

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 25, 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

C. NEW BUSINESS:

1. P.U.D 26-001 Red Ridge Village: DF Development LLC is requesting approval of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) Concept Plan in accordance with Valley County Code Title 9 Land Use and Development, Chapter 9 PUDs. The concept includes 722 residential units including condominiums, multi-family local housing, and single-family residences on 2250 acres. Overall density would be approximately 0.3 units per acre. Approximately 1,400 acres of open space, recreation areas, and wildlife habitat would be created by clustering dwelling units in a village center and surrounding residential neighborhoods. The concept plan includes five development areas with amenities, roads, and a trail network. A water association would provide central water services. Both septic systems and a central sewage treatment facility are proposed. Access would be from West Mountain Road. The 2,250-acre site includes multiple parcels in Sections 3 and 10, T.17N, R.2E and Sections 13, 14, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, and 34, T.18N, R.2E, 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 and summarized the following exhibits:

- **Exhibit 1** – Susan Rouske, Blackhawk on the River resident, is opposed. (February 20, 2026)
- **Exhibit 2** – Steve Stuebner, Valley County Pathways, provided comments. (Received February 23, 2026)
- **Exhibit 3** – Betsy Booth, McCall, is opposed. (February 23, 2026)
- **Exhibit 4** – Brandon Flack, Idaho Fish and Game Department, clarified previous

comments. (February 24, 2026)

- **Exhibit 5** – Melissa Coriell, McCall, is opposed. (February 25, 2026)
- **Exhibit 6** – John Phipps is opposed. The land would be better used to provide timber and logging jobs for the community. (February 25, 2026)
- **Exhibit 7** – Gary and Renee Ladd, 8 Oneida Drive, are opposed (February 25, 2026)
- **Exhibit 8** – Presentation by Applicant (Hard copies were given to PZ Commissioners and a pdf was posted on the Valley County website.)

There was discussion between Staff and PZ Commissioners. Adams County officials were sent notice of the public hearing; however, no comments were received. The Compatibility Rating Process and Resolution 7-98 were discussed. The resolution specifically calls out Questions 6, 8, and 9 which deal with financial matters. The PZ Commission will make recommendations; however, the Board of County Commissioners will determine the numbers for Questions 6, 8, and 9.

Chairman Roberts explained to the audience that there are differences in the process between conditional use permits and planned unit developments. He explained the process of a public hearing and asked that all comments be directed to the Commission, not the applicant.

The applicant was represented by five people, all whom participated in the presentation of the application (**Exhibit 8**):

- Christine Richman, urban planner with GSBS Architects, Salt Lake City, Utah,
- Sam Jones, GSBS Architects, Fort Worth, Texas,
- Teller Bard, civil engineer with Kimley-Horn and Associates INC, Boise, Idaho,
- Charles Brockway, civil engineer with Brockway Engineering, Twin Falls, specializing in the water supply aspects of this project, and
- Josh Gibbons, traffic engineer with Hales Engineering, Lehi, Utah.

An application for this development was previously submitted in October 2024. That application was withdrawn prior to a public hearing as the applicant determined more time was needed to meet with community and stakeholders. The first public open house was held exactly one year ago at the McCall City Library, and a second open house was held the following night. Additional meetings occurred over the past year with stakeholders. The initial concept included almost 1000 residential units; this application has about 722 residences.

An overview of the proposal was given. The concept includes a village center and a farm-to-table vision. The site is adjacent to existing comparable development and near existing infrastructure. Growth has been occurring in this direction. There would be public benefits and amenities, including public access, increased wildfire safety, community amenities at the Village Center, buffers, and preservation of over 1500 acres of open space.

The applicant is requesting concept approval of the P.U.D. It is anticipated that the entire proposal would be implemented over twenty years or more. The applicant would like to have concept approval before making additional investment into engineering work.

Part of the site is within the conical zone of the McCall Airport; thus, building height restrictions would apply for this area.

Key elements that have come from conversations with stakeholders and the public were reviewed.

- Police protection – Sheriff's substation within the Village area and on-site private security

- Electrical Power – A new Idaho Power substation to be constructed during Phase 1A.
- Riparian Zones, streams, and wetlands would be preserved and enhanced. There are areas of water and season streams within the property.
- Fire Protection
 - o Amend impact fee analysis to include site.
 - o Identify location for new fire station.
 - o WUI Plan – Additional plans for each phase would require greater detail. Outside consultant(s) would complete these plans
- Cross-section of the road – this modified version shows the pathway within a 70-ft R-O-W with the pathway outside of the 100-ft buffer areas.
 - o No longer asking for variance from road width r-o-w.
- Internal roadways and access.
 - o Traffic study was done in 2024 and revised in 2025.
 - o Deceleration turn lanes into Red Ridge from West Mountain RD.
 - o Two (2) permanent accesses with an additional emergency access.
- Proposed improvements off-site from traffic study.
- Proposed roadways design, ownership, and maintenance were reviewed.
- Stormwater and drainage
 - o Post-development runoff cannot exceed pre-development.
- Public drinking water system
 - o Regulated by Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (IDEQ) and Idaho Department of Water Resources (IDWR).
 - o The approval processes and requirements were reviewed.
 - o Legal criteria for water permit; burden is on the applicant.
 - o Anticipated design of wells will not affect existing wells.
- Wastewater
 - o Reclaimed Water for Fire Flow and Irrigation
 - o Enclosed wastewater facility
- Response to Public Comments
- Response to Agency Comments
- Response to Staff Comments within the Staff Report

Deed restrictions would be used for local work force housing. A plaza is proposed within the Village center. Small musical concerts could occur within the plaza; however, the amphitheater that was included in original 2024 submittal has been removed from this proposal. Short-term rentals would be allowed only in some condominiums with the Village Center. The phasing plan map is shown on Slide 51. The Village Center would be completed over time, generally during Phases 2-4.

Chairman Roberts opened the public hearing and asked for proponents.

Elaine Murray, 19 Gold Fork Bay Circle, Donnelly, stated growth will occur; growth cannot be stopped. The County can control how to manage this growth. New residents bring a greater tax base which is how many governmental services get funded. She lives in neighborhood with density of approximately one-third acre. Her neighborhood doesn't seem overcrowded due to the open space. A well-designed community has clustered density with open space. This proposal would add housing and deliver modern infrastructure including water and sewer paid for by the development. The alternative is a large lot, high-cost development that only the well-off segment of population could purchase. That alternative would increase commute lengths and the demand on infrastructure.

Chairman Roberts asked for undecided.

Andy Olavarria represented Valley County Pathways and read a letter submitted as **Exhibit 2**. If approved, trails and access would be a key asset. Public access similar to what Jug Mountain Ranch provides is requested. The applicant has closed trails and access that were once open to the public. Recreational easements and public parking in the village area are requested.

Art Troutner, 193 West Lake Fork Road, represented the Valley Soil and Water Conservation District. The District's response was included within the staff report. The Board requested their letter be read during public hearing. A comprehensive groundwater assessment study should be conducted by a third party with a credible technical background. Water quantity and quality are a concern. Where will the development obtain water?

Ron Derose, Adams County, lives in the New Meadows area, north of the proposed development. He is neutral regarding this proposal. Development is going to come to the area. The County can require the developer to pay for the costs of development including water and wastewater infrastructure. Development has costs, both financially and environmentally. The human footprint will increase and the resulting number of people and trails will decrease the number of animals that use the area. Development does not improve the tax base; the tax base will not keep up with the costs of utilities, roads, etc.

Chairman Roberts asked for opponents.

Bill Marineau, 3306 Shaggy Mane, McCall, stated the proposed 100-ft buffer area would mostly benefit the proposed community, not the existing communities. He likes the farm component of the proposal. He would like lower density along West Mountain Road and greater space between the development and existing residents. Widening corners would not address problems caused by over 700 new homes with two or more cars per home. The impact on Highway 55 must be considered.

Margot Lojek, 1045 Valley Rim Road, said the proposal ignores Valley County Code 9-5-2E3 that states higher density projects be located near existing infrastructure and/or developed areas or near existing established incorporated communities. This community does not do that. The proposal is not consistent with the Valley County Comprehensive Plan goals and objectives in Chapter 13. Commercial village and condominium complexes are not to be within the rural area. Nor would 250 nightly rental condos be consistent with those goals. More information is needed. It is not what people who live here want to see.

Robert S. (spelling unknown), 405 N Samson Trail, stated the impact to McCall and Valley County of the overall development that includes Adams County should be a consideration. Congestion already exists; there are too many people for existing infrastructure. Concerns include impacts to traffic, ground water, and surface water. Will monitoring be adequate to identify ecological impacts? Cumulative impacts should be considered, not just this development. Is adding another 722 units the best thing for Valley County? Impacts, risks, and benefits must be evaluated.

Rebecca Hurd, 1505 Chris Lane, stated that although the applicant was able to tailor their presentation, those in opposition were not able to review the presentation in advance. Her family has run and biked and West Mountain Road for many years. The traffic impact study states that the development will generate 8,071 daily vehicle trips but provides no baseline average daily traffic count for West Mountain Road. The language throughout every technical appendix refers to needed information, for example, aquifer studies "ongoing"; water rights "being determined"; pre-development drainage baseline "will be established"; wetlands "not yet completed"; wildlife data "does not exist"; and housing standards "not finalized". The 62% open space is misleading as the majority of this is unbuildable and there are no conservation

easements to ensure permanency. There is a high risk of wildfire. Wildfires in this area are driven by southwest winds. Evacuation of residents and rental guests will be difficult. Baseline data is needed at the concept stage so Commissioners can determine if this development is appropriate for the site. This is a premature application without studies or binding commitments.

Ted McManus, 1045 Valley Rim Road, stated the location is inappropriate and inconsistent with the existing rural character. Traffic is a concern. The proposed density is more appropriate within city boundaries. Schools are near maximum capacity. Would existing residents be required to pay for new schools?

Pete Fitzsimmons, 8 Sawtooth Court, compared the proposal to Avimor and sprawl. The development would impact the property north and south of the site. Concerns include property value degradation (equity drop) and traffic impacts. Property owners of nearby large parcels want space and solitude.

There was a short recess to 8:19 p.m.

Wyatt Albright, 3731 West Mountain Road, is an adjacent property owner and full-time resident. The traffic volume would not be compatible with the current lifestyle of residents. The road is not well maintained and there are many crashes and slide offs during the winter. Many pedestrians and bike riders use the road. During the neighbor meeting, the applicant's representative stated "roads are for the County to manage and not part of our project." Impact to the existing wells is a concern; just digging deeper would not necessarily protect existing wells. A water study should be done by a third party. The proposal would affect wildlife habitat and migration. A 100-ft area is not an adequate buffer zone. There is not enough information provided to assess road safety, water supply, current wildlife integrations or impacts on infrastructure.

Randy Fox, 311 E Lake Street, McCall, represented the Idaho Conservation League. Written comments were submitted. Concerns include the natural resources and availability of water. The results of studies that are required by DEQ and IDWR as well as the commitment and investment to fulfill those requirements should be known before the Commissioners make a decision.

Lea' Albright, 3731 West Mountain Road, is concerned about the impact to the character of the area, including non-motorized users, grazing sheep, wildlife, and existing dark sky. She prefers a low density, large-lot project. There is not enough information to fully understand the magnitude of the proposal and short and long-term effects of the residents, wildlife, and town of McCall. The Comprehensive Plan says to protect private property from negative effects of recreational uses and nearby incompatible uses. The proposed condos are incompatible with nearby properties. The project would increase noise, traffic, artificial light, human impacts, and crime. The proposed village center is directly adjacent to her property with high density condos directly adjacent. Her property would be surrounded by the Village area. Her property has a forest management plan in place and is assessed as agricultural. Dense urban environments should be within a city. She asked if the trail system would be free to access. How would open space be conserved?

Brian Donaldson, 19 Thunderbolt Place, has nearly 40 years of municipal infrastructure engineering in Idaho. This proposal would be isolated high density, leapfrog urban sprawl and is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan's goal of preserving the rural character. Concerns include infrastructure and transportation issues. Taxpayers would be responsible for the cost of remedies, including the fix to the S-Bridge. In comparison, Jug Mountain Ranch, another isolated PUD, has multiple access routes, significantly fewer impacts, and buffers the

development. This proposal's layout concentrates development along shared boundaries, disproportionately affecting adjacent residents and landowners. The right to develop should not override the established rights of existing residents. Concerns include transportation, safety, noise, lighting, and wastewater systems. The County does not have to accept incompatible and poorly designed developments.

Larry Brockman, 81 Sundance Drive, is opposed. Valley County has two sheriff deputies on duty at any time in this area. He was told to take pictures of license plates of speeding drivers near his home as the deputies cannot be there to enforce the speed limit. He is concerned that the cost of the low-income housing will not actually be affordable. Many (10-15) vehicles slide off between this site and McCall every year due to the corners and icy conditions.

Leslie Pierce, 405 N Samson Trail, stated there would be negative impacts outside of the development to roads, hospital, local businesses, law enforcement, etc. Where do the wet areas in the meadows drain to? She wanted more information on the proposed farm and orchard operations and the open space. She asked for clarification on the future Phase 6 area designated for estate lots. She is concerned that the State of Idaho is reducing the criteria for water. She would like more information regarding the quarry location and use.

John Phipps, Fruitland, is concerned that newcomers would ruin the place, the very reason they move here. Newcomers ruin the land and the community. This area is nice because people who have been here for generations have been taking care of it. He is not against logging, mining, or ranching; these things bring local jobs. The Wilks brothers do not have a right to the land; they have not treated the land well and wish to hurt the land more. All the money would go to outside businesses. The Commissioners should preserve what people love about the area.

Ann McQuade, 14042 Deerfield Road, is concerned that the proposal and the overwhelming growth will be approved. West Mountain Road is difficult. The developers should pay to realign the road, the new stop lights, and the impact to schools, not the Valley County taxpayers. The Wilks brothers do not care about the community.

There was no one else who wished to speak.

8:40 p.m.

Chairman Roberts stated the Commission is only considering the proposed P.U.D. Concept. If approved, the applicant would apply for conditional use permits for various phases. There is a lot of information for the Commissioners to review within the application and comments. Additional information from applicant is expected. The proposal will be evaluated using State of Idaho Code, the Comprehensive Plan, and Valley County Code. The process will take time. Chairman Roberts recommends that the public hearing and deliberations be tabled to another time. The PZ Commission decision will be a recommendation to the Board, not a final decision.

Chairman Roberts asked if the applicant's representatives wanted to respond to comments without reiterating the earlier presentation.

Ms. Richman agreed that this will be an ongoing process and a more robust technical approach to some comments will be done at a future date. In response to comments regarding ridgeline construction, there will be a ridgeline protection zone as noted in the application. There will be no structures within 50 feet of the ridge line, other than perhaps necessary water tanks that would be screened. The last phase includes a maximum of 15 estate lots that would be on the other side of the ridge. Many details will be worked through for this P.U.D. Avimor is a much

larger and a different type of development. They are aware of the need for additional details and studies going forward. A development agreement would address many concerns, particularly who pays for improvements to infrastructure such as roads and stoplights.

The Commissioners and Staff discussed the next step in the process and a future work session. The spreadsheets within the staff report that relate to comments, Comprehensive Plan, and mitigation were discussed. Commissioners will send comments to staff prior to the next meeting, including types of studies that would be necessary for P.U.D. Concept recommendation versus conditional use permit decision. Topics mentioned during discussion included:

- trail access,
- deed restrictions into perpetuity,
- restrictions of short-term rentals,
- agency feedback needed, specifically regarding impacts to schools and Highway 55,
- local county road access, carrying capacity, and safety,
- if the traffic study considered impacts to Highway 55, both north and south of McCall,
- cumulative impacts, and
- traffic impacts on West Mountain Road south of the proposed development.

The Commissioners would like the Road Department Director to attend the upcoming work session. Public testimony would not be taken during a work session. A future public hearing would be re-noticed.

Commissioner Schneider moved to continue the discussion of P.U.D 26-001 Red Ridge Village to March 31, 2026, at 9:00 a.m. for a work session. Commissioner Oyarzo seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

E. FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS - Action Items:

- PUD-23-02, C.U.P-23-11, DR-23-28, and SR-23-18 Alpine Storage

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.

Commissioner Schnieder moved to adjourn; Commissioner Potter seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

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