

**Public Hearing for Summerlin (H-2026-0018) by Laren Bailey, Conger
Group, located on the east side of S. Locust Grove Rd., between E.
Via Roberto St. and E. Columbia Rd.**

- A. Request: Annexation of 20.976 acres of land from the Rural Urban Transition (RUT) zone in Ada County to the R-15 (Medium Density Residential).
- B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 506 building lots, 45 common lots on 87.40 acres of land zoned R-8 and R-15 zoning districts.
- C. Request: Development Agreement Modification to include an additional 20 acres of land.

Lorcher: The next application in front of us is -- requests annexation, a preliminary plat and a development agreement modification for Summerlin Subdivision on Locust Grove near -- Locust Grove near Columbia Road and we will start with the staff report.

Ritter: Good evening, Commissioners. So, this site consists of 87.40 acres of land. That's our -- there is -- most of it is already zoned, because it was previously approved R-8 and R-15. So, the applicant is proposing to annex 20.976 acres from RUT to R-15. A preliminary plat to allow for the development of 551 lots consisting of 506 residential lots and 45 common lots, with the minimum size of 3,040 square feet, an average size lot of 4,103 and, then, the modification to the existing development agreement to include the additional acreage and enter into a new development agreement. So, again, this is what's being requested to be annexed in, because the rest of the property was already annexed and zoned in 2024. So, the previous plat was approved in December of 2024 and, again, they are just adding the additional 20 acres to that originally approved subdivision and they have seven phases for this and based on what they have -- so, staff doesn't have any objections to what is being proposed, because the proposal meets the Comprehensive Plan and the UDC there are a couple of issues and waivers that we wanted to bring to light. The two waivers were approved with the previous application and they are asking for those waivers again is to keep the Rawson Canal at the southern portion of the property open and, then, East Crimson Clover Drive -- it exceeds the maximum block length of 1,200 feet. So, they are asking Council for that waiver and, then, we just wanted to bring the light the Kuna School District and, again, it's not based on this development from what I have seen, it is based on all the development around Kuna from the different agencies, the -- all the development coming in, so that's what they are basing this letter on. So, it's not particularly this application, it's just development coming in from the different agencies surrounding Kuna. Again this is just showing the block length. As you can see there is plenty of pedestrian connectivity through this development. We are asking the applicant to remove the portion of fence that is shown here to continue this pedestrian connection that leads over into Hadlar. So, within Block -- Lot 24, Block 18, want that to connect to the pathway within Hadlar No. 3 Subdivision, Lot 25 and Block 4. The applicant did exceed the open space. They are required to have

15 percent open space and they have 21.81 percent, which exceeds the open space requirements and they are only required to have 13 amenity points and they do have 43 amenity points, which exceeds the amenities. The applicant will be required to provide an amenity from the multi-modal group in order to meet the required standards. So, that is a condition of this application. They did provide three conceptual building elevation plans. These are the same elevations that were approved with the previous application. The only thing that staff is asking that the houses -- that the rear and sides that are facing Locust Grove, Recreation Avenue and East Via Roberto Street, that are highly visible, we added a DA provision that required those elevations to incorporate articulation through changes in two or -- in like modulation, pop outs, bays, banded porches -- so, all of those to break up the monotonous wall planes. Single story homes are exempt from that requirement. We did ask Commission -- and -- and asking Council to weigh in on whether or not the applicant should revise the plat map to reconfigure Lots 4 through 7 on Block 18 on the northeast side of East Summerlin Drive, so that Lot 9, Block 18, does not have four lots backing up to its side yard. I did talk to the applicant and they don't have any issue with revising this prior to it going to City Council. Oops. So, again, staff doesn't have any issues with what was presented. We feel that this proposed neighborhood is consistent with our comp plan and it meets the goals related to the residential density. It provides an approved and well-connected transportation network and offers strong proximity and access to the parks and emergency services, so -- we did not receive any written testimony on this. Again, we are asking for approval with the conditions outlined in our staff report and at this time I will stand for any questions that you may have.

Lorcher: Would the applicant like to come forward?

Clark: Hey, everybody.

Lorcher: Hi.

Clark: Hethe Clark. 251 East Front Street in Boise. It's the end of the night, so I think I will skip the ten minute presentation I had on Tier One and Tier Two and Tier Three drive throughs.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Clark: Okay. So, this one I think is kind of a common sense approach to this and hopefully something that we can move through kind of quickly. I'm going to have a record number of slides on the low side this time. So, just a couple of slides. So, you guys are familiar with the site. This is just kind of south of Lake Hazel, east of Locust Grove and you can see that there are two projects that we have identified in green and in yellow. Those are the existing entitlements. So, Hadlar was approved in December of 2022. It's got a couple of final plats that have already recorded. Summerlin, the current, was approved in December of 2024 and the property that we are talking about adding is this 20 acres that's shown in blue on this map. So, back when we were getting the -- primarily the Summerlin approval, but also a little bit during the Hadlar discussion, there were a couple of things that were brought up as a result of having this kind of missing link and one of

those was that there was a private driveway, it was called Cavalli Lane, that was coming out and that was what served the 20 acres and they needed their driveway, but it was going to be very close to our access. Another element of it was that we were going to be having an out parcel in between these properties and -- you know -- and the park and, then, in addition to that there was a piece of the collector road that will serve the park that we didn't have frontage on, so we couldn't complete that collector road. So, we worked very hard -- excuse me -- with the property owner. We were able to acquire it. That additional 20 acres is now part of the site. It removes that private driveway, so our roadway shifted up just a little bit to replace it. We no longer have an out parcel and we have replaced that with city lots that are consistent with the existing entitlements and that also allows us to complete that collector roadway and allow for all that connectivity up into Discovery Park. We are not making changes to the remainder of the site. I just wanted to emphasize that. When we had Summerlin before one of the things we talked about was the size of the lots on the south against the Rawson Canal. That's all the same. No changes there. Really, the main things that we changed were to bring in that 20 acres, make the connections and, then, we added amenities. So, rather than the 38 and a half that we had before, we are up to 43. Largely that's because we added a couple more dog parks and converted the -- the large lawn areas into soccer fields. So, you know, other than filling in that blank area we really -- we think we have seen this as just an -- overall an improvement. It was worth it to us to go and get that property and connect all of this and make it all work together and so with that missing link we think that this is really an overall a good thing for everyone. We are in agreement with the staff report. We are in agreement with the addition of the PED connection that Linda mentioned. We are also in agreement with reconfiguring those lots prior to City Council. That orientation. We are not -- you know, it's not really a code thing in our view, it's -- they -- they fronted on a -- on a -- what was going to be a collector before, so we are fine with reorienting those and we will have that for everyone by Council. Again, happy to provide that missing link. We can get this to a good place and we would look for your recommendation of approval and happy to answer any questions.

Gelsomino: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Gelsomino.

Gelsomino: Thank you so much for keeping it short and sweet. One of my important questions when it comes to developments, especially when it impacts school districts, Kuna School District previously stated on record that it cannot serve this development. All four schools in the -- bless you. All four schools in the service area are at or over capacity and the district lacks the flexibility to reroute or redraw boundaries. District submitted no formal comments during this review cycle. Can you confirm whether there has been any direct communication with Kuna School District since that capacity statement and does the -- do you have any mitigation, phasing coordination or school site dedication to offer in response to the district's stated inability to serve?

Clark: Commissioner Gelsomino, just a couple thoughts. So, Mr. Jensen is here. We are very familiar with Mr. Jensen, we have had a lot of conversations with him over the

years. Great guy. So, a couple of things that I would emphasize on that point. First of all, there are existing entitlements in this area. What we are doing is filling in the 20 acres that remains. At the time there were different comments from Kuna School District than there are now. I will let Mr. Jensen speak to what the current position of the school district is. But I would -- I would just emphasize a couple of things. The state data shows that Kuna School District's enrollment has gone down. That is consistent with eight of the ten largest school districts with -- across the state as well. West Ada School District has seen consistent reductions in enrollment as well and as we discussed with regard to our prior applications, the Kuna School District boundary is like basically right -- almost at our northern boundary of the -- of the project. There is the option of open enrolling in West Ada, which, again, is -- you know, has also seen those reduced enrollments. But I would also point out the charter and private school options. So, the -- actually, the closest school to this site is Gem Prep, which is over on -- on Lake Hazel. So, there is a number of different options there. So, I will leave it to -- to Mr. Jensen to fill in any other points. But, you know, in what we have seen so far in terms of the letter that was provided is it doesn't say that there is not capacity and, again, I just want to emphasize that these are existing approvals and that we are just filling in the -- the gap between them, so --

Gelsomino: Thank you.

Clark: Yep.

Lorcher: All right. Thank you very much.

Clark: Thanks.

Lorcher: Madam Clerk, do we have anybody signed up to testify?

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. I have Tim Jensen.

Lorcher: Good evening. If you can state your name and address for the record.

Jensen: Yeah. Tim Jensen, director of growth and development for Kuna School District. 711 East Porter Street out in Kuna. And I will just jump right in on that. I thought I was going to have a short speaking, you know, tonight, but we didn't provide comments on this specific one, just because we -- just like he said, you know, this was almost kind of like an in-fill and I remember the discussion about this at the original meeting and -- and, you know. And so my intent tonight was just, you know, not to add anything more than previous comments that were made, because, you know, I felt like those were about that main -- that first development that got made and, you know. And it just -- you know, it was like beating a dead horse, you know, to stand up here and do that and -- and so one of the things that I have worked a lot with our -- since December 24 when this went through, I have worked a lot with our -- our school board and to -- to do a different approach with these conversations we are having with developers. Prior to me moving into this position it was a lot of conversation about a specific portal corridor fee that would be paid, you know, and it -- developer's no different than -- you know, someone -- if I

came to you and said, hey, man, can you write me a check for 500 bucks? I just need it. You are going to say what? And so what we really have done is focus more on working with developers on helping us with some of our capital projects. For instance, we have a developer that's offered to expand our high school parking lot by 128 spots, which is much needed and, you know, for them they can do that at a lower cost, because they, you know, have their contractors that work for them, they are going to do it at the same time they are doing their roads and their development. For us it has -- you know, if we contracted that out it's a 450-ish thousand dollar project for -- you know, for the developer to do it while they are on site doing. It -- it's a much cheaper cost to them, but we have the same value out of it and so what -- we have kind of taken a different approach and I have worked with our school board on, we have -- you know, our intent from this process was to help us with these capital projects, but our developers can do a lot of those capital projects much cheaper than we can to contract them out and so it's really been a blessing to be able to go work with developers on that kind of a conversation, like, hey, can we build this conversation -- or this partnership to help us? Here is our list of -- we -- I have got a list of capital projects per school, by the district, you know, all those things and I see all these developments coming in with pickleball courts and I'm like, man, I need tennis courts. Can anybody build tennis courts anymore? And so -- but -- so, anyway, it just -- I -- I didn't come with the intent and I didn't intentionally send a comment, just because, like I said, like Hethe was saying, this was kind of that in-fill to a project that had already been approved. My intent coming tonight was to be here to answer questions. I didn't want -- I know we created kind of a delay in the process, because we didn't come to a meeting - - sorry. I'm over time.

Lorcher: You are fine.

Jensen: We came -- we didn't come to a meeting and it created a delay and I didn't want us to be that reason for there to be a delay in this process again and so I came tonight with the intent of answering questions. The -- the report I submitted -- it is -- Hethe said it perfectly, you know, Summerlin is just one piece of that overall number. The board had asked me to do that study in February and so I was able to provide that. But it's -- that definitely is not, you know, projected students just from this project and so we are definitely in a unique position. We do have the five entities that -- that feed us. We are almost kind of like Oprah Winfrey we are out there, you know, you get a development and you get a development and you get a development and -- and -- but, no, I just -- just to clarify and hopefully that does answer a little bit about your question and stuff, so -- and I will stand for any questions.

Lorcher: Do we have any questions for Tim? I think we are good. Thank you very much.

Jensen: Thank you guys for your time.

Lorcher: Hethe, did you have anything else you would like to add?

Lomeli: Madam Chair, we have someone else signed up.

Lorcher: Oh. Hold on. Sorry. We have somebody else to public testify?

Lomeli: I have Mike Murgoitio.

Lorcher: Come on up. Sorry.

Lomeli: He has indicated he is representing an HOA.

Lorcher: Okay. All right. If you have permission from your collective group you will have ten minutes to speak. If you can state your name and address for the record.

Murgoitio: Mike Murgoitio. 2623 South Hills Place, Meridian, Idaho. 83642. And I'm representing the landowners just south of the property, LNG and Murgoitio, LLC, and Murgoitio Revocable Trust and the address down the street is from Murgoitio Revocable Trust is 6575 South Locust Grove, Meridian, Idaho. 83642. So, we were just -- we seen the sign and for our property's sake we were just concerned about access to utilities. It sounds like this has already been approved. So, we are just making sure that there was no change in access to our utilities for our property. I spoke with the developer. It sounds like there is not a change in access or any sort of constraints on that, so I don't have a problem. But I just want to state for the record that if there was any changes we would want to be informed.

Lorcher: Okay. Yeah. Stay in contact with the developer. They will have more information than -- than we would.

Murgoitio: Sounds good.

Lorcher: Okay.

Murgoitio: Thank you.

Lorcher: Thank you. Madam Clerk, is there anybody else in Chambers?

Lomeli: Madam Clerk -- or sorry. Madam Chair. No one else has signed up and no one else is online.

Lorcher: Anyone else in Chambers? Hethe, you are good? Okay. Then may I have a motion to close the public hearing?

Smith: So moved.

Gelsomino: Seconded.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing on Summerlin. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: I remember -- I remember duking it out a little bit with the applicant when this first came through and I remember there being a lot of heartburn associated with that -- that out parcel regarding access and, candidly, regarding the inevitable future in-fill issue and, you know, like our former chairman Andy Seal used to say, in-fill -- in-fil is hard as the --
Lorcher: It is.

Smith: I think it was almost a catchphrase and to be able to address this all in one go is -- is really -- it's really great. I'm glad to hear that there is no -- no concerns with that kind of reworking of those parcels. I still think we should probably add as a condition just to make sure that happens. Not because I doubt the applicant's, you know, follow through or anything. But, yeah, I think a lot of the concerns that -- that were there and a lot of the heartburn that was there in the last application have either been addressed or have kind of been worked into this -- this -- I guess more cohesive vision that's a lot more -- you know, better interconnectivity. So, I -- I fully am in support of this with those -- that one modification.

Gelsomino: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Gelsomino.

Gelsomino: Just want to quickly state, you know, I am in favor of the application. I appreciate the applicant's explanation and -- and response to my question. Of course, I actually served with Mr. Conger on the steering committee for the master plan several years ago while I was still on the Parks Commission, so I'm more than excited to see them continuing to do their -- to do their work and I'm satisfied with their answers and ready to move forward on this application.

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: I like how you put that. Duking it out. We have had a few of those, haven't we, guys? No, I -- I do think -- I think this is going to be a great addition to that area. I don't love that much density in that location, but because we have the park there and because there is going to be some good pathways and walkability there, I'm a little more comfortable with that. I would say that I have been in communities where there is one swimming pool for every 300 houses and it was overwhelmingly full and closed down half the time. So, I don't know if that's something -- I know they are expensive. I know they are hard to insure. I just wish you all the best of luck of having one for this many homes. But I think for the most part they have addressed everything that -- that staff has had concerns about and -- and so I -- I'm comfortable with voting yes on the application.

Lorcher: So, before we pose a motion as I'm looking at some of the details on our summary for the staff report, there is a waiver for the excess block length for East Crimson Clover Drive that would need to be identified in the motion and also the waiver to keep the Rawson Canal open. So, we will just want to make sure the Commissioners were aware of those two waivers that are being considered to City Council and that we are okay with those. I like the open canals. I mean I think it just -- I don't know if you can use it as an amenity or not, but it definitely just adds some more visual interest and a little bit more wildlife and oxygen to the -- to the space. So, I like that part. As far as the block -- excess block for the East Crimson Clover Drive, like Hethe mentioned a lot of the challenges for connectivity have been addressed because of this acquisition for this part of the parcel and if -- it just makes sense for the topography and the way the subdivision works. We will let City Council decide, but I can support that as well. Any other comments in regard to those two waivers?

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: I just want to state that I really appreciate the block length exhibit that you all put together. That was very helpful and the narrative and I wish every applicant would do a narrative for their communities like this one. It makes our preparation a lot easier. So thank you.

Lorcher: And, then, you will address the -- the four houses with the one before Council, so we are good with that.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council of File No. H-2026-0018 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of July 16th, 2026, with the following modifications: To grant the waivers for block face length and to keep the canal open and with a modification to have the applicant revise the -- the plat map to reconfigure Lots 4 through 7, Block 18, so that Block 18 -- so, that Lot 9, Block 18, does not have four lots backing up to its side yard, specifically to have three or fewer lots backing up to its side yard.

Gelsomino: Seconded.

Lorcher: It's been moved and second to approve Summerlin Subdivision. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Lorcher: I will take one more motion.

Gelsomino: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Gelsomino.

Gelsomino: I move that we adjourn for tonight's meeting.

Smith: