

The Planning and Zoning Commission should consider comments made by Staff and received from agencies and the public.

Staff has also posed some questions for the applicant and have some recommendations.

STAFF COMMENTS, QUESTIONS, and RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The Planning and Zoning Commission will make a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners. The Board will hold a public hearing and make a final decision.
2. Staff's Compatibility Rating was a +13. The Commission shall prepare their own compatibility rating that will be adopted/accepted by the Commission. See Section 5.
3. The property is within the Donnelly Fire District and a herd district. It is not within an irrigation district.
4. Will public events such as weddings and concerts be held in the community space?
5. Will the recreational courts, pathways, playground, etc., be open to the public?
6. Will architecture control (specifying building style, colors, etc.) be proposed in the CCRs?
7. The submittal letter and Table of Contents refer to a lighting plan. Is it included in the application binder?
8. Street names will have to be reviewed and approved prior to recordation of each plat.
9. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has jurisdiction over wetlands; therefore, any impacts to wetlands will be permitted through the Corps.
10. Will fertilizers be used for landscaping? Is proposed landscaping compatible with local conditions and growing seasons? Does landscaping meet minimum size requirements?
11. 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.
12. 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. A Comprehensive Plan analysis has been completed by the applicant beginning on page 4 of the application.
13. Financial guarantees are required at 120%. (page 15 of application quotes 110%)
14. Will only properties within the Planned Unit Development be a part of the Community Infrastructure District (CID)? Please explain the benefit of a CID versus traditional funding sources and/or LIDs.
15. Has there been any thought or consideration to providing a "service provider" parcel that accesses onto Loomis or Old State that could house a fire tender or a county snowplow as part of a Development Agreement?

16. The Impact Report addresses traffic volumes and character, but does not address the condition of exterior roads and infrastructure with proposed mitigation of the impacts ie, additional pavement, turn lanes, stop signs, etc. What will be the mitigation for impacts from added traffic, both to Highway 55 and Lake Cascade?
17. Will there be a bus stop for the school children or the public transit system?
18. Where will snow be stored? (see page 11 #6) An engineer should determine if there is enough area for snow storage.
19. Will you be providing an additional potable water well for the Northlake public water system?
20. Traffic Impact Analysis should be reviewed by the Valley County Engineer.
21. Have you had discussions with service providers such as the public school system, fire and EMS?
22. Will short-term rentals be allowed?
23. How will on-site improvements be maintained? There were no draft CCR's to describe continued maintenance of the on-site infrastructure, parks, recreation uses, etc.
24. Staff recommends a "cheat sheet" be created that shows all variances with setbacks, density, right-of-way, street frontage, lot coverage, and open space.
25. Staff recommends a Sequencing Plan be incorporated into the phasing plan showing that future phases cannot be approved without creation of certain amenities. In example, phase 2 could not be platted until needed amenities for phase 1 are completed, not just a narrative.
26. The Commission should make recommendations on the requested variances to the Board of County Commissioners.

Agency Comments that should be addressed with deliberation and conclusions:

- Saran Becker, Idaho Transportation Department, stated that Traffic Impact Study for the proposal has been forwarded to the reviewing engineer. Please allow 6-8 weeks for the process.
- Jess Ellis, Donnelly Fire Marshal, listed requirements. (Dec. 26, 2023)
- Paul Ashton, Parametrix and Valley County Engineer, stated requirements. A site grading and stormwater management plan will need to be approved prior to any work being done on-site. (Dec. 27, 2023)
→ [Engineer should review Traffic Impact Study, also.]
- Jeff McFadden, Valley County Road Department Superintendent, wants to be involved in the drainage plan. Water from the northern part of the proposed site goes through ditch and culverts on the northern end of Wagon Wheel and Fir Grove subdivisions. These drainages are already maxed out during most spring melts. (Dec. 28, 2023)
- Kelly Copperi, Valley County Dispatch, Laurie Frederick, Valley County Cadastral Specialist III, and

Planning and Zoning Staff commented on proposed road names. Playmaker rhymes with Haymaker so it is not an acceptable name. MacGregor should not be accepted since it is associated with the Cabarton-Snowbank area. Some changes are recommended. (Dec. 11, 2023, Jan. 2, 2024)

- Travis Pryor, North Lake Recreational Sewer and Water District Manager, stated the subject property has not petitioned the District for Annexation which is required prior to the petitioner receiving District services. (Dec. 20, 2023)
- Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) provided general comments on air quality, wastewater, drinking water, surface water, solid waste, hazardous waste, water quality, ground water contamination, and best management practices. (December 22, 2023)
- Valley Soil and Water Conservation District Board of Supervisors state that the proposal deviates from the intent of Codes, Comprehensive Plan, and Waterways Management Plan, and is not low impact. Issues that should be addressed include drainage and loss of valuable farmland. (January 3, 2024)

Public comment received that should be addressed with deliberation and conclusions:

1. Support the trails along the western property line, Loomis Lane, and Old State Road.
2. Would like an additional pond or detention basin in northwest corner for buffer area, pathway, wildlife travel, and viewshed.
3. The northwest corner currently drains to the culvert between Lots 18 and 19 of Railroad Village Subdivision.
4. A log pole or similar style fence is requested along the western property line.
5. The existing trees along the perimeter should be retained.
6. The smaller lot sizes coupled with smaller square footage housing units may provide an expanded opportunity for more moderate-income housing solutions.
7. Valley County Comprehensive Plan states that no development will be approved that may adversely impact existing residents.
8. The developer must be required to directly fund full capacity improvements of both water delivery and sewer treatment.
9. Approval should necessitate requirement of road resurface improvements to areas impacted by the proposal. These should be funded and completed in advance of first plat recording and lot sales. Improvements should be secured via a performance bond or letter of credit.
10. The Old State Road and Loomis Lane intersection should be converted to a four-way stop.
11. The traffic study was completed on November 8, 2023, during the "shoulder season" and low annual traffic period. It did not include the SISCRA Campground traffic nor the Boulder Creek Recreational site traffic.

12. The applicant indicates that amenities in the plat may include a concert venue. Additional noise pollution would not be supported.
13. The traffic study does not address expected outside traffic drawn to the development that would use the proposed coffee and/or alcohol facility, food truck, and skating rink.
14. The property is in a high-water table area and has standing water on the site during spring melt. The engineering plan for water and runoff management should be required prior to approval.
15. Add a controlled draining stormwater detention basin from snow storage areas.
16. Barrier berms with trees should be required along both Loomis Lane and Old State Road to screen the project from view and maintain the natural aspects of the area.
17. View corridors should be preserved. Another pond and larger acreage lots in the northwest corner and along the proposed ponds are recommended.
18. Preserve wildlife habitat by maintaining trees throughout the development; consider using native trees and plants.
19. Construct the ponds to promote wildlife and not large mosquito havens.
20. Consider mountain architecture vernacular focusing on natural and textured structures that blend into the surroundings.
21. The project is not consistent or in harmony with the rural and semi-rural area.
22. Not compatible; this site is surrounded on three sides by productive farmland.
23. Loss of productive farmland in Valley County.
24. Providing community services to a development costs the County more than money than collected on those lands; the opposite of working farmland.
25. Too dense with an average of 0.22-acre lots.
26. Homes proposed right on property line in northwest corner of site; open space or pond area should be added here also.
27. Impacts include county roads and maintenance, Highway 55 intersections, and school capacity, and needed upgrades in water and sewer systems.
28. Any needed upgrades should be paid by developer.
29. Traffic numbers, congestion, and speed are concerns.
30. Limited exit points for the entire area in case of emergencies such as wildfire. This includes both residential and recreational sites.

31. Would negatively impact the wildlife that residents value and enjoy.
32. Inadequate provision for parking. Each home will have 2-4 vehicles.
33. No accommodation for recreational parking needs including utility trailers, RVs, ATVs, snowmobile trailers, etc.
34. Narrow streets and roundabouts are incompatible with snow removal and emergency vehicle needs.
35. Limited areas for snow removal and storage.
36. Inadequate surface water management.
37. The current drainage ditch has been poorly maintained and results in water threatening adjacent properties.
38. The culvert at 12882 Spring Valley Road is already inadequate and should be addressed by Valley County.
39. This area has a high-water table, homes in nearby Fir Grove Subdivision have sump pumps running year-round.
40. The proposal would reduce water percolation of snow melt and rainwater and divert more into the existing drainage ditch.
41. Adding more people will negatively impact the already poor water pressure that occurs.
42. Unknown impact on aquifer changes and groundwater if new wells are required.
43. Using agricultural water from Lake Fork Reservoir to irrigate the development would reduce the water supply for farmland in the area.
44. Contribution of pollutants to Lake Cascade. The proposed ponds would remove cold water from the natural drainage inflow into the lake that is needed for cold water aquatic life and control of algae growth.
45. The loss of wetland that filters downstream water quality.
46. Opposed to relaxation of setbacks.
47. Air quality issues will be problem if most of these houses have wood-burning stoves.
48. Neighborhood meeting was held after application was submitted.
49. Negative environmental impact on the rivers, streams, lakes, reservoirs, wetlands, and wildlife including current sanctuaries and migratory areas.

- 50. The proposed starting home price at approximately \$600,000 is not affordable.
- 51. Facilities such as the proposed community center and ice rink should be in town for all to use rather intensifying the traffic to this area.
- 52. The application was submitted prior to the neighborhood meeting being held.
- 53. Will there be a wall on the south side of the property? The adjacent neighbor has livestock.
- 54. Will there off-site road improvements?