

# Valley County Planning and Zoning

PO Box 1350 • 219 North Main Street  
Cascade, ID 83611-1350



Phone: 208-382-7115  
Fax: 208-382-7119  
Email: cherrick@co.valley.id.us

---

**STAFF REPORT:** P.U.D. 22-02 Valley Meadows and C.U.P. 22-29 – Preliminary Plat  
**HEARING DATE:** October 4, 2022  
**TO:** Board of County Commissioners  
**STAFF:** Cynda Herrick, AICP, CFM  
Planning and Zoning Director  
**APPLICANT:** Tanner Leighton, Triple Dot Development LLC  
811 E McKinley ST  
Boise ID 83712  
**OWNER:** Timberline Development LLC  
132 SW 5<sup>th</sup> AVE STE 100  
Meridian ID 83642  
**ENGINEER:** Joe Pachner, KM Engineering LLP  
5725 N Discovery Way  
Boise, ID 83713  
**LOCATION:** West Roseberry Road x Timberline Drive  
Parcels RP16N03E170895, RP16N03E170945, RP16N03E170965,  
and RP16N03E170700 located in the NE ¼ Section 17, T.16N, R.3E,  
Boise Meridian, Valley County, Idaho  
**SIZE:** 20.8 acres  
**REQUEST:** Townhomes, Multi-family Units, Commercial, and Open Space  
**EXISTING LAND USE:** Bare Land

---

## BACKGROUND:

Previously, PUD 04-01 The Meadows at West Mountain was approved at the location of the current application. Only the first 3 phases were completed prior to the 2008 recession. Attached is a copy of the land use table and map from the application. The permit for PUD 04-01 was extended for a number of years but expired in September of 2020 when they failed to submit the extension.

## CURRENT:

Triple Dot Development LLC is requesting approval of 74 townhomes (5.9 acres), 88 multi-family units (5.9 acres), three commercial lots (1.53 acres), 3.24 acres of recreation/open space, and 4.1 acres of private street area. The site is 20.8 acres.

Commercial lots would include storage units (45,000-sqft), offices, restaurant, and retail sites.

The residential unit combined density is 7.9 units per acre (162 units / 20.8 acres); the applicant calculated their density as 8.93 units per acres (did not include all acres in the development as required). The Valley County Code allows 6 units per acre, so a variance to increase the density is part of this application (Valley County Code 9-9-7.D). Staff created maps showing approximate densities within the general neighborhood ranging from 0.39 dwelling units/acre to 9.6 dwelling units/acre (attached).

Three phases are proposed. Preliminary completion date is June 2025. The phasing plan can be revised prior to platting of subsequent phases. The maximum number of total residential units allowed in any phase shall not vary by 15%. The maximum number of residential units allowed shall remain at 162.

- Phase 1 – 88 Multi-Family Units
- Phase 2 – 50 Townhome Lots
- Phase 3 – 24 Townhome Lots and 1.53 acres of Commercial Use

The application states....the developer intends to construct an on-site water supply, treatment, storage, and distribution facility in cooperation with Northlake Recreational Sewer and Water District (District). Once completed, the system would be owned and operated by the District. Alternatively the applicant reserves the right to construct wells, treatment facilities and storage tanks as may be require by Idaho Department of Environmental Quality as a privately-owned system if the District does not want to cooperate. Underground utilities would be provided. ***(The applicant should clarify if this is already done as part of the water system for The Meadows at West Mountain.)***

The application states....greater than 50% of the residential portion of the development is common open space. The commercial and multi-family phases will have at least 15% and 30%, respectively. The total averaged open space is 16%. Proposed amenities include playground equipment, lawn, community BBQ facilities, and a dog park. Open space will also be used for landscaping and snow storage. ***(The applicant should clarify if The Meadows at West Mountain was used in the overall calculation of common open space.)***

Twenty temporary RV sites would accommodate a portion of the expected construction employee housing requirements. These would be connected to central water and sewer . The RVs would be removed from the site once the project is complete.

Access would be from private roads onto West Roseberry Road (public) and Timberline Drive (private).

Contained within the application is a combination of permits:

1. Concept Approval and Planned Unit Development in accordance with Title 9 Land Use and Development.
2. C.U.P. 22-29 Valley Meadows – Preliminary Plat in accordance with Title 10 Subdivision Regulations.

#### **FINDINGS:**

1. The application was submitted on June 22, 2022.
2. The Planning and Zoning Commission (all 5 Commissioners in attendance) recommended

approval on August 11, 2021, at a properly noticed public hearing. The Planning and Zoning Commission Facts and Conclusions are attached and the following are the listed conclusions:

- That the proposed use is in harmony with the general purpose of Valley County ordinances and policies and will not be otherwise detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare.
- That the proposed use is consistent with the Valley County Comprehensive Plan by providing varying housing types that are affordable and reasonable.
- Valley County must follow the laws of the State of Idaho and in the Valley County Code.
- Valley County has one mixed use zone that is a performance based ordinance which promotes mitigation of impacts.
- The proposed use is compatible with surrounding land uses such as the higher density in the multi-family Meadows at West Mountain units.
- Valley County Comprehensive Plan and ordinances promotes clustering and mixed use; this is residential with supporting commercial uses and amenities in the form of community gathering areas and a dog park.
- Affordable long-term rental housing is much needed throughout Valley County; this development will provide 162 long-term rentals. Short-term rentals will not be allowed.
- Other agencies must approve permits for, sewer, water systems, etc., prior to recordation of the final plats.
- The Valley County Engineer will approve the stormwater management/drainage and snow storage. The existing development will need to provide for their own snow storage instead of using this site.
- This proposal has less environmental concerns due to professional landscaping requirements throughout the development that will be water-wise landscaping rather than a single-family residential subdivision with uncontrolled fertilizer application.
- This applicant is willing to participate in off-site improvements including a traffic feasibility study.
- There are existing services such as sewer, water, and power already located in this area. The developer will connect to the central sewer and attempt to negotiate conversion of the existing central water system to North Lake Recreational Sewer and Water District.
- There is an existing pathway to this property and will be continued through to the next property.
- There are safety concerns for pedestrian crossings on West Roseberry; this development will put in pedestrian crossing with emergency lights.
- Townhomes will not completely block views or create shadows since they are only 26' in height versus the allowed 35'.

- The S-bridge is a safety consideration; however, the applicant will participate in a Road Development Agreement and a feasibility study along with other developers in the area.
  - This development will work with the existing Meadows at West Mountain and remainder piece to implement a stormwater management plan that was originally approved but never created.
  - Emergency ingress/egress can be from Timberline DR on both Norwood RD and West Roseberry RD. The applicant will need to participate with maintenance of any private roads in the existing development that will be used by residents in this development.
  - This site is not currently prime agricultural land and has not been for a number of years.
  - Fish and Game confirmed this is not a wildlife corridor.
  - Even though there was overwhelming opposition to this development from the adjacent neighborhood, there is no guarantee that a person's view and adjacent property use will not change.
3. Legal notice was posted in the *Star News* on September 8, and September 15, 2022. Potentially affected agencies were notified on September 2, 2022. Property owners within 300 feet of the property line were notified by fact sheet sent September 6, 2022. People who commented and/or testified previously were notified by fact sheet sent September 6, 2022. The site was posted on September 6, 2022, on both sides of West Roseberry RD; and two more signs were posted on September 27, 2022 on NE corner and behind mailboxes across from the existing multi-family units. The notice was posted on the Board of County Commissioners' bulletin board and online at [www.co.valley.id.us](http://www.co.valley.id.us) on September 2, 2022.
4. Agency comment received:

Jeff McFadden, Valley County Road Department Superintendent, stated that County-maintained roads that will see increased traffic would include West Roseberry Road, Norwood Road, Tamarack Falls Road, and West Mountain Road. It is expected that transportation services including all season road maintenance, road resurfacing, road rebuilds will be impacted by increased traffic. Three recommendations were made concerning dedication of 50-ft road right-of-way, payment of road improvement costs, and cooperation with a feasibility study for the "S" bridge repair/replacement. Applicant will need to negotiate an agreement with the Board of County Commissioners. (July 14, 2022) Traffic count information for the area is also attached. (July 12, 2022)

Jess Ellis, Donnelly Fire Marshal, replied with requirements regarding roads, fire hydrants, fire flow, sprinkler systems and alarms, and addressing. (July 26, 2022)

Central District Health requires an application and engineering. Plans must be submitted to and approved by the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality for central sewage and central water. (July 29, 2022, and Sept. 14, 2022)

Regan Berkley, Idaho Fish and Game Regional Wildlife Manager, states the area is used by a variety of wildlife during spring, summer, and fall. IDFG is unaware of any specific migration routes through this property, and it is unlikely to serve as a migratory route due to existing development surrounding the property in question. (August 3, 2022)

5. Public comment received:

**Responses Received After the Public Hearing on August 11, 2022**

**Recommends Changes Before Approval:**

Glen Holdren, a retired civil engineer and the Meadows at West Mountain HOA Board Secretary, spoke to HOA Board concerns. These include:

- requirement of a wetlands delineation study,
  - the number of sewer connections,
  - the HOA has not agreed to share the existing inadequate and unfinished water system,
  - snow removal,
  - proposed use of Timberline Drive, a private road owned by the HOA,
  - density greater than allowed by Valley County Code 9-9-7.D,
  - proposed common space does not meet requirements,
  - lack of secondary access from townhomes,
  - incomplete lift station and water system, and
  - concerns about completion of landscaping plan and development plan.
  - The original developer of the Meadows at West Mountain did not complete the landscaping and does not maintain the existing open spaces.
- (Sept. 22, 2022)

**In Opposition – Reasons Given Include:**

- Too dense: not enough room for parking, children and play areas, pets. snow storage, or drainage. The proposed total open space of 16% is not compatible with neighborhood nor intent of the Comprehensive Plan or Code. The open space is too small. High density belongs within city limits.
- Increased traffic will cause issues; the “S-Bridge” is a specific concern.
- A sidewalk along Timberline Drive is needed, particularly for children leaving the bus stop.
- Water should not be directed onto adjoining properties.
- Not enough open space for wildlife migration and natural habitat.
- Building heights are not compatible. Idaho Code 67-6508 and VCC 9-9-7 are referenced.
- Including 20 RV campsites circumvents County Codes for RVs. Where will these sites be?
- Copious conditions of Approval (COA) were included to the flawed application to get a vote.
- The applicant stated that the project is anticipated to be largely secondary and recreational residents. This would not help local residents who need affordable housing.
- Commercial lots are not needed at this location; there are empty spaces in Donnelly.
- Increased crime rate will occur and is already an issue.
- New development will further overload existing services such as law enforcement, fire departments, hospital, schools, internet, post office, bridges, and intersection with Highway 55.
- Pollution into Lake Cascade is a concern.
- The developer of the Meadows at West Mountain did not finish what was promised. What are the mechanisms to hold developers accountable for their commitments?
- Compatibility rating is incomplete and biased towards development.
- Compatibility rating should have been a negative 31.
- No one from the community spoke in favor of the project.
- Insufficient notice on site.

- 1) Maria and Jim Jacobson, Washington, Sept. 12, 2022
- 2) Lenard Long, Friends of Lake Cascade, Cascade, Sept. 21, 2022
- 3) Marsha Moers, Donnelly, Sept. 23, 2022
- 4) Lisa Mohler, McCall, Sept. 23, 2022
- 5) Allison and Rick Hatzenbuhler, Donnelly, Sept. 24, 2022
- 6) Larry and Becky Froemming, Caldwell, Sept. 25, 2022
- 7) Deidre and Shawn Hushman, California, Sept. 25, 2022
- 8) Hollis Putman, Eagle, Sept. 25, 2022
- 9) Bill and Linda Eddy, Donnelly, Sept. 26, 2022
- 10) Chelsea and Christian Tuttle, Donnelly, Sept. 26, 2022
- 11) Stacy Thelin, Cascade, Sept. 26, 2022
- 12) Tina Blease, Donnelly, Sept. 26, 2022
- 13) Tina and Alex Blease, Donnelly, Sept. 26, 2022
- 14) Joey Pietri, McCall, Sept. 26, 2022
- 15) Gregg Gibboney, Donnelly, Sept. 26, 2022
- 16) Geraldine Gallupe-Donnelly, Cascade, Sept. 26, 2022
- 17) R. Steven and Jacquelyn J. Beverage, Donnelly, Sept. 26, 2022
- 18) Karianne and Tony Fallow, Eagle, Sept. 26, 2022
- 19) Dennis and Patricia Scroggins, Star, Sept. 26, 2022
- 20) Pamela McChrystal, Donnelly (?), Aug. 13, 2022; Aug. 17, 2022; Sept. 12, 2022; Sept. 21, 2022
- 21) Therese Gibboney, Donnelly, August 11, 2022; August 12, 2022; August 21, 2022; Sept 7, 2022; Sept. 24, 2022; Sept. 25, 2022, Sept. 26, 2022, Sept. 27, 2022

**Exhibits – August 11, 2022 at P&Z Commission**

- **Exhibit 1** – Paul Ashton, Parametrix and Valley County Engineer, made preliminary comments on the roadway width, easement, and approach connections. (August 5, 2022)
- **Exhibit 2** – Travis Pryor, North Lake Recreational Sewer and Water District Manager, commented on the proposal. The District is currently committed to serving the Meadows at West Mountain Phases 4-6 with 174 EDUs. At a minimum, the proposed PUD would require that Timberline LLC fulfill the requirements of the 2004 Conditions of Annexation, substantially complete Phase 2 & 3 sewer infrastructure, receive District approvals for additional sewer capacity/EDUs, and submit infrastructure design for approvals. (August 8, 2022)
- **Exhibit 3** – Hollis Putman, 165 Margot Drive, is opposed. (August 8, 2022)
- **Exhibit 4** – Pamela McChrystal, submitted a link to a news article titled *Report: Idahoans earning minimum wage must work 104 hours each week to afford two-bedroom rental.* (August 5, 2022)
- **Exhibit 5** – Submittal from Applicant in response to Staff questions in the Staff Report. (August 11, 2022)
- **Exhibit 6** – Submittal from Applicant of a conceptual drawing of development layout and amenities (August 11, 2022)
- **Exhibit 7** – Therese Gibboney - drone video submitted (August 10, 2022) and played at hearing, but she said it wasn't correct.
- **Exhibit 8** – Applicant's Slide Show Presentation (printed).

**Responses received for the Planning and Zoning Commission August 11, 2022, public hearing can be read in the attached P&Z Staff Report and minutes.**

6. Physical characteristics of the site: Relatively Flat Bare Ground
7. The surrounding land use and zoning includes:
  - North: Meadows at West Mountain PUD
  - South: Single-family Rural Parcels
  - East: Meadows at West Mountain PUD and Single-family Rural Parcels
  - West: Single-family Rural Parcels and Meadows at West Mountain PUD
8. Valley County Code (Title 9, Chapter 5 and Chapter 9): In Table 9-3-1, this proposal is categorized under:
  - 2. Residential Uses (h) Planned Unit Development
9. Valley County Code (Title 9 and 10) should be reviewed for determination of technical issues of the plat.

**Standards are allowed to be relaxed as part of the planned unit development:**

---

## **SUMMARY:**

### **(Questions to Board of County Commissioners)**

**Does this application meet the standards of a Planned Unit Development in Title 9-Chapter 9 Planned Unit Development & Chapter 5 Conditional Uses and Title 10 Subdivision Regulations? (Attached are the specific codes for a Planned Unit Development.)**

 A Planned Unit Development is required to allow for the relaxation of the standards as follows:

- Title 9 density to allow for 7.9 dwelling units per acre versus the 2.5 dwelling units per acre as shown in 9-5C-6 and 6 units per acre as shown in 9-9-7.D.
- The building heights, building setbacks, and parking requirements will meet the required standards in Valley County Code.
- Common Open Space for residential developments is 50% and 20% for any commercial development. However, the commission may reduce this requirement if they find a decrease is warranted by the design of, and the amenities and features incorporated into the development. Each residential unit shall have ready access to common areas and facilities. (Valley County Code 9-9-7-I)
- Clustering of the residential area increases the amount of open space available for recreational and community uses.

### **Staff Comments and Questions at the Board hearing:**

The compatibility rating in the application states the following:

- This will be “largely secondary and recreational residents”. The applicant agreed not to Short-term rental any units and will be for more workforce type housing. The applicant

should address this issue.

- That the county will be building a highway on the west side of the property. The road is already constructed and is West Roseberry RD.

It states there is currently no central water, but there is water to the Meadows at West Mountain, Fir Grove, and Crane Shores. Describe your plan for providing water.

How will you work with the Meadows at West Mountain HOA in maintenance of Timberline DR? Will the current owner turn over the remainder open space and rights-of-way to the Meadows HOA?

How will you guarantee long-term maintenance of the roads, facilities, and common areas?

**Staff Comments and Questions in P&Z Staff Report – see applicant’s response in the Minutes of August 11, 2022:**

1. Staff’s Compatibility Rating was a +23. [Planning and Zoning Commission concurred.]
2. The property is within the Donnelly Fire District and is not within an irrigation district.
3. Can water-wise landscaping be required to reduce use of well water?
4. Will C.U.P.s be required for specific commercial uses? Staff recommends there be some sort of guarantee for a service business such as a convenience store, ice cream shop, or tavern to create a sense of place in the community.
5. What is the projected cost to purchase a townhome?
6. Will the development look like the pictures?
7. Do the townhomes come with ownership of a backyard? Will maintenance be done by the HOA of all outside yards? Suggest screening fences for privacy be allowed in backyards and between patios of the townhomes that still allow maintenance of the common areas.
8. Will there be individual meters at each residence for water and/or sewer? Does each owner pay their owner sewer/water bill or is it included in the rent?
9. Will there be a central location for school children to wait for the school bus that is protected from the weather?
10. Will short-term rentals be allowed? Will any of the units be dedicate for community housing through deed restrictions? What do you anticipate the market rate will be?
11. Plat Correction – The portion of Timberline Drive west of W. Roseberry Road is private.
12. Plat Note 7 needs modified. Zoning will continue to be Multiple Use unless there is an ordinance amendment.
13. Plat Note 10 – Conduit should be placed for fiber optic for broadband.
14. Plat Note 14 – Correct ownership of water system infrastructure.
15. Plat Note 15 – Disturbed surfaces should be reseeded to prevent Noxious Weeds.
16. Staff Comments:



- Fish and Game letter dated July 14, 2022 for Roseberry Park stated, “considering the footprint of the project is adjacent to existing subdivisions on the north, east, and south, and it overlays an existing agricultural area that has already been disturbed leaving little intact native habitat on the property, IDFG would not anticipate significant negative effects of the proposed activities on native plant and wildlife populations....recommends precautions be taken to protect nearby wetlands and waterways from contamination as a result of project implementation activities. IDFG has no other records of sensitive wildlife or plants species within 1 mile of the project area...”.
- The Army Corps of Engineers has jurisdiction over wetlands. Any impacts to wetlands will be permitted through the COE.
- Valley County no longer has Stormwater Management BMPs specific to Valley County. We currently use ID Dept of Environmental Quality BMPs that have been adopted statewide. The Valley County Engineer will review the stormwater pollution prevention plan and site grading plans using the current standards to ensure compliance. Engineer should give a description of how stormwater will be treated.
- There should be some collaboration between the Homeowner’s Associations in what was originally approved as The Meadows at West Mountain. After all of the property is platted, the open spaces and rights-of-ways should be deeded to the HOAs that are responsible for the upkeep. This should not happen until all cross easements are in place. This proposal accesses using Timberline DR and should not be deeded to the original HOA without easements.
- Would the people along Moore DR prefer the townhomes be moved to the west and the storage units or parking be along their border so that views aren’t blocked? In the original application the storage was supposed to be a barrier between the commercial uses and the residential uses, but could be used now as a barrier between the single family residential uses and the multi-family uses.
- The 2000 DEQ Implementation Plan “Phosphorus Sources” shows that urban/suburban/roads (11%) is less impact to water quality on Lake Cascade than Agricultural uses (29%) or forestry uses (22%). I suggest with proper BMPS, levels at specific sites can be contained on-site.
- Attached are the traffic counts submitted by the Valley County Road Development. A Traffic Study will be done by Valley County that takes into account the current development, adjacent developments, other proposed developments in this general area, and Tamarack. This development will participate in contributions for off-site road improvements.
- The Valley County Comprehensive Plan is implemented through compliance with the Valley County ordinances. Various portions of the Plan can be used both for approval and disapproval of the same application.
- *VCC 9-9-7-I. Common Open Space: At least fifty percent (50%) of the total area within the boundary of any residential PUD and twenty percent (20%) of any commercial or industrial PUD shall be devoted to common open space; provided, however, that the commission may reduce this requirement if they find that such a decrease is warranted*

*by the design of, and the amenities and features incorporated into, the plan and that the needs of the occupants of the PUD for open space can be met in the proposed development. Each residential unit shall have ready access to common areas and facilities. (Staff: The residents have access to open spaces, dog parks, playgrounds, and a walking path along West Roseberry RD. The Commission may determine this meets the requirements of open space and amenities. The multi-family area in the Meadows at West Mountain has a similar type of centralized open area with a playground.)*

- The color scheme of the storage units do not blend with the development.
- Will storage units be for the exclusive use of the occupants in this development or will they be available on the open market?
- Wood burning devices should not be allowed in the multi-family units.
- A letter from Northlake Recreational Sewer and Water District should be sought concerning service to this development.
- Water rights will be required.

#### **ATTACHMENTS:**

- Conditions of Approval
- PUD Compliance by Staff
- Blank Compatibility Evaluation and Instructions
- Compatibility Rating by Staff
- Planning and Zoning Commission Facts and Conclusions
- Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes – August 11, 2022
- PUD 04-01 The Meadows Excerpts
- Title 9, Chapter 9 PUD Regulations
- Vicinity Map
- Assessor's Plat T.16N, R.3E, Sec. 17
- Neighborhood Densities
- Pictures Taken July 19, 2022; Sept. 16, 2022; and Sept. 27, 2022
- Proposed Preliminary Plat – Page 1 and 1.1
- Proposed Land Use map
- Agency Responses
- Public Responses Received After the Public Hearing on August 11, 2022
- Exhibits from August 11, 2022
- P&Z Staff Report with Public Comments

#### **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 final plat for shall be recorded prior to issuance of building permits or this permit will be null and void. Phase 3 shall be completed by 2030 or a permit extension will be required. The construction of phases cannot be solely market driven.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. Prior to final plat, the applicant's engineer shall certify that the roads have been built to approved standards or be financially guaranteed. Applicant's engineer shall also confirm all utilities were placed according to the approved plans.
7. Wetlands must be delineated and shown on the final plat.
8. Must bury conduit for fiber optics with utilities.
9. A Private Road Declaration is required to confirm that the roads will be maintained.
10. A Declaration of Installation of Utilities is required with the final plat.
11. Must comply with the requirements of the Donnelly Rural Fire Protection District unless specifically allowed as a variance in regard to a planned unit development or a letter of approval is received from Donnelly Rural Fire Protection District.
12. Community rules should address, lighting, noxious weeds, and not allow wood-burning devices.
13. All lighting must comply with the Valley County Lighting Ordinance.
14. Shall place addressing numbers at each residence and commercial unit.
15. The following note shall be placed in the notes on the face of the final plat:  
"The Valley County Board of Commissioners have the sole discretion to set the level of service for any public road; the level of service can be changed."
16. There should be a note that states all lots shall be accessed from internal roads and not West Roseberry Road.
17. The temporary RV sites will be only used by employed personnel working at this location; RVs will be removed from the site at the completion of the project or by December 2026 (whichever comes first).
18. A Development Agreement should be agreed upon for off-site road improvements and

matters agreed upon in the application and presentation. The Capital Contribution Agreement in the application is not agreed to by Valley County.

19. The Valley County Engineer shall confirm there is adequate snow storage on-site.
20. The applicant will update the Planning and Zoning Commission on an annual basis.
21. Extend pathway adjacent to property.
22. Change proposed color of storage units. Storage units cannot be the first thing constructed in the phasing plan.
23. No wood burning devices.
24. No short-term rentals allowed in entire PUD without authorization of Planning and Zoning commission.
25. Only necessary fertilizers allowed on landscaping and must be applied by professionals.
26. Shall use water-wise landscaping.
27. Townhomes shall be a maximum height of 26-ft; the multi-family buildings may be a maximum of 35-ft high.
28. Stormwater easements must be in place as part of stormwater management pollution prevention plan approval.
29. Shall have a maintenance agreement that addresses the shared roads, sewer, and water with Meadows at West Mountain Homeowner Association.
30. Must comply with North Lake Recreational Sewer and Water District concerning sewer connections.
31. Must add screening landscaping to shield view of storage area along northern boundary to shield residential area from commercial area.

**END OF STAFF REPORT**

## Staff Comments in Red

# CHAPTER 9 PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENTS

### 9-9-1: DEFINITION:

A "planned unit development" (hereinafter referred to as a PUD) is an area of land controlled by one or more landowners, which is to be developed under a single and comprehensive plan of development. Any mix of residential building types, or any mix of residential commercial, industrial recreational, and agricultural uses may be permitted to provide greater flexibility in land usage. Additional flexibility in development is furnished because setbacks, height, lot size, density, and other site regulations may differ from those normally imposed for similar uses. Residential units and other buildings, if any, may be constructed by either the developer or individual buyers; however, the application must be accompanied by plans and other documents sufficient for the administrator, staff and commission to review the application for compliance with the requirements of this title. (Ord. 10-06, 8-23-2010; amd. Ord. 11-5, 6-6-2011)

### 9-9-2: PURPOSE:

The PUD concept allows the site planner to propose the best use and arrangement of development on the parcel of land by reducing the more rigid regulations herein. A PUD is designed so that buildings are clustered together to create open space of common ownership, preserve natural features and landscape character, more efficiently use the site and to minimize development costs by sharing common walls, shortening and narrowing roads, and concentrating utilities. It is expected that a PUD will provide certain amenities like recreational facilities, landscaping, and natural open spaces for the enjoyment of all owners, employees, etc., and will demonstrate better than average quality of development. (Ord. 10-06, 8-23-2010)

### 9-9-3: PUD REVIEW AND DETERMINATION:

In considering whether to approve a PUD, the commission shall determine:

- A. That the proposed use nets a positive score on the compatibility rating system herein. The compatibility rating shall be completed by the commission and computed for the full application as presented to the commission after revisions requested during any preliminary review and after the public hearing is closed;

Staff's Compatibility Rating was a +23. P&Z Commission did not change in their hearing.

The directions for completing the compatibility rating are in the packet. The first 3 questions are based solely on the matrix. The remainder of the questions you answer for a range from -2 to a +2.

Plus 2 - assigned for full compatibility (adjacency encouraged).

Plus 1 - assigned for partial compatibility (adjacency not necessarily encouraged).

0 - assigned if not applicable or neutral.

Minus 1 - assigned for minimal compatibility (adjacency not discouraged).

Minus 2 - assigned for no compatibility (adjacency not acceptable).

We have historically determined the number based upon completion of the project after mitigation of impacts.

In the case of PUDs in which the board determines that it is in the public's interest that the board deal exclusively with certain of the nine (9) compatibility questions contained in section [9-11-1](#), appendix A of this chapter, then, subject to the board's direction, the commission shall not consider such questions as part of its compatibility rating of the proposed use;

B. That the proposal works with the characteristics of the site by protecting or highlighting attractive features and by minimizing the impact of development where natural constraints exist;

C. That the proposal's layout promotes the clustering and separation of different kinds of land uses so that both internal compatibility and common open spaces can be maintained;

The original Meadows at West Mountain PUD proposed commercial with storage units separating the commercial from the residential use. The current application is proposing the same separation.

Prior to recordation of the plat, or issuance of building permits, will need to confirm that the open spaces will be maintained by the developer in an association (should be a condition of approval). The residential uses are not being sold to individuals so it will not be the typical HOA scenario.

Thought should go into how this developer will participate with the Meadows at West Mountain HOA (MWMHOA) to maintain Timberline DR.

D. That the proposal's layout and design provides economics in the provision of roads and other site improvements; and

The Planning and Zoning Commission (Commission) thought the access points proposed were adequate.

The Commission appreciated the residential common areas such as the dog park. Thought should be put into memorializing all of the agreed upon amenities, maintenance of open space, roads, traffic signaling, etc. in a Development Agreement.

E. That it is more desirable to have a PUD than a subdivision or some other singular use, and that the PUD is not being proposed simply to bypass or vary the more restrictive standards required of a subdivision, business, industry, or other similar use. (Ord. 10-06, 8-23-2010)

This is a mixed use that contains multi-family residential, commercial, and common open spaces.

#### **9-9-4: TIME FOR COMPLETION:**

The proposed development shall be completed within the time specified in the phasing plan. Extensions may be approved by the commission if it can be shown as necessary and in the public interest. (Ord. 10-06, 8-23-2010)

#### **9-9-5: CHANGES FROM APPROVED PLANS:**

Changes in building design and layout may be approved by the commission if it can be shown as being necessary or more desirable. (Ord. 10-06, 8-23-2010)

#### **9-9-6: SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS:**

In addition to the items required for a conditional use permit, graphic and written material shall also be submitted regarding:

A. Proposed Setbacks: Proposed front, side, and rear setbacks as different from those required under normal standards for like uses and any other changes in similar kinds of standards including, but not limited to, building height, minimum number of parking spaces per unit, street widths, and lot size.

All standards meet current codes in VCC Title 9-5.

Setbacks and parking are shown on the preliminary plat.

Building heights will be limited to 26' for the townhomes (adjacent to the single family residences in the Meadows at West Mountain and a maximum of 35' for the 8-plexes (currently not adjacent to other residential uses).

B. Proposed Building Sites: Proposed building sites if these are to be indicated without, or in addition to, lots, complete with dimensions.

Shown on the preliminary plat.

C. Common Open Space And Facilities: Common open space and facilities with conditions for their permanency.

Shown on the preliminary plat. Need to know more specific conditions for their permanency.

D. Phase Of Development; Time Schedule: Phase of development to be shown geographically and indicating stages in the construction program and time schedule for progressive completion.

3 Phases with final completion on June 16, 2025. See the application.

- Phase 1 – 88 Multi-Family Units
- Phase 2 – 50 Townhome Lots
- Phase 3 – 24 Townhome Lots and 1.53 acres of Commercial Use

E. Outline Of Restrictive Covenants: An outline of the restrictive covenants expressing key provisions.

See the Application

F. Maintenance Plans: Plans for maintaining roads, parking, and other areas of circulation, snow removal, snow storage, and any other necessary upkeep.

The plan shows the snow storage area. The Commission conditioned their recommendation for approval on the Valley County Engineer approving the adequacy of the proposed areas.

G. Surface Water Management: Plans for surface water management.

The Commission conditioned their recommendation for approval on the Valley County Engineer approving the site grading and storm water management plans.

H. Other Information: Any other information deemed necessary by the commission because of the proposed use. (Ord. 10-06, 8-23-2010)

### 9-9-7: STANDARDS:

A. Size: The acreage shall be large enough to accommodate the proposed PUD.

Commission recommended as adequate.

B. Streets, Utilities And Other Site Improvements: Streets, utilities, and other site improvements shall be made for their later installation, at the developer's expense, prior to recording the plat. Streets shall be constructed in accordance with the minimum standards set forth in [chapter 5](#) of this title and all references made therein if they are to be dedicated to the county.

Power will be provided by Idaho Power.

Conduit will need to be placed for fiber optics adjacent to utility lines.

Water is proposed to be provided by Timberline Water Association and ultimately taken over by Northlake Recreational Sewer and Water District (NRSWD). If the applicant is unable to come to agreement with NRSWD they have retained the right to develop their own public water system.

Sewer will be provided by NRSWD. DEQ will release sanitary restrictions prior to recordation of a plat. Building permits will not be issued until sanitary restrictions are released. The board should discuss if building permits can be issued prior to recordation of a plat.

Fire hydrants will be installed. Buildings will be built to fire code. However, Donnelly Fire recommended more entrances onto West Roseberry RD and the Commission did not agree. They thought the access from Timberline was adequate and recommended approval of the current access points.

C. Waiver Or Modification Of Specifications, Standards And Requirements: It is recognized that the uniqueness of each proposal for a PUD requires that the specifications, standards, and requirements for various facilities, including, but not limited to: roads, alleys, easements, utilities, signs, parking areas, storm drainage, water supply and distribution, and sewage collection and treatment, may be subject to modification from the specifications, standards, and requirements established for subdivisions and like uses in this title. The commission may, therefore, at the time of general submission as requested by the applicant, waive or modify these specifications, standards, and requirements which otherwise shall be applicable.

The residential unit combined density is 7.9 units per acre (162 units / 20.8 acres); the applicant calculated their density as 8.93 units per acres (did not include all acres in the development as required). The Valley County Code allows 6 units per acre, so a variance to increase the density is part of this application (Valley County Code 9-9-7.D). The maximum residential units allowed at six dwellings per acre is approximately 125.

Common Open Space for residential developments is 50% and 20% for any commercial development. However, the commission may reduce this requirement if they find a decrease is warranted by the design of, and the amenities and features incorporated into the development. Each residential unit shall have ready access to common areas and facilities.



D. Averaging And Transferring Densities: Averaging and transferring densities within the PUD shall be allowed: 1) upon a showing that it fits the definition of a PUD; 2) as long as the overall average residential density is no greater than six (6) dwelling units per gross acre; and 3) only if residential units are to be connected to central water and sewer systems. The overall average residential density shall be calculated by summing the number of residential dwelling units planned within the boundary of the PUD and dividing by the total gross area expressed in acres within the boundaries of the PUD, except public lands. It is recognized that the increased residential density of a PUD shall be in relationship to the site and structure location, application of technology, design, construction techniques, landscaping and topography.

See above response.

E. Lot And Building Setbacks: Lot and building setbacks may be decreased below or otherwise altered from the standards of like uses set forth elsewhere in this title.

Not proposed.

F. Maximum Height: The maximum height of buildings may be increased above those for like uses mandated elsewhere in this title in consideration of the following characteristics:

Not proposed.

1. Unreasonable adverse visual effect on adjacent sites or other areas in the immediate vicinity.

Commission determined there are none.

2. Potential problems for adjacent sites caused by shadows, loss of air circulation, or loss of view.

Commission determined there are none.

3. Influence on the general vicinity with regard to extreme contrast, vistas, and open space.

Commission determined there are none.

G. Parking Spaces: The design and construction standards for parking spaces shall conform to section [9-5A-3](#) of this title, and the number of parking spaces required may be increased or decreased relative to the number mandated for like uses elsewhere in consideration of the following factors:

1. Estimated number of cars owned by occupants of dwelling units in the PUD.

2. Parking needs of each specific use.

3. Varying time period of use whenever joint use of common parking areas is proposed.

4. Surface parking areas shall not be considered open space for the purposes of subsection I of this section.

See application Section III. Basically 2 parking spaces per residential unit and standards in Title 9-5 for commercial uses.

H. Internal Street Circulation System: The PUD shall provide an adequate internal street circulation system designed for the type of traffic generated, safety, separation from living areas, convenience, and access. Private internal streets may be narrower than normally required; provided, that adequate access for police and fire protection and snow removal equipment is maintained.

Commission thought adequate for the proposal and agree with the layout.

I. Common Open Space: At least fifty percent (50%) of the total area within the boundary of any residential PUD and twenty percent (20%) of any commercial or industrial PUD shall be devoted to common open space; provided, however, that the commission may reduce this requirement if they find that such a decrease is warranted by the design of, and the amenities and features incorporated into, the plan and that the needs of the occupants of the PUD for open space can be met in the proposed development. Each residential unit shall have ready access to common areas and facilities.

The Commission recommended reduction of the open space requirements. Commercial open space is proposed at 15% and multi-family phases will have at least 30%. Proposed amenities include playground equipment, lawn, community BBQ facilities, and a dog park.

J. Materials, Textures And Colors: Harmonious variations in materials, textures, and colors shall complement and supplement the natural beauty and pleasant environment of the site and the individual buildings. The site, design, and construction of all residences shall be planned in such a manner that there is a substantial resemblance of uniformity.

See application. The Commission did condition the recommended approval on the appearance of the storage units conforming to the rest of the development.

K. Assurances Of Performance Bond: It is recognized that the uniqueness of each proposal for a PUD requires that the applicant must make adequate assurances of performance of each phase of the proposal. The commission may impose any form of bond on those portions of the proposal which will provide common services to the public or users of the PUD as deemed appropriate by the commission under the circumstances. (Ord. 10-06, 8-23-2010)

Will be guaranteed through the Development Agreement and timing of recordation of the plat along with issuance of building permits.

#### **9-9-8: OTHER INFORMATION AND DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS:**

The applicant shall disclose and provide the following:

A. The name, address, telephone number of any owner, equitable interest holder, stockholder, partner, associate, or any other person having a financial interest of ten percent (10%) or greater in the proposed planned unit development.

See application.

B. The method of financing and the cost of improvements that serve the common services of the public and users of the PUD.

See application. Will also be a timing of recordation of plat and or occupancy.

Condition of Approval should be amenities will be completed in each phase as constructed or financially guaranteed at time of recordation of the plat or this could also be memorialized in the Development Agreement.

C. The cost of the proposed planned unit development.

See application Section III.

D. The cost of each phase of the planned unit development.

See application Section III.

E. The ratio of the amount of all loans to the value of the property throughout the development of the planned unit development.

See application Section III.

F. Plans for housing employees, construction workers, subcontractors, independent contractors or any other person related to or associated with the applicant's buildings, improvements, developments or temporary uses during and after the proposal.

20 RV spots until phase 2 construction is complete.

G. Plans for providing any additional fire protection and emergency medical services which may be necessary during and after construction.

See application Section III.

H. Proposals for guarantees that the applicant will complete all those improvements that serve the common services of the public and users of the PUD or that the land will be reclaimed to its condition prior to construction.

See application Section III. Should be included in Development Agreement.

I. Plans for any impact fees to be paid by the applicant for the proposal.

N/A at this time.

J. Plans for minimizing any water runoff created by the buildings, improvements, developments or other temporary uses of the proposal.

Site grading and storm water management plans will be approved by the Valley County Engineer prior to any work being done on-site.

It is my understanding the applicant will work with the current owner to fix the stormwater inadequacies that currently exist for the Meadows at West Mountain due to lack of completion by previous developer.

K. Plans for minimizing the impact on solid waste disposal during and after the proposal.

Fee based.

L. Plans for minimizing the impact on fish, wildlife or biotic resources in the general area of the proposal before, during and after the completion of the proposal.

See letter from Fish and Game.

M. Plans for providing for enforcement of security on the site of the proposal.

See application Section III.

N. Plans for transporting workers to and from job sites and special traffic control measures for public safety during and after construction.

See application Section III.

O. Certain disclosures required by this section will not apply to certain PUDs because of the uniqueness and small size of the proposal. When disclosures in subsections B, F, G, H, L, M and N of this section are either not applicable or not of sufficient importance because the impact of the PUD would be minimal, the applicant shall include a statement showing why the disclosure does not apply. Staff shall make a recommendation to the commission as to each application, and the commission shall decide the applicable procedures. All PUD applicants shall adequately respond to disclosures in subsections A, C, D, E, I, J and K of this section. (Ord. 10-06, 8-23-2010)

#### **9-9-9: DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT:**

Because of the uniqueness of each proposal, a PUD may impact county services and/or property which may be mitigated through a development agreement. Compensation for these impacts shall be negotiated in work sessions with appropriate county entities and a development agreement shall be entered into between the applicant and the county through the board as additional conditions considered for approval of a PUD. (Ord. 10-06, 8-23-2010)

Will utilize this tool for off-site road improvements and guarantees of completion of amenities, etc.

## 9-11-1: APPENDIX A, COMPATIBILITY EVALUATION:

A. General: One of the primary functions of traditional zoning is to classify land uses so that those which are not fully compatible or congruous can be geographically separated from each other. The county has opted to substitute traditional zoning with a multiple use concept in which there is no separation of land uses. Proposed incompatible uses may adversely affect existing uses, people, or lands in numerous ways: noise, odors, creation of hazards, view, water contamination, loss of needed or desired resources, property values, or infringe on a desired lifestyle. To ensure that the county can continue to grow and develop without causing such land use problems and conflicts, a mechanism designed to identify and discourage land use proposals which will be incompatible at particular locations has been devised. The compatibility evaluation of all conditional uses also provides for evaluations in a manner which is both systematic and consistent.

### B. Purpose; Use:

1. The compatibility rating is to be used as a tool to assist in the determination of compatibility. The compatibility rating is not the sole deciding factor in the approval or denial of any application.
2. Staff prepares a preliminary compatibility rating for conditional use permits, except for conditional use permits for PUDs. The commission reviews the compatibility rating and may change any value.

### C. General Evaluation: Completing the compatibility questions and evaluation (form):

1. All evaluations shall be made as objectively as possible by assignment of points for each of a series of questions. Points shall be assigned as follows:

Plus 2 - assigned for full compatibility (adjacency encouraged).

Plus 1 - assigned for partial compatibility (adjacency not necessarily encouraged).

0 - assigned if not applicable or neutral.

Minus 1 - assigned for minimal compatibility (adjacency not discouraged).

Minus 2 - assigned for no compatibility (adjacency not acceptable).

2. Each response value shall be multiplied by some number, which indicates how important that particular response is relative to all the others. Multipliers shall be any of the following:

x4 - indicates major relative importance.

x3 - indicates above average relative importance.

x2 - indicates below average relative importance.

x1 - indicates minor relative importance.

D. Matrix - Questions 1 Through 3: The following matrix shall be utilized, wherever practical, to determine response values for questions one through three (3). Uses classified and listed in the left hand column and across the top of the matrix represent possible proposed, adjacent, or vicinity land uses. Each box indicates the extent of compatibility between any two (2) intersecting uses. These numbers should not be changed from proposal to proposal, except where distinctive uses arise which may present unique compatibility considerations. The commission shall determine whether or not there is a unique consideration.

### E. Terms:

**DOMINANT ADJACENT LAND USE:** Any use which is within three hundred feet (300') of the use boundary being proposed; and

1. Comprises at least one-half ( $1/2$ ) of the adjacent uses and one-fourth ( $1/4$ ) of the total adjacent area; or
2. Where two (2) or more uses compete equally in number and are more frequent than all the other uses, the one with the greatest amount of acreage is the dominant land use; or
3. In all other situations, no dominant land use exists. When this occurs, the response value shall be zero.

**LOCAL VICINITY:** Land uses within a one to three (3) mile radius. The various uses therein should be identified and averaged to determine the overall use of the land.

### F. Questions 4 Through 9:

1. In determining the response values for questions 4 through 9, the evaluators shall consider the information contained in the application, the goals and objectives of the comprehensive plan, the provisions of this title and related ordinances, information gained from an actual inspection of the site, and information gathered by the staff.
2. The evaluator or commission shall also consider proposed mitigation of the determined impacts. Adequacy of the mitigation will be a factor.

APPENDIX A

MATRIX FOR RATING  
QUESTIONS 1, 2, and 3

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23		
1. AGRICULTURAL		+2	-1	-2	-2	-2	-2	+1	+1	+1	+1	+2	+1	+1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-2	-1	+1	+2	+2	1	
2. RESIDENCE, S.F.	+2		+2	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	-1	+2	+1	-2	+1	-1	+1	+1	+1	-1	+1	+1	-2	-2	2	
3. SUBDIVISION, S.F.	-1	+2		+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	-1	+2	+1	-2	+1	-1	+1	+1	+1	-1	+1	+1	-2	-2	3	
4. M.H. or R.V. PARK	-2	+1	+1		+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	-1	+2	+1	-2	+1	-1	+1	+1	+1	-1	+1	+1	-2	-2	4	
5. RESIDENCE, M.F.	-2	+1	+1	+1		+2	+2	+1	+1	-1	+2	+1	-2	+1	-1	+1	+1	+1	-1	+1	+1	-2	-2	5	
6. SUBDIVISION, M.F.	-2	+1	+1	+1	+2		+2	+1	+1	-1	+2	+1	-2	+1	-1	+1	+1	+1	-1	+1	+1	-2	-2	6	
7. P.U.D., RES.	-2	+1	+1	+1	+2	+2		+1	+1	-1	+2	+1	-2	+1	-1	+1	+1	+1	-1	+1	+1	-2	-2	7	
8. REL., EDUC & REHAB	+1	+2	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1		+1	+1	-1	+2	-2	-1	-1	+2	+2	+1	+1	+1	+1	-2	-1	8	
9. FRAT or GOVT	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1		+1	-1	+2	-2	-1	-1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	-2	-2	9	
10. PUBLIC UTIL. (1A-3.1)	+1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	+1	+1		+1	+1	-1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+2	+2	10	
11. PUBLIC REC.	+1	+2	+2	+2	+2	+2	+2	-1	-1	+1		+2	-1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+2	+1	+1	11	
12. CEMETERY	+2	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+2	+2	+2	+2		+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+2	+1	+1	12	
13. LANDFILL or SWR. PLANT	+1	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2	-1	+1		-1	-1	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2	+2	+2	+2	13	
14. PRIV. REC. (FER)	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	-1	-1	+1	+1	+1	-1		+1	+1	+1	+2	+2	+1	+2	-1	+1	14	
15. PRIV. REC. (CON)	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	+1	+1	-1	+1		-2	-2	-2	-2	-2	+2	+2	-1	+1	15
16. NEIGHBORHOOD BUS.	-1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+2	+1	+1	+1	+1	-2		+1	-2		+1	+2	+2	+1	-1	-1	16	
17. RESIDENCE BUS.	+2	+2	+2	+1	+1	+1	+1	+2	+1	-1	-2	+1	-2	+1	+1	-2	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	-2	-2	17
18. SERV. BUS.	-1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+2	+2	+2	+2	+2	+2	+2	+2	+2	+2	+1	+1	+1	21
19. AREA BUS.	-2	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	-2	+1	-2	+2	+2	+2	+2	+2	+2	+2	-2	-2	19
20. REC. BUS.	-2	+2	+2	+1	+1	+1	+1	-1	-1	+1	+1	+1	-1	+2	-2	+1	+1	+2	+2	+1	+2	+2	-2	+1	20
21. LIGHT IND.	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	+2	+2		+2	+2	+2	+2	+2	+2	+2	+2	+1	+1	21
22. HEAVY IND.	+2	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2	-1	+2	+2	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	+1	+1	22
23. EXTR. IND.	+2	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2	-1	-2	-2	+2	+1	+2	+1	+1	+1	+1	+1	-1	-2	-1	+1	+1	+2	23

THE SOLID SQUARES AS +2

## Compatibility Questions and Evaluation

Matrix Line # / Use: \_\_\_\_\_

Prepared by: \_\_\_\_\_

YES/NO      X      Response  
   Value

Use Matrix Values:

(+2/-2)    \_\_\_\_\_ X 4 \_\_\_\_\_

1. Is the proposed use compatible with the dominant adjacent land use?

(+2/-2)    \_\_\_\_\_ X 2 \_\_\_\_\_

2. Is the proposed use compatible with the other adjacent land uses (total and average)?

(+2/-2)    \_\_\_\_\_ X 1 \_\_\_\_\_

3. Is the proposed use generally compatible with the overall land use in the local vicinity?

Site Specific Evaluation (Impacts and Proposed Mitigation)

(+2/-2)    \_\_\_\_\_ X 3 \_\_\_\_\_

4. Is the property large enough, does the existence of wooded area, or does the lay of the land help to minimize any potential impacts the proposed use may have on adjacent uses?

(+2/-2)    \_\_\_\_\_ X 1 \_\_\_\_\_

5. Is the size or scale of proposed lots and/or structures similar to adjacent ones?

(+2/-2)    \_\_\_\_\_ X 2 \_\_\_\_\_

6. Is the traffic volume and character to be generated by the proposed use similar to the uses on properties that will be affected by proximity to parking lots, on-site roads, or access roads?

(+2/-2)    \_\_\_\_\_ X 2 \_\_\_\_\_

7. Is the potential impact on adjacent properties due to the consuming or emission of any resource or substance compatible with that of existing uses?

(+2/-2)    \_\_\_\_\_ X 2 \_\_\_\_\_

8. Is the proposed use compatible with the abilities of public agencies to provide service or of public facilities to accommodate the proposed use demands on utilities, fire and police protection, schools, roads, traffic control, parks, and open areas?

(+2/-2)    \_\_\_\_\_ X 2 \_\_\_\_\_

9. Is the proposed use cost effective when comparing the cost for providing public services and improving public facilities to the increases in public revenue from the improved property?

Sub-Total      (+)      \_\_\_\_\_

Sub-Total      (--)      \_\_\_\_\_

Total Score      \_\_\_\_\_

The resulting values for each questions shall be totaled so that each land use and development proposal receives a single final score.

Compatibility Questions and Evaluation

Matrix Line # / Use: 7

Prepared by: CH

YES/NO X Response Value

Use Matrix Values:

(+2/-2) +2 X 4 +8

1. Is the proposed use compatible with the dominant adjacent land use?  
*Planned Unit Development - Multi + Single Family*

(+2/-2) +1 X 2 +2

2. Is the proposed use compatible with the other adjacent land uses (total and average)? *Lot 118 - other rural land - Not Agricultural*  
*Previously approved PUD + Single Family Sub*

(+2/-2) -1 X 1 -1

3. Is the proposed use generally compatible with the overall land use in the local vicinity? *See 142; 1-3 miles are Single Family Subdivisions and Agricultural*

Site Specific Evaluation (Impacts and Proposed Mitigation)

(+2/-2) +1 X 3 +3

4. Is the property large enough, does the existence of wooded area, or does the lay of the land help to minimize any potential impacts the proposed use may have on adjacent uses? *The property is large enough. Will have visual impacts on adjacent residence in the shadows.*

(+2/-2) +1 X 1 +1

5. Is the size or scale of proposed lots and/or structures similar to adjacent ones?  
*Yes - multi family units, larger than single family - same height*

(+2/-2) +2 X 2 +4

6. Is the traffic volume and character to be generated by the proposed use similar to the uses on properties that will be affected by proximity to parking lots, on-site roads, or access roads? *Yes, traffic is similar. They propose to participate in development agreements. No parking lots on exterior; parking within development.*

(+2/-2) +1 X 2 +2

7. Is the potential impact on adjacent properties due to the consuming or emission of any resource or substance compatible with that of existing uses?  
*Noise will be emitted during construction - then will not be an impact*

(+2/-2) +1 X 2 +2

8. Is the proposed use compatible with the abilities of public agencies to provide service or of public facilities to accommodate the proposed use demands on utilities, fire and police protection, schools, roads, traffic control, parks, and open areas? *will be on central sewer/water. say few children. Biggest impact to road.*

(+2/-2) +1 X 2 +2

9. Is the proposed use cost effective when comparing the cost for providing public services and improving public facilities to the increases in public revenue from the improved property?  
*Will be increase in tax revenues and provide needed housing.*

Sub-Total (+) 24

Sub-Total (-) 1

Total Score +23

The resulting values for each questions shall be totaled so that each land use and development proposal receives a single final score.

\* must consider proposed mitigation in determining values (9A-1-F)  
 +2 Full Compatibility  
 +1 Partial Compatibility (9-11-1-C)  
 -1 Minimal Compatibility (adjacency not discouraged)  
 -2 No Compatibility (Not acceptable)



Attachments available upon request.

Contact Valley County Planning and  
Zoning Office at 208-382-7115