

**CITY OF KUNA
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

**MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, September 24, 2019**

PZ COMMISSION MEMBER	PRESENT	CITY STAFF PRESENT:	PRESENT
Chairman Lee Young	X	Wendy Howell, Planning Director	X
Commissioner Dana Hennis	X	Troy Behunin, Senior Planner	N/A
Commissioner Cathy Gealy	X	Jace Hellman, Planner II	X
Commissioner Stephen Damron	Absent	Sam Weiger, Planner I	X
Commissioner John Laraway	X	Doug Hanson, Planner I	N/A

6:00 pm – COMMISSION MEETING

Chairman Young called the meeting to order at **6:00 pm**.

Call to Order and Roll Call

1. CONSENT AGENDA

Meeting Minutes for September 10, 2019.

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for 19-24-DR (Design Review) & 19-10-SN (Sign)

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for 19-08-AN (Annexation), 19-04-S (Preliminary Plat) & 19-19-DR (Design Review)

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for 19-09-AN (Annexation)

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for 19-02-ZC (Rezone)

Commissioner Gealy Motions to approve the consent agenda; Commissioner Laraway Seconds, all aye and motion carried 3-0.

2. NEW BUSINESS

19-25-DR (Design Review) & 19-13-SN (Sign) - The Wendy's Company requests approval of design review for an approximately 2,456 square-foot Wendy's restaurant including landscaping, lighting and a parking lot, within Ensign Subdivision No. 2, Lot 10 Block 1, at 871 North Meridian Road, Kuna, Idaho 83634.

Sam Weiger: Chairman, commissioners for the record Sam Weiger, Planner I for the City of Kuna 751 W 4th ST. The Wendy's Company requests approval of design review for a new approximately 2,456 square-foot Wendy's restaurant, including landscaping, lighting and a parking lot, within Ensign subdivision No. 2, Lot 10 Block 1, at 871 North Meridian Road, Kuna, Idaho 83634. Staff has determined that this application complies with Title 5 of Kuna City Code; Idaho Code; the Comprehensive Plan and the Future Land Use Map. Staff forwards a recommendation of approval for Case Nos. 19-25-DR & 19-13-SN to the Planning and Zoning Commission. I will now stand for any questions you may have. **Dan Brubaker:** My name is Dan Brubaker, I'm out of Denver, Colorado, I'm the construction manager for this area. I really appreciate the opportunity to be in front of you and answer any questions you might have. Our site is the perfect spot, it is heavily landscaped with earth-tone colors like the rest of the buildings in the area. I'm looking forward to being here, and I can answer any questions. **C/Young:** I think the site is well landscaped, and the structure itself gives building relief, and different finishes. **C/Laraway:** It fits. **C/Hennis:** I see stores like this, and I think they've done a nice job with landscaping. I think they've put more than we're asking in there. **C/Young:** I don't think I have any issues with what's been presented. **C/Hennis:** The monument sign is low key, it's nice. I think it conforms really nicely.

CITY OF KUNA PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING MINUTES Tuesday, September 24, 2019

Commissioner Hennis motions to approve Case Nos. 19-25-DR and 19-13-SN with the conditions as outlined in the staff report; Commissioner Gealy seconds, all aye and motion carried 3-0.

18-33-DR-A (Design Review) & 18-17-SN-A (Sign) - On behalf of Toll Brothers (Coleman Homes), Apex Sign Company requests design review approval for two 5-ft tall (approximate) illuminated monument signs for Winfield Springs Subdivision. The subject sites are located at North Sailer Way, Kuna, ID 83634. (APNs: R9466230700 & R9466230020).

Sam Weiger: Chairman, commissioners, for the record Sam Weiger, Planner I, City of Kuna 751 W 4th St. The application before you this evening is for design review consideration for two monument signs for the Winfield Springs Subdivision entrance located near the intersection of Meridian and Deer Flat Road. The proposed signs stand approximately 5 and a half ft tall and 20 ft across at its widest point. The proposed sign copy area is 40 square feet for both signs. Staff has determined the design review application complies with Kuna City Code, title 5, and would recommend that if the proposed project is approved, the applicant be subject to the conditions of approval listed in the staff report and any additional conditions requested by the Planning and Zoning Commission. **Craig Lunsford:** Craig Lunsford, Apex Sign Company, PO Box 2002, Eagle, ID 83616. Just to clarify on the sign area, what we have before you is actually 36 square feet. That is the sign letters themselves. **C/Young:** The existing signs are getting relocated, correct? **Craig Lunsford:** Yes, so Toll Brothers typically has large entry signage. What they have now really fits well with phase five, and not two large entrance signs. I've done half a dozen subdivision signs for them, and they typically aren't flanked on both sides, and they are more horizontal from 15 to 30 feet. They asked me to revisit this, and the plan is to remove the two existing signs and reinstall them into phase five. **C/Hennis:** When you say this is illuminated, is it just back-lit? **Craig Lunsford:** It is internally illuminated. When you see the Sterling Ranch, it's inside and what you see that the letters are mounted out. There's a piece that we call plex, and so the lighting comes through those letters. It's a subtle illumination. **C/Hennis:** It's the insignia that's backlit? **Craig Lunsford:** it's illuminated to what we call a halo. It's kind of subtle and away from you, and it provides a little bit of a halo shape. If you can see the existing signs, it just looks pretty small with that big space. They wanted us to revisit it. **C/Young:** The stone matches what's there, it's just a little bit longer. The entrance is pretty big. **C/Hennis:** It's just a little more appropriate. **C/Young:** Regarding the backlighting on the insignia, that looks good at night.

Commissioner Hennis motions to approve Case Nos. 18-33-DR-A and 18-17-SN-A with the conditions as outlined in the staff report; Commissioner Laraway seconds, all aye and motion carried 3-0.

3. PUBLIC HEARING

19-03-AN (Annexation), 19-02-S (Preliminary Plat) & 19-09-DR (Design Review) – Don Veasey (owner) requests to annex two parcels consisting of approximately 7.67 acres into Kuna City Limits with an R-6 (Medium Density Residential) zone and to subdivide the 7.67 acres into 38 total lots (33 buildable lots, 5 common lots). The subject sites are located at 642 S. Ash St. and S. Ash St., Kuna, ID 83634, within Section 26, Township 2 North, Range 1 West; (APNs: R5070503050 and R5070502835).

Jace Hellman: Good Evening, Chairman and Commissioners, for the Record, Jace Hellman, Kuna Planning and Zoning Staff, 751 W 4th St, Kuna, ID 83634. The applications before you this evening are the annexation of approximately 7.67-acres into Kuna City Limits with an R-6 (medium Density Residential) zoning classification, and the subdivision of the 7.67-acre parcel into 33 buildable lots and five common lots including a 12,000 square foot common lot. Additionally, the applicant has submitted a design review application for the projects landscaping and open space. Following review, staff has determined the annexation, preliminary plat and design review requests are within compliance of the Kuna City Code, Idaho State Code and the Kuna Comprehensive Plan.

**CITY OF KUNA
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

**MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, September 24, 2019**

As a reminder, the annexation and preliminary plat are before you as a recommendation to the City Council, and the Design Review is seeking your decision this evening. If the Commission approves the design review and recommends approval of the annexation/pre plat, Staff would recommend that the applicant be subject to the conditions of approval listed in section "i" of your staff report, as well as any other additional conditions, this decision-making body decides to impose. We did receive one late exhibit, which I have provided a copy for you this evening, and I will read into the record. Let the record show that comments from Cindy Giesen are noted as exhibit D7. Four paragraphs are pertaining to some posting questions with the project that staff is currently working on discussing with Ms. Giesen. We'll start at paragraph four. In particular, I am concerned about 1) the added traffic that a project like this will put on S. Ash and then onto Avalon; 2) the impact of having more homes on the south side of the train tracks which is always a fire/health/emergency rescue issue; 3) the school children's safety and school impact, each time another subdivision is approved; 4) the subdivision street lighting that recently seems to be getting more intense (>3000k) and is on from dusk to dawn, without sensors...; 5) and the impact of more 'white' vinyl fencing city requirements, which reflect even more of this street light into our 'rural;' dark skies. (Please Note: The 2 street lights in the new subdivision (no homes on it yet) on Ten Mile Rd between W. King and Avalon, look like an airplane runway or car with brights on, from my house acres away - due to the brightness of the lights, and it beaming on the white fences - and nobody lives there yet). This project appears to add 1.5x more trip-ends to the existing traffic on S. Ash. THAT IS A HUGE INCREASE FOR ONE PROJECT. South Ash is only wide where recent developments have been added. About 1/3 of S. Ash, nearest Avalon (N) is usually only wide enough for one-way traffic most the time, due to the fact that people park on the street (which they have probably been doing for the life of their homes, so shouldn't be forced to do otherwise). Most of South Ash is not a typical two-way street, it is a rural country road that doesn't even justify a dividing center line. I read there may be more exit/entries in the proposed subdivision, in the future, but we all know how that works out. A sign and rail fence is put up at a dead end road, but the road will not happen until someone decides to sell/develop their adjacent land. It can take years for another exit/entrance to open up, to alleviate the traffic impact. It's worth a study by P&Z to determine how often these promised roads actually happen. And how long did it take. Saying there may be another road in the future, is definitely not a justification for approval for the traffic problems the project generates today. Until there are more road connections, these promises are like promising you can flush a cow paddy down your toilet, without facing any consequences. There will be traffic flow consequences, without the proper infrastructure in place, before giving approval. Please consider my request to postpone the meeting so we can better understand and respond to what is being requested, now that documentation has been provide. Otherwise, please add my comments and concerns to your records for this Planning and Zoning hearing. After which time I can read your minutes and your responses to them, in preparation for the next City Council hearing on the project, if approved by P&Z. Additionally, I realized this morning that comments from the City Engineer were missing a page, so I have provided you with the full document as well, which is exhibit C-8 in your packet. With that, I will stand for any questions you may have. **C/Young:** We will take two-minutes. I do have a question about the City Engineer's report. It ties into the letter on the last page of the packet. In here, the engineer indicates to proceed with the preliminary plat. The letter indicated some concerns with pressurized irrigation, are there any pressure issues in that area? **Jace Hellman:** As far as the City Engineer reporting to the Planning and Zoning Department, there has been no assurance. However, we would be happy to provide documentation on that. As far as where they're at regarding capacity, it's a loop system. **C/Hennis:** How far is the sewer system to it. Is it connectable? **Jace Hellman:** There are some on Ash, and there's one on Cassandra. **C/Hennis:** The engineer doesn't state anything in here as to whether the capacity is the reason or not, though. **Jace Hellman:** Typically, what they would have to do is, once they get to their civil plan review, they'll need to go through and have all density and the QLPE and the serviceability on that. Again, we can reach out and have them provide some specifics on what that capacity looks like. **C/Hennis:** Isn't that kind of the cart before the horse, though? **Jace Hellman:** Yes. **C/Hennis:** I know this is clear on the other side of our sewer plant. The sewer plant is on the upper end of town. Is the old one on the south end of town still functioning? **Jace Hellman:** Yes. **C/Hennis:** Was it at capacity before? **Jace Hellman:** Prior, it was. I'm not too familiar with exactly how they release in

**CITY OF KUNA
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

**MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, September 24, 2019**

capacity, but there has been some shifting capacity in that station. They were able to switch some stuff to the north treatment plant. **Crystal McDaniel:** I'm Crystal McDaniel, and I'm with Accurate Surveying & Mapping. We've submitted the application for our client, Don Veasey, who is the owner and developer of Chotika. I think Jace has pretty much covered a lot of what I was going to cover, but I'll repeat a few things. The subdivision does consist of 33 buildable lots for single-family homes. There are also five common lots, four are landscape buffers and one is usable open space that will be a shared space with grass and trees. We are requesting a zoning of R-6, which would be six dwellings per acre. The buildable lots range from 4,911 square feet to 15,500 square feet. As noted in the Planning and Zoning staff report, Kuna's Comprehensive Plan encourages a variety of housing types for all incomes. A variety of lot sizes encourages a variety of houses in Chotika Subdivision. To assist with connectivity and the flow of traffic, our plan is to extend Recess Way and Cassandra. That's the plat, which shows the extensions of Recess and Cassandra. Cassandra ties into West Sunbeam, which is a mid-mile collector street. This will help with the traffic. If you look at the recently approved projects within the vicinity, most of those approved subdivisions surrounding are R-6. The closest to our proposal is Deserthawk Subdivision, which is a total of 7.41 acres and 36 total lots, 33 residential lots and three common lots. Ardmore Subdivision is a little bit bigger, it's 9.68 acres with 32 total lots, 30 residential lots and two common lots with an R-6 zoning. For irrigation, the property is currently under Boise Kuna Irrigation, and after this it will be the Kuna Municipal Irrigation System (KMIS). KMIS will make assessments and determine how to provide the service. I'll stand for any questions. **C/Young:** It looks faded in the staff report, but for verification, the entries for the existing lot on the northwest corner, it sits on Ash, will be closed off and that one will have new access off of recess. **Crystal McDaniel:** Are you referring to block 1? **C/Young:** Yes. **Crystal McDaniel:** That will lose its driveway access. **C/Young:** On Ash, but it will have it from Recess. **C/Young:** The common lot no. 3, that common area, you've indicated trees and grass for that. Are there any other amenities for that? Tot lots or a gazebo, for example. **Crystal McDaniel:** No, it's primarily just an open park. **C/Gealy:** Can you explain the rationale for the location of the open space within the subdivision. **Crystal McDaniel:** Yes. The owner has a long-term lease tenant on the abutting lot, the one that has the existing house. Part of the agreement with that tenant was that there would be the common lot placed there. **C/Young:** I'll open the public testimony at 6:37. **Jim Russell:** Jim Russell, 781 S. School Ave. Our property adjoins this in the southeast corner. Future Sunbeam Road is my first concern, which does not exist yet. It belongs to a property owner as previously stated. My second concern is fencing. We have livestock, bulls, and horses that are in the south side of my property. I have a wired fence down to there, and we also burn ditches and pasture. You name it, it's probably going to blow across the street. Number four on my list is irrigation, and that's a real high concern of mine. They put in Brandywine, and they eliminated some ditch work that went to my property, and we had to give the City a right-of-way down through my property. As it stands right at moment, the irrigation comes right down through the middle of this cul-de-sac. There's an irrigation box right there in that yellow area. At present, we use that ditch that comes a half-mile down and it flushes all the way down the property through this subdivision at the moment. I don't know how it ever flushed that line once the ditch disappears. We would need at least a ten-foot right of way to maintain that ditch in that irrigation box. Everything within this property is not the City of Kuna water, it's Boise Kuna Irrigation District. It's also affected water that comes down south and through this property. I just want a little more clarification on how they are going to handle this. Noise restrictions is another big item of mine, hydraulic hammers and dust control. Of course, the traffic situation, which I'll leave to the Bakers here, you've got a small subdivision going through Locust Grove, so whoever gets the traffic light first, whether it be Ash Street or School Street, that's the way the traffic is going. **Bryce Baker:** Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, Bryce Baker, I reside at 975 West Recess Way in Kuna. I am representing a group of homeowners. I do have a submittal, and I would like to pass out a late submission. It also includes a letter that summarizes some of our concerns. As homeowners of the Outpost Subdivision, were not anti-growth, and we're not opposed to the subdivision. We are, however, opposed to the subdivision to that is coming before you, with a proposed R-6 zoning. While it meets the intent of the number of people per acre, when you actually look at those lots, particularly the ones that are facing recess way, they are 50 feet wide or thereabouts, which is pretty narrow. If you flip back a couple of pages, just for context, I've drawn some things to scale here to help you visualize what we're talking about. My home on Recess

**CITY OF KUNA
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

**MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, September 24, 2019**

Way is one of the smaller homes in the subdivision. **C/Young:** This is now Exhibit D8, for the record. **Bryce Baker:** My home has one of the smaller footprints in the subdivision. I've drawn to scale what my home looks like on this present lot in Recess Way in the Outpost Subdivision. How would fit on a typical lot in the Chotika Subdivision that's 50 feet wide. At best, the dimensions of the lots that are being proposed would severely limit potential architecture for the types of homes that are put on these lots. I've also included some photographs, these are just on Google Earth. I've just selected a couple typical homes in the Outpost Subdivision, Brandywine, and Placerville. The current lots are outlined in blue, and the proposed typical Chotika lot is outlined in red. You can see how that compares with existing homes in lots that are adjacent to this subdivision. None of these smaller homes, including a small 1400 square-foot home in the middle of the Brandywine Subdivision that I've got outlined there, that would fit on this 50-foot-wide lot. That limits the type of homes in size to probably 1100 to 1200 square-foot homes for the most part. I think I'm allowed 10 minutes, because I represent a group, correct? **C/Young:** There are rules for that, you have to submit a list of people you represent at a time and have it issued prior to the hearing. **Bryce Baker:** I apologize, I didn't understand that rule and procedure. The rest of our comments and concerns are outlined in the letter that I submitted to you. I'd appreciate if you take a moment to review those exhibits and images. **Eddie Moreno:** Eddie Moreno, 1041 W Recess Way, Kuna, Idaho. I live in the Outpost Subdivision, and I've been living there since it was built originally. Our builder, Mick, is a long-time resident, who envisioned the south side of Kuna, which back in 2005 when he was building it, hoped that it would blend with the agricultural feel that it is in the south side. Understanding that on the north side, growth will happen. We lived on the north side before and moved to the south side for the agricultural aspect of it. Looking at the design of the subdivision, I question why so many homes are in such a small area. In my opinion, an R-4 designation would be more appropriate for the area. Not only that, all those homes added and a couple more people on Recess Way wouldn't be good. I work in the government sector, so I know about public safety. I see issues on Recess regarding vehicle speed, and it is what it is. It comes with growth. Regarding Ash, I've driven by Ash. To me, it's not all fully developed to what School Road and Recess Way is. In my opinion, if the subdivision gets approved, I think there should be a lot more improvement to Ash, so it can meet the demands of the population moving in there. Regarding issues of public safety, there was an accident on School Road. I ask you to revisit this plan to be more in tune with what we have in the south side. **Jerry Flarel:** 1022 W Recess Way. I agree with the rest of the group that R-4 would be more appropriate. Regarding the subdivision, when you add onto Recess Way, I'm concerned about traffic. I'm also concerned about the lack of sidewalks going up and down Ash. Right there at the end, kids ride their bikes down the street to get onto Avalon. You've got everything on Ten Mile. Wherever we've developed, we've put sidewalks in. To be responsible you need to include sidewalks. One other thing is emergency services. It does concern me to keep adding here. **Crystal McDaniel:** We're using vinyl fence, but are there any other options we would have? **C/Hennis:** Rod iron is also acceptable. **Crystal McDaniel:** As far as irrigation goes, the Boise Project Board of Control gave their feedback as far as irrigation is concerned. There is a requirement that both irrigation and drainage ditches crossing this property in order to serve neighboring properties must remain unobstructed and protected by appropriate easements to address the irrigation concerns and continued access to it. As far as what kind of houses go in, I don't know which houses will go in, that's the next phase. One of the things that I read in the Kuna Comprehensive Plan. The trends section of the Plan says that Kuna continues to grow. 54,000 is the projected population by 2040. Kuna is shifting from agricultural product to government and service sectors. Kuna has the potential to become a thriving community with more local jobs. There is a growing demand for housing in Kuna. This may be partially driven by younger families and professionals seeking out less expensive housing options. This subdivision will maybe provide some housing for those seeking to move there. **C/Young:** I'll close the public testimony at 6:55. That brings up our discussion. Has our fire department has had a chance to reviewed the preliminary plat. **Jace Hellman:** The fire department was sent the entire packet that was submitted to staff. They did not provide on-paper comments. They were a part of the pre-application meeting. They had no comments as far as access. Their only comments were location of fire hydrants and making those accessible. **C/Hennis:** Mr. Russell indicated that the Sunbeam extension was on other property owner's property. Is there an easement there already for the street, or how will that work with what he indicated? **Jace Hellman:** There is no easement on the

**CITY OF KUNA
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

**MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, September 24, 2019**

property so far. The right-of-way that they'll be dedicating for that portion of Sunbeam will come from their property as far as their half of the road to construct. It will go into a road trust as ACHD is requiring, because as it sits right now, there is no place for it to develop it because the properties around it are undeveloped. There would just be a half of a road section going to nowhere on each side. ACHD has required them to dedicate that right-of-way, which is on their property, for the road trust, which is highlighted at the bottom in that orange. That's the buffer and then below that would be the road section of the right-of-way that they'd be dedicating. **C/Hennis:** I'm concerned about having this many lots in that little area. These are very narrow-fronted lots stubbed with four flag lots. I don't know if I'm concerned as much with traffic, because I think it will access the other way. Ash Street obviously has an issue. It's a small street. I'm also concerned with law enforcement services. We don't have anything on record that they're looking to have substations. They have them on the east side of Kuna, but a lack on the south side. I'm concerned with that. The pressurized irrigation is obviously an issue. Without the sewer hookup, it may not be as big of an issue. We don't know that for sure. **C/Young:** I think the pressure irrigation is alright. For the other subdivisions, they were talking about lift station issues? **C/Hennis:** No, they were talking about the pressurized irrigation, but they irrigate between 3 AM and 8 AM. There was a noticeable performance drop when the systems are in use. **C/Laraway:** A couple weeks ago we had the same scenario, where we had agricultural backing up against the subdivision. A chain-link fence was talked about, I think. We can make a recommendation on that to see what can be done to separate livestock. **C/Young:** A condition to work with the neighbors on a situation to help stabilize and prevent the agricultural interest. **C/Laraway:** This is the first subdivision I've seen that's had so many ingress and egress entrance points. I realize ACHD makes all these trees line up, and we have to have access to them. The lot design is a little bizarre. I don't know if it's designed that way for a reason. That's my personal taste, obviously. They have those long entry points, and I have a question for staff to verify that the fire department is fine with those long driveways going into those back areas. They don't like backing up. **Jace Hellman:** The maximum they're allowed to have is 150 feet, and those driveways are 110. **C/Hennis:** There's five flagpole lots. They're maximizing the amount of lots in there, and I don't know if that's appropriate. **C/Laraway:** I don't know if pushing this to an R-4 would alleviate the flagpole lots. With all those access points, it looks like 50 percent of the traffic is going to go out on School, and the other 50 percent will go out on Ash. Again, we can't stop the access points, that's ACHD. **C/Young:** One nice thing about the existing section of Recess is that there is a roundabout in there to potentially help with that. **C/Young:** Another point up for consideration are the lack of amenities in the common area. **C/Laraway:** Since you've been on Recess, going back to what I was talking about, isn't that roundabout one lane? **C/Young:** Yes, but it still functions as a two-way. **C/Gealy:** Two of my key points are transitional lots and amenities for the people that will live there. It appears that there is a very nice transition for the existing tenant in the home that's there. It appears that there is very little consideration for transitions to many of the surrounding property owners. There is very little consideration for amenities for the people potentially living in this community. When I found myself looking at this plan and asking, is this the best we can do? Surely, we can be more creative. If a promise has been made to the existing tenant to have open space beside them, that's fine. There's no reason why we can't increase the amount of open space that's available to other people living in the neighborhood, and perhaps consider a reconfiguration with additional open space. We don't want to have these flagpole lots, very narrow lots. I understand you really can't predict what size of house is going to go onto a lot, but it's going to be affected somewhat by the size of the lot. I always want to look at transitional lots, transitional lots from existing to proposed. Also, I look at lots within the subdivision. I want to be sure we consider amenities. Is this the best we can do with this piece of property? I think there's a lot more potential than what I see here. I go back to the Comprehensive Plan. We want Kuna to be a desirable place to live. Is this proposed subdivision increasing the desirability of Kuna as a place to live? Or, is this subdivision just increasing the number of houses in Kuna? I think that's two different things. **C/Young:** Would the applicant consider an R-4 designation instead of R-6? **Crystal McDaniel:** That's not something that I can answer at this time. I'd need to have a discussion first. **C/Laraway:** This is not the optimal design. **C/Hennis:** The main is that this doesn't coordinate with the areas around it. We're maximizing the amount that go in here at this point, and it doesn't jive with the properties to the south. I have issues stuffing that many homes in this area, because of safety

**CITY OF KUNA
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

**MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, September 24, 2019**

services on that side of town. Obviously, we already have issues with irrigation. An R-4 would definitely be something that I think could be accomplished a little bit easier. I just think it's a little more appropriate. It still doesn't buffer the southwest, but it's a start. **C/Young:** We have several options. We can table this and have them come back with a little different layout and have that discussion at that time. We can recommend denial, or recommend approval with conditions to potentially recommend to Council. **C/Laraway:** I'm looking at the technicalities of the area around it. The flagpole lots are a concern. **C/Young:** I think they should come back with a little different configuration. Items we would be looking for are fewer flag lots. Another thing would be adding more amenities in common areas. The fencing along the agricultural uses north of the subdivision would be another. **C/Laraway:** The subdivision to the east is R-4, and the subdivision to the north is R-4. **C/Hennis:** There are even R-2's close. **C/Young:** Is there a thought to having them come back with a different layout we can review? Or will we condition approval with an R-4? **C/Hennis:** We could table it, so we can see what comes back and not just kick it to City Council and let them deal with it. We're interested in how this lays out, figuratively and literally. **Wendy Howell:** Regarding kicking it to City Council, if there's a significant change, as to what was presented to you, it would have to be re-noticed at your level. **C/Hennis:** This would be a more efficient use of the applicant's time if we just tabled it? **C/Young:** It would save Council's time too. **C/Hennis:** I would prefer that. **C/Gealy:** I would like to see further consideration of the open space and amenities in consideration of the people that will be living in the subdivision. I understand they put that lot up there because of an agreement with the existing tenant. I'm more concerned actually about the people that will be living there. I am not by any means an architect. I wonder if you couldn't envision scenarios for some of these homes where there is open space that they could all use, versus that common lot. **C/Hennis:** You're talking about the flagpole lots, correct? **C/Gealy:** Yes. **C/Young:** We'll include amenities, additional fencing for separation between the two. **C/Gealy:** Do we want to configure to an R-4? **C/Young:** I don't know if we can do that at this point, we'll see what they come back with. We can suggest that type of density. **Wendy Howell:** If you're going to recommend that, in order for them to make the changes, I'll have it back to staff by October 1, which is next Tuesday, and I don't know if that's possible to make it in that time frame. We will have to review it, and get it back out to packets for you. The conversation is whether October 8 or October 22 would be more appropriate. That need's to be worked out with the applicant's representative. **C/Young:** I know it takes time for them to reconfigure things. I have another question for the applicant. Could we table this to a certain time? Is there a time frame that you would need to try and make revisions? **C/Hennis:** The main question is, at that point, the next available meeting would be the 8th of October. The following meeting would be more preferred. How quickly would you get on that?

Commissioner Hennis motions to table Case Nos. 19-03-AN and 19-02-S and 19-09-DR until the meeting on October 22nd to give the applicant time to address adding amenities in the open space and possibly redesigning the open space for its usage, preferably to see a new layout of the plat, or possibly an R-4 density to remove some of the flagpole lots and widen some areas, and also to address the fencing to separate the subdivision and the property owner to the east with livestock containment; Commissioner Laraway seconds, all aye and motion carried 3-0.

C/Gealy: I have a question for staff, did we have a landscape plan? **Jace Hellman:** Exhibit B2 in your packet. **C/Gealy:** Have we tabled the preliminary plats, annexation and design review? **C/Hennis:** Yes, I think they're all kind of intertwined enough, just one thing will affect all three.

4. COMMISSION REPORTS

5. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Gealy motions to adjourn; Commissioner Laraway Seconds, all aye and motion carried 3-0.

**CITY OF KUNA
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

**MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, September 24, 2019**



Lee Young, Chairman
Kuna Planning and Zoning Commission

ATTEST: 

Wendy I. Howell, Planning and Zoning Director
Kuna Planning and Zoning Department