



PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
Christensen/Indart—Conditional Rezone –RZ2022-0002-CR REMANDED
FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSION OF LAW AND ORDER

In the matter of the application of
Christensen/Indart – Case No. RZ2022-0002-CR
The Canyon County Planning and Zoning
Commission consider the following:

A Conditional Rezone from “A” (Agricultural)
to “CR-R1” (Single Family Residential) for
approximately 151.56 total acres including the
following parcels R36523 (73.06 acres), R36525
(36.79 acres), R33209 (41.21 acres) and R33210
(0.50 acres). The properties are located at and
adjacent to 23422 Ustick Road along Ustick
and Van Slyke Roads and are further described
as being a portion of 4N-4W-31 SE and 3N-4W-
06-NE, Boise-Meridian, Canyon County, Idaho.

Summary of the Record:

1. The applicant is requesting a Conditional Rezone to amend the zoning from “A” (Agricultural) to “CR-R1” (Single Family Residential) for approximately 151.56 total acres including the following parcels: R36523 (73.06 acres), R36525 (36.79 acres), R33209 (41.21 acres) and R33210 (0.50 acres). The properties are located at and adjacent to 23422 Ustick Road along Ustick and Van Slyke Roads and are further described as being a portion of 4N-4W-31 SE and 3N-4W-06-NE, Boise-Meridian, Canyon County, Idaho.
2. The application was filed February 2022. The applicable Comprehensive Plan is the 2020 Plan. The subject properties are designated as “Agriculture” on the 2020 Canyon County Future Land Use Map (Exhibit B2e).
3. The property is located within the Greenleaf Area of City Impact. Greenleaf designates the subject properties as “Agricultural” within the City’s Comprehensive Plan.
4. The subject property is located within Golden Gate Highway District, Wilder and Homedale Fire Districts, Vallivue and Homedale School Districts, and Wilder Irrigation District along with the Boise Project Board of Control.
5. The neighborhood meeting for the revised application was held on August 15, 2024 pursuant to CCZO §07-01-15. The revised application and draft concept plan was submitted on August 23, 2024.
6. Notice of the public hearing was provided on August 21, 2025 in accordance with CCZO §07-05-01. Agency and City of Greenleaf notice was provided on December 10, 2024 and July 17, 2025. A full political notice was provided on July 22, 2025. Newspaper notice was provided on July 22, 2025. Property owners within 300 feet were notified by mail on July 22, 2025. The property was posted on July 22, 2025.

7. The record herein consists of exhibits provided as part of the public hearing staff report, public testimony, and all information in case file OR2022-0002 and RZ2022-0002-CR.
8. On January 12, 2026 the Board of County Commissioners vacated the scheduled hearing date for this case and remanded it back to the Planning and Zoning Commission for consideration of the substantial amount of new materials including a draft traffic impact study, revised letters of intent, a letter of interest from the City of Greenleaf to investigate the feasibility of entering into an extraterritorial agreement to provide for sewer services to the property, and other documents. The Board cited ordinance Chapter 1, Article 17 adopted in 2024, which provides the Board the ability to decide (hear), to table, or remand a case. The change in approach is due to many applications not providing sufficient information/evidence at the Planning and Zoning Commission hearing(s) and providing substantial additional materials prior to the Board hearing not previously considered by the Planning and Zoning Commission.
9. A special hearing was scheduled for the Planning and Zoning Commission to hear the remanded case on March 26, 2026. Notice of the public hearing was provided in accordance with CCZO §07-05-01. Agency and City of Greenleaf notice was provided on February 19, 2026. A full political notice was provided on February 19, 2026. Newspaper notice was provided on February 24, 2026. Property owners within 300 feet were notified by mail on February 19, 2026. The property was posted on February 25, 2026.
10. The Planning and Zoning Commission was provided all hearing materials in the record for consideration at the remanded hearing and on March 26, 2026 took testimony, deliberated and unanimously voted to recommend denial of the case to the Board of County Commissioners with a revised FCOs to revise criteria F and G indicating that the applicant submitted a traffic impact study and noting that the study had not been reviewed and approved by the Golden Gate Highway District Board of Commissioners at the time of the hearing.

Applicable Law

1. The following laws and ordinances apply to this decision: Canyon County Code of Ordinances (CCCO) §01-17 (Land Use/Land Division Hearing Procedures), CCCO §07-05 (Notice, Hearing and Appeal Procedures), CCCO §07-06-01 (Initiation of Proceedings), CCCO §07-06-03 (Comprehensive Plan Amendment), CCCO §09-03 Greenleaf Impact Area, Title 67 Chapter 65 §67-6537(Use of Surface and Groundwater), (CCCO §07-06-07 (Conditional Rezones), and Idaho Code §67-6511 (Zoning Map Amendments and Procedures).
 - a. Notice of the public hearing was provided per CCCO §07-05-01 and Idaho Code §67-6509.
 - b. The presiding party may establish conditions, stipulations, restrictions, or limitations which restrict and limit the use of the rezoned property to less than the full use allowed under the requested zone and which impose specific property improvement and maintenance requirements upon the requested land use. Such conditions, stipulations, restrictions, or limitations may be imposed to promote the public health, safety, and welfare, or to reduce any potential damage, hazard, nuisance, or other detriment to persons or property in the vicinity, to make the land use more compatible with neighboring land uses. See CCCO §07-06-07(1).

- c. All conditional rezones for land use shall commence within two (2) years of the approval of the board. If the conditional rezone has not commenced within the stated time requirement, the application for a conditional rezone shall lapse and become void. *See* CCCO §07-05-01
2. §07-06-01(3): Comprehensive Plan Changes: Requests for comprehensive plan changes and ordinance amendments may be consolidated for notice and hearing purposes. Although these procedures can be considered in tandem, pursuant to Idaho Code section 67-6511(b), the commission, and subsequently the board, shall deliberate first on the proposed amendment to the comprehensive plan; then, once the commission, and subsequently the board, has made that determination, the commission, and the board, should decide the appropriateness of a rezone within that area. This procedure provides that the commission, and subsequently the board, considers the overall development scheme of the county prior to consideration of individual requests for amendments to zoning ordinances. The commission, and subsequently the board, should make clear which of its findings relate to the proposed amendment to the comprehensive plan and which of its findings relate to the request for an amendment to the zoning ordinance.
3. The commission has the authority to exercise powers granted to it by the Idaho Local Land Use and Planning Act ("LLUPA") and can establish its own ordinances regarding land use, including subdivision permits. *See* I.C. §67-6504, §67-6511.
4. The commission shall have those powers and perform those duties assigned by the board that are provided for in the local land use planning act, Idaho Code, title 67, chapter 65, and county ordinances. CCCO §07-03-01, 07-06-05.
5. The burden of persuasion is upon the applicant to prove that all criteria are satisfied. CCCO §07-05-03.
6. Idaho Code §67-6535(2) requires the following: The approval or denial of any application required or authorized pursuant to this chapter shall be in writing and accompanied by a reasoned statement that explains the criteria and standards considered relevant, states the relevant contested facts relied upon, and explains the rationale for the decision based on the applicable provisions of the comprehensive plan, relevant ordinance and statutory provisions, pertinent constitutional principles and factual information contained in the record. The County's hearing procedures adopted per Idaho Code §67-6534 require that final decisions be in the form of written findings, conclusions, and orders. CCCO 07-05-03(1)(I).

Conclusions of Law

For Case File RZ2022-0002-CR, the Planning and Zoning Commission finds and concludes the following regarding the Standards of Review for a Conditional Rezone from "A" (Agricultural) to "CR-R1" (Single Family Residential) (§07-06-07 CCZO):

07-06-07: CONDITIONAL REZONE CRITERIA:

- (1) The commission shall review the particular facts and circumstances of each proposed conditional rezone and make a recommendation regarding the same to the board. The presiding party shall apply the following standards when evaluating the proposed conditional rezone:

A. Is the proposed conditional rezone generally consistent with the comprehensive plan?

CONCLUSION: The requested type of growth is not consistent with the comprehensive plan. The 2020 Comprehensive Plan designates the properties as Agriculture on the

Future Land Use Map. The Plan generally “...encourages the protection of agricultural lands and land uses for the production of food and fiber...” The Commission acknowledges that there is residential development in the area but that this area of the county consists primarily of agriculture and intensive agricultural operations and the Plan does not support residential growth in this area of the county.

FINDING:

1. The Future Land Use Map designates the properties as ‘Agriculture’ (Exhibit B2e).
2. The property lies within the City of Greenleaf area of city impact. The property is designated agricultural on the Greenleaf future land use map (Exhibit B2f).
3. The properties are currently and have historically been in agricultural production including crop and livestock (B2a, C1).
4. The area is not trending toward residential development. There are developments in the area created through conditional use permit approvals from 1998-2011. Those developments are zoned agricultural. There are conditionally zoned properties in the area, CPR2008-2, subject to a development agreement DA#08-111 recorded as instrument #2008051339. The properties have been and remain in agricultural crop production including corn and orchards (Exhibit B2a & Exhibit C).
5. The request is inconsistent with, but not limited to, the following goals and policies of the 2020 Canyon County Comprehensive Plan:
 - Property Rights Policy #8: “Promote orderly development that benefits the public good and protects the individual with a minimum of conflict.”
 - Population Goal No. 1: “Consider population growth trends when making land use decisions.”
 - Population Policy No. 3: “Encourage future population to locate in areas that are conducive for residential living and do not pose an incompatible land use to other land uses.”
 - Land Use Goal No. 2: “To provide for the orderly growth and accompanying development of the resources within the County that is compatible with their surrounding area.”
 - Land Use – Residential Policy #2: “Encourage residential development in areas where agricultural uses are not viable.”
 - Agricultural Policy #1: “Preserve agricultural lands and zoning classifications.”
 - Agricultural Policy #3: “Protect agricultural operations and facilities from land use conflicts or undue interference created by existing or proposed residential, commercial or industrial development.”
 - Natural Resources Goals #1: “To support the agricultural industry and preservation of agricultural land.”
 - Natural Resources Policy #3: “Protect agricultural activities from land use conflicts or undue inference created by existing or proposed residential, commercial or industrial development.”

- B. When considering the surrounding land uses, is the proposed conditional rezone more appropriate than the current zoning designation;**

CONCLUSION: The proposed Conditional Rezone from "A" (Agricultural) to "CR-R1" (CR-Single Family Residential) is not more appropriate than the current zoning designation of "A" (Agricultural). The Commission acknowledges that there is residential development in the area, inclusive of the Timber Stone Golf Course which is laid out in such a manner that it provides a great deal of open space; however, the subject properties and the surrounding land uses are predominantly agricultural consistent with the Comprehensive Plan designation of Agriculture.

FINDING:

1. The subject property is currently zoned "A" (Agricultural). Per CCCO 07-10-25(1), the purposes of the "A" (Agricultural) Zone are to:
 - A. Promote the public health, safety, and welfare of the people of the County by encouraging the protection of viable farmland and farming operations;*
 - B. Limit urban density development to Areas of City Impact in accordance with the comprehensive plan;*
 - C. Protect fish, wildlife, and recreation resources, consistent with the purposes of the "Local Land Use Planning Act", Idaho Code title 67, chapter 65;*
 - D. Protect agricultural land uses, and rangeland uses, and wildlife management areas from unreasonable adverse impacts from development; and*
 - E. Provide for the development of schools, churches, and other public and quasi-public uses consistent with the comprehensive plan*
2. The land use in this region of the county is predominantly agricultural. Properties within the immediate vicinity are predominantly zoned "A" (Agricultural) with the average lot size of 19.13 acres for properties within the 600 foot notification area (Exhibits B1, B2a, B2c, B2d, B6, C1, and C2).
3. The golf course and associated nearby developments have an average lot size of 2.28 acres for 146 lots on 311 acres. Summerwind at Orchard Hills/Timber Stone has greater than 50% of the developed property in open space providing a natural barrier or transition between the residential uses and agricultural lands. The existing developments in the area are not urban density type subdivisions. The properties to the north, south, and west are agricultural and designated agricultural on the future land use map.
4. The property consists primarily of moderately-suited soils, designated as Class 3 and Class 4, that are considered prime farmland and farmland of statewide importance, if irrigated. An approximate 9 acres of parcel R33209 is not considered prime farmland (Exhibits B2k).
5. Within the vicinity, the following residential zones have been approved or pending final approval:
 - CPR2008-2 (Williamson): Comprehensive Plan Amendment to "Residential" and conditional rezone to a "CR-RR" (Rural Residential) Zone of 311 acres approved in 2008 subject to development agreement DA#08-111 (Exhibit B8). Although 311

acres was conditionally zoned "CR-RR", the 311 acres remains in agricultural use. The development agreement included landscaping, exterior lighting, open space and subdivision requirements which have not been met; and therefore, it is unknown if the zone and agreement are vested or expired which would revert the 311 acres back to an agricultural zone (Exhibit B2c Zoning Map)

- OR2021-0012 and RZ2021-0027-CR (Van Slyke Farms): *[pending final signature on FCOs and Development Agreement]* Comprehensive Plan Amendment to "Residential" for approximately 4.66 acres (the balance of the 26 acres was identified as Residential in 2020 Plan) and a conditional rezone of 26 acres from "Agricultural" to "CR-Rural Residential" with a minimum lot size of two (2) acres and no secondary residences. Due to water quality and safety concerns, wells must be drilled, cased and sealed to a minimum depth of 350 feet.

6. The subject property is located within a one-mile radius of eight residential subdivisions, 146 total lots on a total of 333.38 acres with an average lot size of 2.28 acres (Exhibit B2d). The applicants are proposing 135 residential lots on 151 acres with an average lot size of 0.82 acres. All of the existing subdivisions are zoned agricultural and were approved under a different ordinance and comprehensive plan; and therefore, do not reflect current goals and policies. These development final plats were recorded from 1998 with the most recent being 2011. A replat of a common lot to adjust for setback requirements was completed in 2022.

C. Is the proposed conditional rezone compatible with surrounding land uses;

CONCLUSION: The proposed conditional rezone is not compatible with surrounding land uses. The predominant zone and land use is agricultural. Although there is residential development in the area the predominant land use and zoning is agricultural with an average lot size of 19.3 acres within the 600 foot notification area. This is an intensive agricultural area with large farm equipment and trucks traversing the roadways. There are multiple hills and valleys creating site distance challenges at intersections and driveway approaches. Most of the intersections in the area are only two way stops. There is a dairy CAFO approximately 1.25 miles to the northeast of the properties at Boehner and Tucker Roads. The proposed 135 residential lot development will nearly double the current residential development (146 platted lots) in the area with proposed urban transition sized lots of 0.82 acres and very little planned open space or transition areas. The current average lot size of the platted subdivisions within one mile of the property is 2.28 acres. Doubling the residential units in an intensive agricultural area has the potential for conflict with agricultural operations and traffic. Creating further development sprawl could have the effect of encouraging additional creep of residential development in an area that currently does not have planned urban services now or into the future.

FINDING:

1. There are eight platted subdivisions within one mile of the development with an average lot size of 2.28 acres (Exhibit B2d). The majority of the subdivision development is immediately within or surrounding the Timber Stone Golf Course located adjacent to the subject properties and east of Van Slyke Road. All of the platted

developments are zoned agricultural and created through the former conditional use process.

2. In 2008, a conditional rezone to "CR-Rural Residential" of 311 acres was approved (Williamson properties). To date the properties have not been developed and are in agricultural production including crops and orchards. (Exhibit B2a, B2c, and C2) No development plan has been submitted or approved for these properties.
3. The predominant use of the properties in the area is agricultural crop production with sporadic ag-residential homes on farms. (Exhibits B2a, C1, C2)
4. The property is located within the Greenleaf area of city impact but is located more than two (2) miles from the Greenleaf city limits (Exhibit B2p.)
5. Friends Dairy CAFO is located just over one mile to the north and east of the subject properties at Tucker Road and Boehner Road intersection. The dairy has a large composting operation and also applies nutrients to area fields. This is an intensive agricultural operation. (Exhibit B2l, C1).

D. Will the proposed conditional rezone negatively affect the character of the area? What measures will be implemented to mitigate impacts?

CONCLUSION: The proposed conditional rezone for the purpose of creating urban density in a rural agricultural area will negatively affect the agricultural character of the area. The predominant land use and general character of the area is agricultural. The developer is proposing to establish 135 residential lots with a gross average lot size of 0.82 acres. The average lot size of the existing platted developments within one mile is 2.28 acres. The developer proposes to utilize a community water system and to connect to the City of Greenleaf sewer system or to provide a central wastewater system or clustered on-site septic systems to mitigate impacts. The draft concept plan provides for one approximate three (3) acre multi-purpose lot as community space. There are no provisions in the draft plan for rural transition to the adjacent agricultural lands surrounding the properties.

FINDING:

1. The subject properties are agricultural operations. The applicant letter of intent indicates that feedlot operator has abandoned the use however there were cattle in the feedlot in the fall of 2024 as evidenced in aerial GIS photos including Exhibit B2a.
2. There are eight platted subdivisions within one mile of the development with an average lot size of 2.28 acres (Exhibit B2d). The majority of the subdivision development is immediately within or surrounding the Timber Stone Golf Course located adjacent to the subject properties and east of Van Slyke Road. All of the platted developments are zoned agricultural and created through the former conditional use process.
3. In 2008, a conditional rezone to "CR-Rural Residential" of 311 acres was approved (Williamson properties). To date the properties have not been developed and are in agricultural production including crops and orchards. (Exhibit B2a, B2c, and C2) No development plan has been submitted or approved for these properties.
4. The predominant use of the properties in the area is agricultural crop production with sporadic ag-residential homes on farms. (Exhibits B2a, C1, C2)

5. The property is located within the Greenleaf area of city impact but is located more than two (2) miles from the Greenleaf city limits (Exhibit B2p.)
6. Friends Dairy CAFO is located just over one mile to the north and east of the subject properties at Tucker Road and Boehner Road intersection. The dairy has a large composting operation and also applies nutrients to area fields. (Exhibit B2l, C1).

E. Will adequate facilities and services including sewer, water, drainage, irrigation and utilities be provided to accommodate proposed conditional rezone?

CONCLUSION: As proposed and conditioned, the developer proposes to utilize a community water system and to connect to the City of Greenleaf sewer system or to provide a central wastewater system or clustered on-site septic systems to mitigate impacts. The draft concept plan provides for one approximate three (3) acre multi-purpose lot as community space. If approved, the development will require platting as a residential subdivision and the developer will be required to meet the subdivision code requirements, state statutes, and agency requirements as well as all conditions of approval as enumerated in a development agreement with Canyon County.

FINDING:

Sewer: As conditioned the development will require a community wastewater system or connection to the City of Greenleaf municipal sewer. This is a nitrate priority area with area wells that have tested with elevated nitrates and other contaminants that exceed safe drinking water levels of arsenic and uranium. Individual septic systems are not proposed or approved in this application findings.

Water: As conditioned the development will require a community water system for potable water in compliance with Department of Environmental Quality approvals for a public drinking water system in conformance with IDAPA 58.01.08 (Exhibit D4). This is a nitrate priority area with area wells that have tested with elevated nitrates and other contaminants that exceed safe drinking water levels of arsenic and uranium. Private wells are not proposed; however, for safety of the public and aquifer, staff recommends that a condition be added to ensure that if private wells are constructed on any of the properties, that well construction standards as recommended by Terry Scanlan, PE in Exhibit B7 (slide set for Van Slyke Farms water quality testimony). *Proposed condition: A plat note shall be placed on both the preliminary and final plat as follows: Individual wells are required to be constructed at a minimum depth of 350 feet and shall be constructed cased with full length surface seals to prevent comingling of aquifer zones. Following pump installations, well water samples should be collected and analyzed at a state-certified laboratory. At a minimum, analyze for coliform bacteria, nitrate, arsenic, uranium, fluoride, iron, manganese, aluminum and hardness. Well owners should contact reputable water treatment vendors to discuss treatment and conditioning options specific to their well water quality.*

Irrigation: The Christensen property, R36523, has irrigation water rights. The applicant states that the Indart properties, R36525, R33209, and R33210 do not have irrigation water rights. The development proposes that all lots will be irrigated with a pressure irrigation system. A condition should be placed requiring that the developer secure adequate water rights to service the entirety of the development with both community potable water as well as surface irrigation water and ground water rights to meet the irrigation requirements for a pressurized irrigation system for all lots within the proposed development.

Drainage: If approved for development, All stormwater drainage shall be retained on the subject properties. A grading and drainage plan will be required for the subdivision development. The development shall also be required to meet the hillside development code §07-17-33(1) where applicable on slopes exceeding 15%.

- F. Does the proposed conditional rezone require public street improvements in order to provide adequate access to and from the subject property to minimize undue interference with existing or future traffic patterns? What measures have been taken to mitigate traffic impacts?**

CONCLUSION: The applicants submitted a traffic study to Golden Gate Highway District. There are recommended public street improvements, however, the traffic study review and recommendations have not been reviewed and approved by the GGHD Board of Commissioners. There are also identified sight distance concerns at access standard locations which could also require variance(s) from Golden Gate Highway District.

FINDING:

1. Golden Gate Highway District indicates that a traffic impact study is warranted for the proposed project (Exhibit D6).
2. The topography of this area is rolling hills creating sight distance hazards at driveway approaches, intersections, and with vehicle traffic, both farm equipment, trucks and residential traffic.
3. No speed controls are posted on area roadways.
4. The applicants submitted a revised traffic study dated 2-2-26 (Exhibit K14) to Golden Gate Highway District (GGHD) and the revised study has been reviewed by JUB Engineers for compliance with ACCHD standards. JUB Engineers provided a memorandum to GGHD dated 3-10-26 summarizing the findings and recommendations provided in the TIS report completed by CR Engineering with additional recommendations and comments from JUB (Exhibit K13). The memorandum has not been reviewed by the Golden Gate Highway District Board of Commissioners per email response from Bob Watkins, Director of Highways (Exhibit I.1)
5. Exhibit I.1 also indicates that the variances for accesses to the development have not been reviewed and approved.

G. Does legal access to the subject property for the conditional rezone exist or will it exist at the time of development?

CONCLUSION: The subject properties have road frontage on Ustick Road, Van Slyke Road and Boehner Road. There are currently agricultural approaches to the properties and a residential access to R33210. Access will be available to the properties in accordance with the requirements of Golden Gate Highway District (GGHD). The applicants submitted a Traffic Impact Study which has been reviewed by JUB Engineering on behalf of GGHD but has not been reviewed and approved by the GGHD Board of Commissioners and they have not approved the variances for access to the properties due to sight distance concerns and inconsistency with ACCHD access controls.

FINDING:

1. Subject Parcels R36525, R33210, R33209 and R36523 have road frontage on Ustick Road.
2. Parcel R36523 also has road frontage on Van Slyke Road and Boehner Road.
3. GGHD requires that a traffic impact study be completed and that variances may be required for approaches that do not meet spacing requirements due to sight distance concerns.
4. The applicants submitted a revised traffic study dated 2-2-26 (Exhibit K14) to Golden Gate Highway District (GGHD) and the revised study has been reviewed by JUB Engineers for compliance with ACCHD standards. JUB Engineers provided a memorandum to GGHD dated 3-10-26 summarizing the findings and recommendations provided in the TIS report completed by CR Engineering with additional recommendations and comments from JUB (Exhibit K13). The memorandum has not been reviewed by the Golden Gate Highway District Board of Commissioners per email response from Bob Watkins, Director of Highways (Exhibit I.1)
5. Exhibit I.1 also indicates that the variances for accesses to the development have not been reviewed and approved.

H. Will the proposed conditional rezone amendment impact essential public services and facilities, such as schools, police, fire and emergency medical services? What measures will be implemented to mitigate impacts?

CONCLUSION: The proposed conditional rezone may impact essential public services and facilities. Vallivue School District expressed concerns with adding development due to projections indicating that existing and new schools will reach or exceed capacity by 2029 considering currently approved, but not yet constructed, development in their district (Exhibit D3 and D3a). Longer response times are expected from all services including police, fire and EMS (Exhibit A2, page 9). The sheriff's office, fire departments and emergency medical services were notified of the application but no responses or concerns with the proposed development were received by staff.

FINDING:

1. Agency notification: Notice of the public hearing was provided in accordance with CCZO §07-05-01. Agency and City of Greenleaf notice was provided on December 10, 2024 and July 17, 2025. A full political notice was provided on July 22, 2025. Newspaper notice was provided on July 22, 2025. Property owners within 300 feet were notified by mail on July 22, 2025. The property was posted on July 22, 2025 as evidenced in case file no. OR2022-0002 & RZ2022-0002-CR.
2. The following agencies responded to the agency notifications: Boise Project Board of Control noting facilities and required easements on the subject properties, DSD Engineering, Vallivue School District, Department of Environmental Quality, Idaho Transportation Department, Golden Gate Highway District, and a brief email from City of Greenleaf. The responses and exhibits are attached in Section D: Exhibits D1-D8.
3. An agency request for comment was sent December 10, 2024 to the following agencies: City of Greenleaf, City of Homedale, City of Wilder, Homedale and Vallivue School Districts, Southwest District Health, Homedale and Wilder Fire Departments, Centurylink, Intermountain Gas, Idaho Power and Ziply, Boise Project Board of Control, Wilder Irrigation, COMPASS, Idaho Transportation Department, Valley Regional Transit, Canyon County Sheriff's Office, Canyon County Paramedics/EMT, Homedale City Ambulance, CC Assessor's office, CC DSD Engineering, Building Dept., and Code Enforcement, Bureau of Reclamation, Dept. of Environmental Quality, Environmental Protection Agency, and Idaho Department of Water Resources/water rights. These agencies also received a notice on July 17, 2025. All political subdivisions received the full political notice on July 22, 2025.
4. Notices for the March 26, 2026 remanded public hearing were provided in accordance with CCZO §07-05-01. Agency and City of Greenleaf notice was provided on February 19, 2026. A full political notice was provided on February 19, 2026. Newspaper notice was provided on February 24, 2026. Property owners within 300 feet were notified by mail on February 19, 2026. The property was posted on February 25, 2026.

Order

Based upon the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law contained herein, the Planning and Zoning Commission forwards this case with a **recommendation of denial** for Case No. RZ2022-0002-CR, a **Conditional Rezone** of approximately 151.56 acres including parcels R36523 (73.06 acres), R36525 (36.79 acres), R33509 (41.21 acres) and R33210 (0.50 acres) from "A" (Agricultural) to "CR-R1" (CR-Single Family Residential).

DENIED this 2 day of April, 2026.

**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
CANYON COUNTY, IDAHO**


Robert Sturgill, Chairman

State of Idaho)

) SS

County of Canyon County)

On this 2nd Day of April in the year of 2026, before me Caitlin Ross,
a notary public, personally appeared Robert Sturgill personally known to me to be the person
whose name is subscribed to the within instrument, and acknowledged to me that he executed the same.



Notary: Caitlin Ross

My Commission Expires: 5/7/2031