



CANYON COUNTY PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING HELD
Thursday, July 6, 2023
6:30 P.M.

1ST FLOOR PUBLIC MEETING ROOM SUITE 130, CANYON COUNTY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

Commissioners Present : Robert Sturgill, Chairman
 Brian Sheets, Vice Chairman
 Patrick Williamson, Commissioner
 Harold Nevill, Commissioner
 Miguel Villafana, Commissioner
 Geoff Mathews, Commissioner
 Matt Dorsey, Commissioner

Staff Members Present: Sabrina Minshall, Director of Development Services
 Dan Lister, Planning Official
 Michelle Barron, Planner (present but not called during roll call)
 Madelyn Vander Veen, Planner
 Bonnie Puleo, Hearing Specialist

Chairman Robert Sturgill called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Commissioner Villafana read the testimony guidelines and proceeded to the first business item on the agenda.

MOTION: Commissioner Nevill moved to approve & sign the revised Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval for Case CU2023-0002/Alejandro Jimenez – Juan Nieves. Motion seconded by Commissioner Mathews. Voice vote, motion carried.

- **Case No. OR2023-0002/Nampa Area of City Influence:** The City of Nampa is requesting to expand their impact area boundary in accordance with Idaho Code §67-6526 and Canyon County Code §09-11-27. The expansion area is approximately 2,600 acres located north of Lake Lowell.

Planning Official Dan Lister reviewed the Staff report for the record.

Chairman Robert Sturgill affirmed the witnesses to testify.

Testimony:

Doug Critchfield – Applicant (Representative) – IN FAVOR – 500 12th Ave. South, Nampa ID 83651

Mr. Critchfield said it is important in a public setting to define what the area of city impact is. He said this is not an annexation map; it is the map utilized by the city to plan for future growth. A property owner who is outside the area of city impact can annex into the city of Nampa. He said the reason they are proposing this is it will give definition to the area for future annexation. It will also help them anticipate future economic growth, where to locate schools and transportation corridors where denser population could be located. It also helps with the budgeting and zoning of the area. He showed the current 'future land use map' and showed the area, which is a small portion of the total area of city impact. Mr. Critchfield

said in 2016, working with the County and the city of Caldwell, they developed this new area of city impact but the City Council of Nampa voted against it. They rejected the expansion because they felt it wasn't the right time, that development hadn't moved far enough in that direction and there was opposition from landowners. As a result, they pulled back from expanding the area of city influence and just allowed annexation and development in the current area of city impact. He said Nampa has developed out to Midland at this point. Most of the areas around Midway are owned by property owners who are interested in development. Mr. Critchfield has a timeline he is willing to share; it has been about a two year process. He said they have been out to the public several times and had lots of feedback. They have sent out mailers to individual property owners in the area and have done background work with the County and city of Caldwell. The city of Nampa is proposing three different land uses in this area of impact expansion: Mixed Use area (higher density), Low Density residential (which is one to two and a half dwellings per acre) and what their Comprehensive Plan calls Agricultural which is very low density residential (one dwelling unit per acre and greater). This would allow uses that would preserve large areas of agricultural land with clustered housing. He said that area is considered a buffer area between the lake and the development in Nampa. The trade area is an area that is largely served by Nampa already and access to those trade areas is on collector routes; both north and south. In terms of the geographic factors, Mr. Critchfield said they reached out to Deer Flat Wildlife Refuge on several occasions over the last two years and they never responded back to them on this proposed AOI expansion. He said as it has to be an area that can reasonably be annexed into the city in the future, there is already some development that is occurring in that area. He showed on a map how growth is already moving in that direction. Mr. Critchfield wanted to show how the expansion would help with agricultural land use: the density should occur in the city. Traditional view of agriculture is contiguous agricultural land that is production. The city's view is more of open space, farmer's markets, preservation of natural areas and local produce production. Those are two very different views of the land use and the city wishes to help the County preserve the traditional agriculture use on the periphery but within the area of impact, the city's agricultural land use is a little more dense. Mr. Critchfield said there is a compatibility issue between the city's land use decisions and the County's. Agriculture is interpreted differently so he said they need some clarity on that. They need a long term land use vision to plan for utilities, transportation and services to support the citizenry in that area. If the area of city impact is approved. He said they plan on updating their future land use map and comprehensive plan. They will also have to update the joint powers agreement and along with the County, they will be taking a more detailed look at the area and coordination with staff and officials.

Commissioner Williamson asked if what is defined as agricultural in the city is what is considered R-R and R-1 in the County. Mr. Critchfield answered yes. Commissioner Williamson also asked if they will be encouraging or requiring pre-annexation agreements for any development in the newly designated area of city impact. Mr. Critchfield responded that pre-annexation is a tool they have used to encourage growth that is more compatible with the city's requirements while it is in the County but that would be a future discussion.

Commissioner Nevill said he was concerned that there was no input from Deer Flat Wildlife Refuge. He is mostly concerned about the lower area and asked why would the city's definition of agriculture (which is R-1) be a better buffer in that area than the County's definition of agriculture? Mr. Critchfield said the city believes the areas along the lake need to be preserved and the city would like an active role in helping to preserve them as much as they can. There is an option in their agriculture designation to cluster housing on small lot clusters, while preserving large areas of land similar to Harris Ranch in Boise. The city feels that type of approach (is preferable) versus leaving it in agriculture where it could go several different directions and there could be rezone requests in that area. Commissioner Nevill asked if that southern area plan would be laid out ahead of time so someone in the future couldn't put a house there. Mr. Critchfield said if this was approved the city would work with the county to take a more detailed look at the area and develop a sub-area plan to act as an overlay to the future land use map. They feel there are

options to create that buffer. Commissioner Nevill asked staff if they would see that (sub-area) plan. Planning Official Dan Lister said yes, it would go through the hearing process. Commissioner Nevill asked what the city's vision was for what will happen to the Bowman gravel pit. Mr. Critchfield said the city has looked at that area but they haven't done any specific planning for that area. Right now, they are looking at large land use designations, but once they get into more specific plan work, they will have more of an idea of how to approach that area. Commissioner Nevill asked about a small four acre area on the map and confirmed that it was contiguous with the city.

Commissioner Sheets said based on a lot of the issues brought before the Commission, the difficulty in providing city services to one to two acre parcels, was he thinking the cluster communities is the way to provide city services to those areas? Mr. Critchfield said that is one of the approaches but the intent is preserve large tracts of land. From a financial standpoint, it makes sense to cluster them as much as they can. Commissioner Sheets asked if one to two acres lots are impractical? Mr. Critchfield said they see subdivisions that have that kind of request, but he deferred to the city engineer about the practicality of the cost.

Commissioner Villafana referenced attachment F30; he said he likes the idea of the city having higher density housing and expanding from the inside out. Those fields inside the city limits that are still being farmed; is there any incentives provided to develop those areas? Mr. Critchfield said planning responds to development requests to define where they should go to help create as much compatibility as possible. Any project has to meet the future land use map in order to not create a spot zone. He said inside the city limits, any agricultural area has to meet certain standards, outside the city limits but in the area of city impact, that could be farmed in perpetuity. The city is not going to tell farmers they have to get out because the city wants to develop it. Mr. Critchfield said there are a number of infill areas inside the city limits and they are encouraging people to infill before they move outside the city. They are not going to force people to annex in if they didn't want to unless they need to have utility connections.

Commissioner Dorsey said agriculture in a city is a little counterintuitive to him. He would feel better if it was called 'open space'. In his opinion, this is urban sprawl and is wasting agricultural land. He asked why is it called agricultural? Mr. Critchfield said at some point in the process, they posted to the community that they were changing the agricultural designation to low density residential. There was pushback from the public on changing it even though none of the definitions or terms under the title changed. Not changing the definition was largely responding to public opinion. He said responding to urban sprawl is the reason they are expanding the area of city impact; to help define land uses such that they are not creating subdivisions scattered all over the place. They are trying to grow in an orderly fashion. He said they are not interested in sprawl; they are interested in building density within the city limits and infill areas. As they slowly grow, they will have definition on what is supposed to happen in those areas.

Commissioner Williamson said he mentioned setbacks for agriculture. He asked what the setbacks are that the city imposes on distance (for agriculture). Mr. Critchfield said he didn't know but the agriculture definition is only within the city limits, not the area of city influence.

Commissioner Dorsey asked if there was concern that keeping some of the open spaces in the city impact would lead development to push further out. He asked is there anything they can do to mitigate that? Mr. Critchfield explained the annexation requirements, process and how it progresses. He said there are some enclaved areas.

Chairman Sturgill asked where their water will be drawn from to serve this area. Mr. Critchfield referred the question to the city engineer who would be testifying next. Chairman Sturgill asked if the city believed their expansion will be inhibited in the future based on the availability of water. Mr. Critchfield deferred the question to the city engineer.

Daniel Badger – IN FAVOR – 500 12th Ave. South, Nampa ID 83651

Mr. Badger is the city engineer who works on the city's utilities. The city's master plan determines the locations, needs and the size needed. He showed the sewer master plans on a map. He said there will be

a new lift station constructed with the Middlebury subdivision and is within the city limits. The south area will be served by the existing Middleton trunk. Mr. Badger said generally speaking, domestic water is one half mile west of Middleton Road. Their domestic water master plan identifies the need for a new groundwater source as they grow out into the area, in 2040 or beyond. The city does a water rights study and works with Idaho Department of Water Resources on their 'Reasonable Anticipated Future Needs' (RAFN) water rights study. They work on acquiring the water rights well in advance. The city is not concerned about them; they believe they have the water rights they need and are constantly evaluating that. They work with IDWR and their groundwater modeling and keep up with the anticipated uses and needs throughout the city.

MOTION: Commissioner Sheets moved to grant 2 more minutes of testimony to Daniel Badger, seconded by Commissioner Nevill. Voice vote, motion carried.

Mr. Badger continued: he said the population in that area is about 6000. The majority (80%) are in the city limits and the current area of city influence. In answer to the questions about the lavender farm and the unused gravel pit; they met a couple of times with the property owners and discussed converting the gravel pit to soccer fields when they were finished and continuing to operate the lavender farm.

Commissioner Nevill asked about southern area and sewer and water. He asked if they were subservice water rights. Mr. Badger said yes, it was subservice and groundwater rights and said the southern area is not where they would need those, it is likely on the western area. Commissioner Nevill asked if there were hook up fees when they extend those services. Mr. Badger said yes, and he explained the costs associated with hooking up with water. Commissioner Nevill asked if city services become available, does the city require property owners to hook up to the city. Mr. Badger said the city code does not require homeowners with an existing residence to connect to city services just because they are adjacent to those services. The only time they are forced into that is because of state code; if a sewer line becomes available and a septic system fails, they are required to connect to the city's system. Commissioner Nevill asked how the city feels about some of the enclaved areas still retaining their old septic systems. Mr. Badger said the city takes a long view on that; at some point the services will be needed. They will create a new local improvement district to fund the installation of gravity sewers and water mains. Commissioner Nevill asked what the typical hook up fee is. Mr. Badger said water, sewer and irrigation costs about \$9000 for a new connection. Commissioner Nevill asked about irrigation and how the city is moving away from the irrigation water to another (city) source. Mr. Badger said the city has its own municipal irrigation district that overlays the local flood district. He explained how someone migrates from their irrigation district to the city's irrigation district and how the resident is billed. There was additional discussion about adding soccer fields to the existing gravel pit.

Commissioner Sheets thanked Mr. Badger for the population numbers. He said those people could be politically impacted; they can't vote for people in the city but the city can influence decisions at the County level. The city is not accountable to those people who live in the area of city impact. Commissioner Sheets asked what the water treatment plant capacity was now. Mr. Badger said the water treatment plan has a capacity of 18 million gallons per day. In their waste water treatment plant master plan, they feel there is adequate capacity with future upgrades and they are currently in the middle of an upgrade now. Mr. Badger explained where the waste water treatment plant was located.

Commissioner Williamson clarified that when Mr. Badger spoke about the 'flood district', he meant the irrigation district. Commissioner Williamson asked about how the irrigation water is distributed. Mr. Badger explained how the city puts in regional pump stations that can handle a larger volume of water but are using the same canal delivery system. The canals direct the water to their pump stations and through the city's pressurized irrigation system.

Chairman Sturgill said he had some concerns about the water supply. He didn't hear about any modeling of long term water supply and the re-charge rates of aquifers. He said maybe that isn't the city's responsibility but his concern is the city will acquire water rights and provide water to these homes until

there is a water emergency in this part of the valley then there are draconian restrictions imposed on existing users because the city overbuilt based on the existing water supply. He asked if his concern was well founded. Mr. Badger said the city works with the Idaho Department of Water Resources who does the groundwater modeling to identify the city's future needs and put those into their models. They are active with them and continually updating them with their future needs, and based on those modeling activities with IDWR and those that the city has done on their own, he is comfortable that they have adequate groundwater supply to serve the needs of the area along with the city of Caldwell. He said his discussions with the individual with IDWR who does the modeling, they don't anticipate any problems within any reasonable timeframe.

Commissioner Dorsey said Idaho code says they can't deny residential or city water but they can deny new irrigation wells for agriculture. Is he talking about the water table or the ability to get a permit? Mr. Badger said he is speaking of the groundwater model and what they anticipate in that area, not the permitting of it. Commissioner Dorsey asked since they will have agriculture in Nampa, what steps were they taking to prevent individuals from taking groundwater from being used as irrigation water, using city water sources from ground water instead of surface water right irrigation. Mr. Badger said 90% of their irrigation water is surface water; there are very few irrigation wells using groundwater. They require if there are surface water rights, those must be used. If they don't have a surface water right, they must have a groundwater right to be served from the municipal irrigation district. City code does not allow the use of their domestic water system for irrigation with very few exceptions.

Rodney Ashby – IN FAVOR – 500 12th Ave. South, Nampa ID 83651

Mr. Ashby would like to follow up with the last discussion. Nampa was the leader last year to start a water conservation committee, bringing in agencies to identify specific ways to preserve surface water. He said they have seen a dramatic decrease in the amount of irrigation water used in the last year. When they talk about agriculture in the city, they don't want to portray it to the Commission that it is Nampa's interest to have large plots of land for agricultural production. He said that isn't the role of the city and hasn't been the role of the city. The city's use of the term 'Agriculture' is a misnomer, which is why they wanted to change the name to 'very low density residential'. The city has multiple ways to try to preserve as much agricultural land as possible, for as long as possible and one way they do that is infill development. Their comprehensive plan speaks to infill development as the primary way to preserve agricultural land. He said if it was left up to the Nampa city planners, they would grow as much density in the core of their community, as dense as reasonable, to preserve the agricultural land that would remain in the county. Mr. Ashby said development of land is not just planners' decision, it's a political process as well and has to accommodate the rights of property owners and their wishes to develop their properties.

MOTION: Commissioner Nevill moved to grant 2 more minutes of testimony to Rodney Ashby, seconded by Commissioner Sheets. Voice vote, motion carried.

Mr. Ashby continued: He said their hope is for a collaborative process. In 2008, they coordinated with the County and the city of Caldwell to negotiate the boundary between Caldwell and Nampa. It's their intent to continue that collaboration to plan for growth instead of being reactive to development.

Commissioner Villafana asked if the city is incentivizing anyone to build up (multi-stories) not out, especially in the downtown areas. There is a demand for condos and he saw that Nampa grew by 4000 in 2022. Mr. Ashby said there are no specific incentives but they have outlined a goal in their Comprehensive Plan to create that density. They have specific area plans identifying locations where development like that should go. They are looking at some areas in north Nampa for that. The only process incentives they have is that it is supported by their Comprehensive Plan, which was updated in 2020, and it was the first time it really addressed density.

Commissioner Sheets asked what plans the city of Nampa have for legacy areas that are ½ to 2 acres that are in the expansion area? He restated his question: What are their plans for type B and C annexations

(which are annexations without the homeowner's consent)? What is the city's plan for those parcels that are less than 5 acres and those communities? Mr. Ashby said they don't like the term 'forced annexation' and they have no intention of forcing anyone to annex in. There have been some instances in the far distant past when that occurred but that was a different council and a different time. He assures the Commissioner that his discussions with the mayor and city council indicate there are no plans for that to happen. Commissioner Sheets asked Mr. Ashby if he was talking about current property rights or speculative property rights. Mr. Ashby said he wasn't speaking about either one; it was probably both. Commissioner Sheets asked what would be the city's position if the expansion of area of influence proposal doesn't go through. Mr. Ashby said he couldn't speak from the mayor or the council's perspective but there isn't really a solution for them to do anything; it is up to the County to approve it. They will continue to plan for the area.

Commissioner Nevill said it was incredibly important to hear from the city of Nampa in writing when the Commission hears cases in their city of impact. He thinks it is a good idea that there is as much cooperation as possible between the county and the city. Mr. Ashby said their impact area requires the County contact them for comment on development in those areas whereas they are not required to contact them outside the impact area. The expansion of the impact area allows them to coordinate with the County on those issues. He agreed (it was important) and they will continue to make comments and send them to the County.

Commissioner Williamson asked about re-naming the Agricultural designation in the city. There was discussion about the designation of the agriculture zoning in the city and the history of trying to change the name. Mr. Ashby said they try to talk about "open space" versus calling it agriculture. Commissioner Williamson asked what happens to the existing homes' ground water rights if a resident ties into the City Water system. Mr. Ashby deferred to the city engineer for comment on that.

Daniel Badger – IN FAVOR – 500 12th Ave. South, Nampa ID 83651 (recalled to testify)

Mr. Badger said in reference to the question on groundwater rights, if a property owner is changing from an individual well to the city water system, the city requires the property owner to disconnect the well from the home so there is no cross-connection. There are some situations where they can use it for their irrigation, but in many cases, they will abandon or cap the well. The property owner would still retain the water right and could sell it, although it might not be worth much.

Elizabeth Allen – IN FAVOR – 1330 Williams Lane Nampa ID 83686

Ms. Allen was working at the County when they were having discussions about Nampa's area of impact expansion. County staff did a lot of work on it and she is in favor of it. She said the expansion of the area of influence could provide the opportunity for transfer of development rights for infill projects. While she was working on projects for the County she spoke to Deer Flat Wildlife Refuge and they told her that they couldn't comment on land uses that are outside their property boundaries.

Commissioner Nevill said that (no comment from Deer Flat Wildlife Refuge) didn't use to be the case. In the early 2000's, they had Refuge staff in (for hearings) quite often and they spoke passionately about the impacts of too much housing too close to the preserve. He asked what changed. Ms. Allen said the refusal to comment was a policy on the Refuge's side. She said she wasn't sure at what level that decision was made but they couldn't comment. She was told that directly by Refuge staff.

Commissioner Sheets asked where they would find that sort of documentation. Commissioner Sheets said he didn't see Deer Flat Wildlife Refuge on the notification list for this particular application. Ms. Allen said staff would have to clarify but on something like this, they would be notified. She received the information on the no comment policy via correspondence from the Wildlife Refuge when she was working for the County. It might be helpful to get a formal letter from them about their comment policy.

Commissioner Mathews asked Ms. Allen if they were putting an airport by the Refuge, the birds and airplanes would be a danger (to each other). Ms. Allen said she believes if that were to happen, the FAA

would step in and she didn't believe that their regulations would allow an airport to be located next to a wildlife refuge.

Planning Official Dan Lister reminded the Commissioners that this was simply a boundary adjustment and there was no agreement that would come with it. Any future planning will come later. The County's Comprehensive Plan would supersede it and the city of Nampa would have 30 days to comment on any development proposals.

MOTION: Commissioner Nevill moved to close public testimony on Case OR2023-0002, seconded by Commissioner Williamson. Voice vote, motion carried.

DELIBERATION:

Commissioner Nevill said all his concerns had been addressed and the city has answered all his questions even when the questions weren't directly related to the city of impact area expansion but were things they all wanted to know. He is most pleased with the fact that all they are doing is giving an opportunity for cooperation to occur and other final decisions will determine actual land uses. Given that, he is in favor of this proposal.

Commissioner Sheets said there are three factors to look at: trade area, the geographic factors and the areas that can be reasonably expected to be annexed into the city in the future. He said based on those three factors, sufficient evidence from the staff report and the testimony received that night exists that those three requirements are met. Based on that information, he is in favor.

MOTION: Commissioner Williamson moved to recommend approval of Case OR2023-0002, including the Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval, forwarding the recommendation to the Board of Canyon County Commissioners. Motion seconded by Commissioner Nevill. Roll call vote: 7 in favor, 0 opposed, motion passed.

- **Case No. CU2022-0031/Tyler Toups:** Anna Canning with Centurion Engineers, representing Tyler Toups, is requesting a conditional use permit for RV storage located on parcel R34738010. The requested use includes up to 48 RV, trailer, and boat spots and does not include any structures. The northern half of the parcel, which is the proposed site of the RV storage, is zoned "C-1" (Neighborhood Commercial). The subject property is located at 22906 Channel Rd, Caldwell.

Planner Madelyn Vander Veen reviewed the Staff report for the record.

Chairman Robert Sturgill affirmed the witnesses to testify.

Testimony:

David Crawford – Applicant (Representative) – IN FAVOR – 2323 S. Vista Ave. #206 Boise, ID 83705

Mr. Crawford is with Centurion Engineers. This is an outdoor storage facility and they have asked to change the hours to 8 am to 10 pm. Most storage facilities operate on a 24 hour basis, but the owner has no desire to operate that way. The owner is a long haul truck driver and he lives on the portion of the site that is zoned agricultural. They intend to comply with all the conditions of approval except for the hours of operation which they are requesting be changed. They held a neighborhood meeting on the site and most neighbors were generally in agreement, however they had a subsequent conversation with a neighbor who didn't want any development next to them. They feel a storage facility is a great neighbor; particularly one that shuts down at 10 pm. It has low traffic volumes and people just need to be able to

get there after using their boat at the lake. There will be no effluent disposal on site: it would have to be taken care of at appropriate effluent stations offsite.

Commissioner Nevill asked if there was any information on how long RVs or boats take to get up to speed if they are leaving the facility and pulling onto the highway. Do they have any concerns about concerns over traffic if they are coming west on Highway 44 and have to stop for opposing traffic? Is there any way for traffic to get around (them)? Mr. Crawford said he has no information on that, he is not a traffic analysis guy and they rely on the traffic governing body to dictate what goes on. As a civil engineering firm, what they are used to is if there are any concerns about a normal 'T type' intersection that the highway district may have, especially with special vehicles, they will impose a condition when they have the opportunity, if they believe one is required. They can ask for additional right of way or even widening of the road to add a center turn lane but they didn't see any of that here.

Commissioner Williamson asked, in his experience with highway districts, do they take future growth into consideration when they do these analyses. Mr. Crawford said in his experience, yes, they do. Over time, there is volume added to roads due to growth but they didn't see any of that here.

Commissioner Nevill asked if Mr. Crawford had been on site. Mr. Crawford said no. Commissioner Nevill pointed out that there seems to be very little shoulder on the south side of the road; did he have any idea if there was any shoulder on the north side of the road. Mr. Crawford said the person who did the site visit and was supposed to be here tonight, went on vacation. Mr. Crawford had not been to the site.

Planner Madelyn Vander Veen showed some photos that showed some room on the side of the road; Commissioner Nevill clarified that he was talking about the barrow pit.

Chairman Sturgill asked if the owner be managing the storage facility as he lives on site. Mr. Crawford said yes, he will be managing it when he is there. When he is gone, his wife will be managing it.

Commissioner Sheets clarified that there will be no services (water, sewer); it will be a concrete surface. Mr. Crawford said it will be compacted gravel and it is really only intended as a pick up and drop off location. Commissioner Sheets asked if he would oppose adding a condition #12 that stated they will actively prohibit discharge or storage of effluent on the premises. Mr. Crawford said they were not opposed to that but that he felt the biggest deterrent is just not having a place to do it. Commissioner Sheets said if he wasn't opposed to it, he is not opposed to it.

Commissioner Mathews asked if there were going to be assigned spaces. Mr. Crawford said he wasn't aware of assigned spaces.

MOTION: Commissioner Williamson moved to close public testimony on Case CU2022-0031, seconded by Commissioner Villafana. Voice vote, motion carried.

DELIBERATION:

Commissioner Nevill said he was really concerned about turning off of Highway 44. He understands that Idaho Transportation Department was only concerned about signs but he feels this was a perfect example of a request that needs to be postponed until the applicant gets an answer from ITD on the turn. They do have written testimony from someone who said cars go around on the shoulder which he felt was dangerous. He has no problem with the use but he thinks there is a big problem with not getting comments from ITD on the turn. They are talking about RVs and boats which move out at 5 mph until they get up to speed. He believes they should think about postponing the item.

Commissioner Sheets said he would like to add condition #12 to it which would state, "RV storage facility shall actively discourage and prohibit any effluent discharge within the storage facility".

Director of Development Services Sabrina Minshall said the word "discourage" would be challenging but part of that is what the applicant can do to hold the person accountable. She suggested the wording that said "the applicant will add to all lease agreements a clear statements that it is not allowed or they will be removed." Commissioner Sheets provided specific wording to add to the conditions of approval regarding effluent discharge.

Commissioner Williamson said they only have testimony about other RV boat storage facilities operating 24 hours per day. He said 8 am to 10 pm makes some sense if someone is coming from Lake Lowell. He was thinking about people coming from Lake Cascade or Lake Payette, which is when the 10 pm (closing) makes a lot more sense. He said there are some places that open earlier because people want to be out and, on the road, earlier to get to their destination by 8 am. He is comfortable with the 8 am to 10 pm. Commissioner Sheets pointed out that there are three different hours of operation in the application, staff report and the conditions of approval. The planner explained the genesis of the change in hours of operation. Commissioner Sheets pointed out that with the extended hours of operation (8 am to 10 pm), the public didn't have a chance to see that and comment on those hours. He said he was comfortable with 8 am to 6 pm.

MOTION: Commissioner Nevill moved to postpone Case CU2022-0031 until such time as the applicant can receive from the Idaho Transportation Department an answer to the question about acceleration and turn lanes off Highway 44. Motion seconded by Commissioner Mathews. There was discussion about the motion to postpone about adding information on the extended hours. Roll call vote: 6 in favor, 1 opposed, motion passed.

MOTION: Commissioner Nevill later modified the motion to postpone Case CU2022-0031 to a date certain of **August 3, 2023**. Motion seconded by Commissioner Mathews. Roll call vote: 7 in favor, 0 opposed, motion passed.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

MOTION: Commissioner Nevill moved to approve the minutes from 6/1/2023, seconded by Commissioner Sheets. Voice vote, motion carried.

DIRECTOR, PLANNER, COMMISSION COMMENTS:

Planning Official Dan Lister reminded the Commission of the Board workshops coming up:
July 27th at 2:30 pm: Workshop with the city of Middleton regarding their Area of City Influence and development goals and;

August 17th at 2:30 pm: Private Road discussion.

Director of Development Services Sabrina Minshall said they are working on getting a workshop with Idaho Transportation Department and the Board which is tentatively scheduled for August 3rd at 2:30 pm. ITD reached out to Canyon County about the topic on development impact fees and proportionate shares between ITD and local cities. She said ITD is working on the third corridor study for Highway 44. She thanked Chairman Sturgill and Commissioner Mathews for attending the Fire District workshop a couple of weeks ago and discussed some of the concerns that came out of that workshop. Director Minshall said they were going back to the Board the next week and hopefully again in August to discuss the Comprehensive Plan with the Commissioners.

Commissioner Mathews and Chairman Sturgill discussed what they learned from the fire workshop including statistics about smoke alarms and fire sprinklers. There was additional discussion about some of the concerns brought up during the workshop by fire districts.

ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION: Commissioner Sheets moved to adjourn, seconded by Commissioner Mathews. Voice vote, motion carried. Hearing adjourned at 9:41 pm.