

**NAMPA PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING HELD  
TUESDAY, JULY 26, 2016, 6:30 P.M.**

|          |   |  |
|----------|---|--|
| Members: | Victor Rodriguez – Acting Chairman<br>Steve Kehoe<br>Bret Miller<br>Kevin Myers | Peggy Sellman<br>Norm Holm, Director<br>Tom Points, City Engineer<br>Karla Nelson, Community Planner |
| Absent:  | Lance McGrath, Chairman<br>Chad Gunstream- Vice Chairman<br>Sheila Keim         | Harold Kropp<br>Robert Hobbs, Assistant Director   |

**Acting Chairman Rodriguez** called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m.

**Approval of Minutes. Myers motioned and Sellman seconded to approve the Minutes of the July 12, 2016 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. Motion carried.**

**Report on Council Actions.** There were no City Council members present to report on City Council actions.

**Acting Chairman Rodriguez** proceeded to the business items on the agenda.

**Business Item No. 1:**

**Presentation from Carl Miller on COMPASS Development Checklists.**

**Carl Miller of COMPASS, 700 NE 2<sup>ND</sup> St, Meridian:**

- Mr Miller advised he worked for the Community Planning Association, known as COMPASS.
- Mr Miller informed the Commission he would like to receive feedback about some of the processes COMPASS has in place, and how they could better serve the City of Nampa, one of their member agencies.
- Mr Miller explained COMPASS was a metropolitan planning organization, which means they get Federal funding for transportation projects in the two County (Ada and Canyon) area.
- COMPASS, added Mr Miller, serves the various cities and the highway districts, and works to bring Federal funding to the area. They also work to bring together stakeholders in a collaborative fashion, working together to solve community needs and regional issues from the transportation standpoint.
- One of the main items, added Mr Miller, had been to develop a regional long range transportation plan, which was accomplished in 2012 and approved in 2014, to look at where the area would be in the next 25 years and how would the infrastructure and services be implemented to maintain the quality of life the residents in the valley are used to.
- Mr Miller emphasized they did want the long range transportation plan to be a useful tool in order to make regional and local planning come together.
- According to Mr Miller, they came up with a tool for a Development Checklist which would show how different development proposals would either further the goals of the plan, or work against it. The checklist was meant to be a short way to give some feedback regarding whether the proposal was good for the region. The report, added Mr Miller, represented the Communities in Motion regarding transportation, health, land use development space, and infrastructure, etc.

- According to Mr Miller, the Development Checklist Report was usually sent out for large scale developments, or a similar amount of commercial space. Additionally, the Development Checklist Report would also be sent out if an arterial or major roadway would be impacted by developments.
- The Development Checklist Report would also be generated if the City of Nampa requested a report regarding a project and how that project related to the regional goals that had been set.
- Mr Miller requested feedback from the Commission regarding the Development Checklist Report.
- **Acting Chairman Rodriguez** stated he would like to have a training session with the Commission members and COMPASS to see exactly what was determined by the information on the checklist and how COMPASS came to their decisions.
- **Kehoe** concurred that a training session would be very helpful and an explanation of what it really means would be very helpful.
- **Mr Miller** agreed a training session would allow the terms and definitions used by COMPASS to be explained.
- **Kehoe** also suggested perhaps there was not enough negative information provided and narrative could be added indicating any areas of concern. **Mr Miller** stated he had also heard that comment from Boise.
- **Myers** considered that perhaps the criteria was too narrow in terms of distances. **Mr Miller** explained the majority of people are willing to go one quarter mile on foot, but will not travel one half mile. Mr Miller agreed that providing a little extra information at times might be helpful.
- **Myers** noted the most controversial hearing had been the golf course hearing and it would have been helpful to have had that level of detail, and noted the question regarding the Transit Center had been proposed as part of that development.
- **Mr Miller** appreciated the feedback and noted COMPASS was looking at ways to revise the Development Checklist Report and possibly coming back to the Nampa Planning Commission, or perhaps get together a region wide Planning and Zoning Commission group to explain the rationale.
- **Myers** suggested a long term outlook of transportation projects on valley and State level would be advantageous.

**Business Item No. 2:**

**Presentation from City of Nampa Community Planner Karla Nelson on Invest Health Grant and upcoming Public Involvement Process.**

**Karla Nelson – City of Nampa Community Planner:**

- Nelson advised the Commission regarding a grant the City of Nampa had received, called The Invest Health Grant. The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, and The Reinvestment Fund gave the City the grant.
- Nampa, added Nelson, had been working with some other community agencies and organizations on this grant.
- Additionally, stated Nelson, there was a much broader stakeholder group.
- Nelson explained it was an 18 month grant, and the end goal was to come up with some sort of investment project, or community pipeline of investment that would improve health outcomes in the long term for a particular neighborhood.
- For the grant, added Nelson, the decision was made to focus on North Central Nampa, bordered by Interstate 84, Northside Blvd, Sugar St, and the Railroad.
- Nelson reported there were a number of reasons why they decided to focus on that area, and noted the following:
  - Census tracks showing North Central Nampa with concentrated persistent poverty for at least 30 years.
  - The most recent American Community Survey from the Census for the same census track in North Central Nampa, indicated that 50% of the people are living in poverty, higher than any other census track in Nampa or the whole Treasure Valley.
  - Educational attainments also fairly low in that part of Nampa, showing 40 percent of adults age 25 and older who have a high school diploma – the lowest of any census block in Nampa or the Treasure Valley.
  - Diabetes in North Central Nampa – shows 12.4%.
  - People reporting poor or fair health – shows 25% of people in that neighborhood.

- Additionally, the flood plain covers a substantial amount of the area which complicates reinvestment and redevelopment efforts in North Central Nampa.
- Nelson stated the hope was that this type of effort would help to come up with a strategic plan, otherwise there was no view to improving things.
- At the present time, added Nelson, they were working on a variety of public involvements to try and determine what the vision should be. A survey had been sent out to all residents in North Central Nampa, and also a survey would be available at the National Night Out event at the Gateway Apartments, a Community Resource and Health Fair planned for August 6<sup>th</sup> at Lakeview Park where people can get some free health services.
- A citizen's Advisory Committee will then be formed, stated Nelson, to focus in on the vision for the project.
- **Rodriguez** stated a survey had been done for the Hispanic community on the north side and there was a wide diversity of income and education for those residents.
- Rodriguez inquired if the grant would help the residents in terms of further and continued education, or would it just be for health issues.
- **Nelson** replied the grant would be focusing on community development and health and how they intersect because there was a lot of growing research finding that community design really impacts long term health, for example, access to education and early childhood education is correlated to health; income is correlated to health; and, the way communities are designed is also correlated to health.
- The idea, added Nelson, was to look at some of the broader social determinants of health and see how to improve some of those, and maybe in the long term, improve health outcomes in that neighborhood.
- **Kehoe** inquired if that grant would also look at the financial impact of people not being able to afford healthcare.
- **Nelson** stated the survey would be asking the respondents if they have insurance, and if they don't, why not.
- Discussion followed regarding whether information could be taken to the legislature promoting the provision of healthcare for those residents.
- In response to a question from **Acting Chairman Rodriguez**, **Nelson** stated the survey had been translated into Spanish, and the flyers in Spanish as well. There were also a number of service providers from St Alphonsus and St Luke's that were Spanish speaking and would be working to bring out a lot of that community.

**Modification of Approval Condition pertaining to the required 8 ft Concrete Wall and Approval of Building Orientation/Size and Landscaping Plan for Conditional Use Permit for an Automotive Repair Shop in a BC (Community Business) zoning district at 3321 12<sup>th</sup> Ave Rd. (A 1.23 acre portion of the SE ¼ Section 4 T3N R2W BM, Covert Subdivision No. 2, Lot 1, Block 1), granted to James and Michele Connelly on April 26 2016 (CUP 2179-16)**

**Planning Director Holm:**

- Holm reviewed the Staff Report generated by Robert Hobbs and the Conditions of Approval that were attached to the approved Conditional Use Permit on April 26, 2016.
- Holm noted the information the applicants provided regarding the requested modifications -- for a structure under 30 ft in height, with a smaller dimension, centered in the middle of the lot, and eliminating the garage bay doors on the long sides of the building and instead using garage bay doors only at each end of the building.
- According to Holm, the requirement for a wall was an issue, and the applicants indicated they are proposing a 6 ft to 8 ft vinyl fence around the site, in care and keeping with the original Development Agreement assigned to the property upon annexation. The Development Agreement, added Holm, did not speak to a concrete wall as required by the Conditional Use Permit and the applicants advised the cost of the 8 ft solid wall, came in higher than they anticipated at approximately \$200,000. The applicants feel the vinyl fence would accomplish the same as the wall, especially with the redesign of the building.
- The third point brought up by the applicants, reported Holm, was the landscaping for the area on the west side of the lot. The applicant stated they had tried to work with the neighbors regarding landscaping the west boundary of the subject property.
- Holm stated Staff had conveyed the minimum landscaping for the west side of the subject property adjacent to the wall/fence to be constructed: planter islands to be installed with trees at four points.

- **Acting Chairman Rodriguez** stated the applicants' requests were scheduled as a business item and not a public hearing.
- **Kehoe** considered it would be dishonest to the neighboring property owners to make a decision on the modifications without a public hearing.
- Kehoe added that he did like the modified plan, but considered the neighbors should have a chance to see it as well.
- **Miller** concurred with the Kehoe's comments.

**Kehoe motioned and Miller seconded to table the Request for Modification of Approval Conditions to the August 23<sup>rd</sup> Public Hearing Agenda; pertaining to the required 8 ft Concrete Wall, Approval of Building Orientation/Size; and Landscaping Plan for Conditional Use Permit for an Automotive Repair shop in a BC zoning district at 3321 12<sup>th</sup> Ave Rd for James and Michele Connelly.**

**Motion carried.**

**Acting Chairman Rodriguez** proceeded to the public hearing items on the agenda at 7:11 p.m.

**Public Hearing No. 1:**

**Subdivision Plat Short Plat Approval for WinCo Place Subdivision in a BC (Community Business) zoning district at 1175 N Happy Valley Road. (3 commercial lots on 10.094 acres – A portion of the SE ¼ Section 13 T3N R2W BM), for WinCo Foods, LLC (SPS004-2016).**

**Acting Chairman Rodriguez** proceeded to public hearing.

**Dan Zimmerman of Tayten Associates, N 27<sup>th</sup> St, Boise, representing the applicant.**

- Mr Zimmerman explained the applicants wanted to separate three of the lots, the main lot to be the WinCo Foods lot, and the two smaller lots to be sold at a later date.
- In response to a question from **Acting Chairman Rodriguez**, **Mr Zimmerman** stated the property already had the BC zoning designation.
- **Kehoe** inquired the size of the proposed WinCo store, and **Mr Zimmerman** stated the proposed store would be 85,000 sq ft, a little smaller than the existing WinCo on Caldwell Blvd.
- **Myers** inquired where the access points to the development would be and **Mr Zimmerman** stated there would be one off Flamingo Ave, one off Happy Valley Rd and one off Stamm Ln, and no access points off Garrity Blvd. Mr Zimmerman added the access of Flamingo Ave would be right-in and right-out only.
- **Acting Chairman Rodriguez** inquired if a Traffic Impact Study had been done for the subdivision and Mr Zimmerman stated there had been a Traffic Impact Study done for the Gateway development.

**Planning Director Holm:**

- Holm stated he was not aware of a Traffic Impact Study submitted with the current Short Plat application.
- Holm reviewed the Staff Report and stated Staff had determined the WinCo short plat was in substantial conformance with the City Ordinances and State Code.
- Holm reviewed the recommended conditions of approval and Memorandum from the City of Nampa Engineering Division recommending approval.

**Acting Chairman Rodriguez** proceeded to public testimony.

No public comments forthcoming.

**Kehoe motioned and Sellman seconded to approve the Subdivision Short Plat for WinCo Place Subdivision at 1175 N Happy Valley Rd in a BC zoning district for WinCo Foods, LLC, subject to**

- :**
- 1. The water system for the Development shall be completely installed and able to deliver water prior to any Building Permits being issued within the development. The water shall be**

sufficient in volume and pressure to provide sufficient adequate fire suppression for the development in accordance with Fire Department policy or International Fire Code requirements as applicable.

2. Developer's engineer shall correct any spelling, grammar, punctuation and/or and numbering errors that may be evident on the plat face and/or in the proposed plat development notes and include said corrections in a revised Preliminary Plat to be provided to the City.
3. Any exceptions to City adopted subdivision design standards shall/will require separate design [exception] approval from the City Council.

Motion carried.

**Public Hearing No. 2:**

**Zoning Map Amendment from RS-8.5 (Single Family Residential – 8,500 sq ft) to RA (Suburban Residential) at 17155, 17175, 17225, 0 Star Rd and 0 Cherry Lane. (An approximately 27.069 acre portion of the SE 1/4 Section 6 T3N R1W BM), for John Low. (ZMA 018-16)**

Acting Chairman Rodriguez proceeded to public hearing.

**John Low of 4921 Cresthaven, Boise – the applicant:**

- According to Mr Low, the subject properties comprised approximately 28 acres and were split up into four 5 acre parcels and one 7.75 acre parcel.
- The Rezone had been requested, continued Mr Low, because with that much property within each of the subject parcels the landowners would like to Rezone to RA, so they could raise a cow or have a couple of horses. The Rezone to RA, added Mr Low, would allow a large animal for each 10,000 sq ft of pasture.

**Planning Director Holm:**

- Holm noted the subject properties were annexed into the City in 2006 and at that time it was anticipated the parcel would be split into smaller lots under the RS-8.5 zoning.
- That did not happen, reported Holm, and now the current owners would like to revert the zoning to the RA zoning district to accommodate a more rural 5 lot development, with the 5 lots that had already been created.
- The Comprehensive Plan designation, advised Holm, indicated a Community Mixed Use designation bordering Medium Density designation on the north and would, therefore, be eligible for Rezone to RA.
- According to Holm, no communications had been received from surrounding property owners or residents.

Acting Chairman Rodriguez proceeded to public testimony.

**Michael Dudley of 1411 S Secretariat Way, Nampa – in favor:**

- Mr Dudley advised he was the owner of one of the parcels requesting the Rezone to RA.
- Mr Dudley stated he was in favor of the Rezone to Ra as he would like to keep horses on his property.

Miller motioned and Sellman seconded to close public hearing. Motion carried.

**Myers motioned and Sellman seconded to recommend to City Council Rezoning from RS-8.5 to RA for 17155, 17175, 17225, 0 Star Rd and 0 Cherry Lane for John Low.  
Motion carried.**

**Conditional Use Permit for Home Occupation Breeding of Feeder Insects and Non-Aggressive Small Reptiles at 16029 N Broken top Drive (in the SW ¼ Section 7 T3N R2W BM, Crestwood Estates No. 3, Lot 31, Block 8) for Teresa Bahr (CUP 039-16).**

Acting Chairman Rodriguez proceeded to public hearing.

**Theresa Bahr of 16029 N Broken Top Dr, Nampa – the applicant:**

- Ms Bahr stated she would like to start a small home based business breeding and selling feeder insects and small non-aggressive reptiles.
- In response to a question from **Acting Chairman Rodriguez, Ms Bahr** stated it had started out as a hobby and she now wanted to turn the hobby into a home based business.
- Ms Bahr added that at the present time she had two chameleons, four crested geckoes, and two leopard geckoes.
- Ms Bahr stated she purchases the insects from companies that sell feeder insects, and then breeds the insects. Ms Bahr indicated photos of the insects and the geckoes, their respective containers, and the rooms the containers were kept in.
- **Kehoe** inquired if the insects and geckoes would be kept on the inside of the house or would they be kept outside.
- **Ms Bahr** replied the chameleons do go outside in a cage occasionally.
- **Kehoe** questioned how many insects and geckoes there would be if the home business was successful.
- According to Ms Bahr she would like to have an on-line website for on-line orders to ship out and also local sales and the numbers she could care for her would be limited by the size of her house.
- **Myers** inquired if there would be much waste from the insects and geckoes and **Ms Bahr** replied there was not.
- In response to a question from **Sellman, Ms Bahr** stated the crickets were not loud and you could not hear them with the door closed, and the neighbors would not be able to hear them.

**Planning Director Holm:**

- Holm indicated the location of the subject property within a single family residential area.
- The Comprehensive Plan designation, added Holm, was Medium Density Residential.
- Holm reviewed the Staff Report and suggested conditions of approval.
- Holm noted the one letter of opposition received from Mr and Mrs Steven Swartz, of 27152 Soledad Dr, Mission Viejo, California, dated July 12, 2016, owners of 16085 N Broken Top Dr, stating they would need more information before they could support the requested Conditional Use Permit for a Home Occupation.
- Discussion followed regarding the possible conditions of approval for the Home Occupation C-U-P.

**Acting Chairman Rodriguez** proceeded to public testimony.

**Larry Vermilyea of 16029 N Broken Top Dr, Nampa – in favor:**

- Mr Vermilyea stated his wife was very eager to proceed with the proposed Home Occupation and he was in favor of the Conditional Use Permit.

**Teresa Bahr:**

- Ms Bahr stated she would only bring one reptile outside at a time, and if there were offspring she would take those outside in a cage but they would not be loose.

**Kehoe motioned and Sellman seconded to close public hearing. Motion carried.**

Discussion followed regarding the conditions of approval.

**Kehoe motioned and Miller seconded to approve the Conditional Use Permit for a Home Occupation Breeding of Feeder Insects and Non-Aggressive Small Reptiles at 16029 N Broken top Drive, for Teresa Bahr, subject to:**

1. All breeding and keeping of Feeder Insects and Non-Aggressive Small Reptiles (not to include snakes) conducted on the premises shall not be allowed to constitute a nuisance to neighbors by reason of odors, hazards or other causes, beyond the inside of the home.
2. The Feeder Insects and Non-Aggressive Small Reptiles (not to include snakes) shall be housed and contained so as to not be able to get outside of the home. However, one reptile at a time can be brought to exercise, any additional reptiles outside shall be otherwise contained.
3. All insects, including crickets, super worms, mealworms, waxworms, and silkworms shall be kept and/or bred and maintained in clean containers/housing so as to prevent any infestations or hazards. Any dead insects shall be immediately discarded from the premises.

4. **Only small reptiles shall be kept and/or bred on the premises (not to include snakes) and they shall be of the non-aggressive type, and all offspring shall be sold within 3 months of birth.**  
**Motion carried.**

**Conditional use Permit for a Commercial Daycare Center in a BM (Neighborhood business) zoning district at 1004 W Roosevelt Avenue. (A .24 acre portion of NE ¼ Section 29 T3N R2W BM, Falcon Ridge No. 1, Lot 3, Block 2) for Amy Payne (CUP 040-16).**

**Acting Chairman Rodriguez** proceeded to public hearing.

**Amy Payne of 89 S Canyon St, Nampa – the applicant:**

- Ms Payne stated she was requesting Conditional Use Permit approval in order to open a child care learning center at 1004 W Roosevelt Ave.
- For 12 of the last 13 years, added Ms Payne, she had been the Director at a child care learning center in Caldwell and now wished to open her own facility.
- Ms Payne stated her facility would be providing quality child care for children from 6 weeks to 5 years of age.
- **Myers** inquired if there would be an outdoor play area and **Ms Payne** replied there was a grassy area and that will be fenced off for an outdoor playground.
- In response to a question from **Myers**, **Ms Payne** advised she had obtained a Traffic Report and the findings indicated there would be sufficient parking spaces.
- Ms Payne advised the daycare hours would be from 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday to Friday.
- **Sellman** inquired how many employees would be on site and **Ms Payne** replied there would be three employees and herself. Ms Payne added there would be 3 employee cars on site and two of those employees would carpool.
- In response to a question from **Kehoe**, **Ms Payne** stated the outside play area would be on the north side of the building and would have fencing all the way around.
- **Ms Payne** responded to a question from **Acting Chairman Rodriguez** and advised the subject building was approximately 1000 sq ft in size and the Nampa Fire Department would be the entity to determine if that would be enough space for 31 children, however, 31 children would be the maximum number of children for the facility. Ms Payne emphasized the school would be under ratio regarding the number of children for each staff member.
- **Sellman** inquired if the Fire Department inspection had been done yet and **Ms Payne** stated it had not, as she wanted to gain approval for the Conditional Use Permit before requesting the Fire Department inspection.

**Planning Director Holm:**

- Holm indicated the Traffic Impact Study generated by Thompson Engineers and analysis of the parking situation for the subject property.
- Additionally, stated Holm there had been a revised Memorandum from the Nampa Engineering Division which stated that based on the TIS, the Engineering Division did not oppose the application subject to: If pick-up and drop-offs are not contained on-site, owners shall adjust times to eliminate traffic conflicts on W Roosevelt Ave.
- Holm reported the applicant would be enclosing the proposed play area on the north side of the structure.
- According to Holm, no communications had been received from surrounding property owners or residents.
- Holm discussed the past businesses that had operated out of the subject property.
- **Kehoe** noted how busy the S Midland Blvd/W Roosevelt Ave intersection was and considered it would be difficult for other vehicles if automobiles were parked in front of the subject property.
- **Kehoe** inquired if “No Parking” signs could be required for the subject property.
- **Holm** advised a No Parking sign would have to be acceptable to the Engineering Division staff.
- Discussion followed on a “No Parking” sign.
- **Acting Chairman Rodriguez** inquired if there would be an issue with just one ingress and egress point for the subject property.

- **City Engineer Points** stated the sign was not an issue with the Engineering Division, but it may be with the Fire Department.

**Acting Chairman Rodriguez** proceeded to public testimony.

**Tim McMahon of 12711 Wild Rose Ln, Nampa – in favor:**

- Mr McMahon stated he knew of several businesses that had operated out of the subject property.
- Mr McMahon thought the child care business at that location would be a great idea.
- At the present time, added Mr McMahon, there was no sign stating no parking allowed in front of the subject property, however, he had never seen a car parked there, and added if parking were to be allowed then it would be safer just west of the parking lot entrance.

**Amy Payne:**

- Ms Payne advised the child care center will have a registration packet for each parent to sign, and that issue could be addressed, with the parents signing they are aware they are not allowed to drop off or pick up their children in that area along W Roosevelt Ave.
- Ms Payne indicated the exits to the building, the main front door, a side door, and in the back from the parking lot there was also a door, giving three entrance/exit doors for the facility.
- In response to a question from Myers, Ms Payne stated the front door facing W Roosevelt Ave was the main door used for ingress and egress.
- Ms Payne responded to a question from **Acting Chairman Rodriguez** and stated she would be willing to put in a “No Parking” sign if required to do so.

**Sellman motioned and Miller seconded to close public hearing. Motion carried.**

**Kehoe motioned and Myers seconded to approve the Conditional Use Permit for a Commercial Daycare Center in a BN zoning district at 1004 W Roosevelt Ave for Amy Payne, subject to:**

1. **Owner/operator/Applicant(s) shall comply with all applicable requirements [including obtaining proper permits] as may be imposed by City agencies appropriately involved in the review of the request (e.g. Nampa Fire, Building, Planning and Zoning and Engineering Departments, etc) as the C-U-P approval does not, and shall not, have the effect of abrogating the need to comply with lawful requirements administered by those agencies.**
2. **The existing grassy yard on the Property shall be enclosed with a six (6) ft tall, solid screen fence which shall be positioned no closer than twenty (20) ft to Midland Blvd (in conformance N.C.C.§ 10-01-08.E) and shall feature a self-latching gate or similar security gate positioned at the southwest corner of the play yard fence next to the ADA parking stall. The fencing and man gate shall be installed by the Applicant (or their agent/contractor) prior to occupancy/use of the building on the Property for a daycare facility.**
3. **A “No Parking” sign shall be posted on the Property’s frontage on Roosevelt Avenue (subject to City Engineering Division approval).**

**Motion carried.**

**Public Hearings 5 and 6:**

**Amendments to Title 10, chapters 3, 4 and 22 relating to establishment of the GBE (Gateway Business Entertainment) zone, allowable land uses, and parking provisions.**

**Amending Title 10, Chapter 3, Section 10-3-1 and 10-3-2 relating to land uses in the GBE (Gateway Business Entertainment) zone.**

**Amending Title 10, Chapter 4, Sections 10-4-1, 10-4-2, 10-4-5, 10-4-6, 10-4-8, 10-4-9, and 10-4-10 relating to establishment of the GBE (Gateway business Entertainment) zone.**

**Amending Title 10, Chapter 22, Sections 10-22-1, 10-22-4, and 10-22-6 pertaining to parking in the GBE (Gateway Business Entertainment) zone. (ZTA 003-16).**

**Zoning Map Amendment from GB-1 (Gateway Business) to GBE (Gateway Business Entertainment) at 16200 Idaho Center Blvd. (A 55.24 acre portion of Section 7 T3N R1W BM, Idaho Center Subdivision Lots 1 and 3, Block 1), for the City of Nampa. (ZMA 019-16).**

Acting Chairman Rodriguez proceeded to public hearing.

**Community Planner Nelson:**

- Nelson explained the proposed Code Amendments would create a new zone: Gateway Business Entertainment zone, a sub-district in the Gateway Business zoning district.
- A Rezone to GBE was also before the Commission, added Nelson, for the Idaho Center parcel, at 16200 Idaho Center Blvd.
- Nelson discussed the reasoning for the Rezone to GBE, due to the fact the Mayor and the Economic Development Department were working on a proposal to bring in new development to the Idaho Center property, along Idaho Center Blvd, that would be specific to entertainment type uses that would complement the Ford Idaho Center and surrounding land uses.
- At the present time, continued Nelson, a lot of people go to the Idaho Center for a show but go out to dinner in Meridian or Boise and then leave after the show. So the intent was to give people more reasons to stay in the area, with the benefit going to the Idaho Center itself and surrounding businesses.
- Nelson indicated the northwest corner of the subject parcel that would potentially be developed, being a portion of the Idaho Center parking lot.
- Nelson noted the uses in Chapter 10-3-2 for the proposed GBE district that would be permitted, permitted with a Conditional Use Permit, or not permitted – which would all be entertainment based.
- Additionally, some changes to the Parking Code would also be implemented.
- According to Nelson, the Idaho Center has 3,500 parking spaces and 99 percent of the time they do not need all the parking spaces they have. If, in the future, Idaho Center was anticipating they would require additional parking spaces for an event they could implement a parking management plan to potentially work with CWI, or have shuttles, or similar, to address the parking issues and not have so much land devoted to parking the rest of the time.
- From the North East Nampa Specific Area Plan, continued Nelson, there were comments from surrounding property owners and stakeholders that they would like to have a sit down restaurant in the area and different types of entertainment venues that would be more of an attraction to the Idaho Center area.
- Regarding the Comprehensive Plan, Nelson stated the proposed Rezone would be consistent with infill development and flexible parking standards.
- The Ford Idaho Center property, stated Nelson, has a “Public” Comprehensive Plan Future Map Use designation at the present time, but touches the Highway Commercial designation on three sides.
- Nelson reviewed the Staff Report and Staff Findings regarding the proposed Rezone to GBE and Zoning Ordinance Test Amendments.
- Nelson reiterated that property owners had indicated they would like to see more entertainment uses in the subject are, and current zoning designations do not limit uses enough to have a zoning district that would complement the Ford Idaho Center and that was why the proposed GBE zoning had been recommended.
- In response to a question from **Kehoe**, Nelson indicated the location of the Sports Park on the property.
- **Kehoe** inquired why government buildings would be permitted in the proposed GBE zoning district.
- **Nelson** replied that the intent was to keep all of the existing uses allowed, and the Ford Idaho Center could be considered a government building.
- **Myers** noted that during the Rezone hearing for the golf course properties a Transit Center had been listed as a possibility and suggested the Idaho Center property would be a good option for that use.
- **Nelson** replied, that if implemented, the long term plan for a passenger rail service would probably go right by the subject property and would also serve CWI and all the surrounding businesses.
- Discussion followed regarding the fact the Ford Idaho Center would not have many days throughout the year when more parking would be required, and for those times a shuttle service would be an alternative means of traveling to the Idaho Center.

Acting Chairman Rodriguez proceeded to public testimony.

**Terry Mahoney of 2020 Primrose Ln, Nampa:**

- Mr Mahoney stated he owned two properties adjacent to the Ford Idaho Center land, 5720 and 5680 Franklin Rd, comprising an open lot with 1.79 acres, and directly south of that the Legend Office Building at 5680 Franklin Rd which he also owned.
- When they received the Legal Notice, stated Mr Mahoney, they did not realize there would be special incentives as well as an impact to the parking.
- Mr Mahoney stated he definitely supported the idea of promoting economic development in the area.
- Ideally, continued Mr Mahoney, he wanted to see promotion of currently open/vacant spaces, rather than take public property and sell it to private parties.
- Mr Mahoney suggested if the City did approve the Rezone and Zoning Amendments that it should be done on an equitable application for the shared parking to adjacent property owners, and added they could possibly build a hotel on their vacant lot.
- Mr Mahoney considered the parking was not just an issue five times a year as it had become more of an issue since the Ford Idaho center has decided to charge for parking.
- According to Mr Mahoney, when they originally bought the 5720 Franklin Rd 12 years ago they were pretty flexible, however, they ended up with quite a bit of property damage and eventually could not allow parking.
- Mr Mahoney stated the issue did need more substantial consideration of how the reduced parking would be handled, because the capacity parking was more frequent than five times a year.
- Mr Mahoney indicated pictures of vehicles parked on his property, immediately south of the Idaho Center parking lot, where the drivers were actually attending the Ford Idaho Center but parked on his private property and then damaged the parking lot as they left.
- **Acting Chairman Rodriguez** inquired what Mr Mahoney was referring to with the term “incentives”, and Mr Mahoney referred to the incentives of shared parking and different setback requirements.
- Mr Mahoney added that his property addressed as 5720 E Franklin Rd was up for sale at the present time.

**Karla Nelson:**

- Nelson advised Mr Mahoney could apply for a rezone for the GBE zoning district for the property at 5720 E Franklin Rd which would then allow shared parking as well.
- According to Nelson, the Parking Chapter in the Zoning Ordinance already allows shared parking with adjacent property owners if one use is for night time and the other is day time, and they could enter into a shared parking agreement that would address the parking concerns and stipulate what the parking management plans would be.
- Or the property owner could request a Rezone to GBE through the public hearing process, added Nelson.
- The idea behind the Rezone to GBE, stated Nelson, was to draw more interest in the subject area and induce more development in the area.

**Kehoe motioned and Sellman seconded to close public hearing. Motion carried.**

- **Kehoe** considered the proposed Amendments to the Zoning Ordinance to establish the GBE zone, and Rezone to GBE, were good ideas.

**Kehoe motioned and Myers seconded to recommend to City Council approval of the Amendments to Title 10, Chapters 3, 4 and 22 relating to establishment of the GBE (Gateway Business) zoning district, allowable land uses and parking provisions (ZTA-003-2016); and; Zoning Map Amendment from GB-1 (Gateway Business) to GBE (Gateway Business Entertainment) at 16200 Idaho Center Blvd (A 55.24 acre parcel in Lots 1 and 3, Block 1 for the City of Nampa (ZMA-019-2016).  
Motion carried.**

**Amendment of Chapters and Sections of Title 5, Business Licenses, and Title 10 Planning and Zoning (ZTA-004-2016, for the City of Nampa: a) Amending Title 5, Chapter 2, Section 5-2-25; b) Amending Title 10, Chapter 1, Sections 10-1-2, 10-1-3, 10-1-18; c) Amending Title 10, Chapter 1, Section 10-2-8; d) Deleting and Replacing Title 10, Chapter 3, Section 10-3-9; e) Deleting and Repealing Title 10, Chapter 7, Section 10-7-10; f) Amending Title 10, Chapter 8, Section 10-8-6; g) Amending Title 10, Chapter 10, Section 10-10-6; h) Amending Title 10, Chapter 11, Section 10-11-5 ; i) Amending Title 10, Chapter 12, Section 10-12-5; j) Amending Title 10, Chapter 13, Section 10-13-5; k) Amending Title 10, Chapter 16,**

**Section 10-16-5; l) Deleting and Repealing Title 10, Chapter 21, Sections 10-21-6 and 10-21-7; m) Amending Title 10, Chapter 22, Section 10-22-5; n) Amending Title 10, Chapter 23, Section 10-23-20; and, o) Amending Title 10, Chapter 25, Sections 10-25-6 and 10-25-7.**

Acting Chairman Rodriguez opened the meeting to public hearing.

**Myers motioned and Sellman seconded to continue the public hearing until the August 9<sup>th</sup> Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. Motion carried.**

Meeting adjourned at 8:35p.m.



Norman L Holm, Planning Director

:sm