

Valley County Planning and Zoning Commission

PO Box 1350 • 700 South Main Street
Cascade, ID 83611-1350



Phone: 208-382-7115
Email: cherrick@valleycountyid.gov

Ken Roberts, Chairman
Carrie Potter, Vice-Chair

Brad Mabe, Commissioner
Ben Oyarzo, Commissioner
Heidi Schneider, Commissioner

MINUTES

Valley County Planning and Zoning Commission
February 12, 2026
Valley County Court House - Cascade, Idaho
PUBLIC HEARING - 6:00 p.m.

A. OPEN: Meeting called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chairman Roberts. A quorum exists.

PZ Director – Cynda Herrick:	Present
PZ Commissioner – Brad Mabe	Present
PZ Commissioner – Ben Oyarzo:	Present
PZ Commissioner – Carrie Potter:	Present
PZ Commissioner – Ken Roberts:	Present
PZ Commissioner – Heidi Schneider:	Excused
PZ Planner II – Lori Hunter:	Present

B. MINUTES: Commissioner Mabe moved to approve the minutes of January 8, 2026. Commissioner Potter seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

C. OLD BUSINESS:

1. C.U.P. 25-031 Sterling Landscaping: Jody Hurst is requesting a conditional use permit for a landscaping business. The existing home would be used for housing; an 1800-sqft shop is proposed. A variance for a 30-ft setback instead of 100-ft from the front setback along Highway 55 is requested. An individual well and individual septic system would be used. Access would be from one driveway onto Highway 55. The 0.99-acre parcel RP18N03E339481, addressed at 13965 Highway 55, is in the SESE Section 33, T.18N, R.3E, Boise Meridian, Valley County, Idaho. **Tabled from January 8, 2026.** Action Item

Chairman Roberts introduced the item.

Commissioner Potter moved to remove C.U.P. 25-031 Sterling Landscaping from the table; Commissioner Mabe seconded. Motion passed unanimously. Director Herrick presented the staff report and displayed the site and GIS map on the projector screen.

Chairman Roberts asked for the applicant's presentation. Mike Williams of South Beck & Baird, Boise, represented the applicant. The Commissioners previously requested additional information. Mr. Williams submitted this information (**Exhibit 1**). An updated site plan showed the parking area and the removal of the proposed shop. The widest part of the property is 150 feet. The requested variances were reduced and would allow for parking and the five temporary 13-ft by 13-ft storage bins within the setback areas. The requested variances would allow a 5-ft setback on the south (side property line instead of the required 10-ft. The western (rear)

property line would have a 25-ft setback instead of 30 feet. The bins would contain landscaping materials, would be temporary in nature, and could easily be moved. Both the site plan and landscape plan have been revised.

Mr. Williams replied to questions from the Commissioners. Business parking would occur within the 100-ft setback from the property line along Highway 55. This would include pickups with trailers and employee vehicles. There would not be a berm; the existing trees screen the site. The existing home will stay and the proposed shop will not be built. The house will be used for crew members during the working season. The location of parking and number of vehicles were discussed. There is a small crew who use pickups with landscaping equipment in the trailer. Currently there are two business pickups with attached trailers and two employee vehicles. A maximum of six vehicles is requested.

Mr. Williams stated the applicant is a landscape business who wants the site to look well for his business. The bins and aggregates are shielded from view of Highway 55. There will be no retail sales from this site. McCall Fire has no issues since the proposed shop has been removed from the proposal. The existing residence is already close to the highway. The new driveway access will improve fire access to the home. The access will be shared with the adjacent property to the south. Idaho Transportation Department is requiring that the cross-access agreement be in place.

The site will not be used to store additional equipment or supplies. Landscaping equipment such as lawnmowers and weed eaters are kept on the trailers when not in use. There will be no storage of debris on site such as broken concrete, stumps, or dirt piles.

Chairman Roberts opened the public hearing and asked for proponents. There were none. Chairman Roberts asked for undecided. There were none. Chairman Roberts asked for opponents. There were none.

Chairman Roberts closed the public hearing. The Commission deliberated. Commissioner Mabe supports the project with the removal of the proposed shop, the request for smaller variances, and parking limited behind the parallel line of the home along Highway 55. The Scenic Byway will be protected with landscaping and screening of storage bins. Commissioner Potter and Commissioner Oyarzo concurred. Chairman Roberts stated he would not have supported any additional buildings within the 100-ft setback from Highway 55 and appreciates that the proposed shop has been removed from site plan.

Commissioner Potter moved to approve C.U.P. 25-031 Sterling Landscaping with the stated conditions.

COA: Maximum number of vehicles is six (6) which includes three employee vehicles and three service vehicles with trailers.

COA: Bins shall be shielded from view of Highway 55.

COA: Cross access shall be allowed to the property to the south.

COA: No storage of debris or burning on site

COA: This conditional use permit is non-transferable and would expire if property changes ownership.

Commissioner Mabe seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

There is a 10-day appeal period to the Board of County Commissioners in accordance with Valley County Code 9-5H-12.

6:25 p.m.

2. SUB 25-019 Rocky Mountain Storage – Preliminary Plat: Pearson Storage Partners LLC is requesting a conditional use permit for a subdivision on 18.47 acres. Block 1 would include 105 condominium storage units and two offices/bathroom units. Individual septic systems and individual wells are proposed. Access would be from a shared driveway onto State Highway 55. The site, addressed at 14014 Highway 55, is parcel RP18N03E331807 in the NE ¼ Section 33, T.18N, R.3E, Boise Meridian, Valley County, Idaho. **Tabled from November 13, 2025.** Action Item.

Chairman Roberts introduced the item and asked if there was any ex parte contact or conflict of interest. Commissioner Potter recused herself.

Commissioner Mabe moved to move SUB 25-019 Rocky Mountain Storage – Preliminary Plat from the table. Commissioner Oyarzo seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

Director Herrick presented the staff report, displayed the site and GIS map on the projector screen, and summarized the following exhibits:

- **Exhibit 1** – Correspondence from Gregg Tankersley of Crestline Engineers to Kendra Conder of Idaho Transportation Department regarding ITD's response and a right-of-way Encroachment Application submitted November 26, 2025. (February 6, 2026)
- **Exhibit 2** – Dusty Bitton submitted landscaping information, landscape renderings, and CCRs for McCall Valley Storage Condos, similar to the proposed use. (February 10, 2026)
- **Exhibit 3** – Revised Approach Detail Drawing with added signature and striping submitted by Crestline Engineering. Kendra Conder, Idaho Transportation Department, stated there are no issues from ITD's perspective that should hold up the PZ hearing. (February 6, 2026; February 9, 2026; February 10, 2026; February 11, 2026)

Chairman Roberts asked if a traffic study was submitted to Planning and Zoning Staff. Director Herrick stated there is not one in the file, only references that it was submitted to ITD.

Chairman Roberts asked for the applicant's presentation.

Matthew Parks, of Clark Wardle, Boise, represented the applicant. Both Gregg Tankersley and Rob Pair, Crestline Engineering, McCall, were available for clarifications. Mr. Parks summarized the application for 105 storage condominiums, two restrooms, common areas, drive aisles, and landscaping. Lot 2 would remain undeveloped. The public hearing is not about the prior use of the land which includes a personal storage building approved by the County Commissioner through the appeal process. This application should stand on its merits.

Chairman Roberts asked for clarification. Director Herrick stated the issue is well documented. A building permit for a personal garage was issued for the existing structure. It would have to be retrofitted for commercial use and meet commercial building standards if the project is approved.

Mr. Parks stated a building permit would be submitted for commercial use. There is no commercial use at this time. The applicant was envisioning the possibility for future commercial use during construction so retrofitting will not be necessary. However, a new commercial building permit would be required. Mr. Parks referenced public and reporter comments regarding the use of the building and stated the applicant did not think that what he was doing was more than personal use.

Mr. Parks stated the site is well suited for the proposed use which is similar to the existing storage condominiums across Highway 55. The site is not well suited for residential use. Staff rating the compatibility as +22. The Paradigm Storage received a comparable +23. Benefits to Valley County include economic growth, short-term growth, and increased taxbase. It would provide a needed use for residents.

Commissioners previously requested additional information. A traffic study has been submitted to ITD who had no concerns and indicated that turning lanes, deceleration lane, nor acceleration lane are warranted in this location. ITD indicated that there was minimal impact on traffic expected from storage facilities. Regarding water rights and irrigation easements, the applicant has been working with Lake Irrigation District. There are water rights available at this property. There will be a 20-ft wide easement provided to the Lake Irrigation District to clear up any confusion as to the legality of the easement. The staff report indicated that two ponds are proposed. The McCall Fire Department approved the location of the dry hydrants and had no issues with the ponds being used to provide fire protection water supply.

Mr. Parks addressed questions within the staff report. The existing building is not being used for commercial purposes. The applicant believed he could use the property to store vehicles or other things as a business owner. Obtaining the commercial use permit will remedy the issue. Individual meters were installed based on the potential for scaling the operation. Firewalls are in place for the completed units. The building would need inspected by Valley County Building Department to confirm that it meets all the building code requirements. There are no mezzanines in the existing building, just shelving at this time. Adding mezzanines in the future would require building permits.

Mr. Parks reviewed the conditional use permit standards as stated in the staff report. There would be an increase in property value to applicant and economic benefits to community. There are minimal or no environmental impacts. There are no impacts on adjacent properties. ITD has addressed concerns regarding turning lanes. The proposal meets the Comprehensive Plan. It is an allowed conditional use in the area. Impacts can be addressed through conditions of approval. The project is well located, compatible, and provides tangible economic and community benefits.

Chairman Roberts asked if Mr. Parks had thoroughly reviewed the record of the previous decision about the existing building, the 2023 approval, and subsequent appeal to the Board of County Commissioners. Mr. Parks replied that he has reviewed meeting minutes and comments.

Commissioner Mabe stating that the public's dislike of additional storage units along the Scenic Byway has been raised at past meetings. The Commission has asked the applicant on multiple occasions if he would be open to modifying the building layout, so the result was not a long strip of two-toned buildings and changing the layout to provide visibility in the scenic corridor along Highway 55. Mr. Parks said this has been considered. The site plan has been modified and the number of units decreased from 108 to 105 to create a break in the building line parallel to Highway 55. This would be good for both aesthetics and snow removal. Commissioner Mabe stated that the modifications have been to screen the buildings instead of modifying the layout; the buildings and proposed landscaping would block the view from the highway. That is in contrast to the storage buildings across the highway. He would prefer a different alignment of buildings. Mr. Parks disagreed and stated that the site is a low area, and the buildings would not block the viewshed. The landscape screening would break up the monotony more than separation of buildings. Mr. Parks added that the buildings would not be two-story structures but would be similar in design to those storage buildings across the highway.

Commissioner Roberts also commented on the viewshed. He appreciates the existing trees that screen the site. He stated that the area slopes downward to the west. Thus, the buildings on the west side of the highway are lower than buildings on the east.

Rob Pair responded to the landscaping and site plan comments. The traffic study has been submitted to ITD and they are willing to share the study with Commissioners and PZ Staff. ITD will not require turn lanes. The proposal consolidates three access locations into one; currently the Bus Barn, this use, and Sunbridge Drive on the west side of the highway all access Highway 55 at different locations. This consolidation is supported by ITD. An encroachment permit was submitted to ITD in November 2025 but was overlooked by ITD. It is currently under review; Mr. Pair believes the permit will be granted based on ITD's email response. Lake Irrigation District representatives did visit the site. In response to the District's concerns, a 20-ft easement for the ditch and Idaho Code will be added on the front of the plat. Additional building and landscaping renderings were submitted in **Exhibit 2**. The buildings would have a single-pitch roof with the lower side closer to highway. The landscaping interacts with the buildings and breaks up the single wall, solid look.

Chairman Roberts opened the public hearing and asked for proponents. There were none. Chairman Roberts asked for undecided. There were none. Chairman Roberts asked for opponents.

Kathy Deinhardt Hill, 14068 Pioneer Road, is opposed for two reasons. First, the existing building with 12 units was built under the guise of personal use. Commissioners should consider that the applicant was not upfront at the beginning. The proposal includes two storage units with bathrooms. What type of business will use these? She is concerned that business will operate out of the units. The storage units in McCall located behind the carwash along Highway 55 have businesses operating out of the storage units. This has impacts. Would these businesses ask for permission prior? How would this be enforced? Secondly, she is concerned about traffic. She does not have faith in ITD as the recently stated that Highway 55 is at maximum capacity. The highway is busy both during the work week and during the weekend. A turn lane, double solid center line, and a reduced speed limit are necessary at this location. Development should be stopped in this area until these are required.

Scott Harris, 86 Ilka Lane, urged caution. The initial construction was approved for private use but established a precedent for having similar buildings at the site that might have otherwise not been approved. The applicant was deceptive. He is concerned that a turn lane was recommended at Elo Road and Highway 55 for a nearby storage unit use; thus, one should be located here. There is also standing water at times on this property. It is past time to take more aggressive measures to preserve the Scenic Byway.

Chairman Roberts asked for rebuttal from the applicant.

Mr. Parks stated the concerns have been addressed. ITD has reviewed the proposal and determined that turn lanes are not warranted. Wetlands will be labeled as "no-build" areas. The conditional use permit application should be reviewed on its merits.

Mr. Pair added that the two proposed bathrooms are for use by the entire 105 storage units. CCRs would prohibit retail and wholesale outlets, storefront businesses, manufacturer assembly, repair activity, noxious activity, and storage of hazardous materials, high pile combustible storage, residential use, or animals. Chairman Roberts asked for clarification that a business owner such as a plumber could use the unit to store materials and access them. Mr. Pair referred to the permissible uses in the sample CCRs which do allow maintenance and

inventory turnover but not manufacturing. Mr. Pair was unsure if vehicle maintenance would be allowed. Mr. Parks clarified that an owner would be able to winterize a boat in a storage unit or do an oil change on a personal vehicle. That is different than using the unit to do car shop work such as with a lift. These uses can be clarified and limited within CCRs. The intent is not to have manufacturing or day-to-day business operations occurring. Only storage of equipment and the ability to pick up and drop off materials, but not like a shipping or retail business. The units could be used to store seasonal vehicles and owners should have the ability to maintain this equipment within the storage units.

Commissioner Mabe expressed concerns that businesses would use the units for more than storage of materials.

Commissioner Mabe referred to the earlier statements that the individual gas and electric meters were installed to allow for future scaling of the use. Mr. Parks stated that the owner wanted the ability to scale up at a future time; Mr. Parks does not want to revisit the issue if a conditional use permit for commercial use should have been applied for earlier. A homeowner could have multiple meters on a property for different buildings. The firewalls were added during construction in case of a future change of use. Chairman Roberts stated that the applicant originally asked and was approved for personal use of the storage building for family and friends. This limitation was discussed in the appeals process, and the applicant was aware that a change in use would require a conditional use permit. Mr. Parks stated that if a violation has occurred, then the cure is to get a conditional use permit for that use. It was the applicant's understanding that storing his business vehicles was an allowed personal use. Chairman Roberts read from the meeting minutes of February 9, 2023, when Dusty Bitton stated he bought the property and wanted to replace the existing dilapidated buildings with a new storage building. The new building would be used for personal use by his family and his business partners' family. The building would be used to store boats, snowmobiles, trailers, and RVs, and other seasonal equipment. He was clear that was to be used for personal storage, not business equipment. He was aware that a conditional use permit would be required before the building could be used for business use. Director Herrick clarified, for the record, that the use of these storage units for Mr. Bitton's other businesses has recently been in the news. There were leases recorded that state that Mr. Bitton has leased the units to his other businesses. Mr. Bitton's other LLCs are leasing the units. For the record, the leases show business use of the building. Chairman Roberts stated that these leases contradict Mr. Bitton's statements on February 9, 2023.

Chairman Roberts closed the public hearing. The Commission deliberated.

Commissioner Mabe stated the primary issue is a long strip of buildings blocking the scenic view in the middle of the scenic corridor; this is not in alignment with the Comprehensive Plan. The applicant has been asked about landscaping and building modifications. He believes the Commission needs to continue to focus on enabling the scenic view while screening the development that does go into those areas. The other issues raised are not as important. The Commission has asked for site plan modifications to be more in line with the scenic corridor protection, but this has not been done. This proposal does not enhance Valley County. Commissioner Mabe is not supportive of this proposal.

Commissioner Oyarzo concurred with Commission Mabe on issues regarding the scenic byway and viewshed.

Chairman Roberts stated he has a few concerns regarding this proposal:

- 1) Approval would set a precedent that one can get a building permit, do whatever they want, and then incorporate the building into a conditional use permit. This denies the

Commission the ability to apply current ordinances to a building that was built for personal use and creates an unequal playing field for applicants.

- 2) He also concurred with Commissioner Mabe's concerns for the scenic byway and viewshed. If the highway was lined with storage units, one would not see any of the mountains from the highway. This proposal does not meet the Comprehensive Plan. In particular, Chapter 2 - Goals 1 and 2 speak to maintaining the rural atmosphere of Valley County.
- 3) The impact on adjacent landowners, especially the residential areas immediately adjacent or who would overlook this site. This proposal has a significant amount of roof space compared to other possible commercial uses that could locate at the site.
- 4) Safety of Highway 55 is a concern. As a quasi-judicial commission, the Commissioners are to review applications through Idaho Statutes, the Comprehensive Plan, and Valley County Ordinances. Health and safety are two big issues. Adding to the congestion on Highway 55 would lead to more crashes.
- 5) In addition, many impact reports in applications are lacking. That is true for this application. A traffic impact study should have been completed prior to submittal of the application to PZ Staff. The PZ Commission relies on the County Engineer to verify what the applicant's engineer might say. Thus, more information should be included in the original submittal.

Based on these reasons, Chairman Roberts is opposed.

The Commissioners deliberated further and discussed the questions and standards of approval listed on page 4 of the staff report and the policy in Valley County Code Title 9. Standards in Title 9, Chapter 5, that are not met include scenic quality and safety on Highway 55. These are items the Board of County Commissioners have recently asked the Commission to be aware of. The Commission has on multiple occasions asked the applicant to modify the design of the proposal. Chairman Roberts stated that the application will likely negatively impact the property values of adjacent properties. Working on vehicles and equipment in the units could lead to oil and other contaminants draining into the ground; not everyone will have an oil pan. There are runoff ponds for the stormwater; however, there is a tremendous amount of roof area and asphalt that would be impermeable surfaces. Thus, greater amount of water will run off into the creek and irrigation ditch. There would be both negative financial and visual impacts to adjoining properties, including roof glare. The Commissioners and Valley County Engineer have not seen the traffic report to know if this proposal would adversely impact governmental services. The application is not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, particularly the scenic byway guidelines in the open space section. Possible mitigation for approval would include modifications to the building layout and design, improvements to highway safety, and lessening the impact on adjacent properties.

Commissioner Mabe moved to deny the conditional use permit and preliminary plat for SUB 25-019 Rocky Mountain Storage based on the Commissioner discussion. Commissioner Oyarzo seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

There is a 10-day appeal period to the Board of County Commissioners in accordance with Valley County Code 9-5H-12.

Short recess to 7:42 p.m.

D. NEW BUSINESS:

1. **SUB 25-021 Hummingbird Haven Subdivision – Preliminary and Final Plat:** Bennett and Alexandria Childs are requesting a conditional use permit for a two-lot single-family residential subdivision on 6 acres. Proposed lot sizes are 1.3 acres and 4.7 acres. Individual septic systems and individual wells are proposed. Access would be from a shared driveway onto Ilka Lane, a private road. The site, addressed at 62 Ilka Lane, is parcel RP18N03E274204 in the NW ¼ Section 27, T.18N, R.3E, Boise Meridian, Valley County, Idaho. Action Item.

Chairman Roberts introduced the item and asked if there was any exparte contact or conflict of interest; there was none. Director Herrick presented the staff report, displayed the site, GIS map, and relevant Assessor's Plat on the projector screen, and summarized the following exhibits:

- **Exhibit 1** – Correspondence between Director Herrick and Sascha Childs regarding private roads. Legal counsel was recommended. (February 4, 2026; February 5, 2026)
- **Exhibit 2** – Correspondence between Director Herrick and Sascha Childs regarding Ilka Lane, easements, and deeds. Includes attachments. (February 9, 2026)
- **Exhibit 3** – Correspondence between Director Herrick and Sascha Childs regarding Ilka Lane. (February 10, 2026)
- **Exhibit 4** – Brian Oakey, Valley County Prosecutor, clarified the subdivision process and connection to a private road. (February 10, 2026)
- **Exhibit 5** – Applicant submitted email from Trevor Howard, a principal engineer at Timberland Associates, who stated Ilka Lane is less than an 8% grade; Valley County maximum allowed is 10%. The road appears to provide the site distance required. A road width of 24-ft was measured; the road width appears to be uniform for the entire length of Ilka Lane from Samson Trail to the proposed site. The Valley County Private Road minimum width is 28-ft. Pictures of Ilka Lane and Elk Haven Lane were submitted. (February 12, 2026)

Commissioners and Director Herrick viewed the maps on the screen and discussed which parcels are accessed by Ilka Lane. The easement(s) for Ilka Lane were made years ago; Staff did not research that history. The Road Department would determine whether or not the existing road complies with private road standards. Staff has not received that decision at this point. Director Herrick previously recommended that applicant hire an engineer. The Board of County Commissioners determines if a road is to be public road. Property owners along a public road would have to bring it up to a public road standards, which includes pavement. Otherwise, the property owners have an agreement to share expense for maintenance. Director Herrick believes this easement was created around 1990. There are a number of easements in Valley County that were used to access multiple parcels that were allowed to be created in the past. In 1991, the ordinance changed and required access from a platted private road. Ilka Lane was created prior to this requirement. Another ordinance in named roadways for emergency purposes and addressing. That is when Ilka Lane was validated / accepted / acknowledged as a private road. "Validated" does not mean built to today's standards. If Ilka was to become a public road, all the owners along there would have to come to an agreement to have a 70-ft road right-of-way dedicated to Valley County and the road would have to be brought to a public road standard. Easements are recorded; the Commission does not approve easements. However, the County no longer accepts easements to multiple residences, i.e., to more than one building site. Director Herrick is able to do an administrative variance to allow

shared driveway easement to access three building sites. Any more than three building sites would require a variance approval by the PZ Commission and Board of County Commissioners.

Chairman Roberts asked for the applicant's presentation.

Alexandria Childs, 62 Ilka Lane, is requesting a two-lot subdivision. Each lot would have a minimum of 30-ft of frontage along Ilka Lane; the existing flag is almost 66 feet wide.

Director Herrick clarified that 30-ft of frontage is minimum required; there could be one shared driveway or two separate ones. The new ordinance was approved January 1, 2026, required these driveways to be built to fire code.

Ms. Childs currently owns the existing home. The property requires too much work and expense at this time in their lives. They would sell the home and build a new home on the smaller lot. The proposal meets ordinances. Staff calculated a +31 compatibility rating. There is an error in the application; the road does not meet private road standards. Trevor Howard measured the road at 24-ft wide; the private road standards is 28-ft wide. The road is below the maximum 10% grade. The fire department came out and said the road is fine from their perspective. Jeff McFadden, Valley County Road Department Superintendent, stated that there have been lots of subdivisions created in the last 15 years off of private lanes that have not met the private road standards as the roads were all constructed a long time ago (**Exhibit 6**). This private road is appropriate for a two-lot subdivision. The proposal is compatible with existing area. Ms. Childs addressed concerns raised by Mr. Harris regarding the property owners' intent when the property was originally divided some 30 years ago. However, there are no CCRs nor deed restrictions on the property. Any future application for subdividing would require submittal to PZ Commission. In response to the accusation of illegal lot line and splits; these were done correctly according to ordinances at the time. Mr. Harris has a valid point that in 1989, this roadway was an easement. In 1990, the road was validated to provide addresses for emergency responses. In 2019, it was validated as a private level road according to the County with a 70-ft width. Multiple subdivisions in past have been approved using private lanes as access. For example, a two-lot subdivision was approved off Elk Haven Lane that is less than 39-ft wide (**Exhibit 5**). There are two issues with Ilka Lane: the 24-ft width and no fire-turn around in the location. The Road Director is to make the call. There is plenty of room to make a hammerhead if necessary for emergency response. The road can also widen if the Road Director believes this is necessary.

Ms. Child stated that a shared driveway to both lots would make sense due to costs and aesthetics. Neither homesite is visible from Ilka Lane; only two neighbors can see the property. Test holes are in and an application has been submitted to Central District Health. The well and back-up septic drain field site for the existing home is east of the home.

Chairman Roberts opened the public hearing and asked for proponents.

Scott Erickson, 59 Ilka Lane, stated the proposal is appropriate, modest, and conforms to the area. Ilka Lane is recognized as a private road. He addressed Mr. Harris' concerns regarding the property split of 59 Ilka Lane. There was an allowed parcel line adjustment, not an illegal split or subdivision. He previously consulted with PZ Staff and attorney and had a survey done. Mr. Erickson wanted to correct the record.

Chairman Roberts asked for undecided. There were none.

Chairman Roberts asked for opponents.

Scott Harris, 86 Ilka Lane, lives adjacent to proposed site. The private road does not meet Valley County private road standards. Valley County requires that a private road declaration be done. The easement was for the owners of properties abutting the roadway at the time it was recorded. There is no turnaround as required. The roadway is 16-ft wide and narrows to 10-ft at the end with no turn around; vehicles would be required to backup. Valley County stipulates standards for all roads. It makes no sense that a substandard roadway would be allowed to access a new subdivision. In addition, there is no paved apron at the S Samson Trail intersection as required. The email he submitted was to include the historical perspective in the record. He now understands that legal parcel line adjustments occurred.

Chairman Roberts asked for rebuttal from the applicant.

Ms. Childs asked Director Herrick if the private road declaration is required for this project. Director Herrick responded that one is not required as there is not a private road within the proposed subdivision. There is a shared driveway with two 30-ft frontages on a private road. Ms. Child stated according to Jeff McFadden, Ilka Lane is an existing private road that is over 15 years old. There is a road maintenance agreement as shown within the title commitment submitted with the application. The only person who accesses the 10-ft wide part of the roadway is Mr. Harris. The engineer stated the road is 24-ft. It is not 16-ft wide. Ms. Childs read from the Valley County minimum standards for private road design and construction, adopted November 28, 2005, page 4. Variations from these standards must be approved by the Valley County Planning and Zoning Commission and the Valley County Board of Commissioners. Variations will be reviewed on an individual basis. Thus, she asked the Commissioners if the roadway meets enough of the standards to be considered for a variance.

Ms. Child responded to questions from Commissioners. McCall Fire District did write a letter (see Staff Report). Approval of the Wildland Urban Interface Fire Protection Plan and Central District Health are pending.

Chairman Roberts closed the public hearing. The Commission deliberated and discussed if the application should be approved with approval of a variation from road standards as allowed in the private road standards with final approval given by Board. Another option is to bring the road to private road standards. Chairman Roberts preferred to receive comments from the Road Director prior to approval of the subdivision application. The 2025 email from Jeff McFadden was discussed. The road is currently covered in snow. There is a lack of documentation on Ilka Lane. The length of road and cost of improvements and who benefits versus who pays was discussed. Is the road safe? There should not be an undue burden placed on the applicant. Valley County Title 10 subdivision regulations state "as determined by road director". The PZ Commission can make a recommendation. Chairman Roberts and Commissioner Oyarzo do not have enough information tonight to make a decision. Verify and determine if road is adequate to meet the use. The County Engineer and Road Director could advise the Commission if the road meets the required standard or if it is adequate. Commissioner Potter would recommend approval with of a variance subject to condition of approval to meet intended use or require improvements of the road. Commissioner Mabe pointed out the pictures that show the quality of the road. The pictures in **Exhibit 5** were reviewed. The conditions and standards for approval were discussed. A variance is allowed. There would be an increase in property value. Central District Health approval would be required so there would not be an undue adverse impact on the environment. The proposed residential use fits the area. The existing trees provide visual screening. The McCall Fire District responded. Can impacts be mitigated? Chairman Roberts would prefer to have facts before making a decision versus making the approval conditional on more information. He wants more information before making the decision. This does not mean the end result would be different. The Commission does not need to hurry a decision.

Commissioner Oyarzo concurred that there was not enough information on the road. Commissioner Potter stated that all conditions have to be met before a subdivision plat can be recorded. The Road Department would do a site visit to confirm if the road is adequate and, if not, the mitigation and improvements required to make the road adequate.

Commissioner Mabe moved to table the SUB 25-021 Hummingbird Haven Subdivision to April 9, 2026. Commissioner Oyarzo seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

There is a 10-day appeal period to the Board of County Commissioners in accordance with Valley County Code 9-5H-12.

8:52 p.m.

- 2. C.U.P. 25-036 Maini Solar Panels:** Mike Maini is requesting a conditional use permit for three existing ground-mounted solar panel arrays for agricultural use. Maximum height is 10 feet. Access is from Margot Drive, a public road. The 31-acre parcel is RP16N03E202115, addressed at 194 Margot Drive, and located in the SE ¼ Section 20, T.16N, R.3E, Boise Meridian, Valley County, Idaho. Action Item.

Chairman Roberts introduced the item and asked if there was any exparte contact or conflict of interest; there was none. Director Herrick presented the staff report, displayed the site and GIS map on the projector screen. The solar panels were previously installed; no building permit exists at this time. Code Compliance discovered the violation.

Chairman Roberts asked for the applicant's presentation.

Mike Maini, 169 Margot Drive, lives across the street from the solar panels. The panels were installed about two years ago. He uses them to power the greenhouse. He has received no complaints; most neighbors are seasonal. The maximum height of the solar panels are 10-ft during the winter and 7-ft high during the summer. The panels are positioned behind the greenhouse when viewed from Margo Drive. He did not realize permits were required. Installing an electrical connection with Idaho Power would have been very expensive.

Chairman Roberts opened the public hearing and asked for proponents. There were none. Chairman Roberts asked for undecided. There were none. Chairman Roberts asked for opponents. There were none.

Chairman Roberts closed the public hearing. The Commission deliberated. Other than the fact the applicant did not obtain the permits before installing the solar panels, there do not seem to be any issues with the panels at this location. The use meets ordinance requirements.

Commissioner Mabe moved to approve C.U.P. 25-036 Maini Solar Panels with the stated conditions. Commissioner Oyarzo seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

There is a 10-day appeal period to the Board of County Commissioners in accordance with Valley County Code 9-5H-12.

9:00 p.m.

E. MCCALL AREA BUSINESS

1. **PUD-23-02, C.U.P-23-11, DR-23-28, and SR-23-18 Alpine Storage:** Cam Echanis is requesting approval of the final development plan for a self-storage facility. Two buildings with 34 units will total 38,808-sqft. Total lot coverage is 31.7%. An individual septic system and individual well are proposed. A public pedestrian pathway would run along the eastern property line. Access would be from S. Samson Road, a public road. The 2.81 acres, addressed at 450 South Samson Trail, is parcel RP18N03E169755 located in the SESE Section 16, T.18N, R3E, Boise Meridian, Valley County, Idaho. Action Item. *Not a public hearing.*

Chairman Roberts introduced the item and asked if there was any exparte contact or conflict of interest; there was none. Director Herrick presented the staff report and displayed the site and GIS map on the projector screen.

Abbey R. Germaine of Elam & Burke represented Cam Echanis (the property owner) and Hatch Design Architecture and presented a slide presentation (**Exhibit 1**). She explained the request, the project history, and answered questions from Commissioners.

The high-end recreational self-storage facility project consists of four applications: PUD-23-02, CUP-23-11, DR-23-28 and SR-23-18, all of which have been approved. PUD-23-02 and CUP-23-11 were approved by the County Commissioners and DR-23-28 and SR-23-18 have been approved by McCall PZ Commission.

The dedication of right-of-way will be done. There are other commercial uses in the area This proposed is a high-end recreational 34 units storage. The approval process has resulted in revisions from the original proposal. These include a revised site plan; a building was removed, building orientations were changed, and the view corridor was opened up. The footprint was reduced and setbacks increased. There will be a pedestrian pathway. The buildings were be fully fenced.

When the application was originally submitted, McCall City Code 3.10 Final Development plan Code regulated this location and proposed use. The criteria has been met. Expected start date of construction is unknown, perhaps 2026.

The Commissioners deliberated and used the McCall Code 3.10 Planned Unit Development as guidance. The Commissioners concurred that the applicant has met the requirements and completed the process as required.

Commissioner Potter moved to recommend approval of the final development plan in accordance with McCall Code 3.10 for PUD-23-02, C.U.P-23-11, DR-23-28, and SR-23-18 Alpine Storage to the Board of County Commissioners. Commissioner Mabe seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

9:13 p.m.

F. OTHER:

1. **McCall Funeral Home – Is a Conditional Use Permit required to install a crematorium at 155 S Samson Trail?** Action Item.

The McCall Funeral Home has asked if a conditional use permit is required to install a crematorium in the garage of the existing business located at 155 S Samson Trail. The Commissioners discussed the use and determined there would not be a change in the nature or scope of land use activity that currently exists for the funeral home. The building footprint would

not be expanded.

Commissioner Mabe moved that a conditional use permit is not required to install a crematorium in the existing garage of the McCall Funeral Home located at 155 S Samson Trail. Commissioner Potter seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously

2. Approval of Professional Forester Under Valley County Code Title 10-7 – Colin Chambers

Valley County Code requires the PZ Commission or Fire Working Group to approve professional foresters that can write Wildland Urban Interface Fire Mitigation plans. Colin Chambers has requested to be added to this list. His resume and other names on the approved list of foresters were reviewed. WUI plans are reviewed by Mara Hlawatschek, Valley County Wildfire Mitigation Director, as well as the fire districts and Southern Idaho Timber Protection Association (SITPA), Individual WUI plans are reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Mr. Chambers works for DF Development. Commissioners concurred that he is qualified based on his experience.

Commissioner Potter moved approve Colin Chambers as a Professional Forester Under Valley County Code Title 10-7. Commissioner Mabe seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Discussion on Valley County Code 9-5A-4 Landscaping

During a recent meeting with the Board of County Commissioners, there was a desire to review the landscaping guidelines and to add design guidelines. Commissioners were given printed copies of the existing landscaping guidelines. Commissioners concurred a work session is needed. Commissioners requested that Staff obtain landscaping ordinances from other communities to use as examples, including areas with designated scenic byways. Commissions should determine landscaping and structure designs that they do and do not like. Staff will send a copy of the existing McCall design guidelines to Commissioners. There are community members who are also interested in these requirements.

4. Discussion on Public Comments

The commissioners were given information regarding a public information request and request for remote testimony during public hearings. The County's current technology would require upgrading. There would need to be parameters, perhaps a 24-hour advance sign-up to testify remotely. Commissioners are not opposed to additional testimony. Commissioner Mabe is not opposed to remote testimony on the nights there are huge snowstorms and public safety can be enabled by allowing testimony over Zoom. The upcoming public hearing for Red Ridge Village was discussed. There will be a laptop and overflow seating in the "old" Building Department Office across the hall from the Commissioner meeting room. This will not be the only meeting for Red Ridge Village public testimony. Places in McCall with the ability to record the meeting were limited and already booked on February 25, 2026. Other communities that allow remote testimony were discussed. Future design of the current meeting room and needed technology was discussed. Director Herrick will let the Board of County Commissioners know that the PZ Commission is again asking for a remodel of the meeting room.

E. FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS - Action Items:

- C.U.P. 25-033 Brown Commercial Lease Space
- C.U.P. 25-034 Bambic Campground

Commissioner Mabe moved to approve the Facts and Conclusions as presented and authorize the chairman to sign. Commissioner Potter seconded the motion. Chairman Roberts abstained from voting. Motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Roberts adjourned the meeting at 9:37 p.m.