

NAMPA PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING HELD TUESDAY, OCTOBER 8, 2019, 6:30 P.M.

Members: Lance McGrath - Chairman
Peggy Sellman – Vice Chair
Matthew Garner
Steve Kehoe
Jeff Kirkman

Harold Kropp
Ron Van Auker, Jr
Norm Holm, Director
Rodney Ashby, Principal Planner
Daniel Badger – City Engineer

Absent: Adam Hutchings

Chairman McGrath called the meeting to order at 6:52 p.m.

Approval of Minutes: Sellman motioned and Garner seconded to approve the Minutes of the September 24, 2019 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. Motion carried.

Report on Council Actions. No City Council member present to report on City Council actions. **Planning Director Holm** advised the Appeal to City Council to deny the Conditional Use Permit for the V Cut Lounge, approved by the Planning Commission on August 27, 2019 had been denied by City Council during their October 7, 2019 meeting.

There were no Business Items on the agenda.

At 7:00 p.m. Chairman McGrath proceeded to public hearing.

Conditional Use Permit for Home Occupation Gunsmithing with Occasional Special-Order Firearm Sales in an RS6 (Single-Family Residential – 6,000 sq. ft.) zoning district at 1925 Gemini Dr. (.17 acre or 7,594 sq. ft. parcel situated in the NW ¼ of Section 17, T3N, R2W, BM and Lot 6, Block 3, New Karcher Estates #1, less Tax 09042), for David C. Morgan (CUP-00154-19). ACTION ITEM.

Chairman McGrath proceeded to public hearing.

David Morgan of 1925 Gemini Dr, Nampa – the applicant:

- Mr Morgan stated he would like to operate a part time home based gunsmithing business, using approximately 200 sq ft of his home.
- The hours of operation would be in the evenings and weekends until he could leave his full time job to operate the home based business.
- There would be minimal tools involved, added Mr Morgan, just a bench, hammers, punches, files, drill, etc.
- According to Mr Morgan, he would have to fill in the paperwork and forms to stay in compliance with the A.T.F.
- Most of his business, continued Mr Morgan, would be coming from friends, family and acquaintances and possibly neighbors.
- He would also be working with local businesses that do not have a gunsmith on staff.
- Mr Morgan considered there would be minimal increase in traffic in the neighborhood.
- In response to a question from **Chairman McGrath**, **Mr Morgan** stated he would not be putting up any signs on his property.
- Mr Morgan emphasized he did not want any walk-up traffic.
- In response to a question from **Kehoe**, **Mr Morgan** stated he could also take in repairs from firearm dealers or businesses.

Planning Director Holm:

- Holm advised the subject property, in New Karcher Estates No. 1, zoned RS-6 (Single Family Residential – 6000 sq ft minimum lot size), located on the corner of Gemini Dr and Taurus Dr, was more or less surrounded by Single Family Residential zoning.
- The Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map added Holm indicated Medium Density Residential – similar to other single family residential areas.
- According to Holm, the parcel size of the subject property was approximately 7600 sq ft.
- The proposed Home Occupation, continued Holm, would be indoors in an office setting with the tools Mr Morgan indicated.
- Holm reviewed the Home Occupation standards and noted although gunsmithing was not a listed use, the Home Occupation Application states -- any other uses determined by the Planning Director would require approval of a Conditional Use Permit Application.
- Additionally, the Conditional Use Permit section of the Ordinance states the use has to be compatible with, and not adversely effect, the neighborhood or the surrounding area.
- Holm reviewed the Staff Report and recommended conditions of approval.
- According to Holm, no schools were in close proximity to the site.

Chairman McGrath proceeded to public testimony.
No public comment forthcoming.

Kehoe motioned and Sellman seconded to close public hearing. Motion carried.

Kirkman motioned and Miller seconded to grant approval of the Conditional Use Permit for a Home Occupation Gunsmithing with Occasional Special-Order Firearm Sales business at 1925 Gemini Drive, for David C Morgan, subject to:

1. All requirements of the Nampa Planning, Building, Engineering, and Fire Departments as well as State, or Federal agencies regarding use of the property for a Home Occupation for Gunsmithing with Occasional Special-Order Firearm Sales, shall be satisfied prior to occupancy.
2. The owner operates the business as a typical Home Occupation business with no manufacturing and minimal storage of inventory.
3. The owner maintains all regulatory permitting, licensures and operational procedures as required by law.
4. Only occasional special-order firearms sales for family and friends shall be permitted to be conducted on the premises.
5. Inventory is locked in a secure safe.
6. The Home Occupation for Gunsmithing with Occasional Special-Order Firearm Sales shall be continuously operated in accordance with the applicant's provided project description.
7. The Conditional Use Permit is granted only to the property for the duration of the use and shall not be transferable to any other location.

Motion carried.

Chairman McGrath noted action on a Conditional Use Permit by the Planning and Zoning Commission can be Appealed to City Council, within 15 days of the Planning and Zoning decision.

Amendment of Title 10, Chapter 1, Section 19 pertaining to Professional, Public Self-Storage Facility Design and Regulations: locations allowed, structure appearance, project design and layout, lighting and security, and signage; and Amendment of Title 10, Chapter 3, Section 2 pertaining to Land Use Controls for Storage Space Rental and Storage – Conditioned Multi-Level Building, for the City of Nampa (ZTA-00010-19). ACTION ITEM.

Chairman McGrath proceeded to public hearing.

Principal Planner Ashby:

- Ashby reported City Council placed a Moratorium on storage facilities on June 3, 2019 due to concerns regarding an overabundance in the supply of storage facilities, the impact on neighboring properties, using up industrially zoned lands.

- On August 26, 2019, added Ashby, there was a Joint Workshop with the City Council, the Planning and Zoning Commission and the Building and Site Design Standards Committee. The Draft Ordinances were prepared for that meeting, added Ashby, as included in the Staff Report.
- Ashby indicated the summary of the proposed changes related to the Ordinance:
 - Require a Conditional Use Permit for all storage units – regardless of location.
 - No longer allowed in IH (Heavy Industrial) district in order to preserve those zones for land uses that would be more intense than storage facilities.
 - All new storage units shall comply with NCC 10-1-19 (architectural, lighting, setback, etc. requirements)
 - New land use category: “Conditioned Multi-Level Building” – multi level with commercial or retail on the ground floor.
 - NCC 10-1-19 Changes:
 - Design Review required for all storage units
 - 150 ft setback from primary roadway corridor Right-of-Way
 - 2,500 ft buffer from ANY existing or proposed storage facilities of any kind.
 - 100 ft buffer from residential districts and Low/Med Density Residential on Future Land Use Map
 - 25 ft landscape buffer next to roadway, pathway, or residential
 - Conditional Use Permit recommended by P&Z Commission and approved by City Council
- **Chairman McGrath** inquired if the City Attorney commented on the impact of having a Conditional Use Permit go directly from the Planning and Zoning Commission to be approved by City Council, and what effect that would have on due process rights for applicants.
- **Ashby** reported the City Attorney did not address the due process rights – referring to an Appeal.
- According to Ashby, the City Council had discussed the proposal the previous evening for City Council to take responsibility for approving some Conditional Use Permits and noted that specific criteria could be written into the Code and would become part of the Conditional Use Permit process.
- Discussion followed regarding the proposed Ordinance Change that would require the Conditional Use Permit for storage facilities to go directly to City Council for a second Conditional Use Permit review and action.
- **Kirkman** voiced concern regarding changing the CUP process and requiring the Conditional Use Permit for storage facilities to also go to City Council for approval, which would eliminate the Appeal process.
- **Ashby** reviewed the comments from the Engineering Division:
- Engineering Division questioned the purpose of limiting the service drive to 300 ft. Ashby considered the possible reason for that limitation was due to access concerns from a major roadway to the storage facility, but it was a valid concern and could be removed from the Code.
- The Engineering Division, added Ashby, also requested clarification regarding the minimum distance from the freeway measured from right-of-way. Ashby stated the change had already been inserted in the proposed Code requiring a minimum of 250 ft from the Interstate freeway “right-of-way”.
- In response to a question from **Kehoe**, **Ashby** advised the requirement of a minimum of 250 ft from the freeway right-of-way would limit the locations for storage facilities next to the freeway.
- **Kehoe** noted the list of primary roadways where the storage facility would be required to locate a minimum of 150 ft from that primary roadway corridor.
- **Ashby** indicated the proposed wording: the building could not be located within 150 ft of any one of the listed primary roadways.
- According to Ashby, there could be a different type of use within the buffer area between the landscaping and the storage facility setback of 150 ft.
- The landscaping requirement was also proposed to change from 15 ft of landscaping to 25 ft of landscaping along the roadway, and also 25 ft of landscape buffer between a residential use and any storage facility.
- The Engineering Division, reported Ashby, had also questioned the roof restriction in Section B.4. and whether the Code should be changed to allow a single pitch, or flat roof style.
- Engineering Division also questioned the height limitation in Section C.2 because a 3:12 roof restriction and 16 ft maximum height limitation may not allow sufficient area for the larger boats or RVs to have enough area to park. Ashby added that City Council in April 1, 2019 approved a change to allow a 2:12 roof pitch.
- If the Commission preferred to recommend a flat roof style, stated Ashby, then Staff recommends an 18 inch fascia and a minimum of 6 inch columns.
- Ashby reviewed the Staff Report.

- **Van Auken, Jr** referred to the proposed Ordinance 10-1-19 Section B 7 regarding height limitations requiring the buildings within a BN or RP zoning district shall be limited to a height of 10 ft at the edge of eaves, and questioned if that requirement had always been in effect. **Ashby** replied it had been in effect for a typical walk-up storage and added there would be the 16 ft maximum height for RV and boat storage.

Chairman McGrath proceeded to public testimony.

Butch Henry of 2219 Caldwell Blvd, Nampa.

- Mr Henry noted the 2219 Caldwell Blvd property had previously been a Mobile Home Park which had been demolished, and they were now planning an automobile, boat, RV storage facility there.
- According to Mr Henry, they purchased that property in April and then learned about the Moratorium.
- At that time, added Mr Henry, they talked to Staff.
- Mr Henry considered there were some very restrictive items in the Ordinance recommendation that City Council asked Staff to come back with.
- Mr Henry stated his company owns and builds storage facilities in the Pacific Northwest, including one in southeast Boise, similar to what they were proposing to build at 2219 Caldwell Blvd.
- Mr Henry considered requiring a Conditional Use Permit for a storage facility was unusual, other than in the Seattle or Portland area, but added he would not recommend the C-U-P requirement for Nampa. Mr Henry stated a C-U-P would not be the appropriate way to do business, or additionally having the C-U-P go to City Council.
- Mr Henry responded to a question from **Kehoe** and indicated their RV parking facilities on the flyer he handed out for a location in southeast Boise.
- Additionally, stated Mr Henry, there were 14 ft tall, 14 ft wide, and 40 ft long storage units with a door that could accommodate cars, motor coaches or a boat, and added he would refer customers to another facility for walk-up storage.
- Mr Henry considered it appropriate to eliminate storage facilities in the Heavy Industrial zones.
- According to Mr Henry, he supported the addition of a Conditioned Multi-Level Building as a storage facility.
- Mr Henry stated he did not support the proposed changes requiring Design Review for all storage facilities; as well as Conditional Use Approval for all locations.
- Mr Henry added that he did support the 150 ft setback from a primary roadway.
- According to Mr Henry, the requirement of a 2,500 ft setback from an existing or permitted storage facility's property lines would be a real deal breaker for them and suggested that would not be a requirement for a convenience store, bank or restaurant.
- Storage facilities, continued Mr Henry, were convenience businesses that were market driven. Developers do feasibility studies for storage facilities and he did not think the development of storage facilities should be controlled by requiring the 2,500 ft spacing between storage facilities.
- **Kirkman** stated the 2,500 ft separation buffer seemed extreme.
- **Kehoe** noted that storage facilities take up a lot of space and were not the same as convenience stores, banks or restaurants next to each other.
- According to **Mr Henry**, the storage buildings were not substantial structures and a storage facility can be demolished in less than a week, and the land would then be available for other uses.
- Mr Henry discussed the differences between a walk-up storage facility and a facility storing boats, RVs, and vehicles that would include availability of water, lighting and paved areas.
- Mr Henry agreed the 100 ft buffer from residential uses would be consistent with other municipalities.
- Also, the 25 ft landscape buffer next to a roadway was a familiar requirement.
- Regarding the requirement for the Conditional Use Permit to also go to City Council for an additional hearing, Mr Henry considered limiting the Conditional Use Permit public hearing to the Planning Commission and the opportunity to Appeal the Planning and Zoning decision to City Council was the best option.
- In response to a question from **Van Auken, Jr**, **Mr Henry** stated there were 3 levels of storage facilities: primary – typically in Seattle market or San Francisco, Los Angeles – high cost because the land is very expensive, therefore they try and create vertical construction for storage facilities; the secondary market was typically like Boise, Salt Lake City or Omaha, Nebraska where land is not as expensive per sq ft; and then the tertiary market would be Nampa, Caldwell, Canyon County, Bend, Oregon where the land cost is less.

- Mr Henry noted the Treasure Valley area was also recreational driven and the majority of people moving to the area also want to recreate – in the open land and water. There was a real need for storage in the area, stated Mr Henry.

Jerry Henry of 2219 Caldwell Blvd, Nampa:

- Ms Henry indicated some pictures of a proposed storage facility, with a fortress aspect, where the backs of the buildings are 100 percent around the outside of the facility, so for the most part the vehicles and RVs are not visible. Discussion followed on the height of the buildings shown, Mr Henry stated the roof over the RVs was 17 ft to the eave height with a ½:12 pitch on the roof.
- Ms Henry referred to the storage facility located on Sundance Rd and stated the proposed facility at 2219 Caldwell Blvd would not be in competition with the facility on Sundance Rd because they would not be a walk-up storage facility.
- The 2500 ft buffer, added Ms Henry, would prohibit them from building their facility on Caldwell Blvd and she considered that to be unfair.

Jeff Millich – 815 Meadowbrook Ln, Nampa:

- Mr Millich discussed the 2219 Caldwell Blvd property, noting that Pond Trust originally owned the property.
- According to Mr Millich, Mr Henry researched the fact there had been no Conditional Use Permit required in the BC zoning district for a storage facility, and advised they put up a substantial amount of money to purchase the property in good faith after performing their due diligence and finding there were no restrictions.
- Mr Millich noted the Pond Trust had received Conditional Use Permit approval for apartments to be located at the 2219 Caldwell Blvd site.
- Mr Millich discussed the best uses for the Caldwell Blvd property and noted they had purchased the property and had the engineering drawings done before the Moratorium went into effect.
- Mr Millich reiterated his disagreement with the proposed requirement for a 2500 ft separation between storage facilities.

Principal Planner Ashby:

- Ashby stated he was not comfortable with getting into the details on specific projects on a specific property, as the item before the Commission was a proposed amendment to the Ordinance regarding storage facilities throughout the entire City.
- **Kehoe** inquired if there had been any discussion at City Council level regarding the 2500 ft separation for residential areas but not in commercial areas and **Ashby** replied there had not.
- Ashby indicated a map illustrating the existing locations of storage facilities and the 2500 ft separation buffer around those sites. Ashby noted that separation would definitely limit the number of storage facilities allowed in the City but there had not been a discussion as to whether that separation should only apply to residential areas, or with all zoning districts.
- Discussion followed regarding limitations, design, distance between storage facilities, and setbacks from roads within different zoning districts.

Garner motioned and Sellman seconded to close public hearing. Motion carried.

- **Chairman McGrath** discussed the loss of revenue for the City that would occur with storage facilities in place of other Light Industrial or Commercial uses on that land.
- Also, added McGrath, it was important to preserve Light Industrial land for Light Industrial uses.
- But some of the proposed regulations, added **Chairman McGrath**, appeared to be overreaching.
- It was important to be really careful in that regard, continued Chairman McGrath, especially when it starts to impact the work of the Planning and Zoning Commission and the adverse effect on other applicants in the future.
- **Sellman** noted that would also cause a lack of due process for Appeals.
- **Van Auken, Jr** considered it would be best to let the market decide what was and was not needed. When people stop moving to Nampa and buying homes would be when the need for services would diminish.
- **Chairman McGrath** stated the Commission did have the responsibility to help preserve the land choices available.

- **Miller** noted it was important to remember the market driven argument because there was a lot of land in Nampa that was undeveloped and just sitting and not creating a lot of revenue for the City. Miller added that he would rather see market driven businesses flourish than a vacant lot or empty space.
- **Garner** noted that some businesses use storage facilities to store their business inventory.
- **Ashby** stated it was up to the Planning Commission what they recommended to City Council regarding storage facilities.
- Discussion followed regarding the recommendations to City Council from the Planning Commission for the proposed storage facility Ordinance.
- **Holm** suggested taking the Conditional Use Permit application requirement off the IL and IP zones would go against the idea of being sure that was the use wanted on industrial land, versus jobs and economic development.
- **Ashby** noted the intention for the 150 ft setback from a primary roadway was to encourage some different type of use between the roadway and the storage facility – with another type of business in front of the storage facility.
- **Kehoe** made clear the 150 ft setback from the roadway could be used by a different type of business/use any time after the storage facility was built.
- **Holm** suggested the wording could state “up to a 150 ft setback from road right-of-way may be required”, and that would be determined at the time of Conditional Use Permit review.
- Discussion followed regarding the addition of multi-level conditioned storage facilities to the type of storage facilities that could be utilized in Nampa.
- **Ashby** noted the proposed new category for a multi-level conditioned storage facility would be a more expensive type of facility, with part of the ground floor to be used for retail, restaurant, or offices.
- **Chairman McGrath** reviewed the proposed changes for NCC 10-1-19, with comments on each point from the Commission.
- **Garner** questioned if there would be a Landscape Plan Review that would take place as part of the Building Permit process and would there be standards required to be met regarding the trees and shrubs. **Ashby** confirmed that would be the case and noted the Planning Department reviewed the Landscape Plans and inspected the landscaping.
- In reference to the 150 ft setback from primary roadway corridor, **Sellman** suggested if a Conditional use Permit was required for all storage facilities then the Commission could determine at that time the appropriate roads for the setback requirement.
- **Ashby** advised both City Council and the Mayor were concerned with storage facilities in proximity to residential corridors.
- **Chairman McGrath** suggested applicants could be advised at the time of C-U-P submittal that the setback for the storage facility buildings could be as much as 150 ft.
- **Holm** suggested the wording could be that, up to a 150 ft setback from the road right-of-way may be required, and the decision could be made at the public hearing for the C-U-P.
- **Kirkman** suggested the difference between the “walk-up self-storage units” vs “car, RV and boat storage” should be recognized.
- **Ashby** indicated the Engineering Division correspondence regarding the question as to whether a 16 ft height maximum for RV/Boat/ATV storage would provide enough height, with the understanding that 19 ft was generally considered to be the acceptable height. There was also the question of the roof pitch, added Ashby.
- Discussion followed regarding the height of modern RVs, etc, and flat versus pitch roofs.
- **Garner** considered that a Commercial project would require structural engineering for the roof and structure.
- In response to a question from **Garner**, **Ashby** reviewed the proposed additional requirements for architecture, lighting, etc, in NCC 10-1-19.

Miller motioned and Kropp seconded to recommend the following proposed Amendments to Title 10, Chapter 1, Section 19 pertaining to Professional, Public-Self-Storage Facility Design and Regulations; and Amendment of title 10 Chapter 3 Section 2 pertaining to Land Use Controls for Storage Space Rental and Storage – Conditioned Multi-Level Building.

1. Removal of the following sections of the proposed NCC 10-1-19 ordinance:

- Introduction stating: “Additionally, a Conditional Use Permit shall be required from the City Council after a recommendation from the Planning and Zoning Commission and all**

such development shall require Design Review pursuant to Title 10, Chapter 34, Nampa City Code.”

The Nampa Planning & Zoning Commission was concerned about the due process given to applicants or those with interest in a proposal. They felt that it is an undue burden to require applicants go through two public hearings, which is unique from other projects needing Conditional Use Permits. They were also concerned about eliminating the ability to Appeal the decision outside of the judicial process. They expressed that a Zoning Ordinance change by City Council would allow them to ensure that specific requirements, they wish to emplace on a type of project, are met.

- b. A.1. “Exception for primary roadway corridors: Projects along the following roadways shall place storage unit buildings a minimum of one-hundred-fifty feet (150’) from the primary roadway corridor right-of-way and may extend beyond three hundred (300) feet from the right-of-way, when the project has direct access to the roadway; and Caldwell Blvd, Garrity Blvd, Idaho Center Blvd, Cherry Ln, Franklin Blvd, Ustick Rd, State Highway 20/26 (Chinden Blvd), Midland Blvd, State Highway 55 (Karcher Rd), Midland Blvd, Middleton Rd, Roosevelt Ave, State Highway 45 (12th Ave Rd), Southside Blvd, Northside Blvd, Amity Ave, and Lake Lowell Ave.”

The Nampa Planning & Zoning Commission was concerned that this list of roadways was arbitrary. They felt that a setback from major roadways, that allows for alternative uses to be placed fronting the roadway should be handled on a case by case basis through the Conditional Use Permit process. They recommended the following wording to replace this section: “Up to a one-hundred-fifty-foot (150’) setback from a roadway may be required by the Planning & Zoning Commission as a condition of approval for a Conditional Use Permit.”

- c. A.2. “New public storage facilities shall be located a minimum distance of two thousand five hundred feet (2,500’) from an existing or permitted storage facility’s property lines; expansion of storage facilities shall be limited to the property boundaries existing at date of securing Planning & Zoning entitlement; storage facilities having obtained a Building Permit for construction of a storage facility as of October 7, 2019, shall be permitted to expand within the boundaries of the property/properties as those property boundaries existed on October 7, 2019;”

The Nampa Planning & Zoning Commission felt that this regulation would ultimately have the effect of preventing future storage units from being constructed. They felt it was an overreach of government and should be left to the market to decide how many storage units get developed and where they should go.

- d. B.4. “All buildings made a part of a facility shall feature a residential roof structure with a minimum two to twelve (2:12) pitch.”

The Nampa Planning & Zoning Commission agreed with Engineering Division’s suggestion that we allow flat and single pitched storage structure roofs because we have new provisions to separate storage units from residential uses and there isn’t as much need to give a similar residential roof pitch appearance.

- 2. Additional changes are also recommended for NCC 10-3 Service and Office Land Use table, footnote four (4), including removing the statement, “from the City Council after a recommendation is made by the Planning & Zoning Commission...”

This change is necessary to comply with the Commission’s requested change following “1” above, and regarding the desire to protect due process rights of applicants and appellants.

Motion carried.

Amendment of Title 10, Chapter 33 Corridor Beautification changing the title heading to include Landscaping; Amending Section 10-33-01 pertaining to the Description and Purpose of the Corridor Beautification and Landscaping Provisions; Amending Section 10-33-02 pertaining to General Landscaping Requirements; Amending Section 10-33-03 pertaining to the Definition of Corridors; and Amending Section 10-33-04 pertaining to Corridor Landscaping Requirements, for the City of Nampa (ZTA-00011-19). ACTION ITEM.

Chairman McGrath proceeded to public hearing.

Principal Planner Ashby:

- Ashby explained this would be the first of the Zoning Code Chapters the Commission would be reviewing, one at a time, to clarify and reduce the subjective interpretation by staff, to eliminate repetition, and to update the Code to meet our current standards and needs.
- Ashby reviewed the proposed changes.
- Currently – two trees required on residential lots, changing from two in the front yard to just one in the right-of-way and another tree to go on the property somewhere – not required to be in the front yard.
- Smaller residential front yards only required to plant one tree. **Ashby** responded to a question from **Kehoe** and stated the pie shaped lots with minimal frontage would also be permitted to plant only one tree in the front yard.
- Multi-family housing shall plant Right-Of-Way trees per Code and one tree per 2,500 sq ft of landscaping.
- No trees permitted in the Airport Runway Protection Zone.
- Trees shall be selected from the Treasure Valley Tree Selection Guide – with some exceptions.
- Deferral Agreement required for landscaping not installed due to weather/season. **Ashby** responded to a question from **Kirkman** and stated the Building Department would have that as part of their conditions.
- **Ashby** referred to the Engineering correspondence. The Engineering Division recommended adding a section that speaks to tree and deep-rooted shrub planting adjacent to utilities, such as a seepage bed.
- Therefore, added Ashby, there could be some exceptions granted by the Director of Planning when it conflicts with a utility facility.
- Recommended adding language to allow for drought tolerant and xeriscape landscape design and encouraging the requirement of drip style irrigation. Ashby stated he had spoken with the Parks Department regarding that requirement and they were concerned because so many people interpret xeriscape in so many different ways – i.e. rocks and concrete, and that was not the intention.
- **Kehoe** inquired if that recommendation would apply more to drought tolerant plants.
- **Ashby** stated the Parks Department recommended: “May choose to require native plants or plants that use no more water than native plants”. Ashby considered that would require some thought and clear definition as to what those native plants are and how much water they use. Ashby suggested it would take some consideration and recommended that the Planning Commission not approve that particular change.
- **Kehoe** noted the issues involved with drip style irrigation, with plants and trees dying.
- **Van Auker, Jr** stated his company had always been a proponent of xeriscape - without pouring water on grass – and that made much more sense.
- Van Auker, Jr suggested that xeriscape could be defined as including mulch or landscape rock material, with shrubs, or some kind of native plants that are drought tolerant.
- Discussion continued on xeriscape. Ashby suggested more details should be looked into regarding xeriscape.
- **Kehoe** indicated the issues with drip systems clogging up.

Chairman McGrath proceeded to public hearing.
No public comment forthcoming.

Sellman motioned and **Kehoe** seconded to close public hearing. **Motion carried.**

Van Auker, Jr motioned to recommend approval to City Council for Zoning Text Amendments to Title 10, Chapter 33, Corridor Beautification, changing the title heading to include Landscaping; and; Amending Section 10-33-01 pertaining to the Description and Purpose of the Corridor Beautification and Landscaping Provisions; Amending Section 10-33-02 pertaining to General Landscaping Requirements; Amending Section 10-33-03 pertaining to the Definition of Corridors; and Amending Section 10-33-04 pertaining to Corridor Landscaping Requirements:

- **Section 10-2-3 D. of Nampa City Code provides the standards for amending the City’s Zoning Ordinance.**
- **The proposed Ordinance Amendments are appropriate because they are “reasonably necessary, in the interest of the public, and in harmony with the goals and/or policies of the adopted comprehensive plan.” Nampa City Code § 10-2-3-D.**
- **The proposed Ordinance Amendments are in harmony with the City’s Comprehensive Plan—Nampa 2035.**

- **The proposed Nampa City Code Text Amendments would also help achieve Nampa 2035 Comprehensive Plan's Land Use Goal 7: Update the City's Land Use Ordinances, and Objective 13 and the associated 2 Strategies regarding amending the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances.**

Additionally:

- **The Commission indicated approval for the Engineering recommendation to add a Section to allow the Planning Director to modify the placement of trees and deep rooted shrubs where they would conflict with existing and proposed utilities.**
- **The Commission directed that staff research xeriscaping and come back to the Commission in the future with a recommendation.**

Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m.



Norman L Holm, Planning Director

:sm