

- b) Compliance with the requirement(s) listed in the May 27, 2016 e-mail printout from the Nampa Parks Department authored by Cody Swander (including deeding and dedication to the City of specified portions of the Project for (a) pathway(s).
 3. The water system for the Project 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.
 4. Correct any spelling, grammar and punctuation and numbering errors that may be evident on the plat face and/or in the proposed Project plat development notes.
 5. Correct plat note number 3 so that it [only] reads: "Minimum building setbacks shall be in accordance with City of Nampa's adopted Zoning and Building Codes Developer/Development shall comply with City of Nampa landscape standards applicable to the subdivision – to include internal street tree planting and periphery landscape corridor landscape requirements.
 6. Developer/Development shall comply with all provisions/conditions (e.g. to include berming, fencing, pathway development, RML setback adherence, cattle access, phasing plan(s) irrigation drainage works, etc) specified in the Development Agreement Ordinance 4129 (passed 21 July 2014) and any amendments thereto that are appropriately associated with the build-out of the Project.
- Motion carried.

Vice Chairman Gunstream proceeded to the public hearing items on the agenda at 7:00 p.m.

Public Hearing No. 1:

Modification of Zoning Development Agreement between Dan R Turner and City of Nampa recorded 06/02/2006 as Inst. No. 200642614 amending the recitals, conditions, and conceptual plan to provide for revised multiple family residential site development plan and building design for property located at 921 E Colorado Avenue. (A 1.377 acre portion of the NE ¼ Section 34 T3N R2W BM, Kurtz Addition, Tax 07350 in Block 135) for Shannon Robnett representing Scott Thompson, Crane Creek Investments, LLC (DAMO 0005-2016).

Vice Chairman Gunstream proceeded to public hearing:

Shannon Robnett of 3818 E Newby St, Nampa – the applicant:

- Mr Robnett discussed the requested Modifications to the Development Agreement.
- A different building configuration to that attached to the Development Agreement was also being requested.
- According to Mr Robnett, they would be reducing the number of proposed buildings on the subject property to three, with 36 living units, rather than the maximum of 48 living units as indicated in the Development Agreement.
- Mr Robnett added they were also requesting a Variance from City Council on the setbacks for a 3 story building, however, with the slope of the land, the building would actually appear more like a 2 story building than a 3 story building,
- They were also requesting a Variance from City Council for the number of parking spaces.
- Mr Robnett indicated pictures of the subject property showing the difference in elevation.

Assistant Planning Director Hobbs:

- Hobbs noted that Development Agreements were essentially contracts, and were authorized under State law and were set up so that cities and counties could bind the developer to certain conditions of approval beyond and above what they would normally have to comply with at the time of a Rezone or Annexation.
- A Development Agreement had been assigned to the project site in 2006 and in order to change that agreement the applicant was required to apply through a public hearing process and request an amendment.
- Hobbs indicated the Site Plan attached to the Development Agreement in 2006, showing the building configuration.

- The site plan recently submitted by the developer requesting the modification, added Hobbs, indicated 3 buildings.
- The items requiring a Variance, added Hobbs, would be reviewed by the City Council at a public hearing, at the same time as the requested Modification of Development Agreement.
- Hobbs reviewed the Staff Report and recommended conditions of approval.

Vice Chairman Gunstream proceeded to public testimony.

Dave Underwood of 1116 Fern St, Nampa – opposed:

- Mr Underwood stated he lived just down Fern St from the subject property.
- According to Mr Underwood, that small stretch of Fern St between E Colorado Ave and where Fern St dead-ended at the Elijah Drain was the neighbors’ little section of town.
- There were only 26 people that lived on that stretch of Fern St, added Mr Underwood, and all the neighbors know each other.
- Mr Underwood considered with 36 living units/72 bedrooms, there would be at least 100 more people living there.
- According to Mr Underwood, the existing homes were all single family residential and he had not been aware the subject property was zoned for apartments.
- Mr Underwood stated the proposed development would impact the quality of life for the existing residents in the quiet little community.

Denise Sanchez of 1110 Fern St, Nampa – opposed:

- Ms Sanchez advised she was Mr Underwood’s neighbor, and had purchased her home in 1976.
- Ms Sanchez concurred with Mr Underwood’s comments regarding the area being a nice quiet little neighborhood, and a lovely place to live.
- Fern St, added Ms Sanchez did not go through, and dead-ended at the Elijah Drain.
- Additionally, there was water in the Elijah Drain that would be a magnet for children.
- Ms Sanchez considered if the street did go through in the future then the front of their properties would be cut off and they would be right on the street with a steady stream of traffic.
- According to Ms Sanchez, she attended the meeting 10 years ago when the existing Development Agreement was approved, and at that time she understood it would be townhouses or senior living, but the proposed project would be of much greater impact.

Denise Howell of 1102 Fern Street, Nampa – opposed:

- Ms Powell reported she lived on the south side of the property line to where they would be building the apartments.
- Ms Powell questioned what the view would be from her property, would it just be a large building blocking her view.
- According to Ms Powell, she did not like the impact to her property.
- Ms Powell stated she had lived there almost 30 years and the property to the north had been a mobile home park and the best thing that ever happened was for the mobile home park to be removed, as they no longer had the Police or Fire Department going to the subject property almost on a daily basis.
- Ms Powell reiterated she and her neighbors were concerned about the impact of 100 people moving in, and would prefer to see small condos or senior housing.

Doug Peterson of 1009 Fern St, Nampa – opposed:

- Mr Peterson stated his family had lived in the neighborhood since the 1980s.
- According to Mr Peterson, his biggest concern was the family of red tail hawks living in the area and requested that before any construction started the applicant could get in contact with Idaho Fish and Wildlife Service to relocate the hawks.

Shannon Robnett:

- Mr Robnett explained they would actually be downgrading the number of units. At one point, added Mr Robnett, there were 48 units approved for the site, however, they did not like the configuration, the units were too small, were right up against the property lines, and were not attractive.
- According to Mr Robnett, they had considered the surrounding community.
- Mr Robnett indicated some photos showing the grade difference between Colorado Ave and the subject property. Mr Robnett suggested the proposed buildings would not appear to be 3 story buildings, and would only look like a 2 story buildings.
- Mr Robnett advised there would be only one building adjacent the neighbors to the south and added he did want to be neighbor friendly.
- Mr Robnett considered the proposed building and site plan to be a major improvement over what was approved 10 years ago.
- In response to a question from **Keim**, **Mr Robnett** stated they were proposing 36 living units and the project had been approved for 48 in 2006.
- **Rodriguez** inquired if the applicants had contact with the neighbors prior to today and **Mr Robnett** stated they had not because it was not a Code requirement.
- **Rodriguez** agreed the difference in elevation could be even more than 8 ft from Colorado Ave, equal to about one story in height.
- **Kehoe** inquired if there would be any fencing along the south end of the subject property and **Mr Robnett** replied there was currently a fence on the south side of the property and it would be appropriate to repair/replace/to put the fence as new. The north property line would also be fenced, added Mr Robnett.
- **Myers** inquired if there were any plans for a playground area and **Mr Robnett** replied there were not because they did not anticipate a lot of kids because of the proximity to the college, and the majority of the units would be two bedroom or single bedroom.

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

- **Kehoe** considered the proposed building and site plan appeared to be a vast improvement over the original plan 10 years ago – with fewer living units, and it that would be aesthetically nicer looking.

Kropp motioned and Kehoe seconded to recommend to City Council Modification of the Zoning Development Agreement recorded 06/02/2006 as Inst. No. 200642614 for revised multiple family residential site development plan and building design for 921 E Colorado Avenue, for Shannon Robnett, representing Scott Thompson, Crane Creek Investments, LLC, subject to:

1. **The Applicant, as Owner/Developer, [shall] enter into a Modified Development Agreement with the City of Nampa. The Agreement(s) shall contain such conditions, terms, restrictions, representations, exhibits, acknowledgments and timelines as necessary to facilitate development of the Property as contemplated by the Applicant and agreed to and conditioned by the City through its Council or executive departments or outside agencies properly involved in the review of the Applicant's request for the Property's entitlement(s) to be revised to allow for [continued] multiple-family residential use in an RMH Zone, but with a new development plan by a different developer.**

Motion carried.

Planning and Zoning Commissioner Keim left the meeting.

Public Hearing No. 2:

Annexation and Zoning to BC (Community Business) for 3 acres, to IL (Light Industrial) for 7.79 acres, and to RS-18 (Single Family Residential – 18,000 sq ft), for 1.95 acres at 1122, 1214, and 1216 Southside Boulevard, and 0 Wilson Lane. (A total of 9 parcels being a 13.36 acre portion of the NW ¼ of Section 16 T3N R2W BM), for Mason & Stanfield, Inc, representing William T Cushing (ANN 2201-16).

Vice Chairman Gunstream proceeded to public hearing.

Craig Foster of 24040 Camino Del Avion, No. A242, Monarch Beach, Ca – representing the applicant:

- Mr Foster stated he was working with Scott Stanfield of Mason-Stanfield, representing the applicants.
- The subject property, stated Mr Foster, had been owned by the Cushing family for over a decade.

- In its current status, added Mr Foster, the property was somewhat obsolete, as an un-manicured site providing no benefits to the surrounding area or the community.
- Mr Foster noted an application had been submitted last year, recommended for approval on July 14, 2015 by the Planning Commission, and denied by the City Council on August 17th. At that time, continued Mr Foster, there had been many questions from local residents with concerns regarding what would be going in to the subject property, and there appeared to be somewhat of a lack of communication and lack of knowledge of the project.
- Since that time, added Mr Foster, the project has been redesigned with more detail and transparency.
- Mr Foster indicated the proposed retail shops and offices on the commercial site that would be pedestrian friendly, with a formal entrance from the commercial site to an RV parking/Concierge service – not a self-storage facility. However, added Mr Foster, there would be some minimal self-storage on the facility -- to complement the RV parking facility, providing storage for camping gear, water skis, and accessories.
- The residential area, continued Mr Foster, would be reduced from 6 homes to 4 homes on Wilson Ln, and those homes will be on lots over 18,000 sq ft in size, which would add a buffer zone to the other side of Wilson Ln and the neighborhood, would be upgraded homes with a tremendous rear yard, and will butt up to the south end of the RV parking/concierge service facility.
- Mr Foster explained the commercial area and the RV parking facility would have fencing with more of a residential feel.
- The intent, added Mr Foster, would be for the commercial area to have shops such as a gourmet market, bistro bakery, coffee shop and a retail office for the RV parking facility. The commercial area would be pedestrian friendly and usable not only for the community but also as a complement to the RV parking facility and the concierge service.
- The design for the facility would enhance the neighborhood with a residential concept and aesthetics for the buildings and the fencing.
- Mr Foster emphasized the project had been redesigned to reduce self-storage and would instead focus more on storage of recreational vehicles, boats, jet skis, exotic cars, etc., along with state of the art security for the facility.
- Mr Foster explained the number of times they made themselves available to the neighbors and the public to review the plans for the subject property and advised that after receiving feedback they had delayed the project and revised the plans.
- **Kehoe** inquired if the applicants would own the bistro and the coffee shop and **Mr Foster** replied at the present time it was the intent of the owner to own the building and look for an operator to run the coffee shop, deli, etc, and considered those businesses would be, along with the retail office for the RV parking facility, the most logical uses to locate at that site.
- **Kehoe** questioned how the concierge service would operate and **Mr Foster** stated the administration side would operate the office, then there would be people on site to operate the power wash, detailing etc, to be located at the south end of the RV parking facility.
- In response to a question from **Kehoe**, **Mr Foster** advised the operating hours would be established that would be best for the RV owners taking out and bringing back their RVs, but it was not their goal to disrupt the neighbors adjacent to the subject property with extreme early morning or late evening activity.
- **Mr Foster** replied to a question from **Kehoe**, stating he considered the amenities for the community noted in the application to be the gourmet market deli, the bistro bakery, and the sales office for the RV Parking facility.
- **Kropp** inquired if there would be RV repairs done on site and **Mr Foster** stated the intent was for only a limited amount of repair or service, such as repairing sinks, oil changes, etc, and they would not be repairing RV exteriors.
- **Rodriguez** noted the number of businesses located at the Greenhurst/Southside intersection that would be similar to what the applicant was proposing. Rodriguez explained a lot of the business locations at the southeast corner of Greenhurst and Southside were closed up and vacant and questioned why the proposed businesses would prosper.
- **Mr Foster** stated he wanted to develop businesses on the commercial area that would complement the neighborhood, so that neighbors would not have to go to 12th Ave and Greenhurst, and added 40% to 50% of the business would probably be generated by the customers from the RV parking facility.
- **Myers** inquired how many RV parking spaces were anticipated and **Mr Foster** stated at the present time they were anticipating 60 to 80 RV parking spaces, however, that configuration could change with the fact

they were continuing to downsize the number of self-storage units. Mr Foster emphasized it would be an upper end, quality, RV parking facility.

Planning Director Holm:

- Holm indicated the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map which designated the area on the east side of Southside Blvd as Commercial, the area north of Wilson Ln as Light Industrial, and Low Density Residential on the north and south side of Wilson Ln and to the south and the east.
- Holm indicated aerial photos of the vicinity and photos of the subject property and surrounding area.
- Holm explained the requested zoning would be in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use map, and the proposed uses would be in compliance with the requested IL and BC zoning.
- Holm noted a Development Agreement could be required of the developer for the proposed project setting the parameters for development of the property, to include: the engineering related matters; the use of the property; the hours of operation for the RV parking and storage facility; Building and Site Design standards; and, project layout. The Development Agreement, added Holm, would tie the applicant to what had been presented to the Planning Commission.
- Holm indicated the building elevation renderings submitted by the applicant, and the bird's eye view of the proposed project.

Vice Chairman Gunstream proceeded to public testimony.

Paul Sevoian of 3225 E Dorothy Lane, Nampa – in favor:

- Mr Sevoian stated Mr Cushing's property surrounded his property to the west and the south.
- Mr Sevoian considered that section of Southside Blvd needed help, and suggested the area would get developed sooner or later.
- At the present time, stated Mr Sevoian, there were issues with vagrants coming on to the property, thefts and drug deals.
- If the proposed project goes in, added Mr Sevoian, he had been advised there would be a wall or a fence along the property lines which would protect his property from intrusion.
- Mr Sevoian indicated pictures of derelict or abandoned housing on E Dorothy Ln and stated Mr Cushing's proposal would be better than the current situation, and less of an impact than other businesses could be.

Bill Cushing of 3360 Amy Dr, Corona, Ca – the applicant – in favor but did not wish to speak.

Robin Sneegas of 4217 E Iris Ct, Nampa – in favor:

- Ms Sneegas stated she spoke to the owner and his representative about 1 ½ weeks ago, and saw the building elevations and site plan.
- Ms Sneegas stated she was comfortable with the fact the proposed project would help reduce crime in the neighborhood.

Tim Sneegas of 4217 E Iris Ct, Nampa – in favor – did not wish to speak.

Scott Stanfield of Mason-Stanfield Engineering, 826 3rd St S, Nampa – representing the applicant:

- Mr Stanfield referred to the previous applications submitted for the subject property.
- Each time, added Mr Stanfield, the project has improved more and more and the application before the Planning Commission was a vast improvement on what the Commission recommended for approval last year.
- The major difference, continued Mr Stanfield, was the reduced focus on the self-storage facility, which had been the biggest complaint during the City Council public hearing.
- The new project, was completely different to anything else in southern Idaho. Mr Stanfield noted the new detailed architectural building elevations, as well as the detailed Development Agreement.
- The reason that residential use had not been considered for the subject properties, explained Mr Stanfield, was because the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use map indicated an industrial designation, and, the fact the sewer capacity was not available to the site, with the closest sewer line 1 ½ miles away.

Lydia Wallace of 3304 Wilson Lane – opposed:

- Ms Wallace indicated the location of her property on the north side of Wilson Ln, surrounded on 3 sides by the subject property.
- Ms Wallace advised they had a 60 ft easement on the west side of their property for access to Wilson Ln, and noted there would have to be space for a fire truck turnaround, but the applicants were proposing that as an emergency only access to the RV parking facility.
- Ms Wallace noted the previous application had two houses facing 3304 Wilson Ln and three on Wilson Ln, and they were now proposing four houses facing Wilson Ln and considered there would be a big garage and a house behind, with their project going past their house to the garage.
- On the east side was a fence blocking their view, stated Ms Wallace, and now the proposed project would block the view north, with two fences along their access easement making the only view: a fence; the back of someone's home; or, the RV parking facility.
- Ms Wallace considered the existing trees were an asset to the neighborhood.
- According to Ms Wallace, the applicant's website referred to the subject property as a blighted property, when in fact it was the applicant's blighted property and the only weed control that happens is when the Irrigation District mows out by the street and she manually picks up puncture weed and thistles.
- The property, added Ms Wallace, was overrun with weeds and not maintained by the applicant.
- A lot of neighbors, stated Ms Wallace, like to support the local family store, KG Grocery, and questioned if there would be the need for another store in the neighborhood.
- Ms Wallace questioned the fact there would be no buffering between the proposed industrial zoning/use and the low density residential zoning/homes that would be surrounded by an industrial project.
- Ms Wallace stated she would prefer to see two houses facing her home rather than a wall or a fence.
- **Rodriguez** inquired the location of Ms Wallace's home on the map in relation to the proposed project and **Ms Wallace** indicated the location of her property, in between the proposed residential parcel to the south and the proposed Light Industrial land to the north.

Nellie Labrum of 1318 Southside Blvd, Nampa – opposed:

- Ms Labrum presented a Petition with 86 signatures in opposition to the Annexation and Zoning to BC, IL and RS-18 for the 13.79 acres involved in the proposed project.
- According to Ms Labrum, she has resided at 1318 Southside Blvd for 3 years and prior to that resided at 1402 Southside Blvd.
- Ms Labrum stated the subject property was currently zoned for Agriculture in the County.
- When Southside Blvd was widened in 2000, continued Ms Labrum, a lot of her front property was taken and she was not pleased, but accepted it.
- Ms Labrum reiterated that one of the reasons they bought their property in 1976 was because of the Agricultural zoning on the property.
- Ms Labrum stated she had purchased another two houses since her husband passed away 4 years ago.
- According to Ms Labrum, she was not in favor of a café, etc, going on to the Cushing property on Southside Blvd because she wanted KGs Market to continue.
- Ms Labrum considered it to be a small farm community in that area.
- Several of the neighbors, explained Ms Labrum, feel harassed with the proposed development continually recurring, as it was the third or fourth time before the Commission regarding the project.

Darren Crays of 3315 Kaden Ln, Nampa – opposed:

- Mr Crays stated the neighborhood had been to the Commission and City Council so many times, and considered the people had spoken and reiterated that a storage facility was not wanted in the neighborhood.
- Mr Crays advised there was no sidewalks on Southside Blvd and questioned how the commercial businesses could be pedestrian friendly.
- Additionally, there was no room for a turn lane to get into the commercial property, stated Mr Crays.
- According to Mr Crays there were 6 vacant business buildings at Greenhurst Rd and Southside Blvd, and added the café had changed hands 3 times, the pizza business had closed in less than a year and the bakery was gone.
- Mr Crays suggested there would not be a crime problem in the area if the owner of the subject property would take care of his land.
- Mr Crays did not consider the applications before the Planning Commission were any different to what had been submitted last year.

Mary Linden of 1317 Southside Blvd, Nampa – opposed but did not wish to speak.
Debbie Crays of 3315 Kaden Ln, Nampa – opposed but did not wish to speak.

Darrell Hood of 3519 Wilson Ln, Nampa – opposed:

- Mr Hood stated he was present at the meeting last year regarding the proposed self-storage facility.
- Mr Hood voiced concern with the fact an RV storage area was proposed for the property, along with a concierge facility that would include an RV washing facility, which would probably require some large bay buildings.
- RVs take up a lot of space, generating a lot of traffic going in and out on Southside Blvd over any given day or weekend, from 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.
- Southside Blvd, added Mr Hood, was not set up for anyone pulling into a center lane, or waiting until they can cross traffic, to pull into the facility. They would also be pulling out on to Southside Blvd, and there was a lot of traffic on Southside Blvd.
- There was no sidewalk from Wilson Lane to the facility, stated Mr Hood, making access difficult for pedestrians.
- During the City Council meeting last year, added Mr Hood, the self-storage facility was turned down, in part, because it was not compatible with the neighborhood.
- Mr Hood agreed that at some time in the future the property would be developed, however, neglect, and not taking care of the property doesn't justify support for the proposed development, and suggested any future development should be compatible with the neighborhood.

Bruce Wallace of 3304 Wilson Ln, Nampa – opposed:

- Mr Wallace stated his property was surrounded on three sides by the subject property.
- According to Mr Wallace, the applicant's plans indicated the Wallace property would be completely surrounded by fencing and he would not be able to enjoy his front yard.
- According to Mr Wallace, it was the third application for the subject property.
- Mr Wallace reiterated the need for their 60 ft easement to remain clear and retention of the fire/emergency vehicle turnaround, and suggested there would not be enough room for the four proposed homes.
- According to City Code, added Mr Wallace, a 6 ft fence would not be permitted in front of their home and questioned what height and type of fence the applicants would construct in the future.

Linda Weiss of 3216 Kirsten Ct, Nampa – opposed:

- Ms Weiss considered the current application was probably the fourth time she had come to a City hearing.
- Ms Weiss concurred with the earlier speakers.
- According to Ms Weiss, it was never made clear exactly what the hours of operation would be for the proposed development.
- Ms Weiss reiterated the earlier comments regarding lack of weed control on the subject property and added that Mr Cushing had not taken care of his property.
- The property owners, stated Ms Weiss, did not want Light Industrial zoning in a residential area.

David Ferdinand of 2419 W Herron Loop, Nampa – opposed:

- Mr Ferdinand noted that in July of last year, the Nampa Planning Commission recommended approval to the City Council of the planned self-storage facility, and City Council denied the applications on August 17th.
- Mr Ferdinand stated he represented Wilson Ln and the neighbors at the City Council meeting last year.
- Placing RS-18 zoning near Wilson Ln does not buffer the Light Industrial and Commercial uses from the existing residential homes, added Mr Ferdinand
- According to Mr Ferdinand, Canyon County had indicated the zoning designation for the subject properties to be Agricultural and Residential, and the County had not changed those designations since that time.

Kathleen Larson of 3411 Wilson Ln, Nampa – opposed:

- Ms Larson noted Mr Foster had stated there would be self-storage on the subject property and the hours would be 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., and questioned what impact the lighting for the facility would have on the area.

- Ms Larson noted the existing businesses located at Greenhurst Rd and Southside Blvd and added she did not see the need for a convenience store on Southside Blvd.
- The applicant, stressed Ms Larson had stated it would be an RV Park and not RV parking, and considered the use should be confirmed.
- Ms Larson also inquired if RV repairs would only be done internally and no exterior repairs would take place.
- According to Ms Larson, the local property owners had sufficient property to be able to keep their RVs on their own property.

Manuel Larson of 3411 Wilson Ln, Nampa – opposed but did not wish to speak.

Julia Frost of 3305 Wilson Ln – opposed but did not wish to speak.

Gary Hammond of 3605 Wilson Ln, Nampa – opposed:

- Mr Hammond stated he would not want to buy one of the four homes proposed for Wilson Ln because they would have the industrial complex behind their homes, and possibly a tall wall.

Billie Hammond of 3605 Wilson Ln, Nampa – opposed but did not wish to speak.

Ray Becker of 3403 Wilson Ln, Nampa – opposed:

- Mr Becker stated he was in agreement with all the speakers in opposition to the proposed development.
- According to Mr Becker, he was still in opposition to the development.

Janine Becker of 3403 Wilson Ln, Nampa – opposed but did not wish to speak.

Keith Jones of 2707 2nd St S, Nampa – opposed:

- Mr Jones stated he was in attendance at the request of the Wilson Ln neighborhood.
- Mr Jones added he was the owner of All Seasons Storage on 2nd St S.
- Regarding the need for the proposed facility, added Mr Jones, there were two new facilities going in nearby, as well as the new storage facility that had recently been constructed near the Idaho Center and was now up for sale.
- Additionally, stated Mr Jones, there was another large new facility under construction on Caldwell Blvd, just west of Fred Meyers which would be able to facilitate a substantial amount of self-storage and RV parking.
- According to Mr Jones, he had just submitted an application last Friday to build additional self-storage units on a 3 acre parcel of land.
- In terms of need, considered Mr Jones, the community was well served for self-storage and RV parking facilities.
- Mr Jones reviewed the plan submitted for the proposed facility and noted there were 6 buildings that appear to be self-storage structures, and approximately 60 to 70 percent of the property would be self-storage and not RV parking.
- Mr Jones stated it would be useful to have more specifics regarding the actual uses on the property.
- The subject property, continued Mr Jones, would cost millions of dollars to develop and 60 to 80 RV spots could not sustain that type of investment.
- Additional information should be provided regarding the proposed repair shop, sewer management – especially for the concierge service, and for security – including if a barbed wire fence will be in place, stated Mr Jones.
- Concerns were raised, continued Mr Jones, regarding the bistro and deli, and they are valid concerns because it did not appear to be feasible to rely on the proposed facility to justify a restaurant type business.

Shirley McAllister of 3120 Wilson Ln, Nampa – opposed:

- Ms McAllister stated her property was adjacent to the west side of the subject properties.
- According to Ms McAllister, neither she nor her husband had spoken to anyone representing the developer regarding the proposed project, and had not been informed of any of the meetings between the property owner and the neighbors.
- Ms McAllister noted a lot of the neighboring property owners were primarily retired, semi-retired, or soon to be retired.

- Ms McAllister stated they purchased their home next to an agricultural piece of property, with views of Bogus Basin and the mountains, and now they would be looking at the back of houses, walls and fences.
- This was the third time, continued Ms McAllister they had testified in opposition to the proposed applications.
- The neighbors would not need the RV or self-storage facility, or the bistro or convenience store, emphasized Ms McAllister.
- Ms McAllister reiterated the proposed uses would not be a good fit in the neighborhood.

Cindy Zickgraf of 3412 Wilson Ln, Nampa – opposed:

- Ms Zickgraf stated she lived near the proposed project.
- The subject properties, noted Ms Zickgraf, were completely surrounded by residential rural properties.
- According to Ms Zickgraf, she had livestock, and was concerned about bright lighting from the proposed RV parking and self-storage business, as well as the fencing.
- Ms Zickgraf noted the proposed project website stated RVs will be able to dump their sewage on site and questioned what type of sewage facility was proposed, to allow for RV dumping.

Charles Ward of 3320 Wilson Ln, Nampa – opposed:

- Mr Ward advised his property adjoined the full length, on the west, of the proposed RV parking/self-storage facility property.
- Mr Ward considered the Comprehensive Plan future land use map designations were not etched in concrete.
- The self-storage units, tall roofs, fencing, etc, would not be compatible with the surrounding residential neighborhood.

Charlotte Ward of 3320 Wilson Ln – opposed but did not wish to speak.

Cliff Wilson of 3420 Wilson Ln, Nampa – opposed but did not wish to speak.

Dennis McClure of 3605 Kaden Ln, Nampa – opposed but did not wish to speak.

Susan Haueisen of 3121 Wilson Ln, Nampa – opposed but did not wish to speak.

- Ms Haueisen noted there were no sidewalks on Southside Blvd and there was a school bus stop where the applicants were proposing the businesses and questioned how that would impact the children.
- According to Ms Haueisen she had a two story home and all the RVs and self-storage units would be visible from her home.

Jorge Ramirez of 3229 E Dorothy Ln, Nampa – opposed:

- Mr Ramirez agreed with the comments from the earlier speakers.
- Additionally, the irrigation ditch runs through the subject property and he requested confirmation the irrigation would continue to run through that property, either buried or otherwise.

Kehoe motioned and Rodriguez seconded to close public hearing. Motion carried.

Craig Foster and Scott Stanfield:

- **Mr Stanfield** did not consider the process to be harassment, but in fact the due process that allowed the neighbors to discuss the application, and was the process defined by State Code and City Code.
- A lot of the comments, added Mr Stanfield, pertained to the fact the proposed use was not residential, and noted the subject property had been designated as Industrial for quite some time.
- When many of the current residents purchased their properties, added Mr Stanfield, the subject property was already designated Light Industrial on the Comprehensive Plan.
- Mr Stanfield discussed the most recent Comprehensive Plan amendments and noted the subject area could have been discussed for re-designation to Residential at that time – but it had not been re-designated and had remained Light Industrial.
- The proposed project, added Mr Stanfield was a permitted use in the IL zone.
- The applicants, continued Mr Stanfield, would be required to construct sidewalks and widen Southside Blvd along their Southside Blvd property frontage.
- The Nampa Highway District, stated Mr Stanfield, controls Wilson Ln, and they maintain a rural look for that road, and at this point in time it was not anticipated a sidewalk would occur there.

- The pedestrian friendly aspect would be along the Southside Blvd frontage, in the commercial business area, and into the RV parking facility.
- As other property owners develop along Southside Blvd, added Mr Stanfield, the widening and sidewalks would be required.
- The primary difference with earlier developments, added Mr Stanfield, was the Development Agreement, which would nail the project down to RV parking/concierge, with a diminished focus on the self-storage aspect of the project.
- According to Mr Stanfield, the project would not be marketed as self-storage, because the purpose of the self-storage on the property was to support the RV parking/concierge business and that is how it would be marketed.
- In response to a question from **Vice Chairman Gunstream**, **Mr Stanfield** stated the project would not be advertising as general household storage, and the self-storage would be a part of the RV parking/concierge service.
- **Mr Foster** advised the RV parking for 60 to 80 RVs would not all be arriving or leaving at the same time, but would be staggered coming and going. Additionally, stated Mr Foster, there could also be classic cars to be winterized and stored, as well as boats and jet skis.
- The self-storage, added Mr Foster, had been scaled back by 75 to 80 percent.
- **Mr Stanfield** responded to the questions regarding the irrigation ditch and advised Idaho Code mandates continuation of the irrigation supply and protection of irrigation rights.
- According to Mr Stanfield, the focus for the RV parking business would not be major RV repairs, it would just be small repairs.
- Fencing would have to go up, stated Mr Stanfield, a 6 ft vinyl site obscuring fence was proposed, and was included in the Development Agreement.
- Downward lighting would be provided, continued Mr Stanfield, and with the hours of operation some of the lights could be turned down.
- Mr Stanfield advised the proposed RV dump station would be there for the RV concierge service and would not be for general public use. Consideration would be given regarding the location, or specifics could be added to the Development Agreement regarding the location.
- In response to a question from **Kehoe**, **Mr Stanfield** suggested there would probably be an underground holding tank for the RV dump, which would be emptied every so often by a private company because there was no sewer service to the property –to be specified in the Development agreement.
- Mr Stanfield noted the Development Agreement did incorporate requirements regarding any RV repairs.
- Mr Stanfield emphasized how the applicants had come forward with the Development Agreement in order to cover many of the issues brought up during the public hearing.
- According to Mr Stanfield, the proposed RV parking development, with supporting commercial businesses would not be the same as the standard self-storage facilities.
- Mr Stanfield discussed the easement for the property owners of 3304 Wilson Ln, and noted that easement would have to be preserved and could not be blocked off. The desired fencing could be discussed with Mr and Mrs Wallace, added Mr Stanfield.
- **Mr Foster** explained the four residential lots on Wilson Ln would retain the 18,000 sq ft minimum lot size, facing Wilson Ln, with the rear yards extending back – giving a deeper setback from the house to the rear property line, which would provide a buffer to the Industrial zone.
- Mr Foster indicated the easement from Wilson Ln that would provide access to the emergency gate to the RV parking business, for use by emergency services only.
- According to Mr Foster, the paved easement would also be available to Mr and Mrs Wallace at 3304 Wilson Ln for access to their property, so they would not be landlocked. The fencing issue, added Mr Foster, would be flexible in order to allow privacy yet not create a prison effect.
- Discussion followed regarding whether the 3 proposed residential lots would go back as far as the north side of Mr and Mrs Wallace’s property in order to create a buffer.
- **Mr Stanfield** addressed the question of whether there would be an RV Park with people living in their RVs and Mr Stanfield confirmed there would be no one living in the park, the RV parking area was for storage of RVs, equipment, toys, boats, and similar items, only.
- **Rodriguez** considered the number one issue regarding the applications was agriculture, and secondly compatibility. Rodriguez questioned if residential homes in close proximity of the RV parking area would

work and was not in favor of the annexation and requested IL and BC zoning. Rodriguez noted there were 89 signatures on the Petition in opposition to the requested annexation, zoning and development.

- **Kehoe** concurred with Commissioner Rodriguez' comments but added that something would be developed on the subject property in the future.
- Although the proposal was better than what had come before the Commission in the past, added Kehoe, the proposed zoning and development would not be appropriate.
- **Myers** stated he liked the concept of the proposed development, however, the location was not appropriate, and added that the proposed retail area on Southside Blvd may not endure.

Rodriguez motioned and Kehoe seconded to deny the Annexation and Zoning to BC for 3 acres and IL for 7.79 acres, and to RS-18 for 1.95 acres at 1122, 1214, 1216 Southside Blvd, and 0 Wilson Lane, for Mason & Stanfield, Inc representing William T Cushing. Motion to deny carried with Kropp, Kehoe, Myers, Rodriguez and Sellman in favor and Miller opposed.

Public Hearing No. 3:

Amendment of the following Chapters and Sections of Title 5 Business Licenses, and Title 10 Planning and Zoning (ZTA 004-16): Continued from the July 26, 2016 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting:

- a) Amending Title 5, Chapter 2, Section 5-2-25, Pertaining to the obligation to Plant Trees in Connection With One-or-Two-Family Residential Building Permits.**
- b) Amending Title 10, Chapter 1, Sections 10-1-2, 10-1-3 and 10-1-18 Respecting Definitions and Figures Provided in the Nampa Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance.**
- c) Amending Title 10, Chapter 1, Section 10-2-8, Providing Procedures for Public Hearings under the Zoning Ordinance.**
- d) Deleting and Replacing Title 10, Chapter 3, Section 10-3-9, Relating to Non-Conforming Uses.**
- e) Deleting and Repealing Title 10 Chapter 7, Section 10-7-10, Pertaining to the Continuation of Agricultural Uses after Reclassification of an RA (Suburban Residential) District.**
- f) Amending Title 10, Chapter 8, Section 10-8-6, Relating to Requirements for Certain Side Yard Setbacks.**
- g) Amending Title 10, Chapter 10, Section 10-10-6, Pertaining to Area, Width and Setback Requirements in the RD (Two Family [Duplex] Residential) Districts.**
- h) Amending Title 10, Chapter 11, Section 10-11-5 Pertaining to Area, Width and Setback Requirements in RML (Limited Multiple Family Residential) Districts.**
- i) Amending Title 10, Chapter 12, Section 10-12-5, Pertaining to Area, Width and Setback Requirements in RMH (Multi Family Residential) Districts.**
- j) Amending Title 10, Chapter 13, Section 10-13-5, Pertaining to Area, Width and Setback Requirements in RP (Residential Professional) Districts.**
- k) Amending Title 10, Chapter 16, Section 10-16-5, Pertaining to Area, Width and Setback Requirements in BC (Community Business) Districts.**
- l) Deleting and Repealing Title 10, Chapter 21, Sections 10-21-6 and 10-21-7, Pertaining to Non-Conforming Uses, Violations and Penalties in the Context of Animal Zoning Regulations.**
- m) Amending Title 10, Chapter 22, Section 10-22-5, Relating To Parking Area Improvements and Plants.**
- n) Amending Title 10, Chapter 23, Section 10-23-20, Relating to Permanent Signs Permitted in the BC/BF, GB1/GB2, and the IL/IH Zones.**
- o) Amending Title 10, Chapter 25, Sections 10-25-6, 10-25-7, and 10-25-13, Relating to Conditional Use Permit Procedures.**

Vice Chairman Gunstream reopened the public hearing, continued from the July 26, 2016 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

Assistant Planning Director Hobbs:

- Hobbs referred to page 15, 2, b, the 4th line had the word "have" missing, and should read "city staff shall have".
- Page 27, e, Drainage channel: should read a "six (6") to eight inch (8") culvert pipe".

- Hobbs noted Ordinance amendments came from Staff, the Planning Commission, City Council, or a member of the public.
- Hobbs reviewed the proposed Amendments.
- Hobbs noted the Amendment to Title 5 of City Code, did not apply to Title 10, the Zoning Ordinance, regarding planting trees in connection with one or two family residential building permits.
- Hobbs referred to the proposed changes for Title 10-1-2 – Definitions.
- On page 13, Title 10-1-3, Hobbs reported the City legal counsel had determined the proposed changes would be appropriate for Title 10-1-3: Interpretation of Title, to prevent any conflicts or confusion.
- On page 14, continued Hobbs, the Solar Setback diagrams were very obsolete and should be removed from the Ordinance.
- Page 14, 15 and 16, explained Hobbs, referred to public Hearing procedures, and those had been revised as recommended by legal counsel as they specifically did not want to adopt Robert’s Rules of Order.
- Page 3, Title 10-25-6 regarding Conditional Use Public Hearings. Hobbs noted when a Conditional Use Permit was combined with a rezone or annexation then the Commission shall make recommendations on both applications, rather than recommending on the rezone/annexation and making a [conclusive] decision on the conditional use permit.
- Page 17 covered Title 10-3-9: Nonconforming Uses, and noted the date would be reset regarding existing Non-Conforming Uses that existed on and before April 17, 1989.
- Page 20, Item H, covered the “Acknowledgement of Legal Non-conforming Use Rights.
- Hobbs indicated the proposed changes to Title 10-8-6: property Area, Width, Depth, Frontage and Setback Requirements, which now would not require 10 ft and 5 ft setbacks, and would allow 5 ft setbacks on both sides.
- Pages 24 and 25, added Hobbs, referred to amendments to Title 10-22-5: Parking Area Improvements and Plans.
- Hobbs noted the proposed changes to Title 10-23-20: district Permanent Sign Allowances.
- Page 34, covered proposed amendments to Title 10-33-4: Corridor Landscaping Regulations, C, 2, regarding Landscape Corridor Strip Conversion.

Vice Chairman Gunstream proceeded to public testimony.

No public testimony forthcoming.

Myers motioned and Rodriguez seconded to close public hearing. Motion carried.

Rodriguez motioned and Kropp seconded to adopt the proposed changes to the City Code, for Title 5 Business Licenses; and, Title 10 Planning and Zoning Ordinance, for the City of Nampa. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.



Norman L Holm, Planning Director

:sm