

Valley County Planning and Zoning

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



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

STAFF REPORT: SUB 26-005 Pine Creek Ranch South Subdivision - Preliminary Plat - Addendum

MEETING DATE: June 11, 2026

TO: Planning and Zoning Commission

STAFF: Cynda Herrick, AICP, CFM
Planning and Zoning Director

**APPLICANT /
PROPERTY OWNER:** Pine Creek Ranch LLC
517 E Parkcenter Blvd Apt 203, Boise ID 83706

SURVEYOR: NV5
690 S Industry Way Suite 120, Meridian ID 83642

ENGINEER: Crestline Engineers INC
PO Box 2330, McCall, ID 83638

LOCATION: 389 Stockton Court
Parcel RP18N03E154641 in the S ½ Section 15, T.18N, R.3E,
Boise Meridian, Valley County, Idaho

SIZE: 90.87 acres

REQUEST: Single-Family Residential Subdivision – 4 Residential Lots

EXISTING LAND USE: Single-Family Residential Lot with a Residence

A public hearing on SUB 26-005 was held on May 14, 2026. The matter was tabled to June 11, 2026. Chairman Roberts recommended that the Commission direct staff to come up with a proposal to review in writing that includes tiered conditions of approval with options and different levels of approval. Concerns should be incorporated. Tiered approaches would be: 1) if road built, 2) if road only accesses four lots, and 3) if road is used to access development within the City of McCall.

The public hearing was closed. Additional testimony will not be taken unless new information is added to the record.

Commissioners should refer to the Staff Report and meeting minutes for May 14, 2026.

FINDINGS:

1. A properly noticed public hearing was held May 14, 2026. The public hearing was closed and the matter was tabled to June 11, 2026.
 2. Legal notice was posted in the *Star News* on May 21, 2026, and May 28, 2026.
-

STAFF COMMENTS / QUESTIONS:

1. This project is in the City of McCall Impact Area where the Comprehensive Plan recommends development occur. The road will provide circulation through the county, especially for emergencies.
2. Tiered approaches – See **Condition of Approval - Development Agreement (DA) Outline for Road Mitigation** (attached)

Question to P&Z Commission:

1. Does this subdivision meet the minimum standards in Title 9, Chapter 5, of the Valley County Code in regards to frontage, lot size, etc.? If not, which ones does it not comply with?
2. Does this subdivision meet the minimum standards in Title 10 of the Valley County Code in regards to the access road, etc.?
3. Are impacts being properly mitigated? If not, which impacts are not mitigated?

Standard of Approval:

1. Will the application result in an increase in value of private property? VCC 9-5-2(B)(3).
2. Will the approval of the application result in an undue adverse impact on the environment? VCC 9-5-2(B)(3).
3. Will the approval of the application result in an undue adverse impact on adjoining properties? VCC 9-5-2(B)(3).
4. Will the approval of the application result in an undue adverse impact on governmental services? VCC 9-5-2(B)(3).
5. Is the application consistent with the Valley County Comprehensive Plan? VCC 9-5-2(B)(3).
6. Conditional uses may be approved only after a C.U.P. has been evaluated to determine that the impacts can be mitigated through conformance with conditions of approval. VCC 9-5-2(A).

These six standards should be a significant focus of attention during the public hearing and deliberations because they need to be resolved in order to justify approval. VCC 9-5-1(C) directs the decision-making body to encourage conditional uses where noncompatible aspects of the application can be satisfactorily mitigated through development agreements for the costs to service providers and impacts to surrounding land uses. Because mitigation measures are a requirement of approval the applicant needs to understand that he/she will be required to perform some off-site improvements. They are not mandatory but without them the application cannot satisfy the mitigation of impacts requirement and would be denied under the ordinance.

ATTACHMENTS:

- Proposed Conditions of Approval
 - **Condition of Approval - Development Agreement (DA) Outline for Road Mitigation**
- Relevant DRAFT meeting minutes of May 14, 2026

Proposed Conditions of Approval

1. The application, the staff report, and the provisions of the Land Use and Development Ordinance are all made a part of this permit as if written in full herein. Any violation of any portion of the permit will be subject to enforcement and penalties in accordance with Title 9-2-5; and, may include revocation or suspension of the conditional use permit.
2. Any change in the nature or scope of land use activities shall require an additional Conditional Use Permit.
3. The issuance of this permit and these conditions will not relieve the applicant from complying with applicable County, State, or Federal laws or regulations or be construed as permission to operate in violation of any statute or regulations. Violation of these laws, regulations or rules may be grounds for revocation of the Conditional Use Permit or grounds for suspension of the Conditional Use Permit.
4. Must have an approved storm water management plan and site grading plan approved by the Valley County Engineer prior to any work being done on-site.
5. The final plat shall be recorded within two years, or this permit will be null and void.
6. Sanitary Restrictions must be removed by Central District Health prior to recording the final plat when individual lots are proposed.
7. A letter of approval is required from McCall Fire District.
8. Consider this approval of a variance from the requirement of a full-blown Wildland Urban Interface Fire Protection Plan.
9. Fertilizer on lawns shall be wildlife friendly and not contribute to degradation of water quality.
10. Shall place addressing numbers at the residence and at the driveway entrance if house numbers are not visible from the road. Said numbers shall contrast with their background and be at least three and one-half inches (3 ½-in) height.
11. Standard Plat Notes shall be included on the final plat.
12. CCR's, if recorded, shall include Standard Conditions of Approval for CCRs.
13. A Development Agreement will be required for mitigation of off-site impacts. The applicant shall work with the Valley County Road Director and Planning and Zoning Director on an agreement for off-site infrastructure improvements that will be approved by the Board of County Commissioners. The Development Agreement will include the following:

Condition of Approval

Development Agreement (DA) Outline for Road Mitigation - Pine Creek South

Purpose:

To establish terms and responsibilities for road construction, mitigation of impacts, and future utility placement prior to recordation of the final plat.

1. Tiered Mitigation Approach

The DA will address road impacts based on two distinct scenarios:

Scenario 1 – Initial Access for Four Future Parcels

- **Scope:** Four future development parcels; each of the future development parcels would have a new DA with a developer. Also allows 4 residential units; 1 on each parcel.
- **Mitigation:**
 - Consider construction impacts of the internal road to existing off-site roads.
 - Determine proportional contributions for road improvements, including temporary measures during construction.
- **Responsibility:** Developer of Pine Creek South.

Scenario 2 – Secondary Access for Woodlands Subdivision Expansion

- **Scope:** Use of the roads (Stockton, Shiela, Fox Ridge, Deinhard) as secondary access to serve up to 176 residential homes in the east area of Woodlands Subdivision in the City of McCall.
- **Mitigation:**
 - Based on a **traffic impact study** conducted at the time the road becomes secondary access.
 - Developer contribution should be a **proportional share of impact**.
 - Mitigation may be **phased** based on development schedule.
- **Responsibility:** Developer(s) connecting to the secondary access; potentially shared with Pine Creek South if appropriate.

2. Other Key Considerations

1. Utility Placement Timing

- Electricity, water, and sewer connections should be coordinated with road construction.
- Responsibilities and timing for installation must be clearly defined.

2. Future Assigns / Transfers

- Any obligations under the DA should be **assignable** to subsequent owners or developers (e.g., Pine Creek South or northern developments).

3. Performance Bonds

- Require financial security to ensure road construction, utility installation, and mitigation obligations are fulfilled.

4. Road Acceptance

- County or city must **review and approve the road** for future maintenance.
- Specify conditions for acceptance (e.g., construction standards, inspections, warranty period)

5. Alternative Routes such as Stock DR, Shiela, Fox Ridge and Deinhard.

(End Conditions of Approval)

END OF STAFF REPORT

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
May 14, 2026
Valley County Court House - Cascade, Idaho
PUBLIC HEARING - 4:00 p.m.

A. **OPEN:** Meeting called to order at 4:06 p.m. by Chairman Roberts. A quorum exists.

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

B. **MINUTES:** Commissioner Schneider moved to approve the minutes of March 31, 2026; April 9, 2026; and April 21, 2026. Commissioner Potter seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

C. OLD BUSINESS:

1. **SUB 25-003 Tamarack Resort Phase 3.7 Buttercup Villas – Final Plat:** Tamarack Resort Two LLC is requesting is requesting final plat approval. The commission will review the final plat to determine conformance with the preliminary plat, approved densities, and conditional use permit. Original approval was for 10-lot single-family residential lots, an open space lot, and recreational easements. Clearwater Court (private) would be extended to access these lots. The site is a 4.3-acre portion of parcel RP00515006000B in the NESW Section 32, T.16N, R.3E, Boise Meridian, Valley County, Idaho. Not a public hearing. Action Item. *Postponed from March 12, 2026, on request of applicant.*

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 reports, displayed plat and the GIS map on the projector screen, and summarized the following exhibits:

- **Exhibit 1** – Paul Ashton, Parametrix and Valley County Engineer, recommended approval of the grading and drainage plans and drainage calculations. (April 1, 2026)
- **Exhibit 2** – Paul Ashton, Parametrix and Valley County Engineer, did not review the final plat. (May 7, 2026)

Chris Kirk, planning consultant for Tamarack Resort, concurred with staff report and conditions. He responded to questions from Commissioners. The recreational easement is for residents and is an existing bike trail that will be relocated. The easement accesses Tamarack property and eventually State Land. Sanitary restrictions will be lifted prior to final plat recordation.

Chairman Roberts closed the public hearing. The Commission deliberated. LIDs and development agreement requirements were discussed.

Commissioner Schneider moved to approve the conditional use permit and preliminary plat for SUB 26-004 Orange Sky Subdivision with the stated conditions. Commissioner Oyarzo seconded the motion.

There was additional discussion on the standards of approval as listed in the Staff Report. The proposal meets the minimal standard requirements for lot size, density, and access to a public road. Chairman Roberts had concerns regarding Standard No. 3 referring to adverse impact to adjoining properties. However, Valley County Code does allow one-acre splits. He stated Idaho State law requires residences must hook up to sewer if a sewer district ever has service in this area. There was further discussion on this matter.

Commissioner Schneider amended the motion to include the following condition of approval:

COA: Must hook up residences to central sewer and/or water when available in the area.

Commissioner Oyarzo seconded the amended 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 6:02 p.m.

5. SUB 26-005 Pine Creek Ranch South Subdivision - Preliminary Plat: Pine Creek Ranch LLC is requesting a conditional use permit for a subdivision that will contain four-development parcels on 90.87 acres. Permanent public rights-of-way with privately maintained 28-ft wide gravel roads would be platted with the potential to provide emergency access to development within the city of McCall. The site would be accessed from Stockton Court, a public road. The site, addressed at 389 Stockton Court, is parcel RP18N03E154641 in the S ½ Section 15, T.18N, R.3E, Boise Meridian, Valley County, Idaho. Action Item. *Postponed from April 9, 2026.*

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

- **Exhibit 1** – Mara Hlawatschek, Valley County Wildfire Mitigation Director, stated since developable lots are not proposed at this time, a WUI plan is not currently recommended. Once the parcels are further developed or proposed for residential development a WUI plan is recommended. (May 11, 2026)
- **Exhibit 2** – Kerstin Dettrich, Valley County Road & Bridge Director, responded to a May 13, 2026, email from Laurence Huie. (May 14, 2026)
- **Exhibit 3** – Paul Ashton, Parametrix and Valley County Engineer, described requirements for further review and approval. (May 7, 2026)
- **Exhibit 4** – Craig Groves submitted an application statement. (May 11, 2026)
- **Exhibit 5** – Craig Groves submitted Payette Lakes Recreational Water and Sewer District's (PLRWSD) technical memos from April 30, 2025, and June 28, 2021. (May 11, 2026)
- **Exhibit 6** – Gregg Tankersley, Crestline Engineers INC, submitted the Draft Wildland Urban Interface Fire Protection Plan (WUI) that was previously submitted to the City of McCall for the subject property and the adjacent 68 acres. (May 12, 2026)
- **Exhibit 7** – Sonja and Mark Engibous, full-time residents of The Woodlands, are opposed. (May 8, 2026)
- **Exhibit 8** – Brad and Tracy Brault, 669 Koski Drive, are opposed. (May 10, 2026)

- **Exhibit 9** – David and Jessica Argon are opposed. (May 13, 2026)
- **Exhibit 10** – Shealyn and Andre Mascheroni, Woodlands Drive, are opposed. (May 13, 2026)
- **Exhibit 11** – Pat and Kim Allen, 650 Stockton Drive, are opposed. They submitted their compatibility evaluation. (May 12, 2026)

Director Herrick stated some exhibits are over one page in length. Therefore, the Commission must determine whether they will be accepted into the record. Submitted exhibits over one page are from both the public and from the applicant. Commissioners agreed that they would accept all 11 exhibits into the record, waiving the one-page limitation.

Staff used the GIS map to show the overall area and the site. The proposed road would provide secondary access for circulation and emergency access for a parcel within the City of McCall. Future development would require a subdivision application and plat. If the Pine Creek South Subdivision plat is approved, each development parcel would be allowed to have one single-family residence. However, the intent is for future development of the four proposed development parcels.

The WUI plan was discussed. Ms. Hlawatschek originally stated a full-blown plan was required. After further review and discussion, she has determined that one is not necessary at this time.

Chairman Roberts asked for the applicant's presentation.

Gregg Tankersly, Crestline Engineers, McCall, represented the applicant. Director Herrick did a good job explaining the project. The proposed design would minimize impacts and conserve environmental features, including wetlands. It would provide a permanent public road right of way for emergency purposes. Any developments with more than 30 properties are required to have multiple access points according to Fire Code. This proposal is a result of the 90-acre parcel not being annexed into the sewer district. The parcel to the north is within both city limits and Payette Lakes Recreational Water and Sewer District (PLRWSD) boundary. It did not make sense to create one-acre lots when existing zoning suggests a higher density and sewer is available nearby. The Impact Area boundary was also recently modified, and the jurisdiction was changed to Valley County. The applicant and representatives met with Valley County Planning and Zoning and Road Department Staff as well as McCall Fire prior to submittal of this application. This proposal does not connect to The Woodlands. That would be permitted by the City of McCall. Impacts to the road system would be minimal at this time. There would only be four homesites until future applications are submitted and approved for additional development. The draft WUI plan (**Exhibit 6**) was not part of the application as it was created for a much larger project. They have studied the impacts of potential wildfires in the area. It may not make sense to implement this draft WUI in entirety due to change in number and size of lots.

Road construction timeline is not set; the plat would preserve the right to construct it. Construction may be dependent on approval of other application(s). Utilities would not be added at this time. The proposed road location is in the same location as presented to the sewer district. An 80-ft road right-of-way is proposed instead of the 70-ft minimum to provide room for a separate pedestrian pathway.

Chairman Roberts opened the public hearing and asked for proponents.

Kyle Kirby, McCall, is local business owner and supports the secondary access road. This is an important part of infrastructure planning. This proposal would help with housing needs.

Chairman Roberts asked for undecided. There were none.

Chairman Roberts asked for opponents.

McCall Keller, 751 Stockton Drive, the developer has stated his plans to send 100% of construction traffic down Stockton Drive. There are many young kids that live on and use Stockton Drive; the road was not designed to handle greater traffic. This proposal would result in Stockton Drive becoming a construction throughway for 20+ years.

John Riggins, 662 Koski Drive, was concerned about the overall development that would result if this proposal is approved. How can the road be a secondary access road if is not going to connect to roads within The Woodlands. Negative impacts include dust, noise, and traffic; there would be cumulative and incremental impacts.

Doug Campbell, 648 Brady Drive, stated neither a developer nor existing owners should harm the other's private property rights. The proposed gravel access may or may not satisfy the definition of a secondary access road with an "all weather surface". If constructed, the road should be paved, not gravel. There is need for an integrated solution; the current process is adversarial between City of McCall and Valley County. A team consisting of McCall, Valley County, and community citizens would lead to an amicable solution. Safety is most important consideration. The Woodlands was developed without any secondary access; having 118 homes on one access road is not safe. This was either an oversight or negligence.

Marcia Witte, 669 Woodlands Drive, stated the application is incomplete. There was no traffic impact study despite the proposed connections to a proposed 176-unit subdivision and to The Woodlands. A WUI was not submitted. The connectivity has not been approved nor supported by the City of McCall. The proposal is not good for the County as there would be no improvements to existing county roads. It is not clear the applicant would ever be required to contribute given the piecemeal approach to development in which each piece may not meet a threshold for proportional impact that merits road improvement. The application contained no details regarding an enforceable maintenance agreement for the proposed road. The application does not appear to meet standards of approval of Valley County Code 9-5-2B3. The road does not seem to result in increase in value of private property. The increased traffic would result in undue adverse impacts on adjoining properties. The project may create undue adverse impacts on governmental services if the proposed road is not maintained and if Stockton Drive needs further maintenance and improvement as a result of this project. The developer purchased property with the intent to build a large subdivision in an area that does not have adequate road access. He is trying to squeeze the traffic through two local streets in quiet neighborhoods that were not built to accommodate this volume of traffic. This is counter to the Valley County Comprehensive Plan goal of retaining the rural and small-town character. The proposal presents a disjointed approach to planning and is counter to the Comprehensive Plan goal of managing growth and development while protecting quality of life with a specific objective of fostering collaboration with other regional partners and neighboring communities to address growth and development effectively. There are impacts across both jurisdictions, however, this process is a disjointed, piecemeal approach to planning.

Donna Bush, 659 Brady Drive within The Woodlands, stated there is not a clear and complete picture on how the development will affect the area. There would be long-term consequences for city and county residents. A traffic impact study was not submitted. The roads within The Woodlands were not designed for heavy traffic, especially in the winter. Impacts do not stop at jurisdictional boundaries. The entire development and both parcels should be reviewed together.

Melissa Daniels, 656 Brady Drive within The Woodlands, was confused if the Commission is considering this a four-lot subdivision or a parcel with an 80-ft road right-of-way for access to

other parcels. The ramifications are different. It is known that the applicant wishes to further develop the parcel, not just a total of four homes. It is a piecemeal approval to approve a road before future development plans are known.

Mark Engibous, 646 Brady Drive, was also unclear how adding 176 additional units and one roadway helps the access problem. He concurred with sentiments of neighbors opposed to the project, particularly safety. Emergency services will use the shortest route; this would not be Stockton Drive / Blvd.

Pam Wissenbach, 280 May Road, stated this access road may not be needed as the City of McCall has not approved the proposal for the adjacent property owned by the applicant. The proposal would change the rural feel in the West Place neighborhood. Stockton Drive is in poor shape with blind spots. There are too many unknowns in this application, including future development.

Mike Wisenbach, 280 May Road, concurred with previous opposition. Approval would result in adverse undue impacts. Planning should take into cumulative impacts the application would have; however, there is not enough information to determine possible cumulative impacts.

Karl Lindstrom, 650 Woodlands Drive, concurred with previous comments in opposition. The primary purpose of this application is to meet the secondary access requirements for The Woodlands 3 proposed application. The application should include impacts to existing Woodlands 1 and 2. The McCall City Council said the County does not listen to the City Council nor Staff. Both jurisdictions should work together. Mr. Groves does have a right to develop the property he owns; however, this project is too broad.

Dave Carter, 656 Douglas Drive in The Woodlands, referred to the recent severe reduction in the McCall Area of Impact boundary. There is not enough information to make a decision. He previously met with Mr. Groves but never got anything concrete. If approved, the County should require rigorous paperwork and cash in escrow to make sure things are completed.

Pat Allen, 650 Stockton, stated Stockton Drive was created by plowing a roadway. Stockton Drive has not been improved and is very rough. The County plows about three times per year. He is concerned about the impact including the heavy proposed construction vehicles. What will the development lots be used for in the future. The proposed high density and increased traffic will affect the area.

Todd McKenna, 659 Douglas Drive, concurred with previous comments. Unlike the surrounding developments, this proposal would affect other neighborhoods in the area.

Dawn Matus, 618 Woodlands Drive, stated there are lots of reasons to be uncomfortable with the future impacts of this proposal. An impact study should be done as there is much reference to future residential construction. The Commissioners have been asked to approve the foundation for future development.

Chairman Roberts asked for rebuttal from the applicant.

Director Herrick stated, for the record, that she met with City of McCall Staff, including Stewart, Groenevelt, and Todd, approximately a month ago; Valley County Road Director has also.

Mathew Parks of Clark Wardle LLP, Boise, represented the applicant and stated that people have raised valid concerns. This application is for four lots; it is not for a development within the City of McCall. The jurisdictions do need to work together. A future development would require

an addition hearing and more details. The applicant is working with the City of McCall to see how the road connection will work. This road will not connect to the Woodlands unless approved by the City of McCall. An 80-ft road right-of-way would be needed in the future. Opponents addressed planning and safety. As indicated by the McCall Fire Department, this road will help safety concerns.

Mr. Parks responded to questions from Commissioners and stated that this is a unique situation due to multiple jurisdictions, including Valley County, City of McCall, and PLRWSD. The road could be used for recreational use or to future develop the four development parcels even if the parcel to the north does not receive development approval by the City of McCall. If additional development is not approved in the McCall parcel, the constructed roadway would likely be much smaller but would still provide connectivity.

Possible septic system sites are not currently being monitored for the four proposed development parcels. Future development would require additional applications to either Valley County or the City of McCall. There is currently one residence on the parcel. The roadway could provide emergency access for the existing Woodland developments. Director Herrick pointed out existing stubbed access points for future development.

Mr. Parks stated the proposal would benefit the community by providing access and connectivity. Long-term buildout is planned. Connections to PLRWSD sewer services are currently limited to one hook-up per acre. The applicant is trying to address concerns of the various agencies.

Craig Groves, applicant, responded to questions from the Commissioners. If the application submitted to McCall is denied or not accepted, he will need to sell the parcels. Therefore, he would need to construct the road to access these parcels. The road would exceed minimum Valley County Road Standards.

Mr. Tankersly, Crestline Engineers, responded to questions from Commissioners. He has been working on this project site since 2021. A traffic impact study (TIS) was provided to the City of McCall. It was further refined and based on the development proposal for entire development and both parcels owned by the applicant. The current proposal to McCall has been reduced to 68 acres in City of McCall; the third version of TIS is being worked on. To provide water, the property would need to be annexed into the City of McCall. A water model has been done and included fire hydrants; an updated model is in the process. Annexing into the city does not make sense for the 90-acre [SUB 26-005] since the site cannot currently get sewer services. Therefore, development would be limited to a minimum of one-acre lots.

Director Herrick stated that Valley County Code says a conditional use permit is good for one year or up to five years. Proposed condition of approval currently states the plat is to be recorded within two years. Road construction could either be built or financially guaranteed.

Rob Pair, Crestline Engineers, stated that the ground water monitoring for spring 2026 may not be accepted by Central District Health; another year of monitoring may be required. Sanitary restrictions were discussed further. For now, sanitary restrictions would be in place. The four future development parcels would need sanitary restrictions to be released if ever developed.

Chairman Roberts closed the public hearing. The Commission deliberated. Director Herrick described a similar conditional use permit for Herrick Court [CUP 20-32] that permitted a 70-ft road right-of-way for access to larger parcels. The plat has not been finalized.

Commissioner Schneider stated it is hard to separate if the approval would be for a right-of-way for future development versus a shared roadway to four parcels. The conditions of approval would look very different for each.

Chairman Roberts stated a possible condition of approval would be to reserve the right of the PZ Commission to add conditions.

Commissioner Potter stated the impact to neighbors is different for the two scenarios.

Commissioner Schneider stated a secondary access is needed for safety of the neighborhoods. She agreed that the two scenarios would have different impacts and result in different development agreements.

Director Herrick recommended the Commission look at this application as it is proposed, a secondary access to future development in McCall. If that development does not get approval, the applicant plans to sell the four parcels for development by someone else. The road would be an ingress-egress road for secondary access for a future development within the City of McCall. It would be a 80-ft wide right-of-way, 24-ft graveled road with 2-ft shoulders, until such time the area is annexed into City of McCall or a future development application is submitted. At this time, the roadway would be reviewed again. Director Herrick stated the Commission can recommend specific items to be within the development agreement. The Valley County Road Director and Engineer will review the traffic impact study and number of trips in the area.

The overall area was reviewed on the GIS map. The condition of roads in the area was discussed; it is likely no roads within West Place Subdivision are built to County standards at this time. Commissioners concurred that significant improvements to Stockton Drive would be required. Would Stockton Drive need to be improved to Valley County Standards? Not all the lots would be using Stockton Drive at this time.

Chairman Roberts asked if the Commissioners want more information at this time. Commissioner Potter has enough information and stated a development agreement would be required. There was discussion on a possible condition of "If this road is used for a development within the city of the McCall, these would be our recommendations..."

Chairman Roberts recommended that the Commission direct staff to come up with a proposal to review in writing that includes tiered conditions of approval with options and different levels of approval. Concerns should be incorporated. Tiered approaches would be: 1) if road built, 2) if road only accesses four lots, and 3) if road is used to access development within the City of McCall.

Chairman Roberts stated the Constitution and laws of State and Valley County do permit for development but allow for mitigation of impacts. Is the proposed land use acceptable? The Commission must balance rights of landowners and citizens. Chairman Roberts does not believe that Staff's recommendations and options would be considered new information; thus, additional testimony would not be taken unless new information is added to the record.

Commissioner Potter moved to table SUB 26-005 Pine Creek Ranch South Subdivision to June 11, 2026, at 4:00 p.m. Commissioner Schneider seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

8:12 p.m.