



MINUTES

TWIN FALLS CITY PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

February 11, 2014 6:00 PM

City Council Chambers

305 3rd Avenue East Twin Falls, ID 83301

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS

CITY LIMITS:

Nikki Boyd Jason Derricott Tom Frank Kevin Grey Gerardo "Tato" Munoz Chuck Sharp Jolinda Tatum
Chairman

AREA OF IMPACT:

Lee DeVore Steve Woods

Vice-Chairman

CITY COUNCIL LIAISON

Rebecca Mills Sojka

ATTENDANCE

CITY LIMIT MEMBERS

Present Absent

Boyd
Derricott
Frank
Grey
Munoz
Sharp
Tatum

AREA OF IMPACT MEMBERS

Present Absent

DeVore
Woods

CITY COUNCIL LIAISON(S): NONE

CITY STAFF: Carraway, Spendlove, Strickland, Fields, Wonderlich

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER:

Chairman Frank called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M. He then reviewed the public meeting procedures with the audience, confirmed there was a quorum present and introduced City Staff.

II. CONSENT CALENDAR:

1. Approval of Minutes from the following meeting(s): **January 28, 2014 Public Hearing**
2. Approval of Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law: **NONE**

Motion:

Commissioner Woods made a motion to approve the consent calendar, as presented. Commissioner Munoz seconded the motion.

Unanimously Approved

III. ITEMS OF CONSIDERATION:

1. Request for Commission's consideration of approval of the preliminary plat for the Fieldstone Professional Subdivision- A PUD consisting of 11.9 (+/-) acres with 32 lots and 1 tract for a mixed use development located south of the 900-1100 blocks of Cheney Drive West & East of the 1350-1450 blocks of Field Stream Way. c/o David Thibault, EHM Engineers, Inc. on behalf of Brad Wills

Applicant Presentation:

Dave Thibault, EHM Engineers, Inc., representing the applicant stated this is the next step in a long process that began a few years ago as this process is the first step in re-subdividing of an already approved subdivision. This property is east of the Xavier School and the LDS Church that is under construction and southwest of the hospital. The applicant has been through the process to request a rezone of the property to an R-4 PRO PUD Zoning Designation; there were also roadways that were vacated in a portion of the subdivision for the re-subdivision process to occur. The plat is a mixture of residential homes and professional office lots. As part of this development Cheney Drive West will be extended on the north boundary providing another access for the area as it grows. Brad Wills developed the Fieldstone Subdivision and this is the last phase for development of this property.

Staff Analysis:

Planner I Spendlove displayed the exhibits on the overhead and presented the staff analysis of the request. The history starts at approximately 2004 with various plats, PUD approvals and vacations. There are a couple of ordinances that have not been completed. He stated this preliminary plat includes 11.9 (+/-) acres the proposed plat will allow for a planned mixed use development consisting of residential multi-family, professional and medical uses. The minimum lot area for a single family dwelling in the R-4 zone is 4000 square feet, 7000 square feet for a duplex and multi-plex dwelling units will increase over the duplex area by 2000 square feet per dwelling unit depending on how it is designed. The Professional Office overlay states that the lot size shall be of sufficient size to provide for the building, off street parking and landscaping. All of the proposed lots have the required square footage. Professional Office will require parking, landscaping will be required so this will limit the design size.

The preliminary plat is proposing five (5) lots along the future alignment of Cheney Drive West for professional office uses, three (3) lots along North College Road West for duplexes, four (4) lots for single family dwellings at the end of Cobble Creek Road to complete a cul-de-sac and twenty (20) single family cottage-style residences along Field Stream Way. The non-residential uses are restricted to buildings less than 14,000 square feet unless allowed by special use permit. Screening would be required between the residential areas and non-residential areas.

There have been a lot of discussions regarding the construction of Cheney Drive West extension with Twin Falls Reformed Church, MJB, LLC aka Countryside Village Trailer Park and the developer. The City has received road right-of-way from MJB, LLC. The road right-of-way dedication has not been received from the property owner to the north, Twin Falls Reformed Church, Inc. Four of the five proposed professional office use lots access Cheney Drive West, extended. The Commission may wish to place a condition on the preliminary plat that no building permits will be issued for Lots 1 through 5, Block 1 of the Fieldstone Professional Subdivision until Cheney Drive West has been constructed.

A portion of Twin Falls Canal Company's Lateral #43 is located along the northern boundary of the proposed subdivision where Cheney Drive West, extended shall be constructed. The developer is proposing to relocate and pipe the lateral on the property to the north, Twin Falls Reformed Church, Inc. The Commission may wish to place a condition on the preliminary plat that the developer shall provide an approval from the Twin Falls Canal Company for the relocation of the lateral and the necessary easements.

**Planning & Zoning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2014**

Fieldstone Subdivision is currently served with thirty five (35) sewer will serves. This development, being a re-plat of those residential lots, will retain those will serves and associated volume of waste water. There will be no additional capacity available until the waste water treatment plan is complete. The estimated time of completion of the treatment plant is December 2015.

This is the first step of the plat approval process. A preliminary plat is presented to the Planning and Zoning Commission. The Commission may approve the preliminary plat, deny it, or approve it with conditions. A final plat, that is in conformance with the approved preliminary plat and including any conditions the Commission may have required, is then presented to the City Council. Only after a final plat has been approved by the City Council and construction plans approved, may the plat be recorded and lots sold for development.

This request is in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan which designates this area as appropriate for medium density residential development and the urban village/urban infill land use concept. There is not a zoning designation specific to the Urban Village/Urban Infill classification but it encourages mixed density residential development and a mix of non-residential uses that support the area which can be met with the professional office overlay.

Zoning & Development Manager Carraway stated upon conclusion should the Commission approve the request, as present, staff recommends the following conditions:

1. Subject to final technical review and amendments as required by Building, Engineering, Fire, and Zoning officials to ensure compliance with all applicable City Code requirements and standards.
2. Subject to Council approval of an Ordinance for the rezoning of the property from R-2 to R-4 PRO PUD.
3. Subject to Council approval of an Ordinance for the vacation of the dedicated public rights-of-way and easements consisting of 2.7 (+/-) acres located within a portion of the Fieldstone Subdivision located south of the 900-1100 blocks of Cheney Drive West, undeveloped and east of the 1350-1450 blocks of Field Stream Way.
4. Subject to Council approval and recordation of the Fieldstone Professional P.U.D. R-4 Professional Planned Unit Development Agreement.
5. Subject to no building permits being issued for Lots 1 through 5, Block 1, Fieldstone Professional Subdivision, until Cheney Drive West, extended, has been constructed.
6. Subject to road right-of-way being dedicated to the City of Twin Falls from the Twin Falls Reformed Church, Inc. for their portion of Cheney Drive West, extended.
7. Subject to Twin Falls Canal Company approval of the relocation of Lateral #43 and the dedication of necessary easements.

PZ Questions/Comments:

- Zoning & Development Manager Carraway stated that the developer has asked that lot 4 Block 1 be excluded from condition #5, because to construct this building he would be accessing the property from Field Stream Way, she explained the City Engineer Fields may be able to address this issue if the Commission has questions about this request.
- Commissioner Frank asked City Engineer Fields to discuss this request.
- City Engineer Fields stated as long as the entity that chooses to develop on that land and is willing to accept access on Field Stream Way that would work out just fine.

Planning & Zoning Commission Minutes

February 11, 2014

- Commissioner Woods asked about the irregular shapes of the lots along the northeast portion of the plat.
- Mr. Thibault explained these lots were excluded from the plat because the Fieldstone Homeowners Association owns this greenbelt area.
- Commissioner Woods asked if Misty Meadows Trail will go all the way through generating more traffic through a residential area.
- Mr. Thibault stated no the road will not go through it will be posted as private with no on street parking.
- Commissioner Woods asked about the configuration of Tract B and if the reason for it is because of existing construction.
- Mr. Thibault stated the tract contains storm water retention that will need to be reconfigured to accommodate the storm water retention as well as the construction of Cheney Drive West along the northern boundary.
- Commissioner Grey asked how the relocation of the lateral will work if there is not documentation from the church to the north as to whether or not they have agreed to this.
- Mr. Thibault explained he and the developer have been working with the property owners in the area and the canal company on relocating the lateral and suggested Mr. Wills speak on that issue. There is a plan for piping the canal and they are currently working on alignments to complete the project. There are a lot of properties with a vested interest in this project.
- Brad Wills, Wills Inc. stated the lateral is on the churches property, they have been working for about a year with the canal company. To make the pipe work they have an agreement with the canal company to have them relocate the lateral to an open ditch to the north, so that they don't have to pipe it twice. The Twin Falls Reform Church through their PUD Agreement has signed an agreement to give the City right-of-way to move forward with Cheney Drive West construction. The moving of the canal and the development of Cheney Drive West are being worked on together so that it can be done around the same time.
- Commissioner Munoz asked if there have been any traffic studies for this area related to how high density development would impact the area.
- Mr. Wills explained not to his knowledge, but by extending Cheney Drive West that should assist in relieving traffic. This project is not increasing the density but by having Cheney Drive West go through the intention is to have the City grow in this direction and by building Cheney Drive West it should help.
- Commissioner Frank asked the City Engineer Fields to describe how the City designs its roads.
- City Engineer Fields explained the master development plan shows collectors as four lane roads and this has been designed as a three lane road because the access is very limited and in part because there was a desire to get it built.
- Commissioner Frank asked if from what is known of this development does staff see any potential traffic concerns.
- City Engineer Fields stated not along this section.
- Commissioner Munoz asked if there is a deadline for completion of the Cheney Drive West, extension, because the rest of the subdivision can be developed creating density without traffic plans.
- City Engineer Fields stated there is not a due date for construction of the Cheney Drive West, extension but it is her understanding that there is a desire to construct it as soon as possible because there is more than one beneficiary.

Planning & Zoning Commission Minutes

February 11, 2014

Public Hearing: [Open](#)

- Megan Humble, 931 Misty Meadows Trail, stated she knows that it is required for non-residential developments to provide fencing, the request is that the fence go up before the development takes place so that the fencing can be uniform, especially since some of the lots are going to be directly exposed to the Cheney Drive West, extension.

Closing Statement:

- Mr. Wills stated along Grandview Drive there is a nice block wall and it was extended through Sunterra. The home owners are responsible for choosing to fence up along the walking path. The businesses will have to provide fencing between the two uses. They will put the fencing in before the development occurs.

Public Hearing: [Closed](#)

Deliberations Followed:

- Commissioner Munoz stated he still has concerns related to traffic and once Cheney Drive West is developed that will help, but he still has concerns.
- Commissioner Sharp stated he likes this plan better than the high density housing, the concerns have been addresses, as for traffic the property is going to be developed one way or the other.
- Commissioner Boyd stated it's hard to predict because you can't have one without the other development needs the road and the road needs to be there for development. So predicting when things will be built is difficult.
- Commissioner Munoz stated his concern is that Cheney Drive West doesn't have to be constructed until after the other lots are already developed.
- Commissioner Grey stated what if the condition was changed to state that Cheney Drive West must be built before development occurs.
- Commissioner Frank stated that building permits could be withheld until Cheney Drive West is built where the professional office lots are located.
- Commissioner Sharp clarified that Condition #5 states exactly that requirement.
- Commissioner Munoz stated that he thinks restricting development for the entire subdivision is until Cheney Drive West is constructed is too restrictive; he just has concerns with the timing and the traffic.
- Commissioner Frank stated he doesn't have an issue with approving this request.

Motion:

Commissioner Sharp made a motion to approve the request, as presented, with staff recommendations. Commissioner DeVore seconded the motion. Commissioners Boyd, Derricott, Frank, Grey, Sharp, Tatum, DeVore and Woods voted in favor of the motion and Commissioner Munoz voted against the motion.

[APPROVED, AS PRESENTED, WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS](#)

1. Subject to final technical review and amendments as required by Building, Engineering, Fire, and Zoning officials to ensure compliance with all applicable City Code requirements and standards.
2. Subject to Council approval of an Ordinance for the rezoning of the property from R-2 to R-4 PRO PUD.

**Planning & Zoning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2014**

3. Subject to Council approval of an Ordinance for the vacation of the dedicated public rights-of-way and easements consisting of 2.7 (+/-) acres located within a portion of the Fieldstone Subdivision located south of the 900-1100 blocks of Cheney Drive West, undeveloped and east of the 1350-1450 blocks of Fields Stream Way.
4. Subject to Council approval and recordation of the Fieldstone Professional P.U.D. R-4 Professional Planned Unit Development Agreement.
5. Subject to no building permits being issued for Lots 1 through 5, Block 1, Fieldstone Professional Subdivision, until Cheney Drive West, extended, has been constructed.
6. Subject to road right-of-way being dedicated to the City of Twin Falls from the Twin Falls Reformed Church, Inc. for their portion of Cheney Drive West, extended.
7. Subject to Twin Falls Canal Company approval of the relocation of Lateral #43 and the dedication of necessary easements.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

1. Request for the Commission's recommendation on a request for a PUD Agreement Amendment to amend the Magic Valley Mall, LLC PUD Agreement #215 to allow a modification to the sign criteria on property located at 1485 Pole Line Road East c/o David Thibault, EHM Engineers, Inc. on behalf of Magic Valley Mall. (app. 2612)

Applicant Presentation:

Dave Thibault, EHM Engineers, Inc., representing the applicant stated this PUD Agreement was created in the mid 80's and has had several amendments subsequently as the Mall has grown. The request is that the PUD be amended to include language that would make the mall subject to the updated City Sign Code ordinance. The PUD would read that all signs constructed or installed on the subject property shall meet the applicable provisions of the Twin Falls City Code with no other restriction being placed on signs permitted under this agreement. They want to play by the same rules and the Mall has discovered that as they have tried to erect and construct signs for their property that trying to ensure compliance with the PUD Agreement has been laborious for their contractors to sift through their PUD requirements. The one exception to this change would be the pennant signs; the Mall has recently remodeled some of the entrances and added pennant signs previously called out in the PUD Agreement, they would ask that those remain in the PUD Agreement and permitted as allowed through the PUD Agreement. These signs don't necessarily advertise for specific stores or products they are more decorative and gives the customer a sense of place and location. The mall is a destination and these signs assist the customers.

Staff Analysis:

Planner I Spendlove displayed the exhibits on the overheads and reviewed the staff analysis of the request. He stated this request is for the Commission to consider an amendment to the Magic Valley Mall PUD Agreement to allow a modification to the sign criteria on property located at 1485 Pole Line Road East. The modification would allow future signage at the Magic Valley Mall to follow current and revised City Code 10-9; Sign Regulation standards. At the preliminary presentation there was a question from the Commissioners about the change this impact will have on sign for the property. The staff report tried to address the question but essentially there are too many variables to give a specific yes or no answer. They will have to comply with the current city sign code and without a plan with dimensions or locations there is no way of knowing the answer.

Planner I Spendlove stated upon conclusion should the Commission recommend approval of the request, as presented, staff recommends the following conditions:

Planning & Zoning Commission Minutes

February 11, 2014

1. Subject to Master Development Plan amendments as required by Building, Fire, Engineering and Zoning Officials to ensure compliance with all applicable City Code requirements and standards.
2. Subject to recordation of Magic Valley Mall, LLC PUD Agreement #215; 2014 Amendment, as approved by the City Council, prior to development of this site.

PZ Questions/Comments:

- Commissioner Tatum asked if this is approved will this set precedence for other PUD Agreements to change their sign criteria and would that open things up for detracting from the development.
- Planner I Spendlove stated an applicant can always come in and request a PUD Amendment as fro detraction is they wanted to come through and change the construction design if it is removed they would have to comply with city code if there are deficiencies in the city code that might be a place to asked whether or not the amendment is adequate.
- Commissioner Sharp clarified that this will bring their requirements into alignment with the City Sign Code.
- Commissioner Woods asked if a sign could be built along the Bridgeview corridor with bright lights next to sleeping quarters.
- Planner I Spendlove stated that if he is referring to message center signs there are provisions for how bright those can be specifically, it does not preclude any certain areas where they can or can't be except for in commercially zone properties. There are size requirements and conditions that have to be met.
- Commissioner Woods states so message center signs would be allowed.
- Planner I Spendlove stated if he saw a plan he could be more specific but Bridgeview could also be able to have the same type of sign pointed towards the mall property, it is a possibility both properties are commercially zoned.
- Commissioner Woods asked if there are lighting considerations when the sign is next to sleeping quarters.
- Commissioner Frank asked if the current PUD Agreement prohibited message center signs.
- Planner I Spendlove stated he is not sure but he does know that the City Sign Code addresses message center signs and has provisions to address the brightness of the sign, frequency of messages; there are conditions that have to be met.
- Commissioner Woods stated we are here to protect the adjacent properties and while Bridgeview may be commercial it is still somewhat residential and people may be trying to sleep.
- Planner I Spendlove explained if the sign code is deficient in addressing this situation maybe that needs to be discussed.
- Zoning & Development Manager Carraway stated the City has not heard any concerns from the adjacent property owners. Bridgeview was notified through this process if they had concerns she believes they would have been here.

Public Hearing: [Open](#)

Public Hearing: [Closed](#)

Planning & Zoning Commission Minutes

February 11, 2014

Deliberations Followed:

- Commissioner Munoz stated that he reviewed the sign code and what is allowed currently. The sign code makes enforcement easier and rather than studying a massive PUD to make sure it meets the PUD Agreement criteria. The current sign code is much more restrictive than what is in the PUD Agreement. It won't fix signs that are not in currently in compliance but it will be much easier to enforce in the future.

Motion:

Commissioner Tatum made a motion to recommend approval of the request, as presented, with staff recommendations. Commissioner Woods seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor of the motion.

RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL, AS PRESENTED, WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Subject to Master Development Plan amendments as required by Building, Fire, Engineering and Zoning Officials to ensure compliance with all applicable City Code requirements and standards.
2. Subject to recordation of Magic Valley Mall, LLC PUD Agreement #215; 2014 Amendment, as approved by the City Council, prior to development of this site.

SCHEDULE FOR PUBLIC HEARING WITH CITY COUNCIL MARCH 10, 2014

2. Request for the Commission's recommendation on a request for a PUD Agreement Amendment to amend the WS&V PUD Agreement #263 to allow a mixed use development; consisting of professional office and residential uses, on the remaining undeveloped lots within the WS&V First Amended Subdivision-A PUD, consisting of lots 2-5 Block 1 and totaling 16 (+/-) acres, located west of the 1000 block of Field Stream Way and southwest of Cheney Drive West, extended c/o John O Fitzgerald, II on behalf of WS&V, LLC (app. 2614)

Applicant Presentation:

John Fitzgerald, II, representing the applicant, stated they are here to request an amendment that will help to move the process forward with some clarification. He reviewed the area on the overhead and what is surrounding the property. The property to the east of this development has been rezoned to R-4 PRO through a PUD Agreement. The first amendment is a clarification making

Dr. Office's an allowed use without a Special Use Permit process. The second amendment is a clarification that detached accessory buildings be allowed without a Special Use Permit if less than 1000 sq. ft in size. The next amendment is an amendment to the land use regulations the PUD is written presently it provides for 6 units per building. The applicant is asking that this be amended to allow for 8 units per building as a permitted use. This is in line with the concept initially presented; the Devon Senior Housing project would be the concept that they have for the development. Part of the problem with this project in and of itself is that it is conceptual in nature. This is not a typical PUD in which a master development plan is presented. What they are looking for is to provide a list of permitted uses and special uses consistent with the concept of how the property would be marketed and developed. To be consistent with that concept is amending the PUD Agreement allowing 8 units which would be consistent with the Devon Senior Housing project. The next amendment #4 is a clarification associated with detached accessory building larger than 1000 sq. ft. associated with residential carports and clubhouses. The next item in conjunction with taking 6 units up to 8 units they would like to allow anything about 8 units to a maximum of 12 units be allowed by Special Use Permit. In the previous hearings there has been objection associated with

Planning & Zoning Commission Minutes

February 11, 2014

this process and it has been misrepresented. It has been implied that the developer is seeking carte blanche approval in other words this is our concept give us permitted uses and let us go; thereby eliminating governmental oversight and public input. Part of the amendment is to seek a process by which this is a less cumbersome process to go through rather than each time a project comes up a concept comes up that they have to come back and seek amendments to the PUD Agreement. What they have done in this amendment is make seeking a Special Use Permit part of the process which allows for governmental oversight and public input. For example if there is a concept or project that would fall under the Special Use list then they would come back and request approval through the Special Use Permit process providing for input and oversight. That is the item that is listed as number 6 in the staff report. They are looking for a mechanism by which this PUD Agreement and the projects and conceptual development as it progresses into the future it is more amenable and less burdensome process but fulfill the need for governmental oversight and public input. One of the other amendments was the land use regulation associated with access. They included in the statement "or by recorded easement" the applicant is willing to withdraw that from the amendment. The next two items numbered 8 & 9 were previously approved and included them in the amendment to show it was part of the previous amendment. That was via a separate document he was trying to keep all the changes together to make it all part of one document. These items were approved in October of 2013. With respect to conclusions as it relates to the condition that a new water and sewer model be completed, WS&V, LLC is more than happy to cooperate if it was found to be necessary however with respect to the properties in the area and the owners they are working together and in fact have an agreement with respect to the water and sewer systems out in the area and Mr. Gerald Martens one of the owners of the land in this area and he can speak more specifically to that concern. In conclusion with respect to condition #2 it is being worked out amongst the property owners.

PZ Questions/Comments:

- Commissioner Frank asked for clarification of what is being withdrawn.
- Mr. Fitzgerald stated items #7 related to the statement "or by recorded easement" will be removed.

Staff Analysis:

Planner I Spendlove displayed exhibits on the overhead and review the staff analysis of the request. He stated this property has a long history on this property and in summary 2006 was when the property was annexed with an R-2 zone. The applicant is correct in that the property to the ease was approved for the rezone, and the rezone the map shows R-2 is because the ordinance has been adopted, once adopted the map will be updated to R-4 PRO PUD. There have been developments surrounding the property Xavier Charter School and the LDS Church that is under construction. There have been various rezones and PUD amendments from approximately 2009-2012. Progressively these have come through the public hearing process with different items detailed throughout. As for the analysis the applicant's representative has reviewed each amendment item includes so the staff presentation will be about the possible impacts this amendment may have on the development and surrounding area.

Possible Impacts of the PUD Amendment as listed above:

#1: Staff does not feel this amendment has a significant impact on the development in terms of design and use of the property. The changes being made are consistent with Current City Code and the overall design of surrounding neighborhoods and existing zoning districts.

#2 & #4: Although City Code does identify detached accessory and accessory buildings differently in our definitions, this amendment will clarify any discrepancy that may have existed. Staff does not feel this amendment will have a significant impact on the surrounding area in terms of overall design or use of the property.

#3, #5, & #6: In 8 years this area has been up-zoned to include a dramatic increase in available dwelling units and density. In 2006 the area was annexed as an R-2 zoning designation that requires separate lots for each building, and a maximum of 2 dwelling units per building, and no commercial aspect to the development. In 2009, a portion of that area was zoned R-4, which still requires separate lots for buildings, and a maximum of 4 dwelling units in one building (per special use permit). This rezone also brought an inclusion of some commercial/office aspect into a portion of the property. In 2010 the entirety (both R-2 and R-4 PRO areas) was again rezoned to R-6 PRO, this too required each building to be on its own lot, and put a permitted maximum of 6 dwelling units per building. In 2012, a PUD Amendment was approved for a +/- 5 acre portion of the project that allowed multiple buildings on one lot, with a maximum of 6 units per building. This current amendment is asking to increase the permitted number of units per building as well as allow multiple buildings on one lot through a Special Use Permit Process.

The allowance of multiple buildings on one lot is a type of design language not found in any Residential Zone in the Twin Falls City Code. This language is found in the Commercial and Industrial zoning code sections. The Devon Senior Housing project mentioned by the applicant in their letter is found in the C-1: Commercial Highway zoning district.

The amendment to allow 8 dwelling units per building is significantly different from the total allowable units that were possible in 2006 when this area was annexed under the R-2 Zoning district, as well as the subsequent rezone to R-4 PRO that took place in 2009. The approved R-6 PRO PUD currently in effect does place a maximum of 6 dwelling units per building. The base R-6 Zoning District does not have a maximum dwelling unit built into the current code. However, the increase in available density from 6 to 8 units will have an impact on the current uses in the area as well as the potential surrounding uses if approved. Per **City Code 10-6-1.3(A)**: "In residential zoning subdistricts, the number of units per building shall be determined by commission and council action."

The potential for an increase in the amount of possible dwelling units will have an impact on water and sewer services in the area. The recorded subdivision and its lots were calculated at a certain rate of usage for water and sewer. We are unable to determine the actual impacts that may occur due to the conceptual nature of the submitted development plan. Typically, we would be able to ascertain the impacts of these types of developments on a case by case basis when they went through the subdivision process. If the amendment to allow multiple buildings on a lot is approved, we do not have a mechanism that provides for this modeling to be required prior to development of the land. Therefore the extent of the impacts on the surrounding area cannot be determined at this time. We

**Planning & Zoning Commission Minutes
February 11, 2014**

need a new infrastructure model of the water and sewer systems to take place prior to any development on Lots 2-5 of the WS&V Subdivision First Amended, due to the changes in capacity being proposed, because there is no way to responsibly size the infrastructure. The flexibility sought by the applicant means the infrastructure size is likely to be too big or too small.

#7: This amendment will have an impact on the design and use of this development. This amendment will change the requirement for roadways built within the PUD. They roadways will no longer have the requirement to build to City of Twin Falls Standards. The roadways will be private, not maintained or accepted by the City. The development plan does not contain any internal roadways, conceptual or otherwise. The impacts of allowing roadways to be designated via easement could lead to issues with the connectivity to surrounding City Streets. The impacts cannot be determined at this point due to the lack of designated access points on dedicated City Streets. Has been withdrawn by the applicant

#8: Staff does not feel this amendment has a significant impact on the development in terms of design and use of the property. The changes being made are consistent with Current City code and the overall design of surrounding neighborhoods and existing zoning districts.

Planner I Spendlove stated upon conclusion should the Commission recommend approval of the request, as presented, staff recommends the following conditions:

1. Subject to amendments as required by Building, Engineering, Fire, and Zoning Officials to ensure compliance with all applicable City Code requirements and standards and the WS&V PUD #263; a R-6 PRO Planned Unit Development.
2. Subject to a new infrastructure model for sewer and water systems, and corresponding construction plans, being approved by the City prior to any development occurring on Lots 2-5 of the WS&V Subdivision First Amended.
3. ~~Subject to a development plan showing private roadway easements, and access points onto dedicated public roadways, being approved by the City prior to any development on Lots 2-5 of the WS&V Subdivision First Amended; or proposed amendment "Land Use Regulations – (D) Property Development Standards: 7 – Access: ...or by a recorded easement" being removed from the Amended PUD Agreement.~~ **Withdrawn By Applicant**

PZ Questions/Comments:

- Commissioner Frank asked Mr. Martens to address the modeling condition listed in the staff recommendations.
- Mr. Martens stated that he is the property owner to the north of this property; he is the Engineer for this project as well as the Fieldstone Professional development. He stated they have a new water model dated November 26, 2013 he is not opposed to review of the model and believes it meets all of the requirements.

Public Hearing: [Open](#)

- Gerald Martens state he is here to represent the property owner to the north there have been some concerns related to the density and the ability to serve the area. They have worked with

Planning & Zoning Commission Minutes

February 11, 2014

this applicant on design. The water will serve both properties and they are working to get Cheney Drive West, extended which has taken a long time. There will be additional traffic relief concerns addressed in future plans for the area, and from the neighbor's standpoint the requested amendments will no compromise their property.

- Megan Humble, 931 Misty Meadows Trail stated she has a couple of concerns with this request. In 2006 this was R-2 zoned, then rezoned to R-4 then to R-6 PRO, then 5 acres was allowed to be rezoned to allow for 60 apartment units. The request to increase the density is concerning as a home owner in the Fieldstone Subdivision to the east of this property. She believes the comprehensive plan this is listed as an urban village mixed use designation. There was already an approval for apartment buildings project on the southeast boundary of this property. She realizes this is a conceptual plan so nobody has any idea what the development will look like; with the requested amendments it could conceptually become a big sea of apartments and this type of development has already been approved on the other portion of the property. We need a different mix of uses in this urban village designation. She understands the need for rental units in the City it seems there are a lot of other properties that could be used for apartment buildings, some on the east side of town that looks great for apartments. There is not a need for all of these apartments on this side of town in this location. Xavier Charter School generates a lot of traffic and this will just increase the congestion especially during peak travel times. In conclusion a similar request was denied by Planning & Zoning and City Council not long ago nothing has really changed, she asked that they Commission not recommend approval of the increased density and multiple apartment buildings on a single lot.
- Steven Dixon, 1006 Cobble Creek Road, in the Fieldstone Subdivision he would like to echo Megan's comments and add that he has issues with adding another level of complexity to the process for someone to request a special use permit every time someone thinks of something new. We will be coming back over and over again because there isn't a plan.
- City Engineer Fields stated she would like to explain why a water and sewer model is necessary. When there is generally known quantity of units being proposed something like with traditional subdivision the staff can gain an understanding of whether or not there will be sufficient fire flow for the neighborhood and to try and avoid any unintended consequences downstream at the sewer and water treatment plant. The issue tonight isn't whether or not the sewage will get merely across Pole Line Road the request to be able to look at any proposal that comes out the request is to be able to ask that if it looks different that is be modeled to verify that it is or isn't different so that we don't have an unintended consequence. It is not known to her at this point and time how the surrounding neighborhoods are going to develop and what type of fire flow needs will have to be met. If the model done in November 2013 is sufficient staff will accept the document if it is not sufficient then another model will be requested. If the model will meet the needs and it matches the needs of the request the staff will work with that information. If she doesn't understand what the plan is for the large lots then she has to make assumption. This has been done in other places around town, and staff has said once the market has been found for the property staff will review the plan and figure out what needs to be done to move forward. That is the sole purpose for the provision listed in the staff recommendations.
- Monica Rojas, 1017 Cobble Creek Rd, a Fieldstone resident. She would like to ask that the Commission recommend denial.

Planning & Zoning Commission Minutes

February 11, 2014

- Kristina Hill, 932 Starlight Loop, stated she is opposed to this request and agrees with previous testimony. One thought she had is that by amending this document it makes it easier in the future for them to not have to go through a process to approve a project; there shouldn't be projects that don't fit into this agreement because the agreement outlines what was agreed upon at the time of approval. This agreement has changed and the increase density is not what we won't in this area. Her children attend the Xavier School and this is her home, she is concerned with property values, the feeling that exists currently in the neighborhood, and she asks that this request be denied.
- Brad Wills, owner of the property to the east of this property stated he has been involved with planning out this area and trying to keep in mind the traffic and construction of Cheney Drive West, He thinks there is a need for more rentals and there are other uses that will probably happen in this area also. He requested that the Commission recommend approval of the request. He believes that part of the confusion was that the change involved all of the property and it really applied to one lot. He thinks this is a good way to go.
- Michelle Downard, 933 Rice Circle stated she would encourage the Commission to consider carefully what makes it better in the eyes of all of the home owners in the area when you increase the density. Who is this benefiting, that is probably the key issue and to go from 6 to possibly 12 is a huge jump with existing traffic problems, and apartment buildings can impact the home values in the area. Consider carefully the little guys instead of the big guys and what is best for them and what is best for the neighborhood.
- Tara Packham, 966 Rice Circle, stated she lives south of this and was not aware of this request previously and she would like to echo what Ms. Humble said what really concerns her is that plans are being discussed by the developers for property even further west and she hopes that she is made aware of those plans. She would request that this be denied.
- Erika Willsey, 1242 Silver Creek Way, Sunterra Subdivision, she is opposed to this request. There was not confusion about the changes that were approved for the 1 lot, it was clear. She is concerned that she has to keep coming back to defend her neighborhood; because these developers want more and more and more slicing more off for their piece of the pie. She would request that the public notice signs be posted in more visible locations. The neighborhood has given enough and they are done.
- Clint Hales, 213 Edwards, stated he is building a house in this area and had he known this was the plan he is not sure he would have built in this location. There are a lot of problems with that kind of density.

Closing Statement:

- Mr. Fitzgerald stated the applicant respects the neighbors they are asking for an amendment to the process and they would like to make the process less cumbersome. They are seeking to move the 6 units to 8 units and anything above 8 units up to 12 has to go through the SUP process. It is not carte blanche; they just want to make the process less cumbersome.
- Commissioner Frank asked if there is anything that could increase the maximum allowable density with this requested zoning.
- Planner I Spendlove stated until a design is available there is no way of knowing. The amount would be based on the design of the project to determine the amount of land needed for each building, if the buildings are going to be upstairs and downstairs or below ground. There is a base number for lot sizes in the R-6 zone and until staff knows what is going to be there it is not possible to calculate the density.

Planning & Zoning Commission Minutes

February 11, 2014

- Commissioner Grey the R-6 Zone takes it from a maximum of six they are requesting a maximum of eight.
- Planner I Spendlove stated that amount would be per lot under the R-6 Zone, what they are requesting is to allow multiple units per building and multiple buildings on a single lot which makes it even more complicated to determine density calculations along with all the other requirements. In summary this change if approved would increase the number of units in a building and allow multiple buildings on one lot.
- City Attorney Wonderlich stated he and Planner I Spendlove had a long conversation regarding this request and how difficult this is and he is not able to say how dense the project will be with all of the additional requirements that have to be met. What is known is that apartment complex developments only have so much room because of parking and landscaping requirements. This can't be calculated without seeing a design for the project.
- Commissioner Grey wanted to clarify to the audience that until there is a plan there is not a way to know what the density will be for the development.
- City Attorney Wonderlich stated with regards to Mr. Fitzgerald's presentation he is correct, this with the exception of 6-8 it is primarily a process issue. Currently the way it stands is when they choose to develop each lot and decide on a design plan they have to come through the Planning & Zoning Commission & City Council for a PUD Agreement Amendment. This change would require them to come to the Planning & Zoning Commission through a Special Use Permit process. It would not go to the City Council unless there is an appeal.
- Commissioner Munoz clarified as the PUD Agreement stands now a 6-plex is allowed on one lot. This change if approved would allow multiple 6-plexes on a single lot and if they want more than 6 units and multiple units on one lot they would come through a Special Use Permit process.
- Planner I Spendlove explained in the current PUD without these changes a 6-plex can go on one lot they would like to raise the number to an 8-plex and allow multiple buildings on a lot.
- Commissioner Derricott stated there would still be some restrictions because of the parking and landscaping requirements.
- Commissioner Woods stated he sees a gradual degradation in a process that the City has used for years and only for the convenience of the developer. He would see this change making it very difficult for staff to plan for traffic and other development because there is not an existing plan. He also thinks this would set precedence if approved and other developers are going to want the same thing, and the City loses control over transitioning from single family to multi-family.
- Commissioner Sharp stated his big issue is that the home owners in this area were not aware of this plan and was not told that this was going to be the plan and it keeps changing.
- Commissioner Munoz stated he agrees with the transitioning issue and this is allowing a commercial design in a residential zone. This change is changing the nature of how the property will be developed the MV Mall PUD Amendment was not going to change the development it was going to make their process for sign approval less cumbersome.

Public Hearing: [Closed](#)

Discussion Followed:

- Commissioner Boyd stated progress can be messy and there was once upon a time where home owners were building next to a golf course and now it's a church. We need to look at what is happening in the area and what is good for the neighbors. She asked for ownership clarification.

Planning & Zoning Commission Minutes

February 11, 2014

- Planner Spendlove explained the applicant owns lots 2-5 they do not own lot 1 it was sold and it has its own PUD Agreement with a development plan for that parcel to look like what is shown on the exhibit.
- Commissioner Munoz stated having to change the plan over and over again without a plan is not good practice because the planning gets lost in the process.
- Commissioner Frank stated he appreciates the need for flexibility to be able to market the property but there are too many unknowns.
- Commissioner Tatum asked if there could a motion to approve some of the changes without approving all of the changes.
- Commissioner Grey stated for example the portion regarding Dr. Offices and detached accessory those changes were just clarifications and he understands that part of the request but the multiple units and density related portion he is not sure about.

Motion:

Commissioner Tatum made a motion to approve the request, as presented, with the following amendments: to allow Dwellings-multiple household with a maximum of 6 units as a permitted use, and to remove the Dwellings-multiple household allowing more than 8 units to a maximum of 12 units as allowed through Special Use Permit. Commissioners Boyd, Derricott, Frank, Grey, Munoz, Sharp, Tatum & DeVore voted in favor of the motion and Commissioner Woods voted against the motion.

RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE REQUEST, AS AMENDED BY THE PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION, AND AS PRESENTED, WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Subject to amendments as required by Building, Engineering, Fire, and Zoning Officials to ensure compliance with all applicable City Code requirements and standards and the WS&V PUD #263; a R-6 PRO Planned Unit Development.
2. Subject to a new infrastructure model for sewer and water systems, and corresponding construction plans, being approved by the City prior to any development occurring on Lots 2-5 of the WS&V Subdivision First Amended.

SCHEDULE FOR PUBLIC HEARING WITH CITY COUNCIL MARCH 10, 2014

10 Minute Break

3. **WITHDRAWN** Request for a Special Use Permit to allow an impound yard, wrecking yard, automobile salvage and junkyard on property located at 198 Gem Street South **c/o Mark Gordoski DBA Marky's Super Tow** (app. 2616)
4. Request for a Special Use Permit to allow parking of two pieces of heavy equipment in conjunction with an excavation business operating as a home occupation on property located at 911 Rice Circle, **c/o Jim & Juline Crandall** (app. 2617)

Applicant Presentation:

Jim Crandall, the applicant stated they own an acre lot located at 911 Rice Circle in Twin Falls and are requesting a Special Use Permit to operate a home occupation for Crandall excavation. They moved into the home in November of 2000 have operated their business from this location and have never had any complaints from surrounding neighbors. The business has not additional

employees and it does not generate any customers that would come to the home. He can keep an eye on his equipment and there have been no hazardous uses of the property, no odor, fumes or vibrations from the business. There are no plans to change anything and they intend to continue to operate as they have. He accesses the drive way from Rice Circle and when not at work the equipment is parked next to the garage. The other equipment shown is a spare backhoe and dump truck when not in use they are parked neatly square with the road and 60 ft. from the asphalt along Falls Avenue. There is a large 50' entrance at this location and it does not interfere with the traffic on Falls Avenue West. They have been at this location for 13 years without complaints and they ask this to be considered when making the decision.

Staff Analysis:

Zoning & Development Manager Carraway stated this is a request allow parking of two pieces of heavy equipment in conjunction with an excavation business operating as a home occupation on property located at 911 Rice Circle. She stated in January 1996 City Council rezoned approximately 10 acres from RR to R-1 43,000 to allow the site to be developed into a residential subdivision. Bradshaw Subdivision was recorded in October 1998. As the property is located in the Area of Impact the road Falls Avenue West is under the maintenance/development jurisdiction of the Twin Falls Highway District who have reviewed and signed the plat, as presented. The applicants built their home in 2000 and began operating their excavation business from this location at 911 Rice Circle. In 2004 the City and County updated the Area of Impact Agreement as part of the update this area was changed from an R-1 4300 Zoning Designation to SUI; Suburban Urban Interface. The basic uses and development standards did not change in this zone. In 2005 The Crandall's received a building permit for a 952 sf garage. The garage was issued a final inspection in 2006. As stated, the applicant began operating an excavation business from this location at 911 Rice Circle in 2000. The City has had no complaints regarding the operation of a home operated excavation business until last year. Upon investigation it was discovered that there were two pieces of heavy equipment being parked in the driveway. When the property owner was asked about the complaint he indicated they did use a room in the house for bookwork but no customers or employees come to the home. He bids jobs at home and drives his equipment to the job site. The two to three pieces of heavy equipment are vehicles which would not normally be found incidental to a residential use; therefore staff requested that the applicant apply for a Special Use Permit to include the use of the heavy equipment in conjunction with the operation of their home occupation. Staff received two letters from adjacent property owners that Chairman Frank will read into the record.

The location of the home occupation is within a platted subdivision. The lot is zoned SUI within the area of impact. A Special Use Permit is required prior to operating a home occupation in order to mitigate possible adverse effects on adjoining property owners. The total area allowed for an approved home occupation is four-hundred (400 sf) square feet and there cannot be any exterior indication of the home occupation. Approval of a home occupation is specific to the applicant at the approved location.

City Code 10-10-2(c): parking layout states- direct private residential driveway access to arterial streets creates a traffic hazard. No development plan or plat creating lots which require direct residential driveway access to an arterial street shall be approved (Ord. 2347, 9-3-1991). City Code 10-11-4; states all parking and maneuvering areas shall be hard surfaced adopted in 1997. This site is

Planning & Zoning Commission Minutes

February 11, 2014

located on Lot 1, Block 1 of the Bradshaw Subdivision that was platted and recorded 1998. On the plat there is a note that states ..."direct lot access to Falls Avenue West from Lots 1 and 8, Block 1 shall be prohibited". Falls Avenue West is a street with heavy traffic which is why this condition was placed on the plat. The applicants have indicated they park their equipment in a dirt parking area accessed off Falls Avenue West. They use Rice Circle to access their residence. At this time the Falls Avenue West road maintenance in this area is by the Twin Falls County Highway District although jurisdiction for enforcement falls on the City. The Twin Falls County Highway District would have been required to review and approve this subdivision plat and the notes in 1998 as it was and still is located with the Area of Impact.

If the Special Use Permit is granted, as presented and with any conditions, City Staff will conduct a full review of the site and plans to ensure compliance with all applicable City Codes, including zoning and engineering requirements prior to issuing the special use permit.

Zoning & Development Manager Carraway stated upon conclusion should the Commission grant this request as presented; staff recommends approval be subject to the following conditions:

1. Subject To The Site Plan Amendments As Required By Engineering And Zoning Officials To Ensure Compliance With Applicable City Code Requirements And Standards.
2. Subject To Site Plan Amendments As Required Ensuring Compliance With Applicable Twin Falls City & County Highway District Code Requirements And Standards.

PZ Questions/Comments:

- Commissioner Munoz asked if he does any type of maintenance to the equipment.
- Mr. Crandall stated that he does minor things like oil changes but nothing major.
- Commissioner Frank asked if the bulk fuel tank shown in the photo is an issue.
- Zoning & Development Manager Carraway stated if it was put on the property when it is was built, the Fire Department would have reviewed the tank. If not then the Commission could add that it be checked as a condition of approval.

Public Hearing: [Open](#)

- Chairman Frank read into the record two letters from citizens in support of the request these letters have been filed with the application file.
- Tara Packham, 966 Rice Circle stated they are great neighbors and are good stewards of their property; she has no concerns with this request being approved.
- Michelle Downard, 933 Rice Circle, is in support of the request.
- Rob Hendrickson, 934 Rice Circle, would recommend approval of the Special Use Permit.
- Penny Vance, 867 Rim View Lane would recommend approval of the Special Use Permit.
- Gary Cook, 912 Rice Circle, stated the property is in the direct line of site their property is always kept neat and clean and asked that the request be approved.
- Shane Memmott, 965 Rice Circle stated they have been there for approximately seven years keep their yard immaculate and he would recommend the request be approved.

Planning & Zoning Commission Minutes

February 11, 2014

- Tammy King, 981 Rice Circle, seconded all of the testimony given and stated they have been very conscientious about the neighborhood and would recommend approval.

Public Hearing: **Closed**

Deliberations Followed:

- Commissioner Sharp asked how they bring the access issue into compliance.
- Zoning & Development Manager Carraway stated that staff will work with the applicant.

Motion:

Commissioner Boyd made a motion to approve the request, as presented, with staff recommendations. Commissioner Woods seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor of the motion.

APPROVED, AS PRESENTED, WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Subject to the site plan amendments as required by Engineering and Zoning Officials to ensure compliance with applicable City Code Requirements and Standards.
2. Subject to site plan amendments as required ensuring compliance with applicable Twin Falls County Highway District Code Requirements and Standards.
5. Request for a Special Use Permit to allow development and operation of a Tourist Information Center on property located at 3591 Blue Lakes Boulevard North **c/o Shawn Barigar on behalf of Twin Falls Chamber of Commerce** (app. 2618)

Applicant Presentation:

Shawn Barigar, the applicant stated the request is for a Special Use Permit for a Tourist Information Center. The existing center has operated there since 1989, and they are at a point in planning to construct a new modern facility to better serve the area. The new center would operate year round, 8am to 8pm seven days a week. There are approximately 25-27,000 visitors per year currently, calculated by who signed the guest book between March and October each year. The property is owned by the Idaho Transportation Department, the land has been leased to City of Twin Falls for years, the building is owned by the Chamber of Commerce and the City owns the restrooms. If this request is approved a draft lease has been created that would lease the property directly to the Chamber of Commerce and take the City out of the agreement. Along with a new building the site will be altered slightly to align the exhibits up geometrically on the lot, landscape the area with more manageable materials and improve the appearance of the site.

Staff Analysis:

Planner I Spendlove displayed the exhibits on the overhead and reviewed the staff analysis of the request. He stated there is little known zoning history on this particular site. Records show the Open Space Zone was established in the City Code in 1981. It is believed the area where the Tourist Information Center now resides was zoned Open Space at that time. The structure was reportedly built in 1989. The restrooms located on the site were built in 1991-92 in a joint venture between the City and State of Idaho. The latest lease was signed in 2010 between the City and the State of Idaho. The allowance of the City to sign the application had to go through City Council and they allowed Community Development Director Humble to sign the application.

This is a request for a special use permit to allow development and operation of a Tourist Information Center in the Open Space Zone. The applicant has submitted a general overview of the proposed building and its operation. The new building will be approximately 5000 square feet. The building would be open year round, with hours of operation generally being 8:00 AM to 8:00 PM; earlier closing times will be in effect during the winter months. The final employee numbers are unknown at this point; they anticipate using volunteers as well as some paid employees to supplement staffing needs. The new building will include some site improvements, including additional paved parking areas, new/replaced sidewalk, more appropriate landscaping, and some other new elements. The applicant has stated that the Chamber will work closely with the Centennial Commission and the Parks Department on final design of the area to ensure the integrity of the current improvements and the level public access are maintained.

Per City Code 10-4-11.2: Open Space Zone: a Special Use Permit is required to establish and operate a Tourist Information Center within the Open Space Zone. The current Tourist Information Center has been in operation since 1989, it has been an asset to the community for many years. The City has been the lease holder for a number of years. As of this date, there has been no known code violations associated with this property.

Per City Code 10-10: Parking: The parking requirements for this potential building are 1 space per 300 square feet of floor area. With this being a tourist attraction, additional parking should be planned for, especially during the peak season. A full review of the parking requirements will be conducted at the time of building permit submittal. It is believed the site plan provided has accounted for the required parking per City Code, as well as additional spaces.

Per City Code 10-11-1 thru 8: Required Improvements: All required improvements will be reviewed at the time of building permit submittal. These requirements include landscaping, parking areas, drainage, and other applicable City Codes. It is believed the site plan submitted is in substantial compliance with currently applicable City Codes.

Possible Impacts: The current tourist information center is open on a seasonal basis; this also includes the bathrooms on site. Although the peak season for tourist traffic is during the summer months, a substantial amount of tourists visit the Snake River Canyon during the off-peak times as well. Approval of this special use permit will allow the Chamber of Commerce to remove the existing buildings, replace them with a year round staffed visitor center, while maintaining the public access to the City maintained trail. This also alleviates the City of Twin Falls of the responsibility to maintain the facilities as well as the lease of the land. Staff feels the integrity and purpose of the Open Space zone will be maintained while providing for an improved experience for visitors to the Canyon Rim Trail system.

Planner I Spendlove stated upon conclusion should the Commission approve the request, as presented, staff recommends the following conditions.

1. Subject to the site plan amendments as required by Building, Engineering, Fire, and Zoning Officials to ensure compliance with applicable City Code Requirements and Standards.

Planning & Zoning Commission Minutes

February 11, 2014

PZ Questions/Comments:

- Commissioner Frank asked if the items like the bricks will be preserved.
- Mr. Barigar stated yes the intent is to preserve all of the amenities that are on site but to improve the appearance. The one item that may move is the water feature that doesn't function well so they will try and find a better home for that item. The current lease with the City requires the Idaho Transportation Department to approve any changes to the property. The plans have been submitted to ITD and they have comfortable with the changes.
- Commissioner Woods asked about maintenance of the parking lot and snow removal.
- Mr. Barigar stated the lease outlines responsibility for maintenance of the property.
- Commissioner Derricott asked about motorhome and RV parking spaces.
- Mr. Barigar stated this has been discussed and the plan is to allow for good traffic flow and parking for large vehicles.
- Commissioner Woods asked if there will be space provided for rolling their shoots up for the base jumping.
- Mr. Barigar stated they have worked with the base jumpers and they will be maintaining the existing areas and expanding the grass areas that are currently used.
-

Public Hearing: [Open](#)

- Mark Lopshire, 221 Selway Street, Volunteer Chairman of the Board for the Chamber of Commerce. He thinks this will present a first class image of a Visitor Center. There are approximately 850 business affiliated with the Twin Falls Chamber of Commerce and this will provide a meeting place for those affiliates and it will provide an opportunity to introduce people to the community and educational history of the area. He requests that the Commission approve the request.
- Debbie Dane, Executive Director for Southern Idaho Tourism, this facility will provide a gateway opportunity to the area. In 2013 the Southern Idaho Tourism Board voted unanimously to co-locate with the Chamber of Commerce at the New Visitor Center. This facility will prove and opportunity to interface with visitors and highlight recreation, archeology and cultural opportunities in the Southern Idaho area.
- Kelly Trober, representing the Twin Falls Hotel Management Group, stated the three questions she gets asked by visitors most often are: 1) Where is Shoshone Falls, 2) Where is the Evil Knievel Jump Site & 3) Where is the visitor center. She thinks this will be a great facility the Community can be proud of and enjoy year round. She asked that the Commission approve the request.

Closing Statement:

- Mr. Barigar stated he loves the facility they have now but as the City grows and recognition grows it should be a first class facility that will highlight the community and the amenities it has to offer.

Public Hearing: [Closed](#)

Deliberations Followed: [Without Concerns](#)

Planning & Zoning Commission Minutes

February 11, 2014

Motion:

Commissioner Grey made a motion to approve the request, as presented, with staff recommendations. Commissioner DeVore seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor of the motion.

APPROVED, AS PRESENTED, WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Subject to the site plan amendments as required by Building, Engineering, Fire, and Zoning Officials to ensure compliance with applicable City Code Requirements and Standards.

V. PUBLIC INPUT AND/OR ITEMS FROM THE ZONING DEVELOPMENT MANAGER AND/OR THE PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION:

Zoning & Development Manager Carraway reviewed the results of the requests that went to City Council on Feb 10, 2014. An informed the Commission that the February 25, 2014 will be a full agenda as well and she asked that they all attend.

VI. UPCOMING PUBLIC MEETINGS: (held at the City Council Chamber)

1. Public Hearing-**February 25, 2014 6:00 PM**
2. Work Session-**March 5, 2014 12:00PM-1:00PM**

VII. ADJOURN MEETING:

Chairman Frank adjourned the meeting at 9:21 PM

Lisa A Strickland
Administrative Assistant
Planning & Zoning Department