maintain their yards, keep garbage cans off the streets, patrol and maintain the open spaces. There will be drip irrigated trees at the entry ways. The PUD is a development agreement contract. It has how much sidewalk footage required, pathway, and ensures a quality development. Recommendation for approval would be appreciated. There are single story homes. Most of the lots are the 50 to 60 square foot lots. There is a certain product that fits on the 36 foot wide lots. Most of the lots will be the 50 foot wide lots, 40 foot wide homes, two car garages, with parking in front of those garages. Plenty of room to park, and parking on the street and 5 foot setbacks on each house, so there will be 10 feet between each house, which meets the fire code. There is a Traffic Study and the engineer has looked at each of the streets that are first impacted. Once you leave 6th and 10th down to 15th, traffic starts to disperse and brings in traffic from other areas. Those are the intersections that are most impacted by this development. Each intersection has been analyzed and are still A and B levels of service. There is no way to get an on-ramp from a subdivision to the Interstate. There will be a mix of one and two story housing. Ten to twenty percent of the 50 foot lots will be one story. There is a DA that says when there are one story homes adjacent we want to make those one story as well, especially along the larger lots in Bel Air, and we can do that on the south side too.

Chief Moore was asked if there was any issue getting emergency vehicles with apparatus' down these narrower streets with street parking? Chief Moore stated, "We sit at the table at these development meetings and we have never been asked to compromise anything outside of our Code. The Codes proposed within this development are within the parameters of the Fire Code." Fire Marshall Reed, Stated, "The minimum Fire Code for emergency vehicles with apparatus' is 32' with parking on both sides."

Commission Member Eskridge inquired about specifics of the TIS and actual traffic counts. There were actual traffic counts taken at those sites to measure existing traffic. The counts are projected out, there are exiting traffic counts, background traffic and then the projected with the background traffic included in the study to determine impact. Collector streets can carry 3000 cars a day and when you have a street right now that serves 1000 cars a day, there is opportunity to add traffic to those collector streets without changing the level of service.

Chairperson Wallaert asked what the span between the homes in the smaller lots was. There is a ten foot separation between the homes, five feet from each property boundary line. Going set back to set back can cover 50% of the lot.

Jane Suggs stated, "The project should be built out in about five years, starting on the south side".

Commission Member Roeder's biggest concerns were the size of the smaller lots, and the HOA as they tend to go defunct. The community seems to take issue with the lot size. The developer is willing to take the advice of the City to determine the functionality of the HOA.

Chairperson Wallaert, agreed that from what he heard, the smaller lot sizes means more people and more people means more traffic and more traffic means more issues. Asking for smaller lots sizes increases the population that increases the traffic concerns. The first person view is just as important as the TIS. Chairperson Wallaert believed that increasing the lot size would potentially remove some of the traffic issues. The public is saying they do not want an increase flow of danger in the neighborhood.

Janes Suggs stated, "Without the smaller lots, you won't get the larger lots. Without the mix there is not the revenue to develop the property. We have been working with staff for the past six to eight months and staff was very interested in this mix of lot sizes. I can come back with data and there are facts in the TIS prepared by a professional Traffic Engineer based on true counts. I appreciate the first person responses, but that should be balanced with the profession information. We can look at a variety of options for off-site remediation. We can do some bulb outs if requested on the straight streets to make this project more appealing."

Commission Member Sauerwald inquired about the many comments regarding speeding in that area, and wondered if the police department noticed any traffic issues and if they had any concerns with the potential influx of traffic. Police Chief Conner stated, "More traffic does mean more cars. We are not overly concerned about the number of cars." Commission Member Sauerwald commented, "The first observation is the size of this room and the amount of people waiting outside. We are lucky to have one person in a regular meeting. That speaks loudly. The other observation is that four realtors would be concerned about the number of homes to be sold. People don't want Boise in Mountain Home. We do need more homes, but it doesn't sound like those smaller lot sizes and smaller homes are the type of homes residents want to see. Just because something is allowed or within Code doesn't mean it is the best fit for a particular area. It was not said, people didn't want it developed, they just don't want it developed like this."

Commission Member Brletic commented, "There are people who want those kinds of homes, and want to be in a nice area. Retired people are not looking for large homes. They are looking for a place they can handle. What I am hearing is that people want to dictate the kind of houses, other people might need. Everyone has had a chance to buy what they want, but how can you say in another area, no, you can't do that. I do not understand how this project makes us Boise, the more diversity in our town the better. I am pretty conservative regarding individual rights. It bothers me that the biggest response from people here tonight was that a developer wanted to make money. It seems as though that is the bottom line. It is diversity that make the richness."

Commission Member Eskridge asked, "Is it the intent of the developer to develop the infrastructure by phase only? Phase one consists of forty-nine lots, and one small green space. There is not that much green space. To get to the areas with green space, if it is not developed initially, people can't get to those connected areas." Jane Suggs answered, "Yes, you are partially correct. We would start on the south end and we would not extend pathways and infrastructure to the park until phase 2. The park will be built in phase 3. The pathways will be built at each one, that gets you from street to street. We could make a commitment to put the pathway along 10th Street in phase one."

Commission Member Sauerwald asked, "As far as infrastructure, have the schools, hospital and water consumption, been looked at? It was mentioned that there was a hazardous waste area. Has there been an environmental study done? Jane Suggs answered, "Yes, there has been. Many years ago there were tailings left on the property, they were since remediated. MTI did the testing and reported that the site is clean." Mr. Cherry stated, "For any public hearing we have a list of political subdivision that are notified, such as Elmore County, Central District Health, also, the School District. I gave a presentation to the School Board, which included this project, and all the anticipated projects. We are being transparent with the growth that is coming. I would hope that the same amount of people that come to this meeting will go

to the School Board meetings as well to ensure they are doing what is needed to provide sufficient education infrastructure. There was nothing received from them regarding this project. Regarding water, it has been thoroughly reviewed by Public Works and third party engineering group Keller Engineering they found our current infrastructure is sufficient for the development.”

Commission Member Eikeness asked, “The overflow ponds would make me nervous if I lived right next to one. Will they be fenced? Will they be cleaned? They attract mosquitos that carry diseases.” Jane Suggs answered, “You have ordinances that require development to maintain any increase in run off on your own property. These are stormwater detention basins. What they do is, the water goes in and is infiltrated or there is a pipe outlet that controls the amount of water that goes out. The engineering drawing shows those. They fill with water, when it is raining. Within 24 hours the water has to dissipate and be released. You would not want your kid out there in the rainstorm, but they will have some water. They gently slope on the sides. They aren’t anything you can’t get out of. There are specific guidelines to how they are to be built.” Rich Urquidi came forward to speak, “These ponds are all over the place and there are guidelines they have to follow. The water must dissipate within 24 hours. Water and wastewater are set up to service this project. Water pressure is high there. A lot of theses houses will have to have a pressure regulator.”

Commission Member William Roeder made a motion to table these hearing for Thunderbolt Landing to the May 3rd, 2021 Planning and Zoning Meeting. Commission Member Travis Eikenes seconded the motion. Vote is as follows: Commission Member Brletic; aye, Commission Member Devol; aye, Commission Member Sauerwald; aye, Commission Member Roeder; aye, Commission Member Eikeness; aye and Commission Member Eskridge; aye. Motion passed by a unanimous vote.

Action Item-Discussion/Decision and request to sign. **No discussion was had. Tabled to May 3, 2021**

A request by Viper Investments for a Preliminary Plat. Parcels are located South of I-84, North of East 17th North, West of North 10th East and East of North 6th East Street. (RP03S06E242455, RP03S06E242460, RP03S06E244200) (PZ21-0007)

NEW BUSINESS

*None

OLD BUSINESS

*None

DEPARTMENT HEAD ITEMS

* Monthly Building Permit Report – March 2021-None

*Monthly Code Enforcement Report – March 2021-None

ITEMS REQUESTED BY COMMISSION/STAFF

*None

ADJOURN

Chairman Topher Wallaert adjourned the meeting at 8:27 p.m.

Chair _____

