June 16, 2015

TO: ACHD Commission, Director Bruce S. Wong

FROM: Christy Little, Planning Review Supervisor

SUBJECT: Highlands Cove Subdivision – Preliminary Plat
Staff Report for June 24, 2015 Commission Meeting

Executive Summary
The applicant is proposing to construct 60 buildable lots and 10 common lots on 54.4 acres and has submitted an application for preliminary plat, PUD (to allow for clustering and reduced setbacks); and a City Hillside application.

The property is zoned A-1 and R-1B. The density proposal is allowed by the City based on the existing zoning:

- 49.25 acres in A-1 zone, which is 1 unit per acre, or 49 units
- 5.11 acres in R-1B zone, which is 4.8 units per acre, or 24.5 units
- Total units allowed within current zoning is 73 units (49 + 24 = 73)
- Allowed density is 1.34 du/acre (73 / 54.36 = 1.34)
- Proposed density is 1.10 du/acre (60 / 54.36 = 1.10)

This application is on the regular agenda because there are neighborhood concerns about volumes and speeds, and lack of pedestrian improvements in the area. There are also hillside and grading concerns – those issues and permits will be addressed by the City of Boise. The property has the existing zoning necessary for the proposed density, and an Easement Agreement was provided to ACHD in 1991 providing for the connection between Braemere Road and Highland View Drive. Staff has not recommended any off-site improvements because they are not warranted by policy. Staff has recommended that the applicant provide a $20,000 road trust for neighborhood traffic calming, although there is no policy in place for this requirement.

Recommendation
Approve the staff report with Site Specific Conditions of Approval, as presented.

Attachment(s):
Staff Report
Easement Agreement (1991)
Correspondence
A. Findings of Fact

1. Description of Application: The applicant is proposing to construct 60 buildable lots and 10 common lots on 54.4 acres. The property is zoned A-1 and R-1B. The density proposal is allowed by the City based on the existing zoning:

   • 49.25 acres in A-1 zone, which is 1 unit per acre, or 49 units
   • 5.11 acres in R-1B zone, which is 4.8 units per acre, or 24.5 units
   • Total units allowed within current zoning is 73 units (49 + 24 = 73)
   • Allowed density is 1.34 du/acre (73 / 54.36 = 1.34)
   • Proposed density is 1.10 du/acre (60 / 54.36 = 1.10)

   The applicant has submitted an application for preliminary plat, PUD (to allow for clustering and reduced setbacks); and a City Hillside application.

2. Transit: Transit services are not available to serve this site.

3. New Center Lane Miles: 0.82

4. Impact Fees: There will be an impact fee that is assessed and due prior to issuance of any building permits. The assessed impact fee will be based on the impact fee ordinance that is in effect at that time.
5. **Capital Improvements Plan/ Integrated Five Year Work Plan:**

There are currently no roadways, bridges or intersections in the general vicinity of the project that are currently in the Integrated Five Year Work Plan (IFYWP) or the District's Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).

**B. Traffic Findings for Consideration**

1. **Trip Generation:** This development is estimated to generate 581 additional vehicle trips per day; 60 additional vehicle trips per hour in the PM peak hour, based on the traffic impact study. (This is based on ITE trip generation of 9.52 daily trips per household; and 1 PM peak hour trip per household.)

2. **Traffic Impact Study**

   Although not required by Policy, the applicant hired Thompson Engineers to prepare a traffic analysis for the proposed preliminary plat to address traffic concerns of the neighborhood. Below is an executive summary of the findings as presented by Thompson Engineers.

   - All intersections and roadways function at an acceptable level of service under existing traffic conditions. No improvements are required.

   - All of the intersections and roadways function at an acceptable level of service under background traffic conditions. No improvements are required.

   - Under total AM and total PM peak hour traffic conditions in the build out year of 2017, all intersections under study will continue to operate at an acceptable level of service without capacity improvements.

   - Speed data indicate that more than half of the existing traffic is exceeding the posted speed limit on Braemere Road and Highland View Drive.

   - Highland View Drive is posted at 20 MPH; the existing average speed on Highland View Drive exceeds the posted speed limit. It is extremely difficult to obtain compliance with a speed limit that low without extreme measures. Highland View Drive does not have long straight-aways, has a narrow roadway section, centerline and shoulder striping, and on-street parking. These items tend to control speeds. However, the steepness of the road tends to make controlling speed difficult in the downhill direction. speed humps should be installed where the road grader permits. The maximum anticipated peak hour directional traffic volume on Highland View Drive is 236 vph, well below the LOS D maximum of 425 vph.

   - Braemere Road north of Curling is posted for a 25 MPH speed limit for most of the road; the existing average speed exceeds the posted speed limit. It is a 40’ wide roadway with no striping. There are several straight segments, which tend to encourage higher speeds. Traffic calming measures including enforcement, lane striping, and center islands would help to reduce speeds. On street parking is permitted, but was only used sporadically when we observed the street. We noted that speed limit signs were limited and sometimes obscured by vegetation. The maximum anticipated peak hour directional traffic volume on Braemere is 178 vph, well below the LOS D maximum of 425 vph. The intersection of Braemere/Curling Drive will operate at an acceptable Level of Service (LOS) B, as a two-way stop controlled intersection at build out.

   - The intersection of Bogus Basin/Curling Drive will operate at an acceptable LOS B, at build out.

   - The intersection of 15th/Hill Road will operate at an acceptable LOS C, at build out.

   - Braemere Road, Highland View Drive, and Curling Drive will operate at better than LOS D at build out.
• 15th Street currently operates at LOS D, and will continue to operate at LOS D at build out.

• The Highland Elementary School on Curling Drive creates a large volume of pedestrian traffic in the AM peak hour. Most of the afternoon pedestrian traffic is gone by the beginning of the PM peak hour. Students cross Curling Drive at a midblock cross walk, a crosswalk at the intersection of Curling and Bogus, and a crosswalk at the intersection of Curling and Braemere. The midblock crosswalk has student crossing guards, the other cross walks have no crossing guards. Rectangular shaped Rapid-Flash LED Beacons should be installed at the intersection cross walks to provide alert drivers of the presence of pedestrians.

• The developer is proposing access from three existing dead end roads, and extending the roads through the site. Traffic should be divided fairly equally between the three access points, so none of the roads should have more than 15 vehicles existing in the AM peak hour, or 18 vehicles entering during the PM peak hour.

• Traffic Calming Recommendations:
  o Speeding on Braemere and Highland View is an existing problem. If site traffic behaves similar to existing traffic as expected, there will be an increase in the number of cars, but it is not likely that the average speed will increase. Therefore, the development should only be required to pay a proportionate share of any traffic calming improvements. This would be between 20% to 30% on Braemere and 10% to 24% on Highland View.
  o The method of traffic calming should also be made with input from all affected parties. Even the most effective traffic calming measure has a negative impact on some of the homeowners, so the developer should not dictate which traffic calming measure should be installed.
  o Enforcement is recommended in particular to reduce high end speed violators. This can be implemented immediately with or without the development.

• Pedestrians
  o Highland View Elementary School is located at the southeast corner of Bogus Basin Road and Curling Drive. The school is served by buses, but there is significant foot and bicycle traffic.
  o There are cross walks at the intersection of Bogus Basin Road and Curling Drive. During the AM peak hour, 27 pedestrians, including parents of children, crossed Bogus Basin Road at this intersection. There were no pedestrians in the PM peak hour since the school let out well before 4:00 PM.
  o There are also cross walks, marked as a school crossing, at the intersection of Curling Drive and Braemere Road. There were a lot of children using this intersection, but most would turn right from Curling on to southbound Braemere, and would not cross the street at this location. Several crossed Curling at the midblock point, travelled east on Curling, then turned left to northbound Braemere. These children also did not use the crosswalks at the intersection. A few crossed Curling at Braemere. There were several that crossed Braemere and continued east on Curling.
  o Bogus Basin Road and Curling Drive have sidewalks on both sides of the street. Braemere has sidewalks on the easterly side north of Curling and on
both sides after the apartment buildings. South of Curling, there are no sidewalks on Braemere Road. Highland View Drive does not have sidewalks.

- This development can be expected to add some children to the pedestrian traffic and additional vehicles during the AM and PM peak hours. These additional vehicles will create additional potential conflicts with pedestrians. Since most of the site traffic will be along Braemere Road north of Curling, the pedestrians will have sidewalks to avoid conflicts.

- The installation of a flashing beacon would be an economical mitigation that would improve the safety of the school cross walks at Bogus Basin and Curling, and Braemere and Curling.

- Braemere Road between Curling Drive Highland View Drive does not have sidewalks. Sidewalk could be installed on the westerly side for most of the segment, but it would adversely impact landscaping on virtually all the lots on that side of the street. It does not appear to be feasible to install sidewalks on the east side of the street due to elevation issues. The road is probably too narrow to install sidewalk within the travel way.

- Highland View Drive does not have sidewalks. There is significant landscaping, including significant retaining walls which would make installation of sidewalks economically infeasible.

**AM and PM Peak Hour Volumes for Collector Roadways and % Increase at Build Out:** ACHD policy is for all collector roads to operate at better than the LOS D maximum. All roadway segments are expected to operate at significantly better than LOS D except 15th Street which will operate at better than LOS E. 15th Street is currently operating above the capacity for LOS D, under existing conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Segment</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Dir</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Existing Volume</th>
<th>Buildout Volume</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
<th>LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15th St</td>
<td>South of Hill</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>&gt;D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th St</td>
<td>South of Hill</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>&gt;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braemere Rd</td>
<td>North of Curling</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>&gt;D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braemere Rd</td>
<td>North of Curling</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>&gt;D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braemere Rd</td>
<td>N. of Hearthstone</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>&gt;D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braemere Rd</td>
<td>N. of Hearthstone</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>&gt;D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland View</td>
<td>N. of Parkhill</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>&gt;D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland View</td>
<td>N. of Parkhill</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>&gt;D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland View</td>
<td>S. of Selkirk</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>&gt;D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland View</td>
<td>S. of Selkirk</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>&gt;D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogus Basin</td>
<td>South of Curling</td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>&gt;D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogus Basin</td>
<td>South of Curling</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>&gt;D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curling</td>
<td>E. of Bogus</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>&gt;D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curling</td>
<td>E. of Bogus</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>&gt;D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peak Hour Intersection Analysis: All of the intersections are anticipated to function at an acceptable LOS through total AM and total PM peak hour traffic conditions in the build out year 2017. The Bogus Basin/Hill Road intersection was not included in the TIS, but Traffic staff reported that the Bogus Basin/Hill Road intersection operates at LOS D in the AM peak hour and LOS C in the PM peak hour, and operates at an acceptable level of service, and will operate at an acceptable level of service at build-out.

| Table 4A - LOS Summary | AM Peak Hour Conditions | 2014 | | 2017 | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|------|-----|------|-----|-----|
|                        | Existing | Background | Total |
|                        | Delay(s/k) | v/c | LOS | Delay(s/k) | v/c | LOS | Delay(s/k) | v/c | LOS |
| Bogus and Curling      | 10.1      | 0.31 | B   | 10.4      | 0.34 | B   | 10.8      | 0.37 | B   |
| Braemere and Curling   | 12.5      | 0.10 | B   | 13.0      | 0.1  | B   | 13.7      | 0.12 | B   |
| 15th and Hill          | 14.4      | 0.55 | B   | 17.7      | 0.63 | C   | 18.3      | 0.64 | C   |

| Table 4B - LOS Summary | PM Peak Hour Conditions | 2014 | | 2017 | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|------|-----|------|-----|-----|
|                        | Existing | Background | Total |
|                        | Delay(s/k) | v/c | LOS | Delay(s/k) | v/c | LOS | Delay(s/k) | v/c | LOS |
| Bogus and Curling      | 8.8       | 0.17 | A   | 8.9       | 0.18 | A   | 9.1       | 0.19 | A   |
| Braemere and Curling   | 13.2      | 0.21 | B   | 13.7      | 0.2  | B   | 14.9      | 0.26 | B   |
| 15th and Hill          | 15.6      | 0.44 | C   | 17.2      | 0.5  | C   | 18.4      | 0.48 | C   |

3. Existing Conditions
   a. Braemere Road: Braemere Road is classified as a collector roadway from Curling Drive up to Keddoon Avenue. North of Keddoon Avenue Braemere is a local street. As stated in the TIS, the existing average speed on Braemere Road north of Curling Drive is 27.5 MPH, which exceeds the posted speed limit of 20 MPH. North of Hearthstone Drive the average speed is 27.5 MPH, which exceeds the posted speed limit of 25 MPH.
b. **Highland View Drive:** Highland View Drive is classified as a collector roadway from Hill Road up to Selkirk Drive. North of Selkirk Drive, Highland View Drive is a local street. As stated in the TIS, the existing average speed on Highland View Drive north of Parkhill Drive is 29 MPH, which exceeds the posted speed limit of 25 MPH. South of Selkirk Drive the average speed is 26 MPH and the posted speed limit is 20 MPH.

![Diagram of Highland View Drive]

---

c. **Chardie Road:** Chardie Road is a local street. It is 36-feet wide with vertical curb, gutter and sidewalk. There is no traffic count or speed data available due to the low volumes. There are ten houses (existing) that take access to this street out to Braemere Road.

![Diagram of Chardie Road]
d. **Curling Drive:** Curling Drive is classified as a collector roadway from Bogus Basin Road to Braemere Road. Curling Drive is a 36-foot street section with curb, gutter and sidewalk. There are school speed zone flashers and school signage.

e. **Curling/Braemere Intersection:** This intersection currently operates as a 2-way STOP with stop signs on the Braemere Road legs, and there is a crosswalk. ACHD has evaluated this intersection previously to determine if all-way-STOP control should be implemented but it has not many the criteria and warrants for that treatment. ACHD has also evaluated sight distance at this intersection and determined that it was adequate. The most recent intersection related crash at this intersection occurred 12 years ago in 2003. Traffic Services staff recommends that ACHD re-evaluate the intersection for all-way-stop-control after the development is built-out to determine if a change is warranted.

As noted in the TIS, the intersection of Curling/Braemere will operate at an acceptable Level of Service (LOS) B, as a two-way stop controlled intersection at build out.

4. **PM Peak Hour Traffic Count of Area Roadways - Collectors and Arterials**

Traffic Count is based on Vehicles per hour (VPH)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Functional Classification</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour Traffic Count</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour Level of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15th Street</td>
<td>s/o Hill</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>Better than “D”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogus Basin Road</td>
<td>n/o Hill</td>
<td>Minor Arterial</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>Better than “D”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison Boulevard</td>
<td>n/o Brumback</td>
<td>Minor Arterial</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>Better than “E”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braemere Road</td>
<td>n/o Curling</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Better than “D”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland View Drive</td>
<td>e/c Argyll</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Better than “D”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill Road</td>
<td>e/o Bogus Basin</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>Better than “D”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Acceptable level of service for a two-lane collector is “D” (425 VPH).
* Acceptable level of service for a two-lane minor arterial is “D” (550 VPH).
* Acceptable level of service for a three-lane minor arterial is “D” (720 VPH).
5. Existing Traffic Volumes – Daily Counts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Segment</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Functional Classification</th>
<th>Existing Volume</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15th St</td>
<td>s/o Hill</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>6838</td>
<td>9/15/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th Street</td>
<td>n/o Hill</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>4521</td>
<td>2/5/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braemere Road</td>
<td>North of Curling</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>2442</td>
<td>9/15/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braemere Road</td>
<td>N. of Hearthstone</td>
<td>Collector to Local</td>
<td>1668</td>
<td>9/15/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braemere Road</td>
<td>s/o Curling</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>1425</td>
<td>10/15/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland View</td>
<td>n/o Parkhill</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>3390</td>
<td>9/15/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland View</td>
<td>s/o Selkirk</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>10/21/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogus Basin</td>
<td>South of Curling</td>
<td>Minor Arterial</td>
<td>4262</td>
<td>9/15/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curling Drive</td>
<td>e/o Bogus</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>2612</td>
<td>9/15/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogus Basin Road</td>
<td>n/o Hill</td>
<td>Minor Arterial</td>
<td>8878</td>
<td>8/24/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison Boulevard</td>
<td>s/o Hill</td>
<td>Minor Arterial</td>
<td>11381</td>
<td>4/9/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill Road</td>
<td>e/o Bogus Basin</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>5800</td>
<td>7/30/14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Existing Speeds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Segment</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Posted Speed</th>
<th>Average Speed</th>
<th>85%tile Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15th St</td>
<td>South of Hill</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braemere Road</td>
<td>North of Curling</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braemere Road</td>
<td>N. of Hearthstone</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland View</td>
<td>N. of Parkhill</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland View</td>
<td>S. of Selkirk</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogus Basin</td>
<td>South of Curling</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curling</td>
<td>E. of Bogus</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Findings for Consideration

1. Prior Actions

Letters and information received from the neighborhood reference prior ACHD and City actions dating back to 1996 for the zoning of the area. Information and policies from those reports is outdated, and not being referenced within this report. One of the prior actions associated with these parcels resulted in a development agreement that is outlined in the next section.
2. Development Agreement
On June 11, 1990, ACHD approved a preliminary plat of The Highlands Unit No. 25 Subdivision also located in Ada County, Idaho, subject to a number of conditions, including, but not limited to, the following:
1. Provide an easement for a collector road from Braemere to Highland View Drive on land currently owned by The Highlands, Inc., an Idaho corporation.
2. Provide assurance that no further development will occur that would take access from Braemere until a second access is constructed.

In June 1991, The Highlands Inc. granted a perpetual easement to ACHD for a future public roadway to comply with the 1990 conditions. The recorded Easement Agreement is attached.

3. City Ordinances/Hillside Development
The City and ACHD have received numerous inquiries about the City’s Foothills plans and policies. Additionally, the City, not ACHD, has ordinances in place to guide hillside development and grading. This information has been provided to ACHD from City of Boise Planning & Zoning and Legal staff; and these are specific responses and information provided by the City in response to neighbor concerns.

The Foothills PUD ordinance, which implements the Foothills Policy Plan, does NOT apply. This property has existing zoning and the development that is proposed does not need either annexation or a zone change. The Foothills PUD ordinance clearly states that it only applies when annexation and/or a zone change is requested. The Foothills Policy Plan, being the policy guide for the area, does apply to the extent that any policy plan would apply to a development that has pre-existing zoning. Boise City has reviewed the development plan against the guidance in the Foothills Policy Plan and believes that the proposed development does comply with the policy plan in terms of staying off of steep slopes, avoiding skylining on ridges, staying out of riparian zones, providing open space and trails, etc. Also, this project does not stub new roadways to any other adjacent property so it cannot be expected to lead to new development further out.

The Foothills Policy Plan is a planning document which was adopted in 1997 by reference into the City’s Comprehensive Plan (Blueprint Boise). The Comprehensive Plan and its adopted plans are guidance for the City in its zoning decisions and do not operate as legally controlling zoning law. In contrast, an ordinance is legally controlling zoning law. The Foothills Planned Development Standards were adopted by ordinance in 2000.

The Foothills Planned Development Standards explicitly state that they apply only to annexations and rezones. In this matter, since the applicant is using the existing zoning classifications for the property and is not requesting either an annexation or a rezone, the Foothills Planned Development Standards do not apply. The Hillside Development Standards in Boise City Code 11-07-08 are the applicable provisions for an application using existing zoning. The Foothills Planned Development Standards’ distinction between existing zoning as compared to a future request for new zoning or annexation was prudent, as it preserved the existing zoning rights at the time of passage. The Planning and Development Services Department has been consistent in applying the Foothills Planned Development Standards in this manner since their adoption in 2000.

The Foothills Planned Development Ordinance was enacted in December of 2000. It did not replace any previous code sections, but rather was designed to supplement the existing Hillside Ordinance in effect at the time.
The Foothill's PUD ordinance was intended to provide for implementation of the Foothills Policy Plan. It did not replace any existing code. It was all new. It is a quite complex code that focuses on the technical details of how to apply the density bonus formula suggested in the Foothills Plan, how to determine buildable area based on slope, types of environmental habitat to protect, acceptable uses within open space areas and describes an iterative process for designing a foothills PUD. Due to the complexity of the code, and because it assumes a base starting density of only 1 unit per 40-acres, it also clearly describes the situations in which it is to be applied – when land is being annexed and/or rezoned. Great care was taken to clarify that existing zoning rights were not being removed by the ordinance. We knew a Takings lawsuit was likely if we did not take that precaution.

4. Collector Road Policies - Development

Function: The primary function of a collector is to intercept traffic from the local street system and carry that traffic to the nearest arterial. A secondary function is to service adjacent property. Access will be limited or controlled. Collectors may also be designated as bicycle and bus routes.

Off-Site Streets: If the proposed development is not served by a public street that is fully improved to urban standards (curb, gutter, sidewalk) or with a minimum of 30-feet of pavement, then the developer shall provide 30-feet of pavement with 3-foot gravel shoulders from the site to a public street specified by the District; OR the developer shall provide 24-feet of pavement with 3-foot gravel shoulders and a minimum 6-foot wide detached asphalt/concrete pedestrian facility, from the site to a public street specified by the District.

Continuation of Streets: An existing street or a street in an approved preliminary plat, which ends at a boundary of a proposed development, shall be extended in that development. The extension shall include provisions for continuation of storm drainage facilities.

Level of Service (LOS): The level of services for collector streets is established within the District's Traffic Impact Study Policy. The acceptable LOS for a collector is “D” (425 vehicles per hour (vph)).

Front-On Housing in a Residential Area: New collector roadways in residential areas with front-on housing shall be limited to a maximum ADT of 3,000. Driveway location and spacing will be controlled in accordance with Section 7207.4. Existing collector roadways in residential areas with front-on housing should not exceed 5,000 ADT. In some instances a lower ADT for existing collectors in residential areas may be applied due to items such as grades, curves, etc...

Staff Comments/Recommendations: The developer is not required to improve the off-site collector streets (Braemere Road and Highland View Drive segments) because the connecting roadway dimensions exceed the policy for off-site requirement. The roadway volumes will not exceed policy.

5. Local Street Policies - Development

Function: The primary function of a local street is to serve adjacent property. Adjacent property will usually have unrestricted access to the street and ADT will typically be less than 2,000. Access to local streets is generally unrestricted, except near intersections.

Off-Site Streets (Local Streets with greater than 1,000 VTD (existing + proposed)): If the proposed development is not served by a public street that is fully improved to urban standards (curb, gutter, sidewalk) or with a minimum of 30-feet of pavement, then the developer shall provide 30-feet of pavement with 3-foot gravel shoulders from the site to a public street specified by the District; OR the developer shall provide 24-feet of pavement with 3-foot gravel shoulders and a minimum 6-foot wide detached asphalt/concrete pedestrian facility, from the site to a public street specified by the District.
**Stub Streets:** An existing street, or a street in an approved preliminary plat, which ends at a boundary of a proposed development shall be extended in that development. The extension shall include provisions for continuation of storm drain facilities.

**Average Daily Traffic (ADT):** ADT on new and existing local streets should typically be less than 2,000. This ADT applies to both existing and new streets. For new streets that are stubbed to connect to adjacent land that is not fully developed, the allowable ADT for the new street will typically be no more than 1,000 ADT, to accommodate future additional traffic from the adjacent land, depending on the location and type of the stub street and the location and type size of the adjacent undeveloped land. When stub streets are connected and properties fully developed, local streets should not exceed 2,000 ADT. In developed areas where streets already exceed 2,000 ADT or are close to exceeding 2,000 ADT, the Commission may grant approval to exceed the 2,000 ADT based on existing zoning of undeveloped properties or infill development. The Commission may also consider the need for additional roadway improvements or traffic calming to mitigate the additional traffic if necessary. The ADTs listed above are desirable planning thresholds for local streets, not roadway capacities. Actual roadway capacities are much higher than the planning thresholds.

**Maximum Traffic on One Access:** If a proposed development only has one access to a public street that is a local street, or if it proposes to extend public streets from existing development with only one local street access to the public street system, the maximum forecast ADT to be allowed at any point on the local street access is 1,000 and is subject to fire department requirements for the provisions of a secondary access.

**Staff Comments/Recommendations:** The developer is not required to improve the off-site local streets (Braemere Road and Highland View Drive segments) because the connecting roadway dimensions exceed the policy for off-site requirement. The roadway volumes will not exceed policy.

6. **Traffic Calming Policies (Section 5000) – District/Traffic**

Prior to implementing traffic calming:
1. A traffic safety investigation must be completed.
2. A neighborhood traffic speed watch program may be implemented. Participation is a factor in setting priorities for traffic calming measures.
3. Residents must submit a petition showing support of 75% of the households on the impacted section of the street. For a local street, signatures representing a minimum of 10 households are required and may include other residents within the neighborhood where the number of houses on the street doesn’t allow for satisfaction of the requirement. For a collector street, signatures representing 50% of the household of the adjacent local streets, as defined by ACHD on a case-by-case basis, depending upon the collector for major street access, will also be required.
4. For continuous collector streets, additional notification and public involvement of drivers may be required. Collector streets, as defined by ACHD on a case-by-case basis, over 5,000 vehicles per day will generally not be appropriate for speed humps or other measures that may divert traffic to other streets.

**Neighborhood Participation and Financial Contribution:** When the cut-through traffic threshold established in policy is exceeded, ACHD will conduct a study to determine appropriate traffic calming measures, perform the design, conduct the public information process, fund the construction in accordance with available funds and priorities, administer the construction contract, and place all supplementary traffic controls. When the cut-through criteria is NOT met but traffic volume and/or speed thresholds are exceeded, the neighborhood is responsible for the construction costs. ACHD will provide the other services. If none of the traffic thresholds are
exceeded, the options available to the neighborhood are the speed watch program, the speed trailer, and police enforcement.

**Thresholds for Traffic Calming:** Policy 5104.2.4 and 5104.2.5 outline the criteria for traffic calming on local and collector streets. Criteria include: peak hour volumes, average speed in peak hour (based on roadway width), and cut through traffic. Also considered are: lack of sidewalks, pedestrian traffic, vertical and horizontal alignment and sight distance, and on-street parking.

7. **Traffic Mitigation – Neighborhood Concerns**

The adjacent neighborhoods are concerned about traffic impacts from the proposed development, and are concerned about existing volumes and speeds on the street today, generated by the neighborhood users. There are many ideas about where and how traffic calming should be applied on Braemere Road and Highland View Drive; and what improvements could be made (sidewalk, speed humps, bulb-outs, striping, signage, etc…). Due to the existing landscaping, topography, and frequency of driveways on these roadways, there is likely not one good answer that could garner consensus from the neighborhoods with this development application. Further, due to the topography and roadway alignments and grades, an in-depth traffic calming analysis will be necessary to determine safe and effective traffic calming measures.

Staff recommends that the applicant provide ACHD with a $20,000 road trust deposit to be used for future traffic calming or improvements on Braemere Road and Highland View Drive, after build-out. This would allow ACHD adequate time to evaluate the impacts after build-out, and determine feasible solutions while engaging the neighborhood. Neighborhood consensus will be required, in accordance with Section 5000 (Traffic Calming Policy).

Staff also acknowledges that the neighborhood has already made requests for traffic calming (over the last decade), prior to submittal of the proposed development application; and therefore it should not be the applicant’s sole responsibility to mitigate pre-development volumes and speed on surrounding roadways. The road trust amount proposed by staff would cover the cost of two sets of traffic control measures on both Braemere Road and Highland View Drive, though the funds could be used for traffic calming as determined in the future by ACHD and the neighborhood. Additional funding may be necessary (depending on future analysis and needs), and cost allocation is outlined in Section 5000 (Section 6 above).

All traffic calming analysis, criteria, funding, etc…is required to follow Section 5000.

8. **Highlands Elementary School**

The Traffic Impact Study recommends improvements to the pedestrian crossing on Curling Drive. The Boise School District (BSD) provides ACHD with an annual request list of improvements, by priority. For Highlands Elementary School, the BSD has the following projects on their request list (with priority noted).

- Sidewalk on Bogus Basin Road – Curling Drive to Paso Fino (#3 out of 49 for BSD; and #45 out of 45 for City of Boise)
- Pedestrian signal at Curling Drive and Bogus Basin Road (#27 out of 49 for BSD)
- Braemere (Highland View to Curling) – sidewalk on the west side (#49 out of 49 for BSD)

Staff does not recommend that the applicant construct or provide monetary contribution for these projects. The pedestrian crossing on Curling Drive would need to be evaluated for warrants, and if needed is an existing deficiency that ACHD would fund and would also be prioritized and coordinated with the Boise School District. Volumes on Curling Drive are less than 3,000 vpd, and speeds are not excessive.
9. **Stub Streets**
   a. **Existing Conditions:** There are three local streets that have been constructed as stub streets to this site: Chardie Road, Highland View Drive (off of Braemere), and Highland View Drive.

   b. **Policy:**
      **Stub Street Policy:** District policy 7207.2.4 states that stub streets will be required to provide circulation or to provide access to adjoining properties. An existing street, or a street in an approved preliminary plat, which ends at a boundary of a proposed development shall be extended in that development.

      Benefits of Connectivity and Stub Streets include but are not limited to the following:
      - Reduces vehicle miles traveled.
      - Increases and promotes pedestrian and bicycle activity and connectivity.
      - Increases access for emergency services.
      - Reduces need for additional access points to the arterial street system.
      - Promotes the efficient delivery of services including trash and mail.
      - Promotes intra-neighborhood traffic circulation to schools, parks, neighborhood commercial centers, etc...
      - Promotes orderly development.

   c. **Applicant Proposal:** The applicant is proposing to extend Chardie Road into the site that will connect to the proposed Highland View Drive; and has proposed to extend and connect Highland View Drive through the site in accordance with the 1991 Easement Agreement.

   d. **Staff Comments/Recommendations:** Staff recommends approval of the proposed roadway network. The extension of the stub streets is in conformance with District policy and the recorded Easement Agreement. The street connections in this area will provide a benefit to emergency service providers, delivery services, trash service, and provide circulation within the neighborhood.

10. **29-foot Local Streets**
   a. **Policy:**
      **Reduced Urban Local Street—29-foot Street Section and Right-of-Way Policy:** District Policy 7207.5.2 states that the width of a reduced urban local street shall be 29-feet (back-of-curb to back-of-curb) with curb, gutter, and minimum 5-foot concrete sidewalks on both sides and shall typically be within 42-feet of right-of-way. Although some parking is allowed by the following subsections, the District will further restrict parking on a reduced width street if curves or other physical features cause problems, if actual emergency response experience indicates that emergency vehicles may not be able to provide service, or if other safety concerns arise. One of the following three sets of design conditions shall apply.

      Parking is allowed on one side of a reduced width street when all of the following criteria are met:
      - The street is in a residential area.
      - The developer shall provide written approval from the appropriate fire department or emergency response unit in the jurisdiction.
      - The developer shall install —NO PARKING signs on one side of the street, as specified by the District and as specified by the appropriate fire department.
      - Vertical curbs with attached 5-foot (minimum) wide sidewalks, or rolled curbs with 5-foot (minimum) wide detached sidewalks and 8-foot (minimum) wide planter strips, are required.
Traffic volumes on the street shall not exceed 1,000 vehicle trips per day. There shall be no possibility that another street may be connected to it in a manner that would allow more than 1,000 vehicle trips per day.

**Sidewalk Policy:** District Policy 7207.5.7 states that five-foot wide concrete sidewalk is required on both sides of all local street, except those in rural developments with net densities of one dwelling unit per 1.0 acre or less, or in hillside conditions where there is no direct lot frontage, in which case a sidewalk shall be constructed along one side of the street. Some local jurisdictions may require wider sidewalks.

The sidewalk may be placed next to the back-of-curb. Where feasible, a parkway strip at least 8-feet wide between the back-of-curb and the street edge of the sidewalk is recommended to provide increased safety and protection of pedestrians and to allow for the planting of trees in accordance with the District’s Tree Planting Policy. If no trees are to be planted in the parkway strip, the applicant may submit a request to the District, with justification, to reduce the width of the parkway strip.

Detached sidewalks are encouraged and should be parallel to the adjacent roadway. Meandering sidewalks are discouraged.

A permanent right-of-way easement shall be provided if public sidewalks are placed outside of the dedicated right-of-way. The easement shall encompass the entire area between the right-of-way line and 2-feet behind the back edge of the sidewalk. Sidewalks shall either be located wholly within the public right-of-way or wholly within an easement.

**Minor Improvements Policy:** District Policy 7203.3 states that minor improvements to existing streets adjacent to a proposed development may be required. These improvements are to correct deficiencies or replace deteriorated facilities. Included are sidewalk construction or replacement; curb and gutter construction or replacement; replacement of unused driveways with curb, gutter and sidewalk; installation or reconstruction of pedestrian ramps; pavement repairs; signs; traffic control devices; and other similar items.

**b. Applicant Proposal:** The applicant is proposing to construct all of the streets as 29-foot street sections with vertical curb, gutter and 5-foot wide attached concrete sidewalk within 42-feet of right-of-way. In the significant hillside areas the applicant is proposing to construct sidewalk on one side only.

**c. Staff Comments/Recommendations:** Staff recommends approval of the proposed street section – a 29-foot street section with vertical curb, gutter and 5-foot wide concrete sidewalk within 42-feet of right-of-way. In some sections sidewalk may be reduced to one side of the street where there are no home fronting, in accordance with District policy. Install NO PARKING signs to restrict parking to one side of the street. Provide written approval from the Fire Department for the proposed street section. The narrow section will help reduce impacts to the hillsides (compared to the standard 36-foot street section). Standard ACHD design policies apply, such as a maximum grade of 10% for all new roads. The applicant has not requested any modifications to design standards.

**Chardie Road:** The easterly segment of Chardie Road (approximately 120-feet) was not fully constructed with curb, gutter and sidewalk on the north side of the road; and the road was not extended to the property line, within the dedicated right-of-way. The applicant should complete the improvements to Chardie Road that are off-site, and then transition the road from a 36-foot street section to the proposed 29-foot street section.

**Highland View Drive (off Braemere):** Transition the road from a 36-foot street section to the proposed 29-foot street section.
• **Highland View Drive:** Transition the road from a 36-foot street section to the proposed 29-foot street section.

• **Broadstone Court (proposed):** The applicant is proposing to construct one cul-de-sac within the development as a 29-foot street section.

11. **Sunset Peak Road/8th Street**

**Existing Conditions:** Sunset Peak Road is designated as a local street adjacent to the site, and as a collector road from downtown Boise to the Lower Hulls Gulch parking lot. Adjacent to the site the gravel road is approximately 26-feet wide within 50-feet of prescriptive right-of-way. The applicant owns both sides of the roadway adjacent to the site.

**Applicant Proposal:** The applicant is proposing to relocate and reconstruct a segment of Sunset Peak Road adjacent to the site as shown on the figure below. The relocation is necessary to accommodate the extension of Highland View Drive. The applicant is proposing to construct a pedestrian pathway that will connect Highland View Drive to Sunset Peak Road.
Boise City Comments: There is an existing emergency access at the terminus of Highland View Drive that connects to Sunset Peak Road. Boise City staff have reviewed this emergency access on-site with the Fire Department. The Fire Department determined that the current emergency access is quite unusable due to the grade change and as a result of the new road through the proposed development (connecting Highland View Drive to Braemere Road) would be unneeded. The Fire Department also reviewed the relocation/reconstruction of Sunset Peak Road and determined that it would probably result in better site distance than what exists today.

Staff Comments/Recommendations: Staff recommends approval of the proposed relocation and reconstruction of Sunset Peak Road. The applicant will be required to vacate and exchange the existing right-of-way for the proposed right-of-way. The proposed design dimensions meet ACHD policy, with the exception of the grade of the road. The existing grade does not meet ACHD policy of less than 10% for a short segment, and the proposed design is similar. The applicant should provide written approval from the Boise Fire Department for the design and grade of Sunset Peak Road.

Staff has responded to neighborhood inquiries about connecting Highland View Drive to Sunset Peak Road with a vehicular connection. The applicant is not proposing this and staff does not support a connection. Sunset Peak Road serves the recreational uses of the foothills, and has more bicycle and pedestrian traffic than vehicular traffic. The road is not paved, and significant reconstruction and right-of-way dedication would be required. The City of Boise does not support a vehicular connection to Sunset Peak Road.

12. Tree Planters

Tree Planter Policy: Tree Planter Policy: The District’s Tree Planter Policy prohibits all trees in planters less than 8-feet in width without the installation of root barriers. Class II trees may be allowed in planters with a minimum width of 8-feet, and Class I and Class III trees may be allowed in planters with a minimum width of 10-feet.
13. Landscaping

Landscaping Policy: A license agreement is required for all landscaping proposed within ACHD right-of-way or easement areas. Trees shall be located no closer than 10-feet from all public storm drain facilities. Landscaping should be designed to eliminate site obstructions in the vision triangle at intersections. District Policy 5104.3.1 requires a 40-foot vision triangle and a 3-foot height restriction on all landscaping located at an uncontrolled intersection and a 50-foot offset from stop signs. Landscape plans are required with the submittal of civil plans and must meet all District requirements prior to signature of the final plat and/or approval of the civil plans.

14. Other Access

Direct lot access to Sunset Peak Road (8th Street) is prohibited and should be noted on the final plat.

D. Site Specific Conditions of Approval

1. Provide a $20,000 road trust deposit to ACHD to be used for traffic calming on Braemere Road and Highland View Drive. ACHD will evaluate the impacts after build-out, and determine feasible solutions while engaging the neighborhood. Neighborhood consensus will be required, in accordance with Section 5000 (Traffic Calming Policy).

2. Construct all roads within the development as 29-foot street sections with vertical curb, gutter and 5-foot wide concrete sidewalk on both sides of the road, within 42-feet of right-of-way; except where sidewalk is not required. Parking shall be restricted on one side of the roadway, and the applicant shall install NO PARKING signs. The applicant shall provide written fire department approval for the proposed street sections. Sidewalk is required on both sides of the road in hillside development except where there is no front-on housing, and there are a few segments of the propose

   a. Chardie Road: Complete the improvements to Chardie Road that are off-site, and then transition the road from a 36-foot street section to the proposed 29-foot street section.

   b. Highland View Drive (off Braemere): Transition the road from a 36-foot street section to the proposed 29-foot street section.

   c. Highland View Drive: Transition the road from a 36-foot street section to the proposed 29-foot street section.

   d. Broadstone Court (proposed): Construct Broadstone Court as a 29-foot street section terminating in a cul-de-sac.

3. Relocate and reconstruct Sunset Peak Road as proposed. The applicant shall vacate and exchange the existing right-of-way for the proposed right-of-way. Provide written approval from the Boise Fire Department for the design and grade of Sunset Peak Road.

4. Direct lot access to Sunset Peak Road is prohibited and shall be noted on the final plat.

5. Payment of impacts fees are due prior to issuance of a building permit.


E. Standard Conditions of Approval

1. All proposed irrigation facilities shall be located outside of the ACHD right-of-way (including all easements). Any existing irrigation facilities shall be relocated outside of the ACHD right-of-way (including all easements).

2. Private Utilities including sewer or water systems are prohibited from being located within the ACHD right-of-way.
3. In accordance with District policy, 7203.3, the applicant may be required to update any existing non-compliant pedestrian improvements abutting the site to meet current Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. The applicant’s engineer should provide documentation of ADA compliance to District Development Review staff for review.

4. Replace any existing damaged curb, gutter and sidewalk and any that may be damaged during the construction of the proposed development. Contact Construction Services at 387-6280 (with file number) for details.

5. A license agreement and compliance with the District’s Tree Planter policy is required for all landscaping proposed within ACHD right-of-way or easement areas.

6. All utility relocation costs associated with improving street frontages abutting the site shall be borne by the developer.

7. It is the responsibility of the applicant to verify all existing utilities within the right-of-way. The applicant at no cost to ACHD shall repair existing utilities damaged by the applicant. The applicant shall be required to call DIGLINE (1-811-342-1585) at least two full business days prior to breaking ground within ACHD right-of-way. The applicant shall contact ACHD Traffic Operations 387-6190 in the event any ACHD conduits (spare or filled) are compromised during any phase of construction.

8. Utility street cuts in pavement less than five years old are not allowed unless approved in writing by the District. Contact the District’s Utility Coordinator at 387-6258 (with file numbers) for details.

9. All design and construction shall be in accordance with the ACHD Policy Manual, ISPWC Standards and approved supplements, Construction Services procedures and all applicable ACHD Standards unless specifically waived herein. An engineer registered in the State of Idaho shall prepare and certify all improvement plans.

10. Construction, use and property development shall be in conformance with all applicable requirements of ACHD prior to District approval for occupancy.

11. No change in the terms and conditions of this approval shall be valid unless they are in writing and signed by the applicant or the applicant’s authorized representative and an authorized representative of ACHD. The burden shall be upon the applicant to obtain written confirmation of any change from ACHD.

12. If the site plan or use should change in the future, ACHD Planning Review will review the site plan and may require additional improvements to the transportation system at that time. Any change in the planned use of the property which is the subject of this application, shall require the applicant to comply with ACHD Policy and Standard Conditions of Approval in place at that time unless a waiver/variance of the requirements or other legal relief is granted by the ACHD Commission.

F. Conclusions of Law

1. The proposed site plan is approved, if all of the Site Specific and Standard Conditions of Approval are satisfied.

2. ACHD requirements are intended to assure that the proposed use/development will not place an undue burden on the existing vehicular transportation system within the vicinity impacted by the proposed development.
Request for Reconsideration of Commission Action

1. **Request for Reconsideration of Commission Action:** A Commissioner, a member of ACHD staff or any other person objecting to any final action taken by the Commission may request reconsideration of that action, provided the request is not for a reconsideration of an action previously requested to be reconsidered, an action whose provisions have been partly and materially carried out, or an action that has created a contractual relationship with third parties.

   a. Only a Commission member who voted with the prevailing side can move for reconsideration, but the motion may be seconded by any Commissioner and is voted on by all Commissioners present.

      If a motion to reconsider is made and seconded it is subject to a motion to postpone to a certain time.

   b. The request must be in writing and delivered to the Secretary of the Highway District no later than 3:00 p.m. on the day prior to the Commission's next scheduled regular meeting following the meeting at which the action to be reconsidered was taken. Upon receipt of the request, the Secretary shall cause the same to be placed on the agenda for that next scheduled regular Commission meeting.

   c. The request for reconsideration must be supported by written documentation setting forth new facts and information not presented at the earlier meeting, or a changed situation that has developed since the taking of the earlier vote, or information establishing an error of fact or law in the earlier action. The request may also be supported by oral testimony at the meeting.

   d. If a motion to reconsider passes, the effect is the original matter is in the exact position it occupied the moment before it was voted on originally. It will normally be returned to ACHD staff for further review. The Commission may set the date of the meeting at which the matter is to be returned. The Commission shall only take action on the original matter at a meeting where the agenda notice so provides.

   e. At the meeting where the original matter is again on the agenda for Commission action, interested persons and ACHD staff may present such written and oral testimony as the President of the Commission determines to be appropriate, and the Commission may take any action the majority of the Commission deems advisable.

   f. If a motion to reconsider passes, the applicant may be charged a reasonable fee, to cover administrative costs, as established by the Commission.
Easement Agreement
EASEMENT AGREEMENT

THIS EASEMENT AGREEMENT is made and entered into this 20th day of January, 1991, by and between THE HIGHLANDS, INC., an Idaho corporation, with its principal place of business in Boise, Ada County, Idaho, and the ADA COUNTY HIGHWAY DISTRICT, a body corporate and politic, hereinafter referred to as "ACHD," of Boise, Ada County, Idaho.

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, The Highlands, Inc. is the owner of certain undeveloped real property located between East Braemere Road and Highland View Drive and adjacent to the north, south and east boundaries of the second nine holes of Crane Creek Country Club golf course in Ada County, Idaho; and

WHEREAS, on June 11, 1990, ACHD approved a preliminary plat of The Highlands Unit No. 25 Subdivision also located in Ada County, Idaho, subject to a number of conditions, including, but not limited to, the following:

SITE SPECIFIC CONDITIONS:

1. Provide an easement for a collector road from Braemere to Highland View Drive on land currently owned by The Highlands, Inc., an Idaho corporation. This easement shall be shown on a map included with the final plat submittal.
2. Provide assurance that no further development will occur that would take access from Braemere until a second access is constructed.

WHEREAS, The Highlands, Inc. desires to grant an easement over the real property described herein to ACHD to satisfy the site specific conditions for Highlands Unit No. 25 Subdivision; and

WHEREAS, ACHD has agreed to accept such easement from The Highlands, Inc.

NOW, THEREFORE, it is mutually agreed as follows:

The Highlands, Inc., for itself, its heirs and assigns, does hereby grant and convey unto ACHD, its heirs and assigns, a perpetual easement in, to, upon and over that certain parcel of real property described by a metes and bounds description on Exhibit A attached hereto and, by this reference, made a part hereof as if set out in full herein, which includes 25 feet on each side of the centerline description of such easement described on Exhibit A for a total width of 50 feet for a public roadway. A map generally depicting the location of said roadway is described on Exhibit B attached hereto and, by this reference, made a part hereof as if set out in full herein.

It is further agreed by the parties that at the time of the actual construction of the roadway described on Exhibit A, the easement may be realigned from its present location to accommodate future development of the property or realignment for
roadway design, topography, drainage, utilities, street geometric
design standards and requirements, provided both parties or their
successors or assigns mutually agree to the realignment of said
roadway, which consent by either party will not be unreasonably
withheld. If the roadway is realigned and a new easement or
dedication is granted to ACHD for such roadway, ACHD or its
successors or assigns will release the easement described herein.

It is further agreed by The Highlands, Inc. that it
shall not construct, develop or make any improvements to any real
property, for development purposes, owned by The Highlands, Inc.,
or its successors and assigns, that is not already subdivided and
platted if such construction, improvement or development would
allow access to any public or private road allowing vehicular or
pedestrian travel from such development onto Braemere Road in Ada
County, Idaho, until such time as the construction has been
completed on the roadway that is the subject of this easement to
ACHD standards.

This Easement Agreement shall be binding upon and inure
to the benefit of the heirs and assigns of the respective parties
hereto.

Upon any action at law or suit in equity in relation
hereto, the prevailing party in such action shall be entitled to
recover, in addition to all other sums, reasonable attorneys'
fees (including the allocated cost of in-house counsel) and all
other costs and expenses of such action or suit.

EASEMENT AGREEMENT - 3
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have set their hands and seals the day and year first above written.

THE HIGHLANDS, INC.

By

Its President

ATTEST:

By

Its Secretary

ADA COUNTY HIGHWAY DISTRICT

By

ADDA COUNTY

Seal of the Board

STREET 

HIGHWAY DISTRICT

County of Ada

ON THIS 5\textsuperscript{th} day of \textsuperscript{July}, in the year of 1991, before me, the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for the State of Idaho, personally appeared \textsuperscript{S:\textsuperscript{em}} \textsuperscript{S:\textsuperscript{he}} \textsuperscript{S:\textsuperscript{aid}} \textsuperscript{S:\textsuperscript{he}} \textsuperscript{S:\textsuperscript{he}} \textsuperscript{S:\textsuperscript{he}} \textsuperscript{S:\textsuperscript{he}} \textsuperscript{S:\textsuperscript{he}} \textsuperscript{S:\textsuperscript{he}} known or identified to me to be the President and Secretary, respectively, of THE HIGHLANDS, INC., the corporation that executed the instrument or the person who executed the instrument on behalf of said corporation, and acknowledged to me that such corporation executed the same.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal the day and year of this certificate first above written.

\textit{[Signature]}

Notary Public for Idaho
Residing at Boise, Idaho
My Commission Expires: 2\textsuperscript{nd} 1995

BASEMENT AGREEMENT - 4
EXHIBIT "B"

EASEMENT DESCRIPTION
FOR
THE ROSAC COMPANY
SECONDARY ACCESS ROAD

A parcel of land for roadway purposes located in Sections 25, 26 and 27, Township 4 North, Range 2 East, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, lying 25.00 feet on each side of the following described centerline:

Commencing at the one-quarter corner common to said Sections 25 and 26, from which the section corner common to Sections 23, 24, 25 and 26 bears N 0°29'46" W a distance of 2639.05 feet;

thence S 0°15'12" E a distance of 561.28 feet to a point on the centerline of East Highland View Drive as shown on the plat of the proposed HIGHLANDS UNIT NO. 25 and the POINT OF BEGINNING;

thence 459.6 feet, more or less, along the arc of a 328.1 foot radius curve right, said curve having a central angle of 46° and a long chord bearing S 35°06' E a distance of 447.4 feet, more or less;

thence S 19°53' W a distance of 281.4 feet, more or less;

thence S 6°53' W a distance of 588.4 feet, more or less;

thence 329.3 feet, more or less, along the arc of a 328.1 foot radius curve right, said curve having a central angle of 57°10' and a long chord bearing S 35°38' W a distance of 315.6 feet, more or less;

thence S 64°23' W a distance of 153.49 feet, more or less;

thence 250.1 feet, more or less, along the arc of a 477.7 foot radius curve left, said curve having a central angle of 30° and a long chord bearing S 49°23' W a distance of 247.3 feet, more or less;

thence 349.3 feet, more or less, along the arc of a 357.3 foot radius curve right, said curve having a central angle of 56° and a long chord bearing S 52°23' W a distance of 335.5 feet to a point on the centerline of existing Sunset Peak Road, more or less;

thence N 89°37' W a distance of 25.6 feet, more or less;

thence 351.7 feet, more or less, along the arc of a 671.8 foot radius curve left, said curve having a central angle of 30° and a long chord bearing S 75°23' W a distance of 347.7 feet, more or less, to a point on the centerline of East Highland View Drive as shown on the official plat of THE HIGHLANDS UNIT NO. 22 on file in the office of the Recorder, Ada County, Idaho, and the POINT OF TERMINATION.
A field survey has not been performed along this route. It was prepared from scaled angles and distances on an aerial photo. As such Toothman-Orton Engineering Company is not responsible for any discrepancies a field survey will disclose.
Letters sent directly to staff via Mail, E-mail or Fax (before June 16th)

NOTE: Correspondence that was sent to Tellus or e-mailed directly to the Commission is NOT included in this packet, but is a part of the record.
May 29, 2015

Ms. Christy Little  
Program Administrator  
Development Services Department  
3775 Adams Street  
Boise, Idaho 83714

Via email and regular mail to: Clittle@achidaho.org.

Re: Application of Foothills Plan to Proposed Foothills Land Development located in the Foothills Planning Area; PUD15-00004, SUD15-00020, CFH15-00020

Dear Ms. Little:

I am writing as a resident whose home is in close proximity to the proposed development of 60 plus homes by Highlands Cove, LLC (“HCL or developer”), application numbers referenced above.

Regarding the proposed development titled CFH15-00020 Highland Cove, LLC, I am have the following concerns:

Future traffic on Highland View Drive will endanger the citizens living on Highland View Drive. This was established by the attached findings of the ADA County Highway District (ACHD) meeting held on November 13, 1996 which states:

Page 6 Item J “Highland View Drive was approved and developed 20 to 30 years ago when standards of land development were substantially different than they are today. It was also developed without an approved master plan of the overall planned development. As a result, it has many more front-on lots than would be approved today as a residential collector of this length. Additionally the street was constructed without sidewalks, something that was allowed at that time. The are several subdivisions throughout the City developed during that time period that do not have sidewalks.

It would be virtually impossible to retro-fit the street with sidewalks, both because of the topography of the area and the extensive landscaping that now occupies the right-of-way where the sidewalks should be. Therefore, pedestrians using this street will have to walk in the street and will always be at more
risk than on residential collectors of more recent vintage. For this reason, staff recommends that the street should not be allowed to significantly exceed 2,000 trips per day for the upper reaches of Highland View Drive. That level has already been exceeded below the intersection of Braemere Road and Highland View Drive (2.074 vpd)."

Page 6 Item K “The district and Boise City should strongly consider not allowing additional development east of this parcel that would direct traffic to Highland View Drive.”

The meeting noted above dealt with a proposed development of 23 houses and the current development proposes 60 houses. The traffic impact will be more than double what was rejected in 1996. Additionally, the proposed development will connect Highland View Drive to the stub of Highland View Drive. This will not only increase traffic due to the development but will increase traffic due to The Nines and the upper portion of Braemere Drive using Highland View Drive. Obviously, this is in direct contradiction to, ACHD’s previous recommendation.

ACHD has the responsibility of Highland View Drive and Braemere Drive, as well as the most experience with successful traffic calming strategies. As a resident of Highland View Drive, I would suggest that CHD has a responsibility to require the developer to install appropriate traffic calming measures that will successfully provide the level of service to keep all residents safe, per the prior statements and requirements in the attached ACHD meeting findings.

Thank you for consideration of the safety of the current residents on Highland View Drive.

Sincerely,

Bill Richardson
The applicant is requesting approval of a rezone for a 13.7-acre parcel from A to R-1B with a development agreement. The site is located at the end of Highland View Drive approximately 2000-feet east of Selkirk Drive. This development is estimated to generate 230 additional vehicle trips per day assuming that approximately 23 single-family lots will be developed under the requested zoning.

Roads potentially impacted by this development:

Highland View Drive - Residential collector w/o Selkirk, with no pathway designation
- Traffic counts, February 1996: 1406 vpd e/o Braemere
  2074 vpd w/o Braemere

Braemere Road - Residential collector w/o Keldon, with no pathway designation
- Collector w/o Hearthstone, with no pathway designation
- Traffic counts, February 1996: 2292 n/o Country Club
  2656 n/o Curling Drive

ACHD Commission Date - November 13, 1996 - 7:00 p.m.
Facts and Findings:

A. General Information

Owner - The Highlands Inc.
Representative - Chris Korte
A - Existing zoning
R-1B - Requested zoning
13.7 - Acres
23 - Estimated buildable lots
0 - Square feet of existing building
2,200 - Total lineal feet of proposed public streets
215 - Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ)

Northeast Metro - Impact Fee Benefit Zone
Boise/Garden City Metro - Impact Fee Assessment District

Sunset Peak Road (Eighth Street Extension)
Local street with no pathway designation
No traffic count available
510-feet of frontage
50-feet existing right-of-way (25-feet from centerline)
60-feet of required right-of-way (30-feet from centerline)

Sunset Peak Road is a 24-foot wide gravel road.

Highland View Drive
Residential collector west of Selkirk with no pathway designation
Traffic counts in February 1996: 1406 vpd east of Braemere
2074 vpd west of Braemere

60-feet of frontage
60-feet existing right-of-way
50-feet required right-of-way within the project site

Highland View Drive is improved with a 36-foot street section with curb, gutter and sidewalk.

Stub street from Braemere (signed as Highland View Drive)
Local road with no pathway designation
No traffic count available
0-feet of frontage
50-feet existing right-of-way
50-feet of right-of-way for extension of the street
The Highland View tub street from Braemere is improved with a 36-foot street section with curb, gutter and 4-foot sidewalk.

**Braemere Road**  
Residential collector west of Kedron with no pathway designation  
Collector west of Hearthstone with no pathway designation  
Traffic counts in February 1996: 2292 north of Country Club  
2656 north of Curling Drive

0-feet of frontage

Braemere Road is improved with a 36-foot street section with curb, gutter and sidewalk.

**B.** Utility street cuts in pavement less than five years old are not allowed unless approved in writing by the District. Contact Construction Services at 345-7667 (with file numbers) for details.

**C.** This site was before the Commission on January 6, 1996 as a request for annexation (A-18-95). It was also up for consideration as a referral from Boise City on the question of annexation and zoning. Without specific information about the configuration or density of the potential development, the District’s action was limited to general findings related to the potential traffic that would be generated and supposition as to what existing roadways would receive the traffic to be generated by the development of the parcel. During its consideration of the annexation application, the City Council requested the following additional information from the District:

1. What is ACHD’s position on the connection of Highland View Drive and Braemere Road? If the District supports this connection, can it be emergency access in lieu of public roadway? What is the District’s input on the concept of a gate in the middle of A-18-95 development to divide traffic between north and south connections?

2. The Council has requested input from the Boise City Fire Department on the roadway connections being emergency access only in lieu of public roadways.

3. The Council requested current traffic counts for area streets and in particular for Highland View Drive and North 15th Street.

**D.** In response, the District provided the following response to the City:

1. The District believes that a public road connection through the subject parcel from Highland View Drive to Braemere Road should be required. The connection should not be an emergency access in lieu of a public roadway. The District will not allow a gate in a public roadway in this situation.

2. District staff has conferred with Boise City Fire Department staff with regard to this application and concur with their finding that an uninterrupted public roadway should
be constructed through this development. The District will carefully review the design of the roadway to make it safely negotiable by emergency vehicles but curvilinear to avoid speeding by private automobiles. Traffic calming is an option not to be ruled out, but the District prefers design measures to after-the-fact mitigation.

3. Upon receipt of the request from the City, the District measured traffic volumes at the following locations in January of 1996:

a. Highland View Drive e/o Braemere and w/o Braemere. (1406 and 2074 vehicle trips per day (vpd) respectively).

b. 15th Street s/o Hill Road. (4349 vpd. Previously counted n/o Hill Rd. 4142 vpd in 1992).

c. Braemere Road n/o, the Crane Creek Country Clubhouse and n/o Curling Drive (2292 and 2656 vpd, respectively).

d. Braemere Road s/o Curling Drive (923 vpd).

e. Curling Drive w/o of Braemere and e/o Braemere (2902 and 685 vpd, respectively).

These counts are shown graphically on the attached vicinity map.

4. The District recommends to the City that development of this parcel not exceed the density allowed by the R-1B Zone.

5. If approved, the District recommends to the City that the parcel of which this application is a part be the last annexation or zone change allowed that would generate traffic to Highland View Drive.

6. The previous findings and recommendations of the District are not altered by the response.

E. Upon development, it is assumed that the 13.71 acre site will be developed for single-family lots similar to those already developed in the area, and the remaining parcel would also be developed in the future.

F. There are two collector street networks to which traffic from this development will be routed:

1. Highland View Drive/15th Street, by way of the proposed extension of Highland View Drive, approximately 600-feet. This is the most direct route for traffic to and from the downtown area. The combination of 15th - Highland View functions as a collector from State Street to Parkhill Drive and a residential collector from Parkhill
Drive to Selkirk Drive. Highland View functions as a local street from Selkirk to the east end of the street.

2. Braemere Road/Curling Drive/Bogus Basin Road/Harrison Boulevard. Traffic from the development will access Braemere by a 700-foot extension of Highland View Drive to Braemere (See vicinity map).

The combination of Harrison/Bogus Basin/Curling/Braemere functions as an arterial from State Street to Curling Drive/Bogus Basin; a collector from Bogus Basin to Hearthstone Drive/Braemere Road, a residential collector from Hearthstone Drive/Braemere Road to Keldoon Avenue/Braemere Road, and a local street from Keldoon Avenue to the end of Braemere Road.

G. Sections 7202.3.1 and 7202.4.1 of the District Policy Manual identify the ranges of <2,000 vpd for residential collectors and 2,500 to 7,500 vpd for general or mixed use collectors in residential areas. Addition of the traffic from this project to Highland View Drive would exceed this recommended volume below the intersection of Highland View and Braemere Road.

H. Staff believes the route from the proposed development to/from downtown or points west and east/via Highland View Drive to 15th Street to be the most direct and will be the route of choice by residents of the development. This route could accept all the forecast volume from the development and be within the physical capacity of the street but would exceed the desirable range of volume on the lower portion of this route (below the Highland View/Braemere intersection).

The route from the development to Braemere to Curling to Bogus Basin is less direct, but some traffic from the north end of the subject development would probably use this route and decrease the volume using Highland View. This connection would provide a second means of access and connectivity between Highland View Drive and Braemere Road, although not very direct.

The proposed route from the development to Braemere would be the least direct to downtown for residents of the subject project, and would allow traffic from upper Braemere Road to cross through this project to Highland View Drive. This option would tend to add more traffic to Highland View Drive. The alignment of Highland View through the project is quite direct and will not discourage cut through traffic from Braemere to Highland View Drive. Staff recommends that traffic calming devices be installed to discourage cut through traffic or a redesign of the site to make Highland View Drive less direct through this parcel.

I. In discussions with the Boise City Fire Department relative to the annexation, staff was advised by the Fire Department staff that they favor a public street connection between Highland View Drive and Braemere Road through this development to enhance emergency response time and routing. District staff strongly supports this recommendation by the Fire
Department staff for reasons of neighborhood connectivity in addition to the more obvious (and important) enhancement of emergency response capability.

J. Highland View Drive was approved and developed 20 to 30 years ago when standards of land development were substantially different than they are today. It was also developed without an approved master plan of the overall planned development. As a result, it has many more front-on lots than would be approved today as a residential collector of this length. Additionally, the street was constructed without sidewalks, something that was allowed at that time. There are several subdivisions throughout the City developed during that time period that do not have sidewalks.

It would be virtually impossible to retro-fit the street with sidewalks, both because of the topography of the area and the extensive landscaping that now occupies the right-of-way where the sidewalks should be. Therefore, pedestrians using this street will have to walk in the street and will always be at more risk than on residential collectors of more recent vintage. For this reason, staff recommends that the street should not be allowed to significantly exceed 2,000 trips per day for the upper reaches of Highland View Drive. That level has already been exceeded below the intersection of Braemere Road and Highland View Drive (2,074 vpd).

K. Both Highland View Drive and Braemere Road can accept the relatively slight addition of traffic that this development will generate (230 total vpd for both streets) without exceeding their physical capacity. However, the absence of sidewalks on Highland View Drive (and the near impossibility of adding them) and the existing volume on Highland View Drive below the Braemere/Highland View intersection causes staff to recommend that the design of the development direct as much of the development's traffic out to Braemere Road as possible. The District and Boise City should strongly consider not allowing additional development east of this parcel that would direct traffic to Highland View Drive.

L. As staff viewed the subject area, it appears that the topography restricts further development to the balance of this parcel. It appears that this may be the last parcel from which traffic can be relatively easily directed to Highland View Drive.

M. In a previous action in 1992, the Highway District recommended to Boise City that no additional annexations or zone changes for developments that direct traffic to 8th Street be approved until a land use plan and subsequent access plan for the foothills area is adopted.

N. This site abuts one unpaved public road, Sunset Peak Road (8th Street Extension). If Highland View Drive or Braemere were extended, the site could have access to one or more paved public roads. As letter from the applicant states, "Final development of this parcel will provide a street connection between Braemere Road to the north and Highland View Drive to the southwest. This connection will satisfy the Ada County Highway District's requirements placed on Highlands Unit #25 in 1990."
Sunset Peak Road provides primary recreational access to the Boise Front, and closer to the built community, access to the Hull’s Gulch area. An attempt last year by the District’s Maintenance and Operations Department to extend paving 8th Street past developed subdivisions to reduce dust from vehicular use of the roadway met with opposition from environmental groups and was discontinued. The future use and classification of the roadway are unknown.

In 1992, in response to a development request for an additional phase of Somerset Ridge Subdivision, the District recommended to Boise City and Ada County that no additional annexations or preliminary plats be approved that generate traffic to 8th Street, 9th Street or Shaw Mountain Road until the Foothills Plan and a foothills access plan were completed and adopted. Based on that policy setting action, the staff recommends that this project not be permitted to have vehicular access to Sunset Peak Road.

O. There is a portion of Sunset Peak Road (8th Street extension) that appears to conflict with Highland View Drive. Consistent with past action by the Commission, Sunset Peak Road and Highland View Drive should not connect. The applicant should relocate Sunset Peak Road (8th Street extension) and dedicate adequate right-of-way for that portion of the road that is to be relocated. Coordinate the relocation of the Sunset Peak Road with District Staff. Since Sunset Peak Road and Highland View Drive will be adjacent to each other, their rights-of-way may be combined. Coordinate with District Staff.

P. The extension of Highland View Drive, to the site and within the site, should be constructed as a 37-foot street section with curb, gutter and 4-foot wide concrete sidewalk within a 50-foot right-of-way (except right-of-way width may vary where contiguous with Sunset Peak Road). Coordinate the extension with District Staff.

Q. The applicant is proposing a cul-de-sac within the subdivision. The cul-de-sac should be constructed with a minimum radius of 45-feet to back of curb with a 4-foot sidewalk, and within a 50-foot right-of-way.

R. The design of the northwest portion of the off site section of Highland View Drive will have to take into account storm water run-off, and vertical curb and gutter may be required. If curb and gutter is required than the applicant will be required to construct this section of Highland View with 29-feet of pavement. If storm water is not an issue, and curb and gutter is not required than the applicant may construct Highland View Drive with 24-feet of pavement. Regardless of the width of the road the applicant will be required to construct a 4-foot wide concrete sidewalk or a 4-foot wide paved pathway along this segment of Highland View.

S. The development of the property will add approximately 230 trips per day to the 15th Street/Harrison Boulevard pair of streets through the north end of Boise. Because it would be a more convenient route, it is assumed that most of these trips will occur on 15th Street.
T. The applicant should be required to install traffic chokers on Highland View Drive on the north side of the proposed cul-de-sac intersection to mitigate the effects of through traffic volumes. Also, it appears that the design of the subdivision might be modified to avoid the directness of Highland View Drive through the project. Staff recommends the applicant work with District Staff to determine if the topography of the site will allow the redesign.

U. Ordinarily District policy would require the construction of approximately 510-feet of curb, gutter and 4-foot wide concrete sidewalk and pavement for one half of a 37-foot street section on Sunset Peak Road abutting the parcel (or a deposit to the Public Rights-of-Way Trust Fund equal to the cost of construction). However, because of the limitations on the use of Sunset Peak Road and the likelihood that access to the road from this parcel will be precluded, staff recommends that this construction not be required.

V. Based on development patterns in this area and the resulting traffic generation, staff anticipates that the transportation system will be adequate to accommodate additional traffic generated by the proposed development.

W. In accordance with District policy, stub streets to the undeveloped parcels abutting this site may be required upon review of a future application for this site.

X. As required by District policy, restrictions on the width, number and locations of driveways, may be placed on future development of this parcel.

If the rezone is approved and the District receives a development proposal, the District intends to provide the following recommendations, in addition to any additional recommendations that may apply upon District review of future development, to the City:

Site Specific Requirements:

1. Dedicate 50-feet of right-of-way for all the internal roads within the subdivision and all extensions of Highland View Drive by means of recordation of a final subdivision plat or execution of a warranty deed prior to issuance of a building permit (or other required permits), whichever occurs first. The owner will not be compensated for this additional right-of-way.

2. The southwest extension of Highland View Drive to the site and all streets within the development, shall be constructed as a 37-foot street section with curb, gutter and 4-foot wide concrete sidewalk within a 50-foot right-of-way. Coordinate the extension with District Staff.

3. Construct the cul-de-sac with a minimum radius of 45-feet to back of curb with a 4-foot sidewalk, and within a 50-foot (radius) right-of-way.
4. Install traffic calming devices, such as traffic chokers and valley gutters, on Highland View Drive on the north side of the proposed cul-de-sac intersection to mitigate the effects of through traffic volumes and/or redesign the site to avoid the directness of Highland View Drive through the site. Coordinate the design with District Staff.

5. The design of the northwest portion of the off site section of Highland View Drive shall take into account storm water run-off, and vertical curb and gutter may be required. If curb and gutter is required than the applicant will be required to construct this section of Highland View with 29-feet of pavement. If curb and gutter is not required then the applicant may construct Highland View Drive with 24-feet of pavement. Regardless of the width of the road, the applicant will be required to construct a 4-foot wide concrete sidewalk or a 4-foot wide paved pathway along this segment of Highland View.

6. Relocate Sunset Peak Road (8th Street extension) and dedicate adequate right-of-way for that portion of the road that is to be relocated. Coordinate the relocation, design and right-of-way width of Sunset Peak Road with District Staff.

7. As required by District policy, restrictions on the width, number and locations of driveways shall be placed on future development of this parcel.

8. No access points to Sunset Peak Road (8th Street extension) have been proposed and none are approved with this application.

Standard Requirements:

1. A request for modification, variance or waiver of any requirement or policy outlined herein shall be made in writing to the ACHD Development Services Supervisor. The request shall specifically identify each requirement to be reconsidered and include a written explanation of why such a requirement would result in a substantial hardship or inequity. The written request shall be submitted to the District no later than 9:00 a.m. on the day scheduled for ACHD Commission action. Those items shall be rescheduled for discussion with the Commission on the next available meeting agenda.

Requests submitted to the District after 9:00 a.m. on the day scheduled for Commission action do not provide sufficient time for District staff to remove the item from the consent agenda and report to the Commission regarding the requested modification, variance or waiver. Those items will be acted on by the Commission unless removed from the agenda by the Commission.

2. After ACHD Commission action, any request for reconsideration of the Commission’s action shall be made in writing to the Development Services Supervisor within two days of the action and shall include a minimum fee of $110.00. The request for reconsideration shall specifically identify each requirement to be reconsidered and include written documentation.
of data that was not available to the Commission at the time of its original decision. The request for reconsideration will be heard by the District Commission at the next regular meeting of the Commission. If the Commission agrees to reconsider the action, the applicant will be notified of the date and time of the Commission meeting at which the reconsideration will be heard.

3. Payment of applicable road impact fees are required prior to building construction in accordance with Ordinance #188, also known as Ada County Highway District Road Impact Fee Ordinance.

4. All design and construction shall be in accordance with the Ada County Highway District Policy Manual, ISPWC Standards and approved supplements, Construction Services procedures and all applicable ACHD Ordinances unless specifically waived herein.

5. The applicant shall submit revised plans for staff approval, prior to issuance of building permit (or other required permits), which incorporates any required design changes.

6. Construction, use and property development shall be in conformance with all applicable requirements of the Ada County Highway District prior to District approval for occupancy.

7. No change in the terms and conditions of this approval shall be valid unless they are in writing and signed by the applicant or the applicant's authorized representative and an authorized representative of the Ada County Highway District. The burden shall be upon the applicant to obtain written confirmation of any change from the Ada County Highway District.

8. Any change by the applicant in the planned use of the property which is the subject of this application, shall require the applicant to comply with all rules, regulations, ordinances, plans, or other regulatory and legal restrictions in force at the time the applicant or its successors in interest advises the Highway District of its intent to change the planned use of the subject property unless a waiver/variance of said requirements or other legal relief is granted pursuant to the law in effect at the time the change in use is sought.
Conclusion of Law:

1. ACHD requirements are intended to assure that the proposed use/development will not place an undue burden on the existing vehicular and pedestrian transportation system within the vicinity impacted by the proposed development.

Should you have any questions or comments, please contact the Development Services Division at 345-7662.

Submitted by: ___________________________  Date of Commission Action: ___________________________

Development Services Staff ___________________________
June 2, 2015

Dear Commission Members:

Thank you for receiving my testimony by letter. I have lived on Highland View Drive for 26 years. Even though the road meets required widths for additional traffic, I have the following concerns for approving my road as a feeder street for development near Crane Creek golf course.

**Highland View Drive is used recreationally.** The neighborhood uses Highland View for walking, jogging, biking, and skateboarding. In addition, the road is frequently used by serious bikers and large bike groups, including adolescence groups. At curvy parts or where cars are parked on the road, drivers must navigate around pedestrians and bikers using the oncoming lane of traffic. With blind curves on this road, downhill traffic may not be prepared when an oncoming vehicle is in their lane. In addition to this safety concern, I have been passed by bikers who ride faster downhill than the speed limit—a concerning situation if vehicles are coming uphill at the same time.

**In the winter, steep icy driveways are dangerous.** I live on a steeper part of Highland View. The road is straight for about eight houses, so drivers naturally increase their downhill speed. My driveway is steep and blocked from uphill views of the road by neighbors’ spruce trees and blocked from downhill views by retaining walls and shrubbery. To safely pull out, I stop at the bottom of my driveway and check for oncoming vehicles and pedestrians. When my driveway is icy, I do not have traction to stop. Adding more traffic increases the danger of leaving my home on a dark, winter morning.

**The S curve between Braemere and Tartan is deceivingly unsafe during icy conditions.** I know to be cautious driving the S curve. Yet, driving downhill on snow, I have done a 360 spin in front of oncoming traffic because speeds of 15 mph were too fast. In addition, during thaws, water moves from the south side of the road to the north side, outside of any road gutters. Freezing nighttime temperatures change that water to ice, making the bottom section of the S curve an ice rink. This part of the road has blind curves and steep, angled driveways. It was not designed with safety in mind.

I support building in the foothills. It’s a good location and a nice place to live. However, Highland View Drive is steep and curvy. Without sidewalks or ample room to park on both sides of the road, it cannot accommodate pedestrians and host additional vehicles. As the approving commission for smart development, I request that you deny Highland View as a feeder street. It was not designed to safely transport traffic out of other neighborhoods.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Margaret Campbell (and Steve Campbell)
410 W Highland View Drive
HAND DELIVERED

Christy Little
Ada County Highway District
3775 Adams St.
Garden City, Idaho 83714

Re: Highlands Cove Development

Dear Ms. Little:

We have great concern about the additional traffic that will be traveling on Highland View Drive should the proposed development be approved, even if the developer is required to make significant improvements to mitigate the already challenging conditions of the road.

Highland View Drive is a lovely, winding, beautifully landscaped street with a rural character—just the way our neighborhood wants it. It would be a great tragedy for the neighborhood and the City of Boise if public officials allow traffic beyond the environmental carrying capacity of this street: creating more dangerous risks to pedestrians, bicyclists, children walking to and from school, and resident drivers.

The total number of houses located directly on Highland View Drive is approximately 125, with automobiles from many more houses on adjoining streets such as W. Braemere, Wyndemere Drive, Argyll Drive, Cashmere, and N. Selkirk Drive using it for access. While a substantial number of vehicle trips generated by the proposed 63-home subdivision may use E. Braemere Road, many of those will then travel along W. Braemere and thus end up on lower Highland View Drive. And most trips to and from the new subdivision will directly travel the entire length of Highland View Drive.

Furthermore, large numbers of additional vehicle trips will occur on Highland View Drive resulting from circular traffic traveling up E. Bramere and down Highland View, and from circular traffic traveling up Highland View and down E. Braemere. In addition, many vehicles
traveling to and from the upper East Braemere area and the Highlands Nines subdivision will use Highland View Drive for access.

This traffic increase on Highland View Drive is likely to exceed the entire 617 vehicles per day predicted by the developer to be generated by the new homes (the developer's estimate is based on trips generated by median-income homes). Furthermore, the national traffic planning standards-setting organization, American Association of Highway Transportation Organizations (AASHTO) sets the standard for estimating trips per day generated by residential units based on household income. The income of homes in the Highlands neighborhood is well-above median income, and upper-income homes (those above approximately $80,000 per year) generate (according to AASHTO) over 14 vehicle-trips per day per household. AASHTO's standard (which is supposed to set the standard for all highway departments nationwide, would estimate the traffic generated (not even counting the new circular and commuting patterns) by this proposed subdivision at 882 vehicle trips per day.

As I'm sure ACHD staff is well aware, Highland View Drive is designated as a "collector" street, but does not meet current ACHD guidelines for collector streets nor does it meet AASHTO standards. This street servicing the Highlands would not be approved by Boise City or ACHD if an application to build it "as is" were applied for today. The street is narrow and winding, lacking sidewalks on all but about a quarter mile near the top of the hill. There are a number of homes that have hidden driveways which do not meet minimum line-of-sight safety standards that would be imposed on current construction. These conditions become significantly worse near the bottom of the hill, which has the greatest amount of traffic as side streets feed into it.

A large number of driveways on Highland View Drive require owners and their visitors to back out onto the street to egress. And those on the south side must back across both lanes of traffic uphill into down-traveling traffic. Those on the north side must back uphill directly into down-traveling traffic. This is inherently unsafe and risky and has functioned only because of previous traffic volumes.

There are a number of driveways at the lower, highest-traffic-volume portion of W. Highland View Drive that are both narrow and require owners and visitors traveling uphill to go head-on into the oncoming downhill traffic lane and make an approximately 160-degree turn for ingress. Drivers must do the opposite to egress their driveway. This
unsafe situation is not soluble without acquisition and removal of several homes and a re-alignment of the winding, narrow portion of this street.

We routinely observe cars that travel well-above the posted speed of 20 MPH, endangering children, pedestrians, bicyclists and pets. Traffic-count data shows that many of these automobiles are traveling at speeds from 35 to 45 miles per hour. This street is heavily used by bicyclists, walkers, and runners - many from the North End Neighborhood as well as from the Bogus Basin Road area. It is a training route for bicycle teams and a popular access route for mountain bikers.

The Foothill Ordinance, overall city planning, and city open-space policies over the past 24 years emphasize minimizing foothills development, preserving viewscapes, encouraging housing infill within the existing built-up community, and minimizing urban sprawl. Approving this development would be contrary to those values, goals, and policies.

ACHD has suggested that we propose specific “traffic mitigation” or “calming” techniques that the neighborhood would find acceptable to partially offset the very negative affects of increased traffic. Instead, if this development is approved, we insist that such traffic techniques be used. But rather than the neighborhood specifying a particular technique of mitigation, the techniques used must achieve a specific performance outcome. In other words, whatever the developer is to be required to install for traffic mitigation or calming must achieve, at a minimum, traffic speeds that do not exceed 20 to 25 miles per hour the length of Highland View Drive, within the current existing neighborhood. If one technique does not achieve the performance outcome, then others must be installed until the outcome is achieved. This process must be consistently monitored to assure consistent compliance with the stated speed objective. This is a formal request, meeting ACHD’s June 3rd deadline.

Sincerely,

William and Patricia Insko
Ada County Highway District:

We are a couple in our nineties, who live at 1112 West highlande View Dr. we are very concerned about the proposed addition of more homes on this street.

Our lives would be greatly impacted by this project. We would not be able to take walks and getting out of our driveway would be nearly impossible at times. The added traffic noise would also greatly effect our lives.

I hope you will consider the lives of the people who have bought homes in this area expecting a wonderful and quiet lifestyle.

Thank you for your consideration.

Frank & Dorothy Burgess
Gregory S. Garlick  
509 E. Highland View Drive  
Boise, Idaho  83702

June 15, 2015

HAND DELIVERED

Christy Little  
Ada County Highway District  
3775 Adams St.  
Garden City, Idaho 83714

Re: Highlands Cove Development

Dear Ms. Little:

I am opposed to the proposed Highlands Cove development for the following reasons:

1) Highland View Drive & Braemere were not built to handle the traffic. Highland View is narrow with no sidewalks for all but the last quarter mile. It is a fairly steep road with only crown the entire road. Most streets carrying traffic especially in hilly country have supers (banking) on the corners to counteract the forces of gravity acting with centrifugal force. Highland View catches more snow than Boise and holds it longer. I have observed several slide-offs and pileups on the outside of many of these crowned downhill corners in the winter. Very dangerous even with present traffic. Quail ridge has supers on corners, Hill Road has supers, Pierce Park above Hill Road has supers, to mention just a few. There have apparently been no “counts” of foot traffic or bicycle traffic. Until you live here awhile you cannot conceive how many people, from all over, use Highland View Drive as a “no cost” athletic facility. Dogs, baby carriages, runners, walkers, bikers (with dogs & baby carriages). Hundreds in the summer, and many “hardies” in the winter. The narrowness of Highland View turns it into a one lane road when the following occurs: one eight-foot wide service vehicle parked on the side of the road, two cars parked on opposite sides of the street, one car and one pedestrian, pedestrians on opposite sides of the street. Many running and bicycle races are run up and down Highland View. Additionally
there are only four street lights on the entire 1 ½ mile length of Highland View with many runners, hikers and bikers after dark. Already dangerous.

Furthermore, wintertime plowing is never full width of the road, forcing the many pedestrians and runners into traffic lanes since there are no sidewalks.

It would seem to me the developer should be required to upgrade Highland View Drive and lower Braemere, adding supers (banking) to the corners and adding enough street lights to make foot and bicycle traffic safe with the added auto traffic.

2) It appears by the plans that the Highland View cul-de-sac and the trailhead there would be eliminated as would the parking space above Highland View where it nearly abuts 8th Street. These two parking spaces and the trailheads they access have been used by me since 1970. The trailhead at the end of Highland View has been used by me since 1990. The developers seem to be all take and no give. There is no public parking and no trailhead access to replace these. The developers would use the already overburdened streets yet deny the access and parking we have used for decades. At the parking lot above 8th Street I have observed as many as 20 cars with the attractions being the balloon liftoffs, fireworks, SUNSETS, and hiking. What happened to eminent domain?

Thousands of Boise Valley residents and tourists have used these parking areas and trailheads for decades. The developer should be required to replace the two lost scenic parking areas and replace the lost trail and trailhead.

3) We who live here bought and settled here with the expectation of the tranquility that comes with living on a dead end road. This neighborhood will be drastically changed by creating a big driving loop and 60 new homes with as many as 840 new vehicle trips per day (not to mention the potential for Upper Braemere and Highlands Nines residents to access Highland View for a shorter route to downtown). Most recent Ada County subdivisions are created as “islands” with no access through for future or present development. Shouldn’t we have that same consideration? All these recent “island” subdivisions have much wider collector roads and sidewalks.
4) Don’t forget the kids with lemonade stands that dot Highland View in the non-school and summer days and the numerous blind curves on Highland View. Then these two tiny collector streets (West Highland View and West Braemere) come together at a 3-way stop just above a crowned, not banked, blind downhill corner. Most upper Braemere residents use lower Braemere rather than Bogus Basin Road, partly because it is shorter and partly to avoid Highlands Elementary. And then there is the backup on the Hill Road/Highland View four-way stop. Backing up through the Harrison Boulevard traffic light at any high traffic time, Highland View Drivers needing an extra ten minutes at the intersection as it is. What a mess. The kids, seniors, bikers, babies, dogs. Who in government will take responsibility when they get hurt?

5) And this development is right in habitat for deer, foxes, coyotes, quail, grouse, and many other small creatures. The developer admitted during the required public hillside planning session that no Environmental Impact Statement has been prepared, so we have no impartial study of the impact on the flora, fauna, and environment.

6) There is also the issue of run-off and erosion for water that will run off rather than soak in. Roofs, sidewalks, driveways, streets, patios and even sprinkler saturated lawns will flood the already overburdened drainages unless the developer will guarantee a means of collecting all runoff.

Sincerely,

Gregory S. Garlick
June 15, 2015

HAND DELIVERED

Christy Little
Ada County Highway District
3775 Adams Street
Garden City, ID 83714

Re: Proposed Highlands Cove Development

Dear Christy:

I have lived at 509 East Highland View Drive for nearly twenty-five years and am extremely concerned by the number of homes in the latest development proposal.

The current 60-home proposal is unacceptable in its current form because of the undue traffic burden it will place on our Highlands neighborhood and continuing downstream to 15th Street, Historic Harrison Blvd., and Hill Road. Traffic impact was clearly recognized as a problem by ACHD in its response to City Planning & Zoning when a much smaller, 23-home development was proposed nearly twenty years ago.

In 1996, ACHD clearly stated both in its internal staff report and its final report to Boise City Planning & Zoning:

“If approved, the District recommends to the City that the parcel of which this application is a part be the last annexation or zone change allowed that would generate traffic to Highland View Drive. (emphasis added)

In support of its position, ACHD staff cited concerns such as:

...”Sections 7202.3.1 and 7202.4.1 of the District Policy Manual identify the range of >2,000 vpd for residential collectors.... Addition of the traffic from this project to Highland View Drive would exceed this recommended volume below the intersection of Highland View and Braemere Road.

...”The proposed route from the development to Braemere would be the least direct to downtown for residents of the subject project, and would allow traffic from upper Braemere Road to cross through this project to Highland View Drive. This option would tend to add more traffic to Highland View Drive. (emphasis added) The alignment of Highland View through the project is quite direct and will not discourage cut through traffic from Braemere to Highland View Drive....
Highland View Drive was approved and developed 20 – 30 years ago when standards of land developments were substantially different than they are today. It was also developed without an approved master plan of the overall planned development. As a result, it has many more front-on lots than would be approved today as a residential collector of this length. Additionally, the street was constructed without sidewalks...

"...it would be virtually impossible to retro-fit the street with sidewalks, both because of the topography of the area and the extensive landscaping that now occupies the right-of-way where the sidewalks should be. Therefore, **pedestrians using this street will have to walk in the street and will always be at more risk than on residential collectors of more recent vintage.** (emphasis added)

In addition to the comments found in the 1996 ACHD staff report, I would like the Commission to consider the following:

- Significant development has occurred on upper Braemere and its stub streets since 1996, allowing the potential for even more traffic to cut through the new development to reach downtown with the shortest distance via Highland View Drive.

- National traffic standards (AASHTO) have suggested that the number of vehicle trips per household per day increase as median income increases. A more accurate count may be 14 trips per day rather than the county-wide average of 9.7 trips per day used in ACHD calculations. This would increase traffic count from 600 additional trips to 840 trips. It is intuitive that higher income residents not only make more trips themselves but are more likely to hire lawn maintenance, housekeepers, child & elder care workers, laundry service, food delivery, and so forth.

- Three additional houses have been built on Highland View in the interim (710 E. completed in 1997; 940 E. completed in 1999; 318 E completed in 2007), suggesting that the new development should consist of no more than twenty units, based on the 1996 staff recommendations.

- My understanding is that the current developer’s traffic study claims only 30% of the new traffic will utilize Highland View and 70% will utilize Braemere. This is a highly unlikely scenario given that nearly two thirds of the proposed homes are clearly grouped in such a way that Highland View will be the obvious ingress/egress for them; the study further ignores the traffic from Upper Braemere that will, as identified by ACHD staff in the 1996 report, utilize the new Highland View connection as a shorter means of reaching downtown.

- Staff reports (from both ACHD & City P&Z) regarding the precursors to this development that were proposed in 1995-96 and again in 2000-01 clearly state that recommended
traffic capacities had already been met or exceeded on lower Highland View Drive, Harrison Boulevard, and 15th Street, as then defined by ACHD, Boise City, and Compass planning documents.

- **Blueprint Boise** states: *The Central Foothills (between 36th Street and 8th Street) shall be developed only to the extent that it can be demonstrated that traffic impacts on existing neighborhoods will be minimized.* FH-CNN6.7 I do not believe the developer has made any such demonstration.

- As pointed out by ACHD staff in 1996, Highland View Drive was allowed to develop incrementally over the last half century without an overall plan in place. Lower Highland View is the oldest portion of the street, has the most hidden driveways, the poorest line of sight, no streetlights, no sidewalks, and, naturally as the bottom of the funnel, has the greatest amount of traffic.

- To the best of my knowledge, there is still not a specific & detailed plan in place which addresses the larger issues of alternative foothills ingress/egress which ACHD & the City have demanded of developers for several decades.

Please rest assured that I am not opposed to growth and development. Communities that do not grow inevitably wither and die. But I am concerned that growth in the foothills is still being driven by development companies rather than by the leaders we have elected to guide growth. Boise City, ACHD, and Compass worked diligently with representatives of various constituencies to create plans that will encourage smart growth to enhance Boise’s livability. It is incumbent upon those same entities to follow the plans they have created in order to ensure that short-term growth is not achieved at the expense of existing neighborhoods. This is a critical time for elected leaders to be sure that the growth they allow is in line with the long-term goal of making Boise “America’s Most Livable City”.

Respectfully,

Marcia Wing
509 E. Highland View Dr.
Boise, ID 83702
Hello Christy

I am writing to express my support for the Highlands Cove subdivision project. I have looked for a long time for a development project that makes a good balance between land utilization, foothills environmental impact, access, neighborhood involvement and also would be a great place to raise my family. I have also done a lot of due diligence with people who live in the area and now understand that the overwhelming majority of people I talk to are now in support of this project due to the positive effects it will have on the area. Much of this support is due to the fact that developers Dave Yorgason and Chris Conner have not taken a heavy hand in pushing this forward but have done a great job actively involving, listening to and educating all parties I have spoken to.

Please feel free to call me directly if you would like to discuss in more detail

Tim Fitzpatrick
President-Asante Alliance
208-559-3660
tim@asantealliance.com
www.asantealliance.com

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in this message is legally privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of the message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any release, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the author immediately by replying to this message and delete the original message.
Hi Christy,

I currently live in the Highlands neighborhood association off Hearthstone on Hollow Ln. and concur with Mr. Fitzpatrick's opinion in support of this proposed development.

Please feel free to contact me at the number below or my cell at 850-9014 if you would like to discuss my support further.

Kind Regards,

Jeffrey Cliff, Executive Director
Gem State Radiology & Intermountain Medical Imaging
877 W. Main Street, Suite 603
Boise, Idaho. 83702

P: 208-384-9060
F: 208-384-9023

On Jun 4, 2015, at 2:32 PM, "Tim Fitzpatrick" <tim@asantealliance.com> wrote:

Hello Christy

I am writing to express my support for the Highlands Cove subdivision project. I have looked for a long time for a development project that makes a good balance between land utilization, foothills environmental impact, access, neighborhood involvement and also would be a great place to raise my family. I have also done a lot of due diligence with people who live in the area and now understand that the overwhelming majority of people I talk to are now in support of this project due to the positive effects it will have on the area. Much of this support is due to the fact that developers Dave Yorgason and Chris Conner have not taken a heavy hand in pushing this forward but have done a great job actively involving, listening to and educating all parties I have spoken to.

Please feel free to call me directly if you would like to discuss in more detail

Tim Fitzpatrick
President-Asante Alliance
208-559-3660
tim@asantealliance.com
www.asantealliance.com
communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the author immediately by replying to this message and delete the original message.
Hello Leon and Christy,

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION # CFH15-00020 / Highlands Cove, LLC

I am writing in connection with the above planning application for the residential development comprised of 60 detached single family homes on 54.36 acres generally located at 1200 E. Highland View Drive. I have examined the plans and know the site well. I wish to offer my support for this development.

The Highlands area of Boise is a thriving area, and there is considerable demand for housing here. I both live in the area (110 E Hearthstone Drive) and belong to Crane Creek Country Club. The site for this development has been well chosen. It is within the boundaries of the City and is already zoned for single family homes.

The City of Boise states, “The City of Boise Is Open for Business”. In order to attract more business people to Boise we must offer a wide choice of high quality homes to meet people's needs. The Highlands Cove planned development would help to meet the demand for such housing in The Highlands by offering new housing choices that we do not have now.

I am aware of the concerns of some in the community that this development will mean the loss of some open space that is used for informal recreation. I note however that this plan includes the provision of a smaller, but landscaped public green area, which will be open to use by all. I am also aware of demand among the community of The Highlands for new housing choices in the area. Many who have grown up in the area would very much like to remain, but smaller footprint houses such as those proposed rarely come available on the market. This development proposal is therefore welcomed by this section of the community.

I believe that the high quality of the proposed development, combined with the long-term sustainability of the site chosen, is a perfect match for The Highlands/Crane Creek community.

Please contact me if needed to discuss further.

Sincerely,

Greg Redden  I  President  I  Adapt
Office: 208.345.5109
adaptmanagement.org
June 10, 2015

Hi Christy:

As a current resident of Boise’s North End, I am writing to urge you and your colleagues to SUPPORT and APPROVE the HIGHLANDS COVE SUBDIVISION. The development will be a wonderful addition to the area, supporting and improving the local economy and small businesses.

From discussions with my neighbors, I have learned that a majority them are also in support of this project due to the POSITIVE effects it will have on our community. It is our opinion that the project balances land utilization, foothills environmental impact, access and neighborhood involvement.

Again, I urge you to SUPPORT this project that is designed with the betterment of Boise and our community in mind. Please feel free to contact me with any questions that you might have.

Sincerely,

Rachel Smith
(208) 377-5156
To Whom It May Concern:

As a resident and native of Boise, I am writing to urge you and your colleagues to SUPPORT and APPROVE the HIGHLANDS COVE SUBDIVISION. The development will be a wonderful addition to the area, helping create and improve small businesses, jobs and our economy.

I have done a fair amount of research regarding the subdivision and have found many POSITIVE effects it will have on our community. As you might be aware, the project balances land utilization, foothills environmental impact, foothills access and neighborhood involvement very well. These aspects are all very important to me, as I am an avid outdoorsman.

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter. As noted, I urge you to SUPPORT this project due to the wonderful effects it will have on our community. Please feel free to contact me via telephone, email or mail with any questions that you might have.

Fondly,

Courtney Lehosit, 401 West Pueblo Street, Boise, Idaho 83702, (208) 412-3770
June 11, 2015

To Whom It May Concern:

As a current resident of Boise's North End neighborhood, I am writing to urge you and your colleagues to SUPPORT and APPROVE the HIGHLANDS COVE SUBDIVISION. The development will be a wonderful addition to the area, supporting and improving the local economy and small businesses.

From discussions with my neighbors, I have learned that a majority them are also in support of this project due to the POSITIVE effects it will have on our community. It is our opinion that the project balances land utilization, foothills environmental impact, access and neighborhood involvement. Additionally, I am not concerned about traffic flows in regards to the subdivision.

Again, I urge you to SUPPORT this project that is designed with the betterment of Boise and our community in mind. Please feel free to contact me with any questions that you might have.

Sincerely,

Courtney Conner, (208) 334-1776
June 11, 2015

Dear Christy:

As an Idaho native, I am writing to urge you and your colleagues to SUPPORT and APPROVE the HIGHLANDS COVE SUBDIVISION. The development will be a wonderful addition to the area, helping create and improve small businesses, jobs and our economy.

I have done a fair amount of research regarding the subdivision and have found many POSITIVE effects it will have on our community. As you might be aware, the project balances land utilization, foothills environmental impact, foothills access and neighborhood involvement very well. These aspects are all very important to me, as I am an avid outdoorsman.

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter. As noted, I urge you to SUPPORT this project due to the wonderful effects it will have on our community. Please feel free to contact me with any questions that you might have.

Fondly,

Jennifer Beier
(208) 305-7077
June 11, 2015

To Whom It May Concern:

As an Idaho native, I am writing to urge you and your colleagues to SUPPORT and APPROVE the HIGHLANDS COVE SUBDIVISION. The development will be a wonderful addition to the area, supporting and improving the local economy and small businesses.

From discussions with others, I have learned that a majority of folks in Boise whom I have spoken with are also in support of this project due to the POSITIVE effects it will have on our community. It is our opinion that the project balances land utilization, foothills environmental impact, access and neighborhood involvement.

Again, I urge you to SUPPORT this project that is designed with the betterment of Boise and our community in mind. Please feel free to contact me with any questions that you might have.

Sincerely,

Ryan Uptmor
(509) 552-9247
Christy Little

From: Jason Lehosit <jason@lehosit.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 11, 2015 2:09 PM
To: Christy Little
Subject: Highlands Cove

Christy,

I am emailing my support of the Highlands Cove project that will be in front of ACHD for consideration later this month.

Chris Conner is my father in law and I have seen him meet with hundreds of residents of the area to discuss this project. He and Dave Yorgason have worked hard to find common ground with the residents of the immediate area in a professional manner to address everyone’s concerns. I’ve heard nothing but positive feedback from previous clients of Chris Conner Construction. It would be hard to find two more qualified, genuine people to ensure this project is a success. Also as a resident of the north end, I believe this project will be a positive impact to the community and the economy.

I hope that ACHD will work to approve the Highland Cove project.

Sincerely,

Jason C. Lehosit
401 W. Pueblo St.
Boise, ID 83702
June 8, 2015

To Whom It May Concern:

As a resident and native of Boise, I am writing to urge you and your colleagues to SUPPORT and APPROVE the HIGHLANDS COVE SUBDIVISION. The development will be a wonderful addition to the area, helping create and improve small businesses, jobs and our economy.

I have done a fair amount of research regarding the subdivision and have found many POSITIVE effects it will have on our community. After meeting in person with Chris Conner and Dave Yorgason, I believe the project balances land utilization, foothills environmental impact, foothills access and neighborhood involvement very well. As a foothills resident and an avid outdoors person, these aspects are all very important to me.

Thank you for taking the time to read this letter. As noted, I urge you to SUPPORT this project due to the wonderful effects it will have on our community. Please feel free to contact me via telephone, email or mail with any questions that you might have.

Fondly,

Julie Oliver
2393 N. Angelview Ln
Boise, Idaho 83702
julieo@cableone.net
(208) 863-8900
June 8, 2015

To Whom It May Concern:

I write this letter today, urging you and your colleagues to SUPPORT and APPROVE the HIGHLANDS COVE SUBDIVISION. I feel very strongly about this project, as do many of the people that I have spoken with.

First and foremost, it is apparent that Chris Conner and Dave Yorgason are intent on building a subdivision that will have a positive impact on the surrounding community. They have continued to support, listen, meet and answer questions of neighborhood members and community leaders alike. I would much prefer that two men such as Chris and Dave carry out the development and completion of this project, versus a construction corporation out of Texas or California. Neighbors would agree.

This project will have many POSITIVE effects on our community. After attending workshops and meetings with the developers and community leaders, I found that the project balances land utilization, foothills environmental impact, foothills access and neighborhood involvement very well. These aspects are all important to me.

I sincerely appreciate your consideration. Again, I urge you to SUPPORT this project. Please feel free to contact me via telephone, email or mail with any questions that you might have.

Sincerely,

Heather Skow
1101 West River Street
Boise, Idaho 83702
heather@lvsibishop.com
(208) 631-0031
June 12, 2015

Ms. Christy Little
Program Administrator
Development Services Department
3775 Adams Street
Boise, Idaho 83714

Via email and regular mail to: Clittle@achdidaho.org.

Re: Highlands Cove Development;
PUD15-00004, SUB15-00020, CFH15-00020

Dear Ms. Little:

I am writing as a resident whose home is in close proximity to the proposed development of 60 plus homes by Highlands Cove, LLC ("HCL or developer"), application numbers referenced above.

Regarding the proposed development, I have the following concern:
The development will significantly increase storm water runoff. The downstream Crane Creek Flume, which is ultimately where increased storm water drainage would flow, is a 100 year old or so stone lined underground flume that is deteriorating and often overtops the capacity at manholes as it runs through Boise City and ultimately dumps into the Boise River.

Section 11-07-08.5 of the Hillside and Foothills Development Standards deals with Hillside Development Standards. Section D Item (4) states:
"Runoff from areas of concentrated impervious cover such as roofs, driveways, and roads shall be retained on-site or collected and transported to a channel with sufficient capacity to accept the discharge without erosion or flooding."

As stated above the area currently floods. What are the developers plans for permanent retention of the storm water runoff from all impervious cover in the entire development?
'Thanking you in advance for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Bill Richardson
June 12, 2015

Ms. Christy Little
Program Administrator
Development Services Department
3775 Adams Street
Boise, Idaho 83714

Via email and regular mail to: Clittle@achdidaho.org.

Re: Highlands Cove Development;
PUD15-00004, SUB15-00020, CFH15-00020

Dear Ms. Little:

I am writing as a resident whose home is in close proximity to the proposed development of 60 plus homes by Highlands Cove, LLC ("HCL or developer"), application numbers referenced above.

Regarding the proposed development, I have the following concern: The developer is planning on relocating part of Sunset Peak Road (the extension of 8th street) in order to increase the size of three lots for development.

Section 11-07-08.5 E of the Hillside and Foothills Development Standards addresses “Roadways and Circulation”. Item (4) states, “Roads shall be designed to minimize land coverage and soil disturbance.” Relocating a road to increase the size of three building lots does not minimize soil disturbance.

During the Planning and Zoning public work session held on June 3, 2015, the developer stated that ACHD had told him that ACHD had no issue with relocating the roadway.

Relocating the roadway violates the Hillside and Foothills Development Standards. ACHD is not only violating these standards but is informing a developer of decisions made in a private meeting before holding any public meetings.

Thanking you in advance for your attention to this matter.
Sincerely,

Bill Richardson
June 10, 2015

To Whom It May Concern:

This is in urgent SUPPORT and APPROVAL of the HIGHLANDS COVE SUBDIVISION. This will be an excellent addition to our community and add value to the area, neighborhood and nearby properties.

Please note that I live in the area off Bogus Basin Road and NOT concerned with increased traffic issues. No doubt Chris Conner, Dave Yorgason and the community leaders will ensure that normal traffic flows will continue. Residential development is the perfect solution for this property.

Your consideration, support and approval will be appreciated. Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Thank you,

[Signature]

W Darrow Fiedler
4961 N Hollow Lane
Boise, ID 83702
wdarrow1@gmail.com
Christy Little
Ada County Highway District
3775 Adams Street
Garden City, ID 83714

RE: Highlands Cove Development

Dear Ms. Little,

As a resident of the Highlands neighborhood I’m greatly concerned that there is no master plan for traffic flow for the Highlands and the Central Foothills which encompasses the proposed Highlands Cove development and any future development. There are private land owners that have not proposed development of their land, however, any traffic analysis that impacts Bogus Basin Road, Highland View Drive or Braemere Road must also take into account the traffic flow for any additional development that may be proposed. As the various foothills plans have addressed over the past 20 years, this is a significant problem with developing in the foothills since the three streets mentioned above are the only feasible avenues for traffic. Without a Central Foothills Master plan, how can any development proceed since it does impact the overall Central Foothills?

The developers of Highland Cove paid for and submitted the current traffic impact study by Thompson Engineers, however, this study in no way accounts for any additional traffic considerations from additional development in the foothills. Any development will impact Highland View Drive, Braemere Road, Bogus Basin Road, 15th Street, Harrison Blvd. as well as Hill Road.

ACHD’s own Development Application Report from 2001, CAR00-0046 (see attached) states on Page 7, Paragraph 0, states:

“The District recognizes the goals of Boise City’s Comprehensive Plan and Foothills Development Plan. Both these documents establish Level of Service (LOS) C traffic volumes as the maximum volume that should be allowed on streets through the North End.”

At that time, in 2000/2001 when this property was last reviewed, the traffic volumes already exceeded the LOS C “by a considerable amount”. Based upon the Traffic Impact Study submitted by the Thompson Engineers and the developers of Highlands Cove, the LOS for all of the impacted streets in the analysis is “>D” with the exception of 15th street south of Hill Road, which is even worse at “>E”. Understandably, ACHD does not have the ability to enforce LOS, however, ACHD does have a responsibility to mitigate the impact of traffic on these streets that already exceed LOS C.

In Thompson Engineers Traffic Analysis Study, they claim that 70% of the traffic will flow down Braemere Road with 30% traveling down Highland View Drive. Human nature dictates that the average traveler will take the closest street and shortest route to travel to and from home. West Braemere is an...
excellent example of this as shown in the Traffic Analysis Study. Even though West Braemere is more of a secondary, residential street, there is a high volume of traffic that uses this as a “cut through” to Highland View Drive and 15th Street. With this in mind, Thompson Engineers Traffic Study is questionable since human nature dictates there is more likely a 50/50 split for traffic volumes on Braemere Road and Highland View Drive. The site plan places 24 homes closer to Braemere Road and 36 homes closer to Highland View Drive. The density of homes closer to Highland View Drive will push more than 30% of the traffic onto Highland View Drive.

Highland View Drive already has admitted traffic issues as stated in previous reviews of this street by ACHD regarding blind curves, line of sight problems, street width, blind driveways, etc. Highland View Drive does not have sidewalks, they are almost impossible to install due to current landscaping, etc., and no streetlights. Adding additional traffic to this street only compounds already serious safety issues of people backing into the street from their driveways, speeding issues, children walking to and from school or friends’ homes as well as all the mountain bike traffic and road bike traffic using these steep streets to access the Foothills trails or training rides.

The Highlands neighborhood was built without a master traffic plan which contributes to the current safety and traffic issues. ACHD would be severely negligent to approve this current proposal without a Master Central Foothills Traffic Plan as well as addressing the safety issues to mitigate the aforementioned problems. Without a Master Central Foothills Traffic Plan, ACHD would be allowing the developers to drive the master plan vs. ACHD.

Please insure that the entire foothills have a plan vs. piecemeal development. Approve the Highlands Cove proposal only after there is a Master Central Foothills plan in place to protect everyone’s interests.

Thank you for your consideration,

Tim Fox

4480 N. Keldoon Avenue

Boise, ID 83702
ADA COUNTY HIGHWAY DISTRICT
Planning and Development Division
Development Application Report

CAR00-0046 799 Chardie Road/Harrison Hollow Road Rezone

This application has been referred to ACHD by the City of Boise for review and comment. The applicant is requesting annexation of two separate parcels into the City of Boise and a rezone from R-6 to R-3. The two parcels constitute 88.31-acres site into two separate parcels. Parcel 2A is located at the terminus of Chardie Drive, east of Bogus Basin Road. Parcel 2B is located at the terminus of Harrison Hollow Road, west of Bogus Basin Road. It is difficult to determine how many daily trips this site could generate based on the zoning and the percentage of this land that is developable. When a development application is received for these parcels, it will be easier to determine a trip generation.

The applicant has requested a zone of R-3, twenty dwelling units per acre. The R-3 zoning designation generates approximately 200 vehicle trips per day per developed acre of land. Boise City staff has recommended a zone of R-1B, that allows up to 4.8 dwelling units per acre. At the District meeting of January 17, the applicant stated that a zoning classification of R-1B was acceptable. The R-1B zoning designation has the potential to generate up to 48 vehicle trips per day per developed acre of land. In order to be developed to the potential density, the land would have to be developed as multi-family buildings, either apartments or townhouses.

On January 8, 2001, the Boise Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed this annexation and rezone request. The Commission recommended approval of the annexation to City Council with a zoning designation of A (open land).

Roads impacted by this development: Bogus Basin Road
Harrison Boulevard
Hill Road
Braemere Drive
Curling Drive

Note: This report has been modified in accordance with the Commission’s findings at its meeting of January 17, 2001.

ACHD Commission Date – February 28, 2001 – 6:30 p.m.
Facts and Findings:

A. General Information

Owner – Highlands Development Corp.
Applicant – Dave Powell, Toothman-Orton Engineering Co.
R-6 - Existing zoning (Ada County)
R-3 - Requested zoning (Boise City)
88.31 - Acres (52.63-Ac. and 35.68-Ac.)
212 - Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ)

Northwest Metro - Impact Fee Service Area
Boise/Garden City Metro - Impact Fee Assessment District

Bogus Basin Road
Minor arterial with bike lane designation
Traffic count of 10,550 on 4-28-99 (n/o Hill Road)
B - Existing Level of Service (Planning Threshold is 15,000 vehicles per day)
B - Existing plus approved projects Level of Service (not including this project)
0-feet of frontage

Bogus Basin Road is improved with a 3-lane street section with curb, gutter and sidewalk. The roadway was formerly a four-lane facility. In 1997, the District re-striped the street for two through lanes, a two-way left turn lane and two bicycle lanes.

Harrison Boulevard
Minor arterial with bike lane designation
Traffic count of 11,809 on 2-2-00 (s/o Hill Road), and 14,054 n/o Ada on 4-18-00
B - Existing Level of Service s/o Hill Road and LOS C at the southern end
B - Existing plus approved projects Level of Service s/o Hill Road (not including this project)
C - Existing plus approved projects Level of Service n/o Ada (not including this project)
0 - feet of frontage

Harrison Boulevard is improved with a 2-lane street section with a wide center median and on street parking with curb, gutter and sidewalk.

Hill Road
Collector with bike lane designation
Traffic count of 5,664 on 4-28-99 (e/o Bogus Basin Road)
Traffic count of 11,308 on 4-28-99 (w/o Bogus Basin Road)
C - Existing Level of Service (Planning Threshold is 12,500 vehicles per day)
C - Existing plus approved projects Level of Service (not including this project)
0 - feet of frontage
Hill Road is improved with a 2-lane street section with on-street parking, bicycle lanes and curb, gutter and sidewalk west of Bogus Basin Road.

**Braemere Drive**
Collector from Curling Drive to Keldooin Avenue
Traffic count of 3,007 on 9-29-98 (e/o Curling Drive)
0 - feet of frontage

Braemere Drive is improved with a 37-foot street section with curb, gutter and sidewalk.

**Curling Drive**
Collector from Bogus Basin Road to Braemere Drive
Traffic count of 2,881 on 9-29-98 (n/o Braemere Drive)
0 - feet of frontage

Curling Drive is improved with a 37-foot street section with curb, gutter and sidewalk.

B. Utility street cuts in pavement less than five years old are not allowed unless approved in writing by the District. Contact Construction Services at 387-6280 (with file numbers) for details.

C. In accordance with District policy, stub streets to the undeveloped parcels abutting this site may be required upon review of a future application for this site, and existing stub streets abutting the parcel may be required to be extended into the site.

**DEVELOPMENT HISTORY IN THE AREA:**

D. On March 23, 1994, the Commission reviewed and approved the preliminary plat for the Foothills at Harrison, a 20-lot residential subdivision. That subdivision is located on the west side of Harrison Hollow Lane, approximately 300-feet north of Bogus Basin Road. That project was never constructed and is now part of a future phase of the Healthwise office development.

E. On April 12, 1995, the Commission reviewed CU-20-95V/DR-25-95, an application for the Healthwise office building located between Bogus Basin Road and Harrison Hollow Lane, approximately 1/4 mile north of Hill Road. This development is complete and the office building is occupied.

F. On August 27, 1997, the Commission reviewed Leoni Hills, a 4-lot residential subdivision on 14.93-acres. That site is located on the west side of Cartwright Road approximately 800-feet northwest of Bogus Basin Road. That project has been platted but no additional homes have been constructed.

G. On April 22, 1998, the Commission reviewed CAR98-0008, a rezone from C-2 and RP, to R-8 and L-OD, for a 14.03-acre site located on the west side of Harrison Hollow Lane, generally north of Bogus Basin Road. No homes have been constructed.
H. On March 30, 1999, District staff reviewed CUP98-146, a conditional use application requesting approval for an 84-unit apartment complex. The 9.3-acre site is located on the east side of 15th Street approximately 500-feet north of Hill Road. Some of the apartments have been constructed.

I. On July 28, 1999, the ACHD Commission reviewed and approved Cartwright Canyon, a 22-lot residential subdivision on 12.57-acres. This development is estimated to generate 220 additional vehicle trips per day. The subdivision has been platted and homes are currently being constructed on the site.

J. On July 28, 1999, the ACHD Commission reviewed and approved Somerset Ridge, a 79-lot residential subdivision on 121.16-acres. This development is estimated to generate 790 additional vehicle trips per day, and has not yet been given final approval by Boise City.

K. On December 1, 1999, the ACHD Commission reviewed CUP99-0128, an application for conditional use and design review approval to remodel an existing grocery store, and add a drive-thru pharmacy. The 3.59-acre site is located at the southeast corner of Bogus Basin Road and Parkhill Drive. This development is estimated to generate 1,820 additional vehicle trips per day based on the submitted traffic study. After subtracting the number of pass-by trips, the site is expected to add approximately 1,035 new daily vehicle trips to the roadway system per day based on the submitted traffic study. The store has been constructed and is fully operational.

L. The Boise City Council adopted the Boise City Foothills Policy Plan as an amendment to the Boise City Comprehensive Plan. The Boise City Foothills Policy Plan provides land use, transportation, environmental, and neighborhood protection policies to guide growth and development in the Foothills, and indicates that the City will work with the COMPASS, Ada County, and the Ada County Highway District to develop a concomitant Foothills Transportation Plan. The subject site is located within the Central Foothills Transportation Planning Area, which consists of approximately 874-acres, on which Boise City placed a cap of 90-residential lots that could be approved. However, a later analysis by Boise City found that there was currently zoned land that could allow up to 500 lots. These parcels constitute some of that currently zoned land. (Please see the attached map that shows the future developable lots allowed in the foothills—provided by NETA.)

TRAFFIC IMPACTS

M. Boise City staff has recommended that this site received the zoning of R-1B, 4.8 units/acre. The proposed R-3 zoning is not compatible with the Boise City comprehensive plan. Under the R-3 zone, 20 dwelling units per acre are allowed. If fifty percent of the land is developed under the R-1B zone, 212 dwelling units could be constructed on 44-acres (2,120 vehicle trips per day out of the total development). The R-1B zoning designation generates approximately 48 vehicle trips per day per developed acre of land.
N. The following table summarizes the existing and anticipated traffic volumes on the North End (Boise) streets, using 10 trips per day per household. This chart does not include the trips from the parcels being rezoned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic Volume Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Threshold Traffic Volume (LOS C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Capacity Traffic Volume (LOS E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the Existing Conditions Exceed the Planning Threshold?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the Existing Conditions Exceed the Capacity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Somerset Ridge Traffic Volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional CUP98-146 Traffic Volume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Cartwright Canyon Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Volume Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volume</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Plus Approved Projects Traffic Volume (Rounded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the Existing Plus Approved Projects Exceed the Operational Capacity?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 This roadway segment is functionally classified as a local street and the volume exceeds the local street planning threshold of 2,000 vehicles per day. The Boise City Foothills Policy Plan identifies that this street should be considered for further study as an arterial roadway. This roadway segment does not exceed the collector street planning threshold of 8,500 vehicles per day.

Note 2: This roadway segment is functionally classified as a collector street. However, the Boise City Foothills Policy Plan identifies that this street should be considered for further study as an arterial roadway. A two-lane arterial roadway has a Level of Service C planning threshold of 12,500 vehicles per day. A two-lane arterial roadway has a Level of Service E capacity of 15,500 vehicles per day.

Note 3: This roadway segment is functionally classified as a minor arterial street. A three-lane arterial roadway has a Level of Service C planning threshold of 15,000 vehicles per day. A three-lane arterial roadway has a Level of Service E capacity of 18,500 vehicles per day.

Note 4: This roadway segment is functionally classified as a collector street. A two-lane collector roadway has a Level of Service C planning threshold of 8,500 vehicles per day. A two-lane collector roadway has a Level of Service E capacity of 10,500 vehicles per day.

O. The District recognizes the goals of Boise City’s Comprehensive Plan and Foothills Development Plan. Both these documents establish Level of Service (LOS) C traffic volumes as the maximum volume that should be allowed on streets through the North End. At the July 28, 1999, Commission meeting the Commission determined that developments that are allowed to generate traffic through the North End should be required to provide traffic mitigation on the roadways affected by the development. The Foothills Transportation Plan encourages ACHD to take a proactive approach to evaluate traffic calming measures on residential collectors and other roadways as foothill developments occur. The Commission, in an effort to work with Boise City and COMPASS, decided that additional development would exacerbate the conditions on roadways already over the planning threshold as adopted by COMPASS and Boise City. Because the physical capacity of the streets exceed LOS C by a considerable amount, the Commission has previously determined that the District does not solely have the authority to enforce LOS C as an absolute limit of traffic volume on a given street. Therefore, the District recommends that Boise City establish a system of fees to be imposed on developments that direct new traffic to Boise’s North End streets, said fee to be used for the purpose of mitigating the impacts of the traffic from the respective proposed developments. The amount of the fees can be determined from the North End Traffic Analysis currently underway by the District.
The District retained Washington Infrastructure Group (formerly MK Centennial) to evaluate the existing traffic volumes on streets in the North End and traffic that would be expected to impact these streets after the anticipated 500 dwelling units are developed. This analysis is also to identify facilities that can be installed to mitigate the traffic impacts identified by the study and estimate the costs of those facilities.

The first phase of the North End Traffic Analysis (NETA) was to look at possible short-term solutions for neighborhood traffic mitigation based on the projected Foothills growth up to the year 2005. A scope of work is currently being prepared for a second phase that would discuss long-term solutions. The NETA made several recommendations for traffic calming, reclassification, and speed control in the north end. Some of the recommendations from the report include:

- **Harrison Boulevard:** No recommendations because the street is functionally classified as an arterial, and currently has one measure of traffic calming — a landscaped median along the length of the corridor.
- **Hill Road:** No recommendations because portions of the street have limited front-on housing. Based on model projections the existing traffic signal, stops signs and crosswalk adequately manage the traffic volumes.
- **15th Street:** Recommends entrance treatments on 15th Street to alert motorists that they are entering a residential area; placement of chokers at six intersections; and further investigation as to the reclassification of 15th Street to an arterial. The cost estimate for the 15th Street improvements is $80,000.

P. Boise City and COMPASS have adopted Harrison Boulevard as a Downtown Boise Historic Street and the planning capacity for Harrison Boulevard has been set at 14,000 Average Daily Traffic. The existing plus project traffic currently exceeds the "Historic" planning capacity of the roadway. The most recent traffic counts on 9th Street, 15th Street, Harrison Boulevard and Hill Road exhibit volumes that exceed their planning threshold established by COMPASS and adopted in the Long Range Transportation Plan.

**Special Recommendations to Boise City:**

1. Development of this property under any residential zoning should only be allowed after the preparation of a Traffic Impact Study that addresses the intensity of development that would be allowed by the City and indicate the volume of traffic that will be directed to Harrison Boulevard, 16th Street, 15th Street and Hill Road. This TIS should be prepared, submitted to the District and accepted by the District prior to the submittal of any subsequent development applications.

2. If this application is approved, the District recommends that the City impose a fee in the form of a Trust Fund deposit in an amount sufficient to mitigate the proportionate share of this development’s traffic impact on streets in the North End. The North End Traffic Analysis will provide the estimated costs of recommended mitigation facilities on impacted streets.
If the rezone is approved and the District receives a development proposal, the District intends to provide the following requirements, in addition to any additional requirements that may apply upon District review of future development, to the City of Boise:

Site Specific Requirements:

1. A Transportation Impact Study (TIS) will be required by ACHD when a development application is submitted for these sites. The TIS should address the impacts of traffic that will be directed to Harrison Boulevard, 16th Street, 15th Street, and Hill Road. Contact District staff to discuss the scope of the TIS prior to commencing the efforts.

2. Stub streets to the undeveloped parcels abutting this site may be required upon review of a future application for this site, and existing stub streets abutting the parcel may be required to be extended into the site.

Standard Requirements:

1. A request for modification, variance or waiver of any requirement or policy outlined herein shall be made in writing to the ACHD Planning and Development Supervisor. The request shall specifically identify each requirement to be reconsidered and include a written explanation of why such a requirement would result in a substantial hardship or inequity. The written request shall be submitted to the District no later than 9:00 a.m. on the day scheduled for ACHD Commission action. Those items shall be rescheduled for discussion with the Commission on the next available meeting agenda.

Requests submitted to the District after 9:00 a.m. on the day scheduled for Commission action do not provide sufficient time for District staff to remove the item from the consent agenda and report to the Commission regarding the requested modification, variance or waiver. Those items will be acted on by the Commission unless removed from the agenda by the Commission.

2. After ACHD Commission action, any request for reconsideration of the Commission’s action shall be made in writing to the Planning and Development Supervisor within six days of the action and shall include a minimum fee of $110.00. The request for reconsideration shall specifically identify each requirement to be reconsidered and include written documentation of data that was not available to the Commission at the time of its original decision. The request for reconsideration will be heard by the District Commission at the next regular meeting of the Commission. If the Commission agrees to reconsider the action, the applicant will be notified of the date and time of the Commission meeting at which the reconsideration will be heard.

3. Payment of applicable road impact fees are required prior to building construction in accordance with Ordinance #193, also known as Ada County Highway District Road Impact Fee Ordinance.

4. All design and construction shall be in accordance with the Ada County Highway District Policy Manual, ISPWC Standards and approved supplements, Construction Services
procedures and all applicable ACHD Ordinances unless specifically waived herein. An engineer registered in the State of Idaho shall prepare and certify all improvement plans.

5. The applicant shall submit revised plans for staff approval, prior to issuance of building permit (or other required permits), which incorporates any required design changes.

6. Construction, use and property development shall be in conformance with all applicable requirements of the Ada County Highway District prior to District approval for occupancy.

7. It is the responsibility of the applicant to verify all existing utilities within the right-of-way. Existing utilities damaged by the applicant shall be repaired by the applicant at no cost to ACHD. The applicant shall be required to call DIGLINE (1-800-342-1585) at least two full business days prior to breaking ground within ACHD right-of-way. The applicant shall contact ACHD Traffic Operations 387-6190 in the event any ACHD conduits (spare or filled) are compromised during any phase of construction.

8. No change in the terms and conditions of this approval shall be valid unless they are in writing and signed by the applicant or the applicant’s authorized representative and an authorized representative of the Ada County Highway District. The burden shall be upon the applicant to obtain written confirmation of any change from the Ada County Highway District.

9. Any change by the applicant in the planned use of the property which is the subject of this application, shall require the applicant to comply with all rules, regulations, ordinances, plans, or other regulatory and legal restrictions in force at the time the applicant or its successors in interest advises the Highway District of its intent to change the planned use of the subject property unless a waiver/variance of said requirements or other legal relief is granted pursuant to the law in effect at the time the change in use is sought.

Conclusion of Law:

1. ACHD requirements are intended to assure that the proposed use/development will not place an undue burden on the existing vehicular and pedestrian transportation system within the vicinity impacted by the proposed development.

Should you have any questions or comments, please contact the Planning and Development Division at 387-6170.

Submitted by: Planning and Development Staff

Commission Action: February 28, 2001
6/13/2015
Greetings,

I am writing to express the concerns I share with neighbors about the proposed Highlands Cove development, it's multiple phases, and the unplanned for, development traffic potential on adjacent lands that it will open up. This development will affect all of us who live in the Highlands neighborhood profoundly and permanently. We hope you will consider our investment in our homes, our families, our goals and needs at least of a par with those of the developer. The amount of traffic generated by the proposed development will create a dangerous and unacceptable situation, and will complicate existing traffic problems.

BRAEMERE - EXISTING BOTTLENECK:
The proposed Highlands Cove development as well as certain future development above there will funnel all traffic into Braemere and Highland View Drive. Because Highland View Drive is narrow and winding, Curling St. has become a highly popular cut through that connects with Braemere at Highlands School and Crane Creek Golf course. The already existing bottleneck during commuter hours slows traffic to a halt as commuters, Highland School drop-offs and Crane Creek members all converge. I cannot imagine what will happen with 60 more homes from Highland Cove, and potentially 100 more homes above that as I have heard discussed by realtors.

HIGHLAND VIEW -DANGEROUS CONDITIONS:
Highland View, a so-called collector, is ill equipped to handle additional traffic. The traffic rate there is already high, unsafe and the speed of cars on that is already a danger.
Consider that many driveways are short, steep, and sight lines are very poor. This is a major bike route for teams, and many children ride, walk and play in this sidewalk-free street.
Sincerely, it may be only a matter of time before someone is hurt badly once the Highland Cove gateway to the foothills opens. Imagine how this steep and narrow road will carry speeding traffic in Winter.

LACK OF MASTER PLAN:
When we purchased our home in the Highlands we looked at traffic counts published by ACHD to help us in making our decisions. At that time, 2 years ago, there was no mention, notation, plans, or even supposition by ACHD that the land above us was planned for development. Quite the opposite in fact, as all maps show this as either open space with no projected plan of any kind for development. We based our home purchase partly on ACHD data, and now our house risks being on what may become a busy thoroughfare.

I am asking that you please take our neighborhood concerns into consideration when planning for this project that will impact all of our lives deeply. Please postpone any development until a full master plan has been developed for this area that takes into account potential future development. That, is seems, is the responsibility of ACHD. Unless and until a proper plan has been developed, the entrances and exits to our neighborhood will be impassable and traffic will be even more of a problem than it is now if the development is not postponed then ACHD should mandate that Highlands Cove also has an egress from 8th street which would route some of the traffic in that direction and that the developer bear the costs of improving the road. This would provide 3 potential routes into Highlands Cove as well as for future development above.
Sincerely,
Michael Dorey
Selkirk Drive
802-318-0820
I am writing to voice my concerns regarding the highlands cove development. I am mostly concerned about traffic issues on Highland View Drive. People living along highland view currently have a hard time exiting their driveways due to fast and frequent traffic and the limited visibility the street presents.

Highland View was not built to accommodate the traffic model that will exist if Braemere and Highland View are connected. Highland View has no sidewalks or bike lanes. It is dangerous to ride a bike down Highland View and will be a mistake to allow development connecting East Braemere to Highlands View.

Mary Westerlund
Ms. Little:

Please enclose the following as my written submission to be included in the staff report to the ACHD commissioners on this proposed development, for which the hearing before the commission is scheduled for June 24, 2015.

June 14, 2015

Commissioners
Ada County Highway District

Re: Proposed Highland Cove Development

Dear Commissioners:

I am a long-time resident of the Highlands Neighborhood, and am currently the President of the Highlands Neighborhood Association. I write you in anticipation of the Commission hearing of June 24 regarding the above development proposal.

The following are indisputable characteristics of this proposed development and the neighborhood:

- The current developers propose building 60 units of single-family residences on approximately 17 acres of land south of Braemere Rd, north of East Highland View Dr., east of E Chardie Rd, and west of Sunset Peak Rd.
- In 1996-1997, Highlands Inc applied to develop land in the southern portion of the above 17 acres. 23 units of single-family residences were proposed.
- Boise Planning and Zoning (P&Z), in a letter dated May 1, 1997 to the developer's representative outlined the "findings and conclusions set forth" for denying this application.
  - Among these findings, was a statement:
    - "Highland View Drive is a substandard street with narrow roadway, no sidewalks, and extreme grades and curves.
      - Additional traffic on Highland View Drive would add to the safety hazard that already exists on that street.
      - Any additional traffic on Highland View Drive would ultimately also impact lower Braemere Road, where there are traffic and safety issues."
- The Commissioners of the ACHD, in a document dated November 15, 1996 outlined the "conditions of approval and street improvements which are required" regarding this 1996-1997 proposed development. At that time, the proposed development was estimated to generate 230 additional daily vehicle trips.
Findings in that staff report included vehicle trip per day (vpd) of 2074 on Highland View Dr west of Braemere; 4349 vpd on 15th St south of Hill Road.

The District recommended to the City that if the development was approved, that this parcel "be the last annexation or zone change allowed that would generate traffic to Highland View Dr".

ACHD staff also concluded that traffic from the proposed development of 1996-1997 would use Highland View Dr/15th Street, as "This is the most direct route for traffic to and from the downtown area".

At the time of this report, Sections 7203.3.1 and 7202.4.1 of the policy manual (regarding volume of traffic on residential collectors) were cited when concluding that "Addition of the traffic from this project to Highland View Dr would exceed this recommended volume below the intersection of Highland View and Braemere Road".

Staff believed that "the route from the proposed development to/from downtown or points west and east via Highland View to 15th Street to be the most direct and will be the route of choice by residents of the development". Furthermore, this volume "would exceed the desirable range of volume on the lower portion of this route (below the Highland View/Braemere intersection)."

Staff assessed that the route from the development to Braemere to Curling to Bogus Basin "is less direct, but some traffic...would probably use this route". Further, staff wrote that the "proposed route from the development to Braemere would be the least direct to downtown for residents of the subject property, and would allow traffic from upper Braemere Road to cross through this project to Highland View Drive. This option would tend to add more traffic to Highland View Drive".

Because of the characteristics of Highland View Drive (substandard for a collector), ACHD "staff recommends that the street should not be allowed to significantly exceed the 2,000 trips per day for the upper reaches of Highland View Drive. That level has already been exceeded below the intersection of Braemere Road and Highland View Drive (2,074 vpd)."

- Development of this property will require repositioning of E Sunset Peak Road at the southern edge of the development. The developers have publicly stated that ACHD had no objection to this action.
- In 1991, when Highlands Unit #25 was proposed ACHD obtained an easement agreement from Highlands Inc requiring the connection of Braemere Road to Highland View Drive. The second "Site Specific" (for the parcels now being considered for development) "Condition" was that Highlands Inc would "Provide assurance that no further development will occur that would take access from Braemere until a second access is constructed."
- Highlands Elementary School is on the northwest corner of the intersection of Curling and Bogus Basin Roads. As befits this school zone, traffic is slow in this area by the numerous students crossing Curling Rd, numerous parents dropping off or picking up their elementary school-aged children, and the flashing lights alerting drivers to the school zone reduction in speed. These factors influence drivers to avoid Curling and Bogus Basin Roads at this time, and use Highland View Dr/15th (directly or via West Braemere from East Braemere).

My assessments:

- The current development application exceeds by at least a factor of 2 the number of vehicles trips of the 1996-1997 development proposal that was rejected.
- The developers' traffic analysis biases its conclusions by assuming that more than two-thirds of traffic from their proposed development would use Braemere to Curling to Bogus Basin as their primary route out of the development. This assumption is clearly biased and is directly contradicted by the ACHD staff report of 1996 noted above. Given this important, unsubstantiated, and biased assumption, the conclusions of the developers' traffic analysis can be discounted as self-serving.
- Despite their bias, even the developers' traffic analysis recognizes that Highlands View Drive is a poor residential collector with numerous blind curves, blind driveways, and no rational means of improvement.
• Highland View Drive is clearly a "substandard residential collector" road, as assessed nearly two-decades ago by the ACHD, agreed to by the Boise City Council, and tacitly by the developers' traffic consultants.

• Section 7206.3.7 of the ACHD Policy Manual, regarding Front-on Housing in a Residential Area, states in part in that "In some instances a lower ADT for existing collectors in residential areas may be applied due to items such as grades, curves, etc." This standard should be applied to Highland View Drive now, as it was in 1996-1997.

• The developers' statement that ACHD has no objection to repositioning E Sunset Peak Road implies a level of communication and assurance that should only come after the application has been submitted, a staff report written and submitted to the Commissioners to review.

• The 1991 easement agreement between ACHD and Highlands Inc was a recognition by ACHD that with Highlands Unit #25, Braemere Road was being extended into an even larger "cul de sac" east of Curling, with no other outlet. The "second access" might have been to E Sunset Peak Rd, but given the Hulls Gulch Reserve, this was never completed. There is therefore no "second access" to Braemere, and likely there will never be one. (In the easement agreement, the nature of this second access is not otherwise specified, and it is possible there is some other meaning that I am not considering.)

• The influence of Highlands Elementary School in effectively "redirecting" traffic to West Braemere/Highland View Dr/15th Street will only be amplified by the increase in vehicle traffic from this proposed development.

• While there may have been changes over the last twenty years in how traffic analysis is done, I submit that the conclusions of the ACHD and the City of Boise outlined above still hold for roads that have not significantly changed, with drivers who have not significantly changed, and children who are still walking/riding on the poor roads built over 40-50 years ago.

My recommendations for the Commissioners to consider:

• Deny the current developers' application because of the excessive number of residential units causing too much vehicle trip impact to this substandard residential collector road (Highland View Dr).

• Recommend to the City of Boise P&Z and City Council that any future development be limited to size (number of units and therefore traffic impact) that the Commission deems is reasonable for this recognized substandard collector road.

• Consider issuing a clarification about what kind of private assurances the developers were given prior to officially submitting an application to the City of Boise P&Z.

Respectfully,

Philippe Masser, MD
901 E Chardie Road
Boise ID 83702
To whom it may concern:

In the past 21 years that I have lived on Harrison Bvld, this is one of many letters I’ve written about increased traffic on Harrison Blvd. My husband and I used to attend the meetings and try to make a stand against further development but it just seemed like a waste of time.

With every new development up the hill, more cars have to go through our neighborhood to get there. We have always asked, "Why does our street/neighborhood have to be sacrificed for new development"? If the developers want to continue to make more living areas in the foothills then they should have to find a way to get them there without impacting others quality of life. Yes, they have an investment in the land that they want to make money on- but we have investments in our property as well. We can barely pull away from the curb in the front of our house during peak hours due to the number of cars backed up at the lights. Harrison Blvd is a beautiful street and a jewel for the city, as witnessed by the tour train and other busses that bring tours down our street.

I would ask that further development be put on hold until a "ring road" or some other thoroughfare is put into place. This is the same thing myself and my neighbors have been asking for for the past 25+ years!

Lisa Hudson-Beale
1414 Harrison Blvd.
bitsysmom@mac.com
208-989-5264
Dear Ada County Highway District Commissioners:

We are writing in opposition to the proposed development of 60+ new homes at the top of Highland View Drive. We have lived at 605 East Highland View Drive since 1996. Soon after moving to the neighborhood, a development was proposed which was ultimately denied by the City. As Phil Masser's letter to this Commission points out, ACHD opined in that proceeding that there were significant traffic and safety issues that already existed on Highland View Drive and that vehicle traffic was already at a maximum and should not be allowed to increase. I won't reiterate those findings in this letter.

Since that time, however, the situation has changed to exacerbate the traffic/safety situation previously identified and documented in 1996. The neighborhood has changed in that younger families with more children have moved in as older residents have sold their homes to these younger families. This conclusion is supported by the fact that Highlands Elementary is at maximum capacity, even with modular classrooms that have been added over the years.

We have personally observed the change in our neighborhood which has resulted in an increase in foot and bike traffic on our street that has no sidewalks. People often park in the street. Because Highland View Drive has homes dating back to the early 1960's, there is a lot of renovation work that goes on which causes subcontractors to park in the street. In addition, because of the mature landscaping up and down this street, residents often utilize landscaping services that park their vehicles on the street. This all causes pedestrian and bike traffic to utilize the vehicle lanes themselves, putting these individuals in harm’s way of any vehicular traffic moving up or down the road. Increased traffic only increases this danger. The traffic and safety issues previously identified by this Commission in 1996 not only still exist, they are much worse today.

Approving a development of 60+ homes in the bowl of foothills land at the top of Highland View Drive is inconsistent with the decision this Commission made almost 20 years ago. Any development allowed in that area would have to be reduced to less than 20 homes in order for the impact to be decreased to the point where it would not risk a terrible accident occurring on Highland View Drive.
Finally, traffic calming devices placed on Highland View Drive are not the answer, as the developer might like this Commission to believe. Although speeding is obviously a safety concern, it is the volume of traffic that is the main concern. This Commission previously and correctly recognized this concern in the prior proceeding where a proposed development of this very same land was denied in 1996. The Commission should rule consistently in this case.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Peter and Rosalie Sisson
605 East Highland View Drive
208-284-4021
June 15, 2015

Ada County Highway District
3775 Adams Street
Boise, ID 83714

Re: Proposed Highlands Cove Development

Dear ACHD Commissioners:

I have lived on Highland View Drive for 19 years. I’m deeply concerned about traffic impacts to my street if the proposed Highlands Cove Development is recommended.

Safety has always been a concern on Highland View because of the steep hill, no sidewalks, and its narrow width. But because the street is a dead end, there is a limit to the number of cars. If this development is approved as is, a conservative estimate of 600 more cars on Highland View, which is the most direct route downtown, will turn it into the Highlands Expressway, posing a constant safety threat to everyone who uses the street, but especially current residents.

Please consider the following:

- In 1996, a development was proposed at the top of Highland View which would have added 23 single residential units, connected it with E. Braemere, and generated 230 additional vehicle trips per day—much less than the proposed Highlands Cove development of 60 homes and 600 vehicle trips.
- The 1996 ACHD report found that traffic counts on lower Highland View Drive below W. Braemere already exceeded the then-recommended number of vehicle trips per day (less than 2,000) for a residential collector street. It also stated: “Staff believes the route from the proposed development to/from downtown or points west and east via Highland View Drive to 15th Street to be the most direct and will be the route of choice by residents of the development.”
- The 1996 report stated, “If approved, the District recommends to the City that the parcel of which this application is a part be the last annexation or zone change allowed that would generate traffic to Highland View Drive.”

ACHD rightly recognized that Highland View Drive, originally built in the 1960s without any of the safety features that would be designed into a residential collector street today, was already near full capacity for traffic loads.

Two decades have passed since that proposed development which was ultimately denied. But nothing about Highland View Drive has changed since ACHD’s 1996 report, including the fact that no additional roads have been built in the Highlands that might ease the burden of new development on our half-century-old residential neighborhood.

The only thing that has changed is, as I understand it, ACHD’s policy manual now allows up to 5,000 average cars per day on a residential collector street, instead of 2,000. If ACHD determined in 1996 that 2,000 was already more than Highland View Drive could handle, raising the limit to 5,000 cars and pretending that any development within that range is acceptable, defies common sense.

Please consider the following options with regard to the proposed Highlands Cove development:

1) Please lend ACHD’s support and commitment to work with the City of Boise and the local neighborhood associations to buy back this land from the developers and commit it to open space for everyone in our city and county to enjoy. It would be a
treasured asset for our community and end the recurring issue of traffic impacts that cannot be absorbed by Highland View Drive.

2) If you cannot support Option #1, please recommend a dramatically reduced number of homes for this development so additional traffic does not destroy quality of life for existing residents. Please consider reducing the proposed 60 homes to 23, which was the proposed number in 1996 that ACHD staff recommended be the last development to add traffic to Highland View Drive.

3) Please include a comprehensive plan for mitigating traffic impacts on Highland View Drive for any recommended development. The 1996 ACHD staff report recommended significant traffic calming measures at the top of Highland View Drive to discourage cut-through traffic from East Braemere. This plan should also address ways to distribute traffic impacts across multiple streets. Sunset Peak Road, which abuts the developers’ land, should be part of this discussion.

The findings by ACHD in 1996 regarding development at the top of Highland View Drive are still relevant in 2015. Please consider them in your decision, and thank you for hearing my concerns.

Sincerely,
Susan Rowe
520 W. Highland View Drive
Boise, ID, 83702
I would like to express my concern for the proposed connection of Highland View Drive to Bramere as I feel Highland View is already used to it's maximum capacity. With the hidden drives and corners the road can become dangerous easily. I have only lived on Highland View for a bit over a year and feel that I drive cautiously but have had a few near misses that would have been horrible. Once a teenager came on a bike out of a driveway behind trees and looked completely out of control and shocked to see a car. Luckily I was going up hill and driving slow so was able to stop without incident. Another day a young boy on a bike was loosing his balance with his school bags and instrument and swerved all the way across the street, I was thankful I saw him from up the road a bit. But cars coming the other way may not have been able to see him so easily. Just this morning at the intersection of 15th and Hill Road I passed a accident that appeared to be between a bike and car. I can not speak to what actually happened, or to the condition of the pedestrian. This was at the intersection where I feel people are being cautious and looking for each other. On the majority of the road it is difficult to watch for bikes, pedestrians and the multitude of construction trucks, trailers and cars that are forced to park half into the road due to the limited shoulder. The addition of more traffic as well as creating a thorough fair on Highland View Drive would ultimately make these problems worse and that is why I oppose the highlands cove development.

Thank you,
Tegan Bohannan
(To whom it may concern,
Is there an age limit on those you can receive letters from?  If not please see below.)

My name is Harper, I am almost two years old and live on Highland View Drive. I love to walk north toward 8th street to enjoy the neighborhood and watch birds. I keep to the sidewalks when they are available, but walk in the road when they are not. I am not always dependable on staying to sidewalks but do my best.
I also enjoy playing in my front yard talking with the neighborhood dogs and waving to the many bicyclist that go by.
An increase of traffic on Highland View Drive would limit my use of the front yard and walking to enjoy the neighborhood.
Thank you for your time,
Harper Bohannan
June 8, 2015

To Whom It May Concern:

I write this letter today, urging you and your colleagues to support and approve the Highlands Cove Subdivision. I feel this project will be a positive addition to our community, as do a majority of the people that I have spoken with.

My husband and I live at the end of Hearthstone, on Hollow Lane and are not concerned with increased traffic issues. I trust that Chris Conner, Dave Yorgason and community leaders will do a fine job ensuring traffic flows continue as normal.

Chris Conner and Dave Yorgason continue to support, listen, meet and answer questions of neighborhood members and community leaders alike. I would much prefer that two men such as Chris and Dave carry out the development and completion of this project, versus a construction corporation out of Texas or California.

This project will have many positive effects on our community. After attending workshops and meetings with the developers and community leaders, I found that the project balances land utilization, foothills environmental impact, foothills access and neighborhood involvement very well. There is also the benefit of additional fire access.

I sincerely appreciate your consideration. Again, I urge you to support this project. Please feel free to contact me via telephone, email or mail with any questions that you might have.

Sincerely,

Erica Hill
4961 N. Hollow Lane
Boise, Idaho 83702
Erica@kw.com
208.867.0872
Dear ACHD,
Thank you for taking the time to consider the concerns of Highland residents in regard to the proposed development in our neighborhood.

My husband and I moved from DC to Boise three years ago. My husband had finished 15 years on active duty in the US Army. We were delighted to have found Boise. Our wish list for a home: proximity to trails, good public schools, safe streets, and a family friendly neighborhood. (We had hoped that moving into an older neighborhood meant stability and a family friendly environment in which to raise our family.) The proposed development will take away every single one of these reasons for living in our home.

--My favorite loop to hike with my daughter in a Kelty pack is the trail that will be replaced with a road.

--Those who can afford to leave the busy streets of the Highlands will do so and drop property values as a result. This does not bode well for Highlands Elementary as folks will gravitate to other districts.

--Highland View Drive is a tragic accident waiting to happen. It is already a steep speedway and not a single step has been taken to calm traffic. (Other than speed, one particular residence has a line of trees that have grown into the road forcing all traffic into the other lane or foot traffic into the middle of the road.) It was our hope for our daughter to walk to school and enjoy life's lessons along the way. We do not believe 'Frogger' is a life lesson.

--The majority of the homes and almost the entire first phase of the proposed development are intended for singles and couples, not families. This is not a development that will contribute favorably to the school. This proposed development is hundreds of people making an average of a dozen trips per day down Highland View Drive. From what I see each day already, no one will adhere to the speed limit on our steep street.

In short, the street layout of the Highlands is not favorable to high volumes of traffic. As is, no measures have been implemented to calm the existing known and documented traffic hazards let alone additional traffic from 60 plus homes feeding onto one road.

Thank you again for your time.
Best,
Lauren Brassell
Dear Ada County Highway Department

06/15/2015

I would like express my concerns regarding the Highland Cove development proposed in the Highlands.

While I understand that anyone who owns property has the right to develop it I feel that this development in its proposed form has some major concerns.

Have traffic flows done by you, not the developer really support the narrow Highland View Dr corridor? I live on Highland View Dr and as it is very few motorists go the speed limit, not many stop at the stop sign on Braemere, and the flow of cars up and down the street at peak times seems excessive.

With the additional 60-70 homes proposed and the resultant drivers not only will Braemere and Highland View Dr be overrun but 15th St and Harrison will surely be over traffic recommendations. Are 13th, 15th, and Harrison ready for 600 more cars a day?

Additionally, I fear that homeowners that live above the development on Braemere will now cut through the proposed development and use Highland Dr as a short cut to downtown. When speaking to the developers they had not considered this in their financed traffic survey.

It seems that there is a lack of a long term plan which maps out traffic and future development moving forward. Braemere and Highland View Drive were never meant to be collector streets.

Even if the development is allowed to progress, which I hope it won’t in its proposed scheme, I strongly believe it should be significantly scaled down in size to alleviate the above traffic concerns.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Christopher Sours

713 W. Highland View Dr

Boise, ID 83702
I live on West Braemere between Curling Rd. and Highland View Dr. I am very concerned about the impact this development and the resulting traffic will have on our neighborhood.

A couple years ago, John Wasson for ACHD met with us regarding our concerns about traffic down our street. We get a lot of the traffic from upper Braemere, Hearthstone, and other connecting streets in the "Nines". Our section of Braemere is very narrow - in fact its one of the narrowest streets in the Highlands- and we do not have sidewalks. John did a traffic study for us and found that the traffic counts during peak traffic exceeded the target by almost 100%. The average speed was well above the posted 20 mph. limit.

The decision was made to rebuild a series of speed bumps on our street. After this was completed another traffic study was done. The average speed had decreased a little and the traffic counts had come down a little but were still well above the target.

Many people walk on our street with their dogs and children and it is becoming very dangerous because of the traffic. The recent repaving of our road made the edges of the road very slanted and difficult to walk on which pushes pedestrians further out into the road where the risk is even greater.

It has already been determined by ACHD that traffic counts on our street are well above the target of 100/hour during peak times. I saw a figure that they anticipate that up to 600 trips per day might be added from the proposed number of houses in Highland Cove. If even a fraction of these come down our street it will still negatively impact our neighborhood. I don’t think it is appropriate to approve a development that will make this problem even worse.

Sincerely,

J. Dianne Soule
729 W Braemere Rd.
Boise, Id 83702