#### PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

MINUTES • August 1, 2016

**FINAL** 

City Hall - Council Chambers

6:00PM

### COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT

- □ Rich Demarest, Chair
- ⊠ Milt Gillespie, Vice-Chair
- $\boxtimes$  Stephen Bradbury
- ⊠ Douglas Gibson
- ⊠ Jennifer Stevens
- ⊠ Tamara Ansotegui

#### PDS MEMBERS PRESENT

Scott Spjute, Cody Riddle, David Moser, Celine Acord, Susan Riggs, Todd Tucker, Brianna McNall, Teri Thompson, and Andrea Carroll (Legal).

### **<u>PUD16-00019</u>** / Affordable Housing Solutions

Location: 3119 W. Moore Street

Conditional use permit for a 50-unit planned residential development on a 3.1 acre site located in an R-2 (Medium Density Residential) zone. <u>*Cody Riddle*</u>

Cody Riddle (City of Boise): Thank you Mr. Chairman, Commissioners. This application is a request for a conditional use permit for a 50-unit planned unit development comprised of 6 apartment buildings, an office, community center, maintenance building, and site amenities. Those amenities include a sports court, outdoor play structure, community garden space and then patio space. The approximately 3-acre site is located at 3119 W Moore St. in an R-2 or medium density residential zone. The site, as well as all the surrounding properties, are within the boundaries of the 30<sup>th</sup> St. master plan. It abuts Whitewater Park Blvd. where future expansion to transit or bus services plan. Because the site abuts an arterial, has access to transit, a density of up to 20 units per acre is permissible. That would potentially allow up to 61 units on the property. The applicant is proposing 50 at a density of roughly 16 units an acre. The project does include the extension of 32<sup>nd</sup> St. It will be improved with curb, gutter, and a detached sidewalk. The applicant is also proposing to install new curb, gutter, and detached sidewalk along Moore, and then Whitewater Blvd, as you know, was recently improved. As outlined in your report, this is an appropriate location for multi-family residential development. The site is in a transitional location between Ester Simplot Park and Whitewater Park Blvd and then the predominantly single-family residential neighborhood to the East. As detailed in your report, the project is consistent with Blueprint Boise and the 30<sup>th</sup> St. Masterplan. The design is also consistent with the standards for multi-family residential development. We are aware of opposition to the project. That opposition appears to focus on density,

MINUTES • August 1, 2016

City Hall – Council Chambers

6:00PM

#### FINAL

traffic, and then also some of the income status of potential residents. It's not our place to tell you what you should or shouldn't consider this evening, but I thought it would be a good time to remind you of the approval criteria you need to base this decision on tonight. You need to find that the project is compatible with other uses in the neighborhood. That the project won't place an undue burden on transportation or other services. That the site is large enough to accommodate the project. That it will not adversely, from a land use perspective, will not adversely impact other properties, and that it complies with the comprehensive plan and design guidelines. As detailed in your report, we believe the project clearly meets all the objective criteria and we also believe there is clear policy support for the proposal. The project is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. The area is comprised of a diverse mix of uses, including commercial, office, and residential. It will add another housing choice to the neighborhood. Additional residents will be within walking distance of numerous services, amenities, and employment opportunities. Correspondence in your packet confirms the project will not place an undue burden on transportation or other public services. No public agency has voiced opposition to the request and all of their requirements have been incorporated into the conditions of approval before you this evening. The site is large enough to accommodate the proposed use. The density does not exceed the limits of the zone. All height and setback standards have been met and no variances are included in the request. The project includes 82 parking spaces where 69 are required and as required includes 50 bicycle parking spaces, or one for every unit. The project exceeds the requirement for two amenities. In fact, it's a better amenity package then we see with most projects. Includes a community center building, basketball court, playground, patio space, and raised planters for community gardening. While you'll hear testimony to the contrary this evening, from a land use perspective we don't believe this will adversely impact surrounding properties. In fact, it's in an ideal location for this kind of project between a public park and transportation corridor and a residential neighborhood. It abuts right-of-way on three of four sides that will provide a good transition to adjacent properties. The one location where it does abut single-family residential is at the southeast corner. As detailed in your report, the required transitional setback has been provided in that location and additional buffering in the form of fencing and landscaping will further mitigate any impact. It's also important to note that there are no upper level balconies on that elevation. Finally, parking and trash services have all been located interior to the site to further mitigate impact. Finally, as detailed in your report, we believe the project is certainly supported by policy that includes Blueprint Boise and the 30<sup>th</sup> St. Masterplan. Not going to recite all the numerous policies that were included in your report, but both emphasize the importance of higher density housing and specifically mention this location. So, in conclusion, we are recommending approval of the project. We believe it's compliant with the approval criteria for a conditional use permit and that there is also significant policy support for the proposal. Before you get into testimony this evening, I'd like to remind you again, your approval criteria have been provided on the screen. Thank you.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you Cody. Is the applicant ready?

#### PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

#### MINUTES • August 1, 2016

6:00PM

#### FINAL

**Bob Reed (2721 W Bellagio Drive, Meridian)**: There will be two of us tonight talking on behalf of the owner. My name is Bob Reed, I'm the developer. This development, we have designed this to meet afford...

Chairman Gillespie: Mr. Reed, could you read your address into the record please?

Bob Reed (2721 W Bellagio Drive, Meridian): Yes, sir. 2721 W Bellagio Drive in Meridian.

Chairman Gillespie: Mr. Reed, would 15 minutes between the two of you be sufficient?

Bob Reed (2721 W Bellagio Drive, Meridian): I think that should work fine.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you.

#### **APPLICANT TESTIMONY**

Bob Reed (2721 W Bellagio Drive, Meridian): We're looking to build 50 developments, primarily affordable housing. We're looking at doing one, two, three, and four bedroom units. This will actually be built to accommodate a wide variety of income levels from a 30% level all the way up to a 50% level. That basically is looking at those at the lower end somewhere around a fifteen thousand dollars a year income. On the upper end, somewhere in the range of about thirty-six thousand. Rents will range from about two ninety on the low end to about seven seventy-five on the upper end. We'll have a wide variety of amenities as Cody has talked about. We've got some market-rate units as well. We've really listened to what the neighborhood had to say as far as a neighborhood meeting. To accommodate that, we've gone through and added some market-rate units, put some fencing line around the project itself, moved a couple of buildings to not be quite so bearing on the neighborhood itself. Also, we have a side entrance which will be beneficial as far as providing a very residential look on Moore St. as well as Whitewater Park Blvd. I think this makes a great deal of sense. We're going to provide a number of services to the residents as well. As far as after school activities, there will be some seminars and so forth put on to try to assist residents to look for ways to improve themselves in the job market through resume writing. Could be some health clinics put on. Nutrition. Those types of activities. We generally go out and actually get a survey from the residents themselves to find out what type of services they would like to have and design something to fit that need at that point in time. So I'd like, at this point in time, to go ahead and have our architect, Jim Glancy come up. He's got a PowerPoint presentation to kind of go through a little bit about the site itself.

**Jim Glancy (595 Americana Blvd. Boise):** Good evening Commissioners. My name is Jim Glancy. I'm the architect for the project. I'm representing Affordable Housing Solutions.

Chairman Gillespie: Mr. Glancy?

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

MINUTES • August 1, 2016

#### City Hall – Council Chambers

6:00PM

#### FINAL

Jim Glancy (595 Americana Blvd. Boise): Yes?

Chairman Gillespie: Could you give us your address for the record please?

**Jim Glancy (595 Americana Blvd. Boise)**: My address is 595 Americana Blvd, Boise. Will this mouse work up here? Okay. Okay. Is that better? Okay. Basically, Cody's went through all this. Three-acre site, R-2 zoning, fifty units. We have six buildings. Thirteen one-bedrooms, twenty-one two-bedrooms, eleven three-bedrooms, and five four-bedrooms. Along with the community center, eighty-two parking spaces and we're looking at LEED certification. We're aiming for LEED platinum. We're at LEED gold level now so we anticipate but, we hope to go platinum. Following I'm going to kind of go over our approach to the site design. Let me see if I can enlarge this screen.

Jim Glancy (595 Americana Blvd. Boise): Okay. Thank you. So, we went through the site. Basic parameters I'd like to point out is we started off on the west side. We have, we're bounded by Whitewater Blvd and Ester Simplot Park. On the East, the red arrows indicating Moore St. and the dash red line on the North is the 32<sup>nd</sup> St. extension that we had approved the other night with ACHD. So, City wanted the extension and we totally are in agreement with that for connectivity of the neighborhood and I believe it helps this site and the neighbors as well. So the project as we designed it, we, shown in red, that the buildings around the perimeter of the site. We tried to align the buildings on the major street thoroughfares, on Moore St. as well as Whitewater Blvd. We have a singular vehicular access which is more than adequate for the fifty multiple family units we're providing. And that will be situated where the arrow is on 32<sup>nd</sup> St. This should minimize the traffic throughout the neighborhood although it's a right-in right only on 32<sup>nd</sup> due to the median on Whitewater. It still will significantly reduce any traffic through the neighborhood. There also allows for us to gain more street frontage for the buildings along Moore St. We tried to integrate the design such that the massing of the buildings will be the larger building are along Whitewater Blvd. As you can see, these elevations are the Whitewater elevations. They're three stories high and perspective looking down Whitewater. Then along Moore St. side we reduced them to two stories trying to fit more, be more appealing to the residential neighborhood that exists where there is single story and two story homes at this time. Quite a few two story I should add. The planned 30<sup>th</sup> St. extension calls, I believe, for two to four story in this neighborhood. It also, we're adjacent to the ITD district which calls for up to six story. So we're, I think well within the building height limitations as Cody pointed out. We also designed these such that the massing of the buildings, they're shallower, they're only single unit deep so we don't have massive roofs overpowering the adjacent properties. I can see, this is kind of a typical footprint. Again, I'm showing there's basically a plate with four units there. It would be twelve units on the Whitewater side or eight units on the Moore St. side. There's connectivity through from the streets through the interior that arrow showing there's a pathway connecting. There's actually an iron gateway that creates a sense of entry on the street sides. The balconies that you see on the lower side of the floorplans are all faced to the interior of the site so we don't have residential balconies on the street like you may see on many apartment projects. We also want to keep children, if there's children in the homes, keep them to the interior of the project rather than going out toward the street. This

MINUTES • August 1, 2016

#### City Hall - Council Chambers

6:00PM

#### FINAL

is a continuation of the site plan and what's showing here you can see the connectivity between the site. Again, we have access points this is the main access and these other red lines show the pathways that go through the buildings into the interior of the sites. The red line on the south is a six-foot fence that creates a buffer to the residential properties to the South. These points, I wanted to point this out is, the project being three sided, although there is only one vehicular access, the buildings have basically, are fronting on streets like any other single-family residence with full access for fire and emergency vehicles along the street as well as the interior. There are also pedestrian accesses throughout the buildings as pointed out. This next shot is showing a highlighted area on the southeast are amenities. It's pointed out there's a community building that is community residential pitch-in open space that can be used for multifunctions. There's a leasing area; on-site property manager will be there at all times. There's also an exercise room, computer center, community garden to the side of the community buildings. Sports court, which we had moved further away from the property line to help mitigate sound to the neighbors. Play structure off the patio area. And there's patio bar-b-que area in the center. There's also an open lawn area to the south for children to play. Additional amenities have been pointed out by Cody, as far as walking distance to the park and the greenbelt proximity to many services their plans we would have a bus stop right here at the northwest corner so we feel this is an ideal site. We met with the neighborhood. One impact, one of the neighbors is impacted more than I think the rest of the neighborhood definitely and its residence right here which will be impacted with a new street in front of her home. We also had a three story structure there on the corner, graphing the corner. We've modified the design, as Bob was speaking, to create a two story structure here on the corner. We also put more landscaping, created more of a landscape buffer at this corner so we just, to help mitigate the impact where she's used to having this open space. It's going to be housing of some type so we tried to put the lowest density housing so it's one bedroom units there and they're two stories high. We also shifted the entry further. We had approval from ACHD, but we went as far to the west as we possibly could and our engineer [unknown word 22:37] got it kind of aligned so that we got approval so that it doesn't have as much impact of the traffic coming in and out to her house. So that was one of the things we did try to mitigate things from our original neighborhood meeting. Some of the other items included, we couldn't accommodate, there was a request for a greenbelt path through, but we have a new street path that will give them access. Currently people walk across the site. There's dirt paths through the site. So I think it'll actually be a benefit to the neighborhood. Last thing I'd like to do is go over briefly the building design. As we said, the buildings will be LEED, will be energy efficient, healthy environments and building materials. We used shed roofs we thought that was, we'd select those as kind of a whimsical, it gives some dynamic form, we felt, to the buildings. Kind of the gull-winged characteristics seemed appropriate for Sandhill Crane Apartments on the waterfront. These roofs also will articulate the entries. You can see on some of these renderings there's, we have a reverse pitch which really accentuates the entry procession for all the units. The rooflines also helped us break up the roofs as well as screen all the mechanical units are on the roof, we don't have them on the ground, so they're all be screened by the shed roofs. It also offered us an opportunity to have a variety of roofs that can have solar panels if we so desire. We looked at the option of putting PV panels, the site does not have a true north/south orientation, but by manipulating the roofs,

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

MINUTES • August 1, 2016

City Hall – Council Chambers

6:00PM

#### FINAL

we actually gain more southern exposure. We don't know if that's in the budget yet or not. This is just another view. We have a 3-D model kind of showing the buildings a little bit better. Again, the buildings are designed single depth, so when you're in the unit you have views to the street. A parent has a street view. They're balconies are on the back and they also have views toward the community center and the parking areas. The buildings will be built of high quality durable materials and the majority of the exteriors are clad in brick while the remainder are cement board siding. Roofing will be thirty to fortyyear comp shingles. The soffits, we're using a natural wood. We feel that it appropriate, it's protected from the sun and moisture and will add some quality and warmth as well as being appropriate material for native material Idaho in the Northwest. This is the end of my presentation. Thank you for your time and I did say that we're full support, the staff report we had no issues and available for any questions you may have.

**Bob Reed (2721 W Bellagio Drive, Meridian)**: Once the public hearings are all concluded and so forth, everyone's given testimony, if there's a chance, the owner would like to have chance for maybe rebuttal at the very end?

Chairman Gillespie: He will.

Bob Reed (2721 W Bellagio Drive, Meridian): Thank you very much.

Chairman Gillespie: He will. Questions from the Commission for the applicant or staff?

Commissioner Stevens: Mr. Chair.

Chairman Gillespie: Commissioner Stevens.

**Commissioner Stevens:** I want to start by addressing one of the letters we got from the public with regard to one of the land use maps for this area. Just want to clear up the record a little bit to make sure that we're all on the same page, so to speak. One of the letters we received indicated that one of the land use maps actually shows this as a different density, a fourteen unit per acre density, so I just was hoping, for the record, if you could just sort of clarify that. I know you mentioned it in your staff report, but if you could explain why the fourteen unit per acre density is not what's on this particular property, that would be great.

**Cody Riddle** (**City of Boise**): Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Stevens, the land use map identifies this site and a lot of property in the area as compact. That's just the general designation, the zoning itself it R-2 that typically allows fourteen and a half units an acre. The multi-family residential standards allow up to twenty units an acre anytime an R-2 site is along an arterial roadway that's also slated for future transit. This site is, and the applicant has agreed to a condition to actually install a concrete pad for a future bus stop for this project.

### PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

#### MINUTES • August 1, 2016

#### City Hall – Council Chambers

6:00PM

#### FINAL

**Commissioner Stevens**: Great, thank you. May I ask a second question? And I just wanted to clarify or not clarify, but just confirm that in fact ACHD did approve the punch out and the reason I'm asking is because their staff report indicates that they did not support it. So, if you could just update us on that and whether or not if you know if there's been any appeal filed at this point.

**Cody Riddle (City of Boise)**: Certainly Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Stevens. My report was completed prior to ACHD actually having a hearing. They did in fact approve the project with the 32<sup>nd</sup> St. extension. To my knowledge, it has yet to be appealed.

Commissioner Stevens: Okay. And when did that happen?

Cody Riddle (City of Boise): Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Stevens, I believe it was last Wednesday.

Commissioner Stevens: Great.

Commissioner Bradbury: Wednesday the 25<sup>th</sup>.

**Commission Stevens**: Thank you.

Chairman Gillespie: Any other questions for the applicant or staff?

Commissioner Gibson: Mr. Chairman

Chairman Gillespie: Commissioner Gibson

**Commissioner Gibson**: Two questions for the applicant. The first one's specific to your site plan exhibit A-02 where you have a, I'll call it a pochette or a darker area in the parking lot. In this exhibit it's the kind of the brown

Jim Glancy (595 Americana Blvd. Boise): Yes

Commissioner Gibson: Is that a permeable paving or a brick

Jim Glancy (595 Americana Blvd. Boise): It...

**Commissioner Gibson**: Paver application?

**Jim Glancy (595 Americana Blvd. Boise)**: It is permanent permeable pavers, we're considering permeable concrete or permeable pavers, right now it's pavers it's designed for until we get the full report we don't know what the design, but we know shallow ground water is a problem so we're looking at some sort of surface treatment rather than a lot of swales around the site.

#### PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

MINUTES • August 1, 2016

#### City Hall – Council Chambers

6:00PM

#### FINAL

**Commissioner Gibson**: Okay. One more follow up? Specific to the activity of the project to West Moore St., along Whitewater you made reference to some sort of decorative gate element or you know at the base of the structure at the breezeway. Did I hear that correctly?

Jim Glancy (595 Americana Blvd. Boise): Commissioner Gibson, I was referring to the awnings.

**Commissioner Gibson**: Okay.

**Jim Glancy**: I was referring to these elements here where we have the pilasters with the wood columns with the reverse shed roof and so the underside of that would be natural wood. I thought that would accent the entries.

**Commissioner Gibson**: Okay. So then as a follow up, so along the West Moore St., there's no intent for a lower fence or gate or anything that would prohibit interaction with the facilities, the building type (A) and the sidewalk along the public right of way?

**Jim Glancy (595 Americana Blvd. Boise)**: So, there was discussion about putting a low fence along Moore St. We may look at that coming back in an application. Currently, what we have is on the back side here will be a, it's like a rot iron gate. Basically it's a wire fabric gate that will be, you can pass through, but it should keep younger children in so it's basically a free access passage through there, but it's designed as a doorway, an entrance gate so for egress. We didn't want to put gates at the front of each.

**Commissioner Gibson**: Okay. Alright. That's what I wanted to make sure that was what I heard correctly.

Jim Glancy (595 Americana Blvd. Boise): Okay.

**Commissioner Gibson**: So, thank you.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you very much.

Jim Glancy (595 Americana Blvd. Boise): Thank you.

**Chairman Gillespie**: So now, we'll hear from the neighborhood association which is Veterans Park. Is there a representative of the Veterans Park Neighborhood Association? And you have up to fifteen minutes to chat.

Tyler Victorino (2112 Madison Ave. Boise Idaho 83702): Okay.

#### NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION TESTIMONY

**Tyler Victorino (2112 Madison Ave. Boise Idaho 83702)**: Alright. Thanks for your time tonight. My name's Tyler Victorino, I'm the president of the Veterans Park Neighborhood Association. My address is

MINUTES • August 1, 2016

#### City Hall - Council Chambers

6:00PM

#### FINAL

2112 Madison Ave. Boise Idaho 83702. So, this issue has been one that the neighborhood association has been really, had a pretty extensive discussion over. I'm relatively new to the position of president of the neighborhood association, but our long standing board members have basically indicated that this is the most significant opposition to a development that we've seen from our neighbors. So, you know, based on that we felt that we needed to make some sort of statement here tonight. So a hundred, at least a hundred of our neighbors have signed a petition against this proposed development and you know, having met with them and spoken with them, I want to say that I don't feel that the news coverage of what they've been saying has really accurately reflected their opinions and their willingness to work, work with you know, the ACHD, the City of Boise, Boise City, Ada County Housing Authority to develop a win-win situation. So that said, we have, the VPNA board has five main points that we have voted on and discussed addressing tonight. So the first of those points and I feel the kind of most, I guess the biggest problem from our perspective as a VPNA board, you know we really appreciate the changes that the neighborhood or that the developer and owner has made in regard to comments they received at the neighborhood meeting, but neighbors and specifically the VPNA board would have appreciated an opportunity to be involved with the planning of this development many months ago when it was first dreamed up. Besides the required public meeting notice and the public hearing notices we're not aware that BCACHA reached out to the VPNA board or to adjacent neighbors in the creation of this development plan. As a, as it is indicated, they should, in the 30<sup>th</sup> St. Masterplan and Blueprint Boise. Page twenty-one of the 30<sup>th</sup> St. Masterplan says increase housing, oh sorry, I'm skipping ahead. VPNA had requests for BCACHA to come and present at a special meeting of the VPNA board that we had to discuss this issue. They didn't reach out to us, we had to ask them to come give us their side of the story. Basically we had had a lot of neighbors coming to us with their issues and nothing from the owner's side of things. We really feel that had they, you know, reached out to us a long time ago and really worked with us during the design that we could've helped to mitigate a lot of the issues that have come up with the neighbors and, you know, helped gain support for the project. We're also of the opinion that the funding structure with investor backers has caused BCACHA to push the design plans through without exploring impacts to the neighborhood. The current funding structure does not allow them to lower their density because investors would not be able to get a return on investment that is worthwhile. And that's according to the BCACHA. So our second talking point is basically with regard to the 30<sup>th</sup> St. and opening 30<sup>th</sup> St. up to Whitewater Park. You know, we had, I wasn't there personally, but we did have a member of VPNA at the VP, or ACHD meeting on Monday and it was our sort of opinion as well, that they, as you said didn't seem to actually support opening 32<sup>nd</sup> St. and, you know, it seems, and their traffic studies don't strongly indicate there is a need to open up the 30<sup>th</sup> St. connection even if they did build the 50 plan, 50, you know 50-unit apartment complex as planned. So, you know, and I think it's definitely worth noting that, you know that it's been indicated here tonight that the, they felt the neighborhood was in support of this, but I think it was pretty clear at the planning meeting that they had for this and at least during conversations that I had that the neighborhood was pushing for a pedestrian pathway through  $32^{nd}$  not an actual road opening through  $32^{nd}$ . So that's, you know, the point we want to really indicate there is that we really want to make sure there's pedestrian access that's going to be a very

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

MINUTES • August 1, 2016

City Hall – Council Chambers

6:00PM

#### FINAL

important pedestrian access point for that whole neighborhood to get to Whitewater Park. In addition, we think it's really important that traffic calming be implemented within the neighborhood especially on Moore St. We know some of the, there's approximately 333 trips per day estimated that will be added in this area and basically we want the developer and the owner to address the dispute of cars going down through that neighborhood. Our third speaking point tonight is with regard to the 30<sup>th</sup> St., 30<sup>th</sup> St. Masterplan and its emphasis on stabilizing the neighborhood and providing more opportunities for home ownership. We want to make sure that work-force housing was a priority when we, we wanted to make sure work-force housing was a priority when we worked with the City of Boise to developed the 30<sup>th</sup> St. Masterplan. We feel that the BCACHA has ignored the neighborhood wishes which are outlined in the masterplan for work-force housing. Page 23 of the 30th St 21 of the 30th St Masterplan says increase housing affordable across a range of incomes within the planning area across all residential types including but not limited to apartments, condominiums, townhouses, duplex, duplexes, single-family houses, live-work units and cooperative and senior housing. The VPNA neighbors that we have spoken with are not in favor of putting more very low-income housing in a neighborhood that is over subscribed for the 60% and below AMI. Sandhill Crane provides forty-five more units in the 30% - 50% AMI. Work-force housing is typically nationally recognized at 60% - 120% of AMI. So, again we don't want the, you know, I hope this doesn't come across the wrong way because the VPNA overall, absolutely understands the need for more low-income housing, especially close to the down-town area. We do feel that, you know, and this basically leads into talking point number four, which is related to the resident services that we think that they should have to provide for a low income housing type of unit. You know, the developer indicated tonight that they, they plan to provide a survey once the housing unit opens up, they'd provide a survey and determine what kind of services that the residents needed at that time. And we really don't feel that's adequate. We think that they need to be prepared ahead of time with services that are going to be provided for those, you know, residents when they move in, not a year down the road after they've developed funding for that and found teachers for their classes and all the other things that need that go into putting together resident services. You know, I'd like to briefly compare it to the Trail Winds Apartment complex in Garden City where they are located next to the Boys and Girls Club of Ada County. And now obviously every apartment complex, low income, can't be located next to the Boys and Girls Club, but this was planned at, something they planned ahead of time and they were looking into, you know, this is another low income housing tax credit project so I think it's certainly worth them, it's something they need to look into. It's absolutely something they need to look into. And our fifth talking point today was, there are several large housing projects in the west end right now. We've got a 175-units total including Sand Hill Crane. 128 of those are proposed at the Boise Marine and they would have some transitional homeless housing. The Whitewater main development is also bringing high density housing to the neighborhood. We've got somewhere in the neighborhood of 50 to 150 units there, ten of those are to be affordable housing. And these developments we've heard nothing from the neighbors, virtually. I mean it's, you certainly don't have the kind of uproar that we're hearing about in this project. And, you know, these projects are a lesser percentages of income housing, but they are increasing income housing in the area with, you know, potentially without, and I don't know the exact fact on this but, potentially

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

MINUTES • August 1, 2016

City Hall – Council Chambers

6:00PM

#### FINAL

without increasing the percentage of low income housing in the area. They're increasing the amount of low income housing without creating undue burden on the area. So, you know, really in summary I want to touch on the points that were brought up at the very beginning here. This is a, this project is tasked with being compatible with other uses, no undue burden on transport, is to comply with comprehensive plan, and not have an adverse effect on other properties. I think we've addressed how we feel it doesn't necessarily comply entirely with the comprehensive plan and I think that the adverse effect on other properties will probably be testified by to a very, a variety of neighbors tonight. You know, and again I want to emphasize that we feel that this could have, you know, maybe not been avoided, but certainly we could have made this process a lot smoother had the housing authority and the developer reached out to VPNA, you know, months ago. And I think those were all my points, so, if you have any questions for me.

**Chairman Gillespie**: Thank you very much. Okay, so we'll go through the sign-up sheet and then after we go through the sign-up sheet anybody else who wants to testify will get a chance.

The first person on the sign-up sheet is Geoff Baker.

### **PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

Geoff Baker (3120 Moore): Hi my name is Geoff Baker. I live at 3120 Moore. Thanks for hearing my testimony today. I would like to start out by talking about some of the history of this site. There used to be three small houses about 800 square feet each. All these houses were purchased and demolished. Then in 2002, a project of 109 units was proposed by the Boise City Ada County Housing Authority. That was CAR01-00042 and CUP01-0019/Appeal. All the neighbors we talked to about at that time, about 100, opposed this unit going in. We took it to P and Z and stated our concerns about the poor fit with the neighborhood and it was three stories tall and this is an area adjacent to single-story houses on large lots. The other thing was it was placed in more subsidized affordable housing in this neighborhood when there's already abundance in the neighborhood. The narrow streets of just 32 feet wide of pavement also presented safety issues. There's usually parking on both sides of the street and it makes it very difficult for cars to pass each other. Usually someone's going to have to yield and at times you may even have to back up. Based on that, planning and zoning back then declined the conditional use permit for it. The applicant did appeal to the City Council and some of our Council members actually went down there and looked at the neighborhood and looked at the traffic issues and stated that's a real concern to get through there. So they also denied it and refused the appeal. A couple years went by and a new developer approached the neighbors and asked what might be acceptable. He came back and proposed 14 singlestory condominium-types and we agreed that was a good fit. Then ACHD did eminent domain on his property and took a large portion of it for the 30<sup>th</sup> St extension. Since then, the land has been undeveloped until now, and the neighborhood's changed quite a bit. Large amounts of infill have taken place and even though all these skinny units do have parking and garages in the back of them, they choose to park out on the street as convenience. So I'm worried about this project also parking out on the street for convenience.

#### PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

#### MINUTES • August 1, 2016

#### City Hall – Council Chambers

6:00PM

### FINAL

The applicant also states that no traffic survey is needed even though the last one done on  $32^{nd}$  was done in 2001 and that's the one being extended.  $31^{st}$ 

Brianna McNall (City of Boise): Time.

Geoff Baker (3120 Moore): I can't find one.

Chairman Gillespie: Mr. Baker, thank you.

Geoff Baker (3120 Moore): In conclusion I request you deny it.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you.

Geoff Baker (3120 Moore): Thank you.

Chairman Gillespie: Next person on the list is Liz Gatchel? And then after that will be Deslyn O'Dell.

**Liz Gatchel (3120 Moore St)**: Greetings, fellow Commissioners. The first thing that I'd like to do before I begin my testimony is I know there are several people here that have not signed up to speak if they are in opposition of this project.

Commissioner Stevens: Mr. Chair. There's no name. She hasn't stated her name.

Chairman Gillespie: Ms. Gatchel, could you state your name and address for the record.

**Liz Gatchel (3120 Moore St)**: Yes, my name is Liz Gatchel. I live at 3120 Moore St. I have been a resident in that neighborhood since 1990. I work at the VA Hospital, and have for over 16 years.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you.

**Liz Gatchel (3120 Moore St)**: Again, I'd like to ask that the people stand up in opposition to this if they would please because I know there are several that are not speaking. Thank you very much. One of the first thing I'd like to say is I am in complete opposition to this project. Again they did not address us. One of the major things that my husband started address is parking. They have stated on their application that there will be no on-street parking. When we had our neighborhood meeting, they said there would absolutely be on-street parking on Moore St. As we've already testified, the streets are only 32 in width. Part of ACHD's proposal stated to have a decent street section and right-of-way urban local street district policy 7207 dash or dot 5-2 states the standard street section shall be 36 feet back of curb to back of curb for developments for any buildable lot that is less than an acre in size. And clearly this is bigger than that. So we are not going to have the ability to pass safely with the bicycling and the pedestrian accesses that we have had in our neighborhood lately increased significantly, that's going to cause a huge safety issue that I am afraid to see what's going on. With 30<sup>th</sup> St to go out, and only have a right-in right-out, there

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

MINUTES • August 1, 2016

#### City Hall – Council Chambers

6:00PM

#### FINAL

have been numerous studies that talk about sweeping curves going at 35 MPH and that that is a huge issue if you don't have a gap of six seconds in traffic, it leads to a 3.2% increase in accidents. There's also an issue with driving through our area. Depending on how they put the stop signs through the area, either is going to be a quick pass through that will allow traffic to avoid the Whitewater Park St State St light. You'll just go straight down 32<sup>nd</sup>, turn at Gooding and go straight down 31<sup>st</sup> and Moore and or 31<sup>st</sup> and you will not hit a single stop sign and will take you right to State St. The biggest thing that I want to address is our sewer is at huge maximum capacity. Right now, where we live, we constantly receive outgassing. We smell fecal things every summer night and I invite you to come down and enjoy the ambiance. We've worked with ACH or worked with the Boise City to put fragrant stations in it has not mitigated the idea and I think this project will put a huge burden on that. The other thing I want to talk about it is, we have sent in two FOYA requests. Most Idaho financial housing association asking for the density in our area and as well as Boise City Housing Authority and we don't have those.

Brianna McNall (City of Boise): Time.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you, Ms. Gatchel.

Liz Gatchel (3120 Moore St): Thank you very much.

**Chairman Gillespie**: Next person is Ms. O'Dell and after that is Don May. Could you pull that, pull that microphone down?

#### Deslyn O'Dell (2153 W Martin Creek Court Meridian, ID 83646): Will do

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you.

**Deslyn O'Dell (2153 W Martin Creek Court Meridian, ID 83646**): Good evening Commissioners. My name is Deslyn O'Dell. My address is 2153 West Martin Creek Court in Meridian, Idaho 83646. I'm a licensed real estate agent in Idaho as well as an investor/owner of two parcels located on Moore St. In response to the developer's proposal, we've gathered nearly 150 signatures on our petition to assert that this project is not the right fit for this location. For any project there are always a few people in the neighborhood who resist change and feel that whatever the developers want to do is a bad idea. In those cases, it's important to listen and let them voice their opinions. In this case, however, we did not find a single resident of the neighborhood who is in support of this project. With such strong opposition, the reasons should be examined and clearly understood before the project is even considered. I believe one of the reasons for such a disconnect between the neighborhood and the developer is that the developer did not make any effort or take the time to meet with the neighborhood committee or the local residents to understand the needs and issues of this locality before the required neighborhood meeting. This area of Boise already has a significant affordable housing population. As part of our collecting signatures, we met with many of the residents of affordable housing and they also are opposed to this project. Federal standards, HUD guidelines, and the Boise Blueprint all require a distribution of affordable housing to

MINUTES • August 1, 2016

City Hall – Council Chambers

6:00PM

#### FINAL

avoid concentration of these projects. This is to protect those in affordable housing from being clustered into a single area thereby reducing their quality of life and experience. It also balances the types of housing to keep the neighborhood strong and thriving. Local residents are not against development of this property, in fact just the opposite is true. We want the land to be developed to improve the quality of the neighborhood. We also want to ensure that any future development compliments the existing character of the area which supports one of the primary goals of Boise Blueprint. Adding a 50-unit apartment complex would clearly impact the character of this particular neighborhood. We're all excited to have the new Whitewater Park improvements close by. The land that is being proposed as high density apartments is prime land that can be the last part of a well-planned and orchestrated effort to revitalize this area. The residents want to have this developed in a way that will enhance the quality of the neighborhood, promote the pride of home-ownership, and increase the value of their property. This is completely possible with a conscientious developer who is willing to work with neighbors. It's important for you to understand that no one currently living in this neighborhood is in support of the project and everyone we contacted, without exception, believes this project will have a significantly negative impact on the neighborhood. We ask that you respect the opinions, beliefs, and knowledge of those living in this area as a reason to reject this project in favor of a project that fits the character of the neighborhood and the natural limitations of access and traffic. Thank you for your consideration.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you Ms. O'Dell. Next person listed is Don May followed by Greg Hayes.

Don May (926 N 32<sup>nd</sup> St): Hi, my name is Don May and my address is 926 N 32<sup>nd</sup> St. First of all, I just want to say thank you so much for serving on this. I don't envy you at all. So I'm going to put on my hat as a potential resident of the proposed units. So I'll be someone who lives in affordable housing and speak to you from that perspective. Any affordable housing project that receives federal funding must comply with what's called a Federal Fair Housing Act. And since this particular project is receiving what's called Federal Low Income Housing Tax Credits, which have been used since 1986 for the predominant use of affordable housing projects, it must comply with this Federal Fair Housing Act. And what it says, I'm going to read to you, and it says right there on the screen as well, there's a certain section and I won't read the number there, but it says, you, this, the title of it is must not concentrate low income persons and then underneath that, it says the site must promote greater choice of housing opportunities and avoid undue concentration of assisted persons in areas containing a high proportion of low income persons. So, essentially what I'm asking for as a low income, or as someone who needs affordable housing is for you to protect my right to live in a diverse neighborhood. And what does the data say? So, we went and did some research and census says that our neighborhood is currently an area of low income concentration. This comes out of the one of the reports in 2015 that Boise City did. So how does HUD determine if a site complies with these Federal regulations? Well, existing data sources, such as the census are too broad, unfortunately, so what they do is, HUD does these site specific surveys to get neighborhood level accuracy. And we believe that such a survey should be performed in this particular case. In the meantime, what we did is, we did our own little bit of research. We found that the neighborhood is already inundated

MINUTES • August 1, 2016

#### City Hall – Council Chambers

6:00PM

#### FINAL

with affordable housing. The Boise average for affordable housing units is 2.7%. Currently, with as it stands right now, within 500 feet of the proposed site, there is 24% of all housing units are affordable housing. If you added the proposed site of 50 units, you would get up to 36% and, therefore, we believe the site does not qualify for new affordable housing. So again, I'm just asking if you could please protect my right to diverse, to live in a diverse neighborhood. And I'm going to take that hat off and get back to just Don May and say that to reiterate that our neighborhood proudly embraces diversity. We're not against development. We know development is going to occur and we will embrace the right kind of development that aligns with the character of our neighborhood, such as having eight to twelve homes in a cul-de-sac. Thank you very much.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you Mr. May. Next person is Greg Hayes followed by Robert O'Dell.

Greg Hayes (877 N 32<sup>nd</sup> St): Hi I'm Greg Hayes. Greetings Commissioners. I live at 877 N 32<sup>nd</sup> St. I also own two other empty undeveloped lots. All three properties are all adjacent to each other right there at the location. One of those properties is currently the 32<sup>nd</sup> St garden that is open to refugees and they use about 40% of the garden to date. I want to compliment the well thought out Boise Blueprint plan and all of the neighborhood plans that are within including the 30<sup>th</sup> St Masterplan. These are great plans that have taken years to develop. Planners of all disciplines have poured over and put their input into these plans. It's an intricate puzzle that fits together and works together. Kudos to the City of Boise. Replacing any piece of that puzzle with a non-fitting piece will not complete the puzzle properly. Metaphor intended. Now let me give you some good reasons for the City of Boise to stick to the plan. This project is not a good fit for this location. Within those plans, the land use map, it shows this area as orange compact not high density. That area is 14.5 units per acres. I've been told it's 20 now, but this is what is published in the plans currently. I also want to point out that this area is not indicated as a mixed use activity center, nor a neighborhood activity center. In the section for infill housing, it says, support in anticipation of northeast end primarily through the development of accessory units, duplexes, and townhouses rather than high intensity multi-family units. B, Focus on higher density housing and mixed use development within the 30th St Masterplan and as planned. Note that the 30th St Masterplan does not show this as multis units. It says, six mixed use activity centers have been designed or designated to serve the northeast end to promote the availability of local services within walking distance of residential neighborhoods. I won't read them off but this project is not adjacent to any of those locations. Under the Main St/Fairview Ave./30th St extension, there it says encourage high density transit support of mixed use development along that area consistent with the 30<sup>th</sup> masterplan. Let's stick to that plan. Under street classifications it says avoid upgrading local streets and collectors in the northeast end to higher classifications to accommodate development in the foothills. I'm not sure what that means exactly but it sounds like leave our streets alone and don't add another connection that isn't part of the original plan. In other words, don't punch  $32^{nd}$  St through. None of these maps have the  $32^{nd}$  St extension on there. I bring attention to these details because it is unfair to someone like myself who refers to these plans and make decisions based on these plans. Throw in the wild-card PUD, planned unit development, and all bets are off. I'd like

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

MINUTES • August 1, 2016

#### City Hall – Council Chambers

6:00PM

#### FINAL

to point out that the BBP it's, or the Boise Blueprint Plan it says that a PUD can deviate from minimum lots sizes and other standard requirements of the code in return for provision for common open space and offer more creative design features. The first meeting with the BCACHA, they said they had nothing for outsiders. Now...

Brianna McNall (City of Boise): Time

Greg Hayes (877 N 32<sup>nd</sup> St): They have something. What, are they making this up as they go?

**Chairman Gillespie**: Thank you Mr. Hayes. Thank you very much. The next person is Robert O'Dell followed by Ryan Gilbert.

Robert O'Dell (2153 W Martin Creek Court Meridian, ID 83646): Good evening. My name is Robert O'Dell and I live at 2153 W Martin Creek Court in Meridian. Over the last several years, the area around Moore St has made significant progress in becoming an area where people want to live and invest. A well planned project will contribute to the area's up-trend. I, along with many others, are very optimistic for this area's growth and for the positive changes to create a safe and desirable area. On the other hand, a poorly planned project, like this one, will take the neighborhood backwards. Investors and homeowners will not be so willing to put their money into the area that does not have the right access, safety, and the character that everyone loves down there. What we need is a project that will provide the right mix of density, type and quality of housing to create a desirable place for everyone. The current plans for this area support the positive direction of the neighborhood having taken into account both the limitations and opportunities of the area. The proposed project is not in alignment with these plans and ignores many of the natural limitations affecting the project. Such as, the width of the streets, the limited access to the property, only one access to a 50-unit complex, limited egress and ingress and egress through the neighborhood and access to additional parking required for residents of such a dense complex. The area's existing plan should not be tossed aside or changed without serious consideration to the impacts of these changes. There has been little or no communication with the neighborhood committee, tenants, and owners to understand the needs and perspective of the people that live there. One might believe the developers chose not to communicate their plans because they knew the response would not be favorable. This lack of interest in truly understanding what would serve the area, the current people living there, and those who would live here in the future all but guarantees problems, and less than a favorable result. In conclusion, this product is not being created with the neighborhood in mind. No attempt was made to work with the organizations or people living here to create a positive outcome for everyone but the developer. The project is a very poor fit and because of the natural limitations of access to the property, it will overwhelm the neighborhood and most importantly, the project will result in a significant impact to the neighborhoods ability to be positive, to continue the positive trend it's currently on. Please give the neighborhood what it needs and deserves. A project that works within the plans already developed. A project that will allow it to reach its potential and a project that is designed to attract and maintain investment and home ownership. Thank you very much.

#### PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

MINUTES • August 1, 2016

6:00PM

#### FINAL

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you Mr. O'Dell. Next sign-up is Ryan Gilbert followed by Shana Foster Moore.

**Ryan Gilbert (874 N 30<sup>th</sup> St)**: Commissioners, before my time starts I wanted to let you know that the neighborhood is appealing the ACHD decision and we are filing that paperwork here before Wednesday.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you sir.

Ryan Gilbert (874 N 30<sup>th</sup> St): Thank you.

Chairman Gillespie: Just need your name and address please.

Rvan Gilbert (874 N 30<sup>th</sup> St): Commissioners, my name is Rvan Gilbert. I live at 874 N 30<sup>th</sup> St. I'm a project manager for Pierson Education. Want to give you an overview. Over the last few years, our neighborhood has been growing in a very positive direction. Our home-ownership is up. Our property values have increased. With the help of the Boise Police Department, crime has gone down significantly. We went down from a high density crime area to a medium crime density area. The general outlook of the neighborhood is positive. With this development, it has brought, not only concern to me but concern to all of our neighbors. My main points here to address tonight is traffic and congestion and lack of neighborhood safety that would be brought by this development. Traffic, the traffic impact from this development would cause major issues in our neighborhood. This sweeping curve and opening on  $32^{nd}$  St, the right in and right out without a traffic signal is reckless in its design. At 35MPH, as stated before by one of my colleagues, the sweeping curve, has been shown to increase traffic accidents at this location by 3.2 %. The staff for ACHD did not recommend that 32<sup>nd</sup> St be punched through for this very reason and numerous others. Safety. The design is not, the design of this complex is not safe for the neighborhood or would-be residents either. There are three pinch points in the design from 32<sup>nd</sup> St and Moore and Whitewater and 32<sup>nd</sup>. They block EMS, traffic, police, and fire from getting through. If one area, if one pinch point in an actual opening of that neighborhood is blocked, fire trucks will not be able to get through and police or emergency medical services. Another thing to reference is there are usually multiple openings in an apartment complex for police and fire to get through. This one only has one, but if you open up one to the north, it goes out on Moore St. If you open to the south, you take away the gate where kids will be protected. This is not a safe development. On another note, this is actually something dear to our neighborhood. The police used to affectionately call the triangle between Moore and State between Moore and Steward, the golden triangle because we had two heroine houses. We had two meth houses and a crack house. Neighbors worked very hard to drive every single one of these entities out of our neighborhood. This has been ten years going on. We feel that this development would revert back to that aspect. We do not want that. Don't change the character of the neighborhood. The development doesn't fit. The Boise Blueprint does not fit that at all. The 30<sup>th</sup> St masterplan, it doesn't fit that as well. There is already too much affordable housing here. If this project goes in, not only there will be not only that but

#### PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

MINUTES • August 1, 2016

6:00PM

#### FINAL

all the other projects the other projects going in, 17% of all affordable housing will be concentrated in our sub-neighborhood. Property needs to have homes built on it.

Brianna McNall (City of Boise): Time.

Ryan Gilbert (874 N 30th St): Not a large apartment complex. Thank you commissioners.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you. Next person is Shana Foster Moore followed by Jim Van Der Heyden.

Shana Moore (901 N 30th St): Is that good? Alright. My name is Shana Moore and I live at 901 N 30th St. I'm not sure I'm going to have a lot more to add here than what's already been said but I do know that I'm in favor of this project and I don't feel that enough community involvement has happened to give the project approval. I lived in the Davis Park neighborhood for nearly 15 years both as a renter and a home owner. When I was looking to purchase my home in 2003, a friend of mine who is a police officer said, oh no. Do not buy over there. That is where we go when we're bored. Is known for drugs, crime and low property values. That was thirteen years ago and we have come so far. For the last 8 years, I've been running a community garden. The Jordan St community garden. And this garden has been able to bridge cultural divides, bring neighbors together, has created a safe place for people to meet and share. As homeownership has increased, so did property condition and property values. As homeownership increased, relationships between neighbors flourished and a community was created. Thirteen years ago, this connectivity did not exist. Police had a constant presence and it did not feel like a safe place to raise a family. To this specific project, I'm not sure who it's going to benefit. Does it benefit the forty-five families that will be restricted to very low income caps that will have kids getting bussed to other schools because their neighborhood school is full? Does it benefit the neighborhood that has put so much love, sweat, and tears into increasing property condition, property values and increasing our voice as a neighborhood? Does it benefit the City and the best use for generating property tax base? Does it support the local boutiques and restaurants that took a chance on opening their businesses in our area? It feels like the only people benefitting are the investors that need a certain number of tax credits in order to make this a lucrative project for themselves. I request this project not be approved at this time. That it be required to have a more mixed demographic and that the neighborhood gets to be an active role in the development. We have a voice and we've earned the right to be active participants in determining what's happening in our own neighborhood. Thank you.

**Chairman Gillespie**: Thank you Ms. Moore. The next person is Jim Van Der Heyden followed by Sarah Wyss.

**Jim Van Der Heyden (894 N 32<sup>nd</sup> St**): Hello. Thank you for hearing our voices this evening. My name is Jim Van Der Heyden. I live at 894 N 32<sup>nd</sup> St. I know zoning is a critical tool for the benefits of growth while minimizing growing pains but in far too communities, zoning is used to benefit specific property owners or special interests at the expense of quality of life. When zoning works well, the pace of growth does not cause over school burdening, traffic congestion, sewer overflows, water shortages will

MINUTES • August 1, 2016

City Hall – Council Chambers

6:00PM

#### FINAL

overwhelm police, fire and ambulance or other services. Through-traffic on residential streets is not increased. Residential zoning districts are laid out to facility mass transit, walking and bicycling for both existing new neighborhoods. Zoning requires retention of sufficient open space to accommodate active passive recreation needs. Through zoning new development is directed to compact growth where areas where density is kept high to keep property taxes low, preserve rural lands, facilitate mass transit etc. Good planning is the key to designing a set of zoning regulations, zoning ordinances, and zoning maps which will achieve these goals. At a minimum, every local jurisdiction should have a comprehensive plan setting forth goals and community wishes to achieve the area growths and objectives essential to achieving these goals. And the BBP, currently on the infill area where skinnies are being built on existing one land houses, is increasing our density and the neighborhood is going beyond its planned density and is according to current zoning if it continues street traffic will be burdened as it is becoming burdened. Sewer systems are becoming more burdened along with the issue at 32<sup>nd</sup> and Moore. The density in this neighborhood is now greater than in 2002 when a 190-unit complex was halted. Homeownership has increased in the area to accommodate increased density of garages. The garages are mostly being used by smaller cars because the skinnies are so small, they can't accommodate large vehicles so large vehicles are on the streets. And a lot of people are using these garages mostly for storage. This project, I don't feel is the right fit for the neighborhood, does not fit the current master plan. The fifty units I don't believe are going to accommodate the amount of parking necessary for the vehicles. Putting 32<sup>nd</sup> St through will be an increased burden of traffic flow and parking as well. Whitewater Parkway was not designed to add an additional roadway to interfere with the flow of traffic that it was originally designed for based on ACHD. Let's see. To add this area to add this to the area subdivision is already the capacity of adding an LITCHC project which will overburden the school systems as well. And another personal note that I have is we've had a lot of jay walking in the area across State St quite a few years and finally a young man was killed last year. And this is all coming from low income housing in that area between 27<sup>th</sup> and Veterans. And my concern is that the route that comes around Whitewater Parkway with the curve, we're going to have a lot of kids and people not walking down to Steward and crossing straight across Whitewater Parkway, right into the greenbelt access across the street. Thank you.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you sir. Next person is person is Sarah Wyss followed by Luke Roberts.

**Sarah Wyss (3021 W Moore St)**: Sarah Wyss. It's Swiss. AEIOU and sometimes y. I live at 3021 W Moore and at the property where I live runs one whole side in the back to the property where things are going to be built. But I'm not on the side where they're going to punch the street through. I am opposed to rezoning the property on Moore St so it can accommodate a 50-unit one to four-bedroom complex. It's the tax payers and neighborhoods like mine that make programs like the housing authority possible. And for businesses like Northwest Real Estate grow on tax credits and subsidies. It's my neighborhood that is so diverse there is even a plaque down on the greenbelt an accolade for us being that diverse. And we're proud of it. It's my neighborhood that needs to be heard who's vision for the present and the future need to be respected. The Housing Authority has a vision statement. A model community with progressive

ANNING & ZOMING COMMISSION MEETIN

MINUTES • August 1, 2016

City Hall – Council Chambers

6:00PM

#### FINAL

housing programs and partnerships that provide help for today and hope for tomorrow. I don't see progressive. There's no partnering with the neighborhood. They want to build the same big old buildings with the same lots of people. The design to me is somewhat like a clone of  $42^{nd}$  St except  $42^{nd}$  St at least has the Boys and Girls Club across the way. Northwest Real Estate is involved in about twenty other complexes in Boise. I got to get my trees in. The architects say those are all junk trees, mow em' down. Well, one man's junk is another woman's treasure and those trees, those old growth trees that are in that lot should not be torn down. The Housing Authority also has a mission statement and I think we heard some of this stuff in a debate the other day or an acceptance speech. That you should take those statements quite personally. They want to enhance our community by providing safe and affordable housing, fostering self-sufficiency and stability. I don't see that adding 200-plus people will enhance my quality of life or that of my neighbors. I don't think we'll be safer or give the neighborhood stability. The property does need to be developed. It has been neglected for way too long. They could consider partnering with Habitat for Humanity and use the Housing Authority's program for home ownership or a small senior development. Why not let some of us age in place? Slow down this process, involve the neighborhood, really be progressive. If you're going to talk the talk, walk

#### Brianna McNall (City of Boise): Time

Sarah Wyss (3021 W Moore St): The walk.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you Ms. Wyss. The next person is Luke Roberts followed by Debbie Helms.

**Luke Roberts (1809 W Washington St)**: Hi, I'm Luke Roberts. I live at 1809 W Washington St. About three or four years ago, we purchased the property right next to, adjacent to this. It was probably the worst house in the neighborhood. I put a lot of hard work and time into fixing up the house. You know, when we bought, we knew that there's no way that this great open space could stay like this forever, but we also didn't possibly imagine that they'd try to shoehorn, you know, 150/200 people into a small three-acre space like this and cause all the problems that everyone has been talking about with traffic and parking and everything else. I guess the type of development that I envisioned going in there would be something similar to like on 36<sup>th</sup> St in Garden City, townhouses, nice density, everything matches with the surrounding community. You know, it's not my, I'm not going to tell the Housing Authority how to do their job but if they want to shoehorn a bunch of people in just down the street on Whitewater between Main and Fairview, you know there, the City of Boise has a three-acre lot and a six-acre lot that is all hardscaped, they could take and put as much housing as they want, there's not going to be any complaining form any of the businesses nearby. There's no issues with access, no issues with parking, none of the things that are going on right now or trying to put this into an established community like this.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you Mr. Roberts. The next person is Debbie Helms followed by Erin Sorenson.

MINUTES • August 1, 2016

#### City Hall – Council Chambers

6:00PM

#### FINAL

Deborah Helms (3201 W Moore St): Thank you for allowing me to speak. My name is Deborah Helms. I live at 3201 W Moore St. I'm against this. Over the last few years our neighborhood has gone under a great deal of change. Some good, some bad. Recent addition to our area has concerned me. My main points are traffic, safety, congestion, and noise pollution which would be caused by this proposed development. The traffic impact from this potential development will cause major issue in our neighborhood. For the on-street parking, the applicant did nothing to account for on-street parking in their application stating there were 19% over the requirement set by the City of Boise. They assume all residents will be parking inside the complex of 82 parking slots which we all know is incorrect. Not taking account for friends, guests, or people who would be subleasing from the tenant which most likely will happen. This doesn't work with ACHD's recommendation of 97 parking slots should be in the complex. This sweeping open curb on 32<sup>nd</sup> St, the right in and right out without a traffic signal is reckless in its design. At 35mph curve has been shown to increase traffic accidents at the location at 3.2. The staff for ACHD did not recommend 32<sup>nd</sup> St to be punched through for these reasons. It will stall traffic on Whitewater Blvd. plus the amount of traffic coming in and out of the neighborhood would be too much of an in-fracture to take on. Whitewater's listed as a minor arterial roadway in the packet given to ACHD by the applicant. It is not. It is an arterial roadway on the 30<sup>th</sup> St Masterplan. The traffic noise is already high. When the park opens up, it will be higher. When this development, if this development is approved it will be even greater. This development and  $32^{nd}$  St goes through, if it does, I have a great deal of fear that the value of my home will plummet. This development does not fit. There's already too much affordable housing here. Tonight I am standing here before you and asking please don't change the character of this neighborhood. My roots as well as a grown tree are deep and rooted here. My granner built five houses on these lots. This property is meant to have homes built on it and not a large complex. I ask you to deny this application. Thank you very much.

**Chairman Gillespie**: Thank you very much Ms. Helms. The next person is Erin Sorenson followed by Jaime Goode.

**Erin Sorenson (2999 W Moore St)**: Erin Sorenson, 2999 W Moore St. As the neighborhood rep for the Park Davis neighborhood, I just want to thank my neighbors for coming here today. It's very nice to hear everyone's voice at a meeting like this and I think this is the most support that we've had from our neighborhood in many, many, years. In 2009 I was elected to, I'm a part of the Veterans Park Neighborhood Association board but in 2009 my neighbors elected me to represent their needs, the needs of census tracked for on the neighbor works Boise board of directors. Within three blocks of this planned development, there's actually sixty affordable housing units. All of those are available to families 60% and below the area median income. Davis Park Apartments is where we have our Veterans Park Neighborhood Association meetings every month so everyone's pretty familiar with what affordable housing is and what that looks like and we partner with the community and we have a lot of events which gets us involved with the needs of our low income rent neighbors. So when I hear that I have 150 neighbors in my direct sub neighborhood who have an issue with an affordable housing development, I

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

MINUTES • August 1, 2016

City Hall – Council Chambers

6:00PM

#### FINAL

come to you with really my heart and my hand because I do support the needs of low income housing in our neighborhood but I also need to represent the needs of my neighborhood. Presently there's 175 affordable housing units that are proposed in our neighborhood. 120 units are proposed on City land over where the Boise Marine property is and then there's ten units which are a part of the larger planned community that could be anywhere between fifty and 150 units right on Whitewater Park Blvd, Main and Fairview. I want to re-emphasize two of the talking points that our board president talked about today that I think are pretty significant and I just have a few seconds to do this. The minimal plan for resident services is a big concern for our neighbors. We know what the needs are of the children who are going to be coming to this neighborhood and we would like to see some stronger partnerships formed. Whittier School is a recipient of a promise grant through the United Way. It's also going to be a community school. We don't know what the plan that exists today doesn't fully meet the needs of our neighbors and we request more collaboration and rework before this plan is approved. Thank you.

**Chairman Gillespie**: Thank you Ms. Sorenson. Ms. Sorenson I also think you signed up as number twenty-one, so I'm going to skip over you later on the list if that's alright with you.

Erin Sorenson (2999 W Moore St): Okay. Thank you.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you. The next person is Jaime Goode followed by Penny Iuliano.

Jaime Goode (2801 W Moore St): Thank you commissioners, or commissioner and chairman. First, before I address myself and my name, thank you neighbors because this is kind of my first start to this discussion so thank you all for everything that's you've raised and hopefully I can just underscore a few of the points and not reiterate too much. My name is Jaime Goode. I live at 2801 W Moore St which is the home on the major five-way intersection between Stewart, Moore, Ross, and 28<sup>th</sup> St. One thing that I would like to highlight and underscore is the issue of traffic in this neighborhood. My husband and I have owned our house there for five years. We have two other units on the property. We live in the third unit. There's a three-unit house next to us and we have already seen increases in traffic related to Whitewater Park Blvd's development and the connection with Stewart Ave. My worry for this project is the increase in traffic and number of people passing through that intersection, particularly the five-way stop that we witness people not knowing how to navigate with limited stop signs and view most days. And what I'd like to highlight is the lack of realization I think that the community feels for the future development of the Ester Simplot Park. Currently this summer with the opening of the ponds near the Idaho River Sports, there's been a surplus of need for parking in our neighborhoods and I imagine that will grow even further with the opening of the park when it's fully realized on Whitewater Park Blvd. That, in addition to this development, would create some severe stress on our community as far as parking goes. Traffic as everyone has, other people have highlighted before, is a problem because of the width of our street and issues with traffic. The only other thing that I would like to highlight that hasn't really been brought up so far is not only the nature and character of our community and our neighborhood but also the nature and

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

MINUTES • August 1, 2016

#### City Hall – Council Chambers

6:00PM

#### FINAL

character of Boise as a whole. In addition to the units that I rent on my property, I am an Airbnb host and I see at least three to five guests a week of people that are move, coming to Boise to check it out as a new place to live from California, unfortunately, Oregon, all sorts of places looking at Boise as a new place to live and they come to our neighborhood and they see they see what they see in its existing form. They park on the street, they have no problems, they're within walking distance of the park and they like the feel of it and the feel of it in order to move in the future so, I would like you to take that as an additional aspect of this community argument against this project as its potential character its potential degradation of Boise as a community as a whole. Thank you.

**Chairman Gillespie**: Thank you Ms. Goode. The next person on the sign-up is Penny Iuliano followed by Ryan Gilbert. Except Ryan, you already went so I'm going to skip over you. You signed up twice. Followed by Sunnee Szurgot. Please.

Penny Iuliano (894 N 32<sup>nd</sup> St): My name is Penny Iuliano. Thank you for saving my name correctly. It's not easy. My address is 894 N 32<sup>nd</sup> St. Would like to say in regard to safety that fifty units of anything next to a busy road for children is not safe interrupting a giant sweeping curve on the Whitewater to move traffic along from the round-a-bout to Jordan. Whitewater was the plan all along. Interrupting that was the addition of 32<sup>nd</sup> St. isn't part of a plan or parts of it would have been already added when the road was built. Diane Bevins, manager of the WW project made arguments for this sweeper turn to be just as it is in order to facilitate the movement of traffic as designed by traffic engineers of ACHD. I'd also like to say that this neighborhood is represented by a very diverse lovely group of people who deeply care and at all levels of income of all levels of experience and I think it's so important to listen to what these people have to say. We're greatly opposed to the way this project has presented itself in the best interest of the neighborhood and I see people speeding down our little tiny section of  $32^{nd}$  St and there are children playing which is a lovely thing to see. They feel safe, they feel like they can run out but there's already cars speeding down Moore St and 32<sup>nd</sup> St. and I can't imagine what adding that level of traffic to this area would mean for the ability to have children out, feeling safe, playing, people being out in their neighborhood. It just changes the quality of the life there. So, thank you very much. And I am definitely opposed to this. So thank you.

**Chairman Gillespie**: Thank you very much Ms. Iuliano. Next person is Sunnee Szurgot followed by Susie Crandlemire.

**Sunnee Szurgot (908 Whitewater Park Blvd)**: Good evening commissioners, thanks for your time. My name is Sunnee Szurgot. I live on 908 Whitewater Park Blvd. Bought that place coming on three years. So many great points have been talked about by my neighbors so I'm going to go over a couple studies. One called the impacts of low income housing tax credit program on neighborhood housing turnover. It's a thirty-three-page document from 2014 from the Urban Affairs Review. I don't have time to address all the issues so I've highlighted some findings. This article examines impacts of the LIHTC program on neighborhood stability and turnover in the cities of Charlotte North Carolina and Cleveland Ohio. The

MINUTES • August 1, 2016

City Hall – Council Chambers

6:00PM

#### FINAL

article finds significant impacts on the stability of the LIHTC developments in both cities. The results suggest that the stability of neighborhoods may be an important factor when considering the citing of the LIHTC development and I want to point that out now because this neighborhood is just now starting to become stable. Community residents and particularly home owners seek neighborhood stability. Stability is an important aspect of neighborhood quality. This brings predictability, assurance and confidence, and the maintenance and quality of neighborhood conditionings, the quality of life and housing prices. Charlotte, a growing subbelt study, may be a representative of a hot housing market where job prospects are strong and the demand for housing is strong. Cleveland, however, is a declining rust-belt city that could be characterized as a cold market. Comparing these housing turnovers in two different cities allows us to assess the impact of subsidized housing developments in two different housing market conditions. Assessing the results of this article, there was strong evidence that the LIHTC developments significantly increase neighborhood housing turnover in both cities. Under the article's conclusion, our citywide results suggest the LIHTC developments generally significant spill-over effects undermining neighborhoods stability in both Charlotte and Cleveland. These results are also consistent with those found by the Bomsno and the Marion from 2009. Our results from Charlotte and Cleveland suggest that the introduction of the LIHTC developments may deteriorate neighborhood stability in terms of high rates for home owners, turnover, and some researchers also suggest that LIHTC developments crowd out unsubsidized rental housing construction in neighborhoods. One other study low income housing tax credit developments and neighborhood property conditions, this is from 2011 by the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City. It's a thirty-seven-page document but it generally states that there is a need for affordable housing and that they can be good for communities but also verbatim from this report it states that further analysis reveals that when the model does not control for crime, the effect of the proximity in the LIHTC development on the property conditions is negative. And I point this out because the project has not been properly planned. No provisions for crime control have been thought out, unlike the Davis St. Apartments where there is a 360° access all around. This property place does not, however they do have time to plan this fifty-unit LIHTC at that Fairview and Main location. So, I am

#### Brianna McNall (City of Boise): Time.

Sunnee Szurgot (908 Whitewater Park Blvd): Strongly opposed. Thanks for listening.

**Chairman Gillespie**: Thank you Ms. Szurgot. Thank you. The next person on the list is Susie Crandlemire followed by Sharla Davison.

**Susie Crandlemire (892 N 31<sup>st</sup> St.)**: Good evening. My name is Susie Crandlemire and I live at 892 N 31<sup>st</sup> St. I am here to speak to you tonight in opposition of this building project. I purchased my home in March of 2016 and when I was looking for a home to live in Boise, I love the feel of the area, that it was mostly single family homes and just the security I felt as I walked around the neighborhood. A few of the reasons why I'm opposed to this is, as an educator the impact the number of new families in the area will have on the already overcrowded schools. Another one that's been mentioned is the increase of traffic in

MINUTES • August 1, 2016

#### City Hall – Council Chambers

6:00PM

#### FINAL

the area. Would the children and the cars going quickly and the narrow streets, I think all of that causes a lot of concern for the families who are living there. The third one is the size of the development. As it's been mentioned, I'm not opposed to having something developed on that area, but I just think having a place with fifty-one to four bedroom condos is much too large for the area that we have there. And the last one is just a concern for the property value but also my personal safety of living in the area by myself. I just wanted to say that as a homeowner I am strongly opposed to this project. Thank you.

**Chairman Gillespie**: Thank you Ms. Crandlemire. Next person on the list is Sharla Davison followed by Gary Hanes.

Sharla Davison (886 N 32<sup>st</sup> St.): Thank you for having us. My name is Sharla Davison. I live at 886 N 32<sup>nd</sup> St. The people in my neighborhood and I have many concerns about this project. Concern that I've heard over and over from the neighbors is the reduction of our property values. A person's home is usually their number one investment. This means preserving its value is extremely important. This project will likely effect this value due to several factors. The density of affordable housing in this area, the changing of the character of the neighborhood, and crime. The Boise Blueprint states in principle GDP.3 section C, avoid creating large concentrations of specific types of housings such as multi-family or affordable units within a neighborhood or segregating certain types, housing types from others. And another principle it states support intensification of the north/east end primarily through the development of accessory units, duplexes and townhouses rather than high density multi-family units. It also states, regarding neighborhood character design new development to reflect elements of the historic architecture and traditional neighborhood character that exists in the northeast end. We do already have two high density multi-family units just within three blocks. The Davis Park Apartments with forty-units and the Stewart St. Apartments with fourteen units and a large number of 4-plexes. The residents of these units are all mostly under the affordable housing program. The neighborhood has also been under stress with all of the in-fill going on. Single story homes are being replaced with two to three row houses. Not against those because I live in one but there are a lot. Researchers at the University of Wisconsin found that low income or affordable housing has a negative effect on property values when they are built in areas that already have concentrated affordable housing and low income housing. This is the exact situation that we have here. Crime rates are an important factor for home ownership and property values. The home owners of this area have seen an abundance of police interactions and crime at or near these affordable housing units. In the last five to ten years, we have seen a positive change happening in this neighborhood despite all of the in-fill. Many of the rental units have been converted to ownership and many of the older homes are undergoing remodeling. None of us want this positive trend to end. We are proud of this area and do not want to see it nor our property values change negatively. Many of the residents I have talked to have stated that they may move if this project is approved. My husband and I have actually talked about it as well. I have heard one family that has already left in anticipation of the approval of this project. We ask that the planning principles found in the Boise Blueprint be adhered to and that our concerns be addressed by declining this approval. Thank you so much for your time and attention.

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

MINUTES • August 1, 2016

#### City Hall – Council Chambers

6:00PM

#### FINAL

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you Davison. Next person on the list is Gary Hanes followed by Mark Alldredge.

Gary Hanes (992 E Riverpark Lane): Good evening. Its Gary Hanes and I live at 992 E Riverpark Lane. I'm here tonight to speak in favor of affordable housing in general and I'd like to support this project as well. The City of Boise and its affordable housing needs assessment. Determined that there is 8200 units of unmet affordable housing needs in this city and its, to me, that's kind of an overwhelming number and something the City has not been able to come to grips with at this point. And with reduced, with reduced financial federal assets that are going to affordable housing, it makes it more and more difficult for developers to put these projects together. And so, looking at concentration and densities as a way to work with those kinds of limitations. I'd also, I was very interested in what Mr. May had to say about the fair housing implications of this project and in fact I agree it should be something that's looked at kind of in a general way in this neighborhood. But, I want to also point out that the fair housing rules, did I say affordable housing, I meant fair housing. Fair housing, fair housing implications to a development like this can also favor a project like this in some cases. And so, is isn't always just a negative thing when we're looking at affordable housing development and where it's placed. Just in general, I think, I've been around affordable housing for most of my professional career, I just looking at this without having the intimate knowledge that the neighbors do of this area, I thought it was a very well designed property and something that would be a benefit to people that really need this. These are not people that are different from the people already living in the neighborhood. These are the same kinds of people that are already living in the neighborhood and all over Boise. They just don't have a place to live where it's affordable to them where they have an opportunity to grow their own personal wealth and improve their lives. So, anyway, I'd like to speak in favor of the project. Thank you.

**Chairman Gillespie**: Thank you Mr. Hanes. The next and last person on this sign-up sheet is Mark Alldredge. Okay, no Mr. Alldredge. So now we'll kind of go to open testimony so if you'd like to testify just hold up your hand and please come on up and at the podium you'll see a, hopefully a pen and a little sheet where you can sign your name and address. Again we need that to create the record for anybody who wants to appeal. If you could pull that microphone down. Thank you very much.

Shawna Thomason (3021 Gooding St.): Should I fill this out real quick before my time starts?

**Chairman Gillespie**: You can speak and then fill it out afterwards and then just hand it up to us if you'd like or you can do it however you like.

**Shawna Thomason (3021 Gooding St.)**: Okay. I am Shawna Thomason. I live at 3021 Gooding St. I live in this neighborhood and have, I was born in the home that I live in. My grandparents originally bought the farm in 1900 and this land was very special to me and is very special to me. It's gone from generations to me and our homes are single story to two story homes in this neighborhood. It would be a complete safety issue having one to four bedrooms and 50-units put in where three little small houses

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

MINUTES • August 1, 2016

#### City Hall – Council Chambers

6:00PM

#### FINAL

used to dwell. It's a crime against the neighborhood and we had to fight the 109 units in 2002 and the blessing that came out of everything was Simplot's park. I think it would be very nice if they created a children's park to go with the Simplot Park. It would be a beautiful area for that and zoning is there for a reason. And the reason is very clear. It's not safe to put that much traffic, that many units, that many people, that many buildings in a place where homes have dwelled and where families are trying to keep their beautiful families in a safe environment. Thank you very much.

**Chairman Gillespie**: Thank you Ms. Thomason. If you could drop that off. The slip just up here on your way.

#### Shawna Thomason (3021 Gooding St.): Thank you.

**Chairman Gillespie**: Is there anyone else who'd wish to testify on this matter? Okay. Hearing done. The applicant has five minutes for rebuttal. Will that work?

### APPLICANT REBUTTAL

Bob Reed (2721 W Bellagio Drive, Meridian): I think we've heard tonight, I mean the City of Boise's report for the affordable housing project we're looking to develop it definitely supports that for a variety of reasons. They've addressed the issue as far as traffic goes. They've addressed the issue as far as it's compatibility with the neighborhood and they've also addressed it from other aspects too as far as meeting the various plans within the City of Boise. City of Boise since the year 2000 has grown population wise by over 17% and the last 5% over 6%. As you heard earlier by one of the neighbors, there's a huge demand right now for affordable housing. We have a huge shortcoming of housing that's actually affordable for those who have limited income. There's been a lot of apartment complexes built on a marker rate standpoint. They're charging between 1100/12/1300 dollars a month for an apartment complex for housing for some of our citizens. There's a large population that simply cannot afford to pay those kinds of rents, hence the reason why we're trying to develop this on Moore St. As far as concentrations of housing, low income housing in the Moore St area, there really hasn't been a lot. The last affordable housing development that was new construction for housing for families, hasn't been built in the last fifteen years in the City of Boise. In the Moore St. area neighborhood, there hasn't been one in the last 20 years. There has been some acquisition rehab of smaller developments around the city that have been done over the last fifteen years, but it's been a small amount. So this development going into an area that basically hasn't had any development for a very long time, the demand continues to be extremely high for those who need the housing that are moderate income families. We really believe in a lot of ways that this is going to meet that need. As far as services are concerned, it's been our experience that you basically, as opposed to setting up a set of services for residents, there's no reasons for us to say this is what we're going to give you or provide to you. We really need to get some input by the residents themselves as far as what they see are needs, what they see as shortcomings in their living environment and try to design programs around their needs as opposed to us giving them a menu saying this is what

MINUTES • August 1, 2016

#### City Hall – Council Chambers

6:00PM

#### FINAL

we're going to offer you. So, it makes more sense to get input on their part to see for sure what we can do to try and meet those needs. So based on that, I mean we've done a lot to try to design this to be very residential in nature, to blend in with the neighborhood. I think we've met that for the most part. There's things there we want to add to that development as time goes on but I think we've gone through and really have brought together a great development for that market and for that neighborhood. So I would encourage your acceptance and approval of this development. Thank you.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you. I believe we have two, oh. We've got to reset the timer.

Jim Glancy (595 Americana Blvd. Boise): Two more minutes? I just wanted to add a couple.

Chairman Gillespie: Two more minutes.

**Jim Glancy (595 Americana Blvd. Boise):** Okay. Just to rebut some of the comments, I just wanted to clarify it's' not a rezone and I know the commission knows a lot of the neighbors do not understand. I sympathized with their concerns. Meeting the neighbors, we had the neighborhood meeting, and we're open to calls and I don't know how much more outreach to do honestly. But, you know, it's hard, you do not design, it's not a giant project. It is a major impact to some of these neighbors. I think they have to understand it's not a high density project. Just north along Jordan St. a block away it's R-3. Most the neighbors live with single family homes in R-3 where they have 43.5 units per acre. I think they should realize what they live in now is changing. The last comment I want to make is the sweeping curve. It's right in, right out. So, any, it's not going to affect the traffic. The traffic's going the right hand lane going north. The curve, we're not exiting onto a curve. So, if it was going across a left turn, it would be much more dangerous. I believe this is a very high quality project. It is affordable housing. It's going to be higher quality than most the projects in the neighborhood. I believe in it and I do sympathize with the neighbors' concerns. But, thank you.

#### PUBLIC TESTIMONY CLOSED

**Chairman Gillespie**: Thank you very much. So, I think we did have a couple of points of clarification that commissioners might want to ask. So, Commissioner Stevens, did you have a question for staff? **Commissioner Stevens**: I do not.

**Chairman Gillespie**: Okay. Well, I did have one. Cody, several folks have mentioned resident services and I think that's different than what we mean by amenity. I've never seen resident services referenced in the R code or the Comp plan. So is that part of what we're considering tonight is the adequacy of resident services?

Cody Riddle (City of Boise): Mr. Chairman. No, that's not before you this evening.

#### PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

MINUTES • August 1, 2016

#### City Hall – Council Chambers

6:00PM

#### FINAL

**Chairman Gillespie**: Okay. Thank you. Alright, with that the public part of this hearing is closed and it is before the Commission.

Commissioner Stevens: Mr. Chair.

Chairman Gillespie: Commissioner Stevens.

**Commissioner Stevens**: I'm prepared to make a motion but I have a question first.

Chairman Gillespie: Please.

**Commission Stevens**: For my fellow Commissioners. And I'll sort of tell you where I'm heading and then see if you have some suggestions on how to handle this one particular thing. I'm preparing to make a motion to approve this project and that said, I am concerned about the traffic through the neighborhood. And so, I would like to approve the project and I'll get into the reasons when we get to the discussion. However, I would like to add a condition regarding traffic calming through the neighborhood. And I'm not quite sure how to word that and I haven't seen the Commission add that kind of a condition with a lot of specificity in the past. So, I don't if anybody who's been on the commission more recent months has entertained something like that or the commission's done something like that but, that's where I'm heading and I'm just curious if anybody has any suggestions.

Chairman Gillespie: Commissioner Bradbury.

**Commissioner Bradbury**: I'm not sure I have a suggestion, maybe just questions for you. Maybe we can figure it out. Do you think you could create the condition this evening? Or do you think that, or is it the issue that it might be more complex and require some time?

Commissioner Stevens: Mr. Chair.

Chairman Gillespie: Commissioner Stevens

**Commission Stevens**: The answer to that Mr. Bradbury is that I'm concerned that it's going to take some time. I mean I think if you look at the map of what we have in front of us, I think there is a very valid concern with the neighbors that people are going to take a right out of this apartment complex and drive through the neighborhood. It's, as well designed as Whitewater Park Blvd is, I can see people doing it. And so, I'm concerned with the neighbors' concerns there and I, you know, understanding that there are no stop signs on 31<sup>st</sup> St that take you straight to State, I think it's incumbent on the developer to be responsible and pay for that traffic calming measure. However, of course that is not in our purview in terms of how we design those things. That's an ACHD thing. And so, I mean, you know, I'm comfortable and maybe this is a question that's better aimed at staff and maybe the whole, maybe my whole, maybe I should just go for the motion because perhaps it's not going to go anywhere anyway. But, you know I

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

MINUTES • August 1, 2016

#### City Hall – Council Chambers

6:00PM

#### FINAL

think it's clearly something that the developer's going to need to work out at least in my opinion and I want to make sure that we have something on the record that requires it before, you know.

**Chairman Gillespie**: Before you make a motion, can I just, may I speak, just add one thing. So, the ACHD staff report basically concludes that the punch through isn't necessary, that all the traffic could go onto the existing grid in that they, you know you can read their report, but they didn't seem to have any big problem dumping all of the traffic onto the grid. Well the way it will work now is, you know a big chunk of it is going to go onto Whitewater, which is a very big street. So, one would infer from ACHD that they don't have a problem with the people coming, turning right on 32<sup>nd</sup> and then driving through the neighborhood.

Cody Riddle (City of Boise): Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Gillespie: Cody.

**Cody Riddle (City of Boise)**: If I may, that's one of the very reasons the City's been a proponent of that 32<sup>nd</sup> St extension even before this application was that it mitigates many of those concerns, that it provides a direct connection to Whitewater Park out to State and it doesn't funnel all the traffic from this development back through the neighborhood. So, we looked at that connection itself as a very significant improvement in terms of mitigation on the neighborhood from a traffic perspective.

Commissioner Stevens: I'll go ahead and make my motion Mr. Chair.

Chairman Gillespie: Commissioner Stevens.

**Commissioner Stevens**: If I could. No I'm not quite ready. Hang on, just a second. I'd like to move to approve PUD16-19. I'd like to add a condition of approval for the developer to work with the neighborhood association representative to determine traffic calming measures down  $31^{st}$  St and at the corner of Moore and  $32^{nd}$ .

#### Commissioner Ansotegui: Mr. Chair.

Chairman Gillespie: Commissioner Ansotegui.

**Commissioner Ansotegui**: I'd like to second that motion.

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

MINUTES • August 1, 2016

City Hall – Council Chambers

6:00PM

#### FINAL

MOTION: COMMISSIONER STEVENS MOVED TO APPROVE PUD16-00019 IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROJECT REPORT AND CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL THEREIN WITH THE ADDITION OF A CONDITION THAT THE DEVELOPER WORK WITH THE NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION TO DETERMINE TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES DOWN 31<sup>ST</sup> AND AT THE CORNER OF MOORE AND 32<sup>ND</sup>.

SECONDER: COMMISSIONER ANSOTEGUI

Chairman Gillespie: We have a motion and a second. Is there discussion?

Commissioner Stevens: Mr. Chair.

Chairman Gillespie: Commissioner Stevens.

**Commission Stevens:** I want to address a few things that were brought up this evening. I just want to start with the zoning issue and point out that this neighborhood has been zoned the way it's been zoned. I think my question at the beginning of our session with staff clarified for me why the density that's proposed in this development is appropriate for this particular spot. So I'm very comfortable with that and I, it's clear to me, based on code, based on City code that they could have gone up to 20-units per acre. I am, I understand the concerns about the low income housing, however, we've a pretty major problem in this city with homelessness right now and with the demand for affordable housing and this is a spot that has been zoned for this kind of density that for the various reasons that our staff report makes clear, and I'm not going to go through all the different parts of the code that our staff sited. But, I agree with all of them and I have read them all. This is a spot where transportation is supported. There's going to be bicycle spots. I feel very comfortable that there's enough parking internal to this development. I think I've compared the numbers. City code requires 73. ACHD prefers 97. I think 87 is a reasonable compromise. I think to staff's point too about connectivity, you know I read the community input regarding pinch points and about crime and it's clear that the punch through is going to improve connectivity for emergency services and other things. So, I'm comfortable with that as well. I want to just make a point about the sewer and about the school district. There were a couple comments about overcrowding and I went back through our staff report. Boise City School District, the Independent School District number one, did not say anything about there being a concern with overcrowding and sewer folks also did not mention anything about there being a sewer issue. So, I think, you know the main thing I want to point out after everything else I just said is that the people who are going to live in this neighborhood are residents of the City, just like the rest of us are and there's just as much an opportunity for them to become a part of your neighborhood, to contribute to your neighborhood association and to be good neighbors as any one of you that's sitting out here. And so, for those reason, I'm going to support my own motion.

#### PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

MINUTES • August 1, 2016

#### City Hall – Council Chambers

6:00PM

#### FINAL

Commissioner Ansotegui: Mr. Chair

Chairman Gillespie: Commissioner Ansotegui.

**Commissioner Ansotegui**: I conquer with everything that Commissioner Stevens said. I would also like to add that I think the project has done a good job in integrating this the best they can in terms of the size of it, and the way that it scales up from the neighborhood out to the street. The three-story buildings are in fact on Whitewater and could in fact provide kind of a screen, if you would, of Whitewater. I think that you're going to see increased traffic there no matter what happens. I don't quite know what the outcome, or how we measure traffic calming or the effort toward traffic calming works, would work with this motion. Do we need to discuss that a little further? Whether we are proposing that the developer meet with the neighborhood one time and come up with a couple different alternatives. I don't know. I'm stuttering. Do we need to ask staff about how that would work? Cory? Cody?

Cody Riddle (City of Boise): Mr. Chairman. Commissioners.

Commissioner Ansotegui: Sorry.

Cody Riddle (City of Boise): It's okay. I get that a lot. Just one time.

**Commissioner Ansotegui**: Okay that's it.

**Cody Riddle** (**City of Boise**): It's a difficult situation when you get into offsite improvements like that. We really shy away from that typically. If ACHD or traffic impact study has demonstrated a specific need, certain roadways over capacity, unsafe intersections/crossings, it's really easy to identify where those improvements might occur. That's not the case here. There's capacity on all the roadways. Clearly there will be more traffic. I mean it's fifty additional units. But as far as a specific location or what those improvements would be, it's really going to be difficult to identify.

**Commissioner Stevens**: Mr. Chair.

Chairman Gillespie: Commissioner Stevens.

**Commission Stevens**: I hear what staff is saying. I think my concern is that we have, I have seen in the years that I've been sitting here, which spans about, on and off for about twelve years, several instances where we approve developments and the problems come later and then we are dealing with a situation where the neighborhood comes back to us and we, or they have no opportunity to come back to us because there's nothing before us, nothing for us to do. And so what I'm trying to do here is prevent that. To make it so that we don't have a situation for the neighbors where, you know, and I understand the punch through with 32<sup>nd</sup> St and I think that will make a difference. But I also don't think that it's, I think it would be naïve of us to think that every single person's going to go left and then take Whitewater Parkway out to State St. I think it's pretty clear some people are not going to do that. And so, I would like

#### PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

MINUTES • August 1, 2016

6:00PM

#### FINAL

to try to prevent that if at all possible. Unfortunately, I don't, I suppose if the seconder of the motion would like me to, I could try to be a little more specific and perhaps that would be better for the applicant as well.

Commissioner Ansotegui: Yes.

**Commission Stevens**: Do you have suggestions being that you have a little more background in this particular area than I do.

**Commissioner Ansotegui**: In terms of, the question for you is also how do we involve ACHD in this. If an alternative might be to reconfigure stop signs, you know, along in the grid. How do we, do we get them, are we able to get them to the table to discuss this with the neighborhood. It also gives an opportunity for the developer to meet with the neighborhood again and talk about how this integrates. And I see that's the only real issue of how, how it integrates because I really think otherwise it's a good, I think it's an excellent development. But, it is kind of a wall right there and I think traffic is one of the ways that you can solve one of the major issues there that has been brought up from the neighborhood has suggestions about how that might work. How to implement it? Again, I'm not sure.

Commissioner Bradbury: Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Gillespie: Commissioner Bradbury.

**Commission Bradbury**: So, on the topic of the moment, the how do we get the neighborhood and the developer and ACHD talking about traffic calming. If we go down that path, my suggestion is that we defer action, direct the activity and then have information presented to us at a subsequent meeting where we can make a decision based upon, well the information that's developed. Otherwise, we're approving something on condition that may not, that we may not be able to, or that ACHD may conclude they will not agree to, which gets both the neighborhood and the developer in a situation where they, they don't know where to go next. So, I'm not a huge fan of deferring action but if it's, but I think we should let ACHD weigh in before we decide rather than after we decide. That'd be my approach.

Chairman Gillespie: If we go there.

**Commissioner Bradbury**: If we go that route.

Chairman Gillespie: Thank you.

**Commissioner Bradbury**: Personally, I'm not terribly concerned about the traffic issues. I, you know, I tend to agree with the analysis of ACHD staff and the City staff regarding the traffic issues but I'm not necessarily opposed to having the highway district take another look at it and think about ways that perhaps the neighborhood could be a little bit better protected against the potential for cut-through traffic

MINUTES • August 1, 2016

City Hall – Council Chambers

6:00PM

#### FINAL

which I can see, could certainly happen. So, I don't have a problem with that, with the idea of doing that. My views about this are that first of all I think it's a well-designed project. I think it's a well located project and I think that it is, it certainly meets all, most of, maybe all and I hesitate here because in a second I'm going to talk about where I'm not sure I agree. But I think it meets most of all the criteria of our code. But, here's the issue that I'm concerned with and maybe somebody can help me with this one, and it's a little off the topic what we were talking about before. But, I have to say that I am a little concerned about the notion of, and the criteria in our code which requires that we find that the project will not have a detrimental impact on the neighborhood. And I'm thinking about the notion of the concentration of affordable housing in this neighborhood. And frankly, I don't know that answer to that. I don't know if the concentration of affordable housing really does have a detrimental impact on the neighborhood. We apparently, we've heard some testimony about studies that suggest that it might but it seems to be premised on the notion that there's, that you reach a tipping point and I have no idea and we've not been provided any information about where I'm getting hung up.

Commissioner Gibson: Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Gillespie: Commissioner Gibson.

**Commissioner Gibson**: So I'm going to just kind of throw my hat in the ring relative to the traffic. Based upon the speed and design of Whitewater I would infer that residents going toward State St would stay on Whitewater and not make a cut through based upon the speed of travel and the distance. It's not like you would be cutting significant time off. So secondly, if an individual is on east bound State St thinking that they're going to make a cut through to get over to Whitewater Park faster, they'll be sorely disappointed when they discover that that's a right in right out. That's already been designed into the program. So, specific to whether you're going to have significant issues with residents who aren't part of that area but who are trying to attempt to cut through, I think it's already been into the design aspect of it. I personally would not favor a motion that stipulated traffic calming or traffic mitigation efforts at a future date. My recommendation would be to either defer it until we have quantifiable information or to just approve it as is based upon the fact that it meets the requirements of specific Blueprint Boise and other requirements of the City of Boise.

#### Commissioner Bradbury: Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Gillespie: Commissioner Bradbury.

**Commissioner Bradbury**: And just to finish my thought, if the Commission decides that it would defer for purposes of studying the traffic issue a little more closely, I'd like to know a little bit more about the notion of detrimental impact caused by concentrations and whether the concentration in this neighborhood is, it would in fact, whether the studies really support the notion of detrimental impact on existing neighborhoods and whether the concentrations of affordable housing in this neighborhood really

### PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

#### MINUTES • August 1, 2016

#### City Hall – Council Chambers

6:00PM

#### FINAL

has reach that tipping point. I mean, I don't know the answer to that. Otherwise, without that information I'd probably, I'd probably have to, well I don't know what I'd do frankly. I find myself torn.

**Chairman Gillespie**: Okay. So let me reframe. So, we have a motion on the floor to approve the PUD with an extra condition to, I think, encourage ACHD, the developer and the City to work together on traffic calming in the neighborhood. Is that an acceptable phrase-y-ology Commissioner Stevens?

**Commissioner Stevens**: It is. And if I could respond to Commissioner Bradbury, maybe we can clear some of this up?

Chairman Gillespie: Yes. Commissioner Stevens.

**Commissioner Stevens**: So I support the idea of a deferral. I do, I would at least like to have some information about 31<sup>st</sup> St. and more information about Moore. I've gone back through the ACHD report which I had read already. But I think that personally, I'd like to defer, I think that's a good way to handle it. With the direction to the developer that there'd be a meeting with the neighborhood association representative and ACHD to determine what sort of calming measures would satisfy the neighborhood association but also would be supported by ACHD. So, if the seconder agrees, I'd, and, there you know maybe we wouldn't need to discuss a minute or two longer I'd be happy to withdraw and move toward that direction.

Chairman Gillespie: Commissioner Ansotegui.

**Commissioner Ansotegui**: Thanks. I am leaning towards not deferring at this point. After hearing some of the discussion about the design of the roadway to Whitewater Park Blvd and I also feel that just because this development hits all the other major points in terms of compatibility with the existing uses, it's residential, that it doesn't burden transportation on the arterial there, that it's large enough to accommodate the project, that it's a well-designed, it's a well-designed project I think. And I think it's an amenity to the neighborhood frankly. Again, I have a little issue about whether or not, because I do believe there may be an adverse impact in terms of traffic we just don't know. But I don't think, I don't feel that it's enough at this point to defer further. So, do I withdraw my second?

#### Chairman Gillespie: No.

Commissioner Ansotegui: Or nope? I hold tight.

**Chairman Gillespie**: You don't have to. So, just a point of parliamentary procedure, you're welcome to offer a motion to defer. You don't have to withdraw your main motion. You can just put the deferral on top of it. And we'll vote on the deferral. And your main motion will be outstanding when we reconvene on the matter if that' what you wish to do. Otherwise, we'll need to you know, proceed on the main motion.

### PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

#### MINUTES • August 1, 2016

#### City Hall – Council Chambers

6:00PM

#### FINAL

Commission Stevens: Well I think we, if I could Mr. Chair. I think we can go ahead

Chairman Gillespie: Commissioner Stevens.

**Commissioner Stevens:** If I'm not mistaken, you're suggesting that, Commissioner Ansotegui, that we, that you want the traffic calming, you want the motion to stand as it is.

**Commissioner Ansotegui**: No. No. No. I would like to not defer. Was that on the original motion was to defer?

**Commissioner Stevens**: No, the original motion is to approve with some sort of vaguely worded thing. So.

**Commissioner Ansotegui**: No. I don't think; I don't feel that we can do that. I don't feel that we can do a vaguely worded thing.

Commissioner Steven: So I think I'd like to withdraw the motion with your second then agreeing.

Commissioner Ansotegui: I agree.

**Commissioner Steven**: Okay. So, I'm withdrawing the motion and I am not offering a substitute at this point. Any other motions?

# COMMISSIONER STEVENS WITHDREW HER MOTION, COMMISSIONER ANSOTEGUI AGREED.

**Chairman Gillespie**: Okay. So we have a clean slate. We need to make a decision and so the matter is before the Commission.

Commissioner Gibson: Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Gillespie: Commissioner Gibson.

**Commissioner Gibson**: I'm going to jump out in from of this and make a motion to approve PUD16-19 with all of the conditions as stated by the Staff report, based upon Staff's findings and recommendations.

Chairman Gillespie: We have a motion. Is there a second?

Commissioner Bradbury: I'll second.

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

MINUTES • August 1, 2016

6:00PM

#### FINAL

#### MOTION: COMMISSIONER GIBSON MOVED TO APPROVE PUD16-00019 IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROJECT REPORT AND CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL THEREIN.

#### SECONDER: COMMISSIONER BRADBURY

Chairman Gillespie: We have a motion and a second to approve PUD16-19. Is there any discussion?

Commissioner Gibson: Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Gillespie: Commissioner Gibson.

Commissioner Gibson: As the maker of the motion I wanted to make sure that I went on the record. I was keeping tally of the number of neighbors who provided testimony. The one that had the highest hit mark, if you would, was decreasing quality of life followed by compatibility with the neighborhood followed close by safety and then fourth place was the developer's relationship with the neighborhood group and some oversight and some missed, or disconnects relative to communication. I know the local firm, Glancy Rockwell, they do product all over the valley. They're a quality firm. This is a quality product. The layout, defensible space was not an issue that was brought up. One of the testimonies dealt specifically with pinch points and police pinch points. Defensible space by definition is consistent with this type of product where you have eyes on the courtyard, eyes on the center of the project where residents are able to self-police. You have a first floor/ground floor corridors where police can drive by and actually look into the project, look into the ground floor areas, can make and ascertain whether or not there's an issue. Secondly, I don't believe that it's within the purview of this board in specific to adjudicate or discuss density per federal statute for UFOSS and any of the HUD requirements. I do understand the process of how low income housing tax credit projects are financed and one of the concerns I had about a deferral was there are statutory deadlines and application deadlines that the developer may not have brought forward that weren't part of the testimony that would have an adverse effect. They may not be able to obtain tax credits if this project was deferred and dropped out of cycle. So, I don't want to say that that was a reason for my decision but I wanted to make sure I went on the record that I understand the process and that there are specific requirements that the federal standards, as well as the state and the City, stipulate the supervisory services, on-site manager, minimum requirements and as well as a very comprehensive background search or process that they go to for residents that has the minimum requirements for anything that you would imagine somebody would require a resident to have produce. So, I want to make sure that the project can go forward based upon its location and then the fact that it does meet many of the specific Blueprint for Boise requirements. I can name them but it's in the report.

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

MINUTES • August 1, 2016

#### City Hall – Council Chambers

6:00PM

#### FINAL

### Commissioner Bradbury: Mr. Chairman I'm going to try

Chairman Gillespie: Commissioner Bradbury.

**Commissioner Bradbury**: I'm going to try not to repeat myself but I do want to make it clear that my concern about the concentration of affordable housing in the neighborhood is not so much aimed toward whether it does or does not meet fair housing criteria as whether it meets or does not meet the criteria of the City's zoning ordinance which requires us to make a finding that the project will not have a detrimental impact on the existing neighborhood. I guess, and I second the motion because we really need to try and discuss these things and find our way through this somehow tonight and its obvious I hope everyone can see that we're struggling up here and that we're, we have a number of different points of view and thoughts about this. So, I think it's fair to say that we hear you. Whether how this thing comes out may not be to, well it's going to be to someone's satisfaction and someone's general dissatisfaction, but I think at least that it's clear that we're hearing you. We're listening. But, so we have to decide what we're going to do. And if I think about it from the standpoint of being a, essentially a judge at this hearing, I have to go, I have to make my decision based upon the evidence presented and although I'm concerned about the notion of the detrimental impact, I guess I, in all fairness, I haven't heard enough evidence to convince me that that detrimental, that this project will cause the detrimental impact that the neighborhood is concerned about. So, I guess I've pretty much said where I'm headed.

**Chairman Gillespie**: Thank you Commissioner Bradbury. Any other comments from the Commission? Okay. So we have a motion to approve PUD16-19. Will all those in favor of the motion, please say aye? Opposed?

#### FOUR IN FAVOR, ONE OPPOSED (COMMISSIONER STEVENS), MOTION CARRIES.