



City of Idaho Falls
City Council Meeting
680 Park Avenue

COUNCIL WORK SESSION AGENDA

Monday

October 19, 2026

3:00 P.M.

Mayor

Lisa Burtenshaw

City Council

Jim Francis

Council President, Seat 4

Brandon Lee

Council Seat 2

John Radford

Council Seat 5

Jim Freeman

Council Seat 6

Kirk Larsen

Council Seat 3

Michelle Ziel-Dingman

Council Seat 1

 Livestream at www.idahofallsidaho.gov/429/Live-Stream



Work Session

Agenda

Monday, October 19, 2026

3:00 PM

Council Chambers

The public is invited to attend in person or watch via the livestream at <https://www.idahofallsidaho.gov/429/Live-Stream>. This meeting may be cancelled or recessed to a later time in accordance with law. If you need communication aids or other physical accommodations to attend or access this meeting, please contact Linda Lundquist, City Clerk, at (208) 612-8414 or Lisa Farris, ADA Coordinator, at (208) 612-8323 prior to the meeting.

1. **Call to Order & Roll Call**

2. **Agenda**

A) **Office of the Mayor**

- 1) **Mayor and Council Reports:** Announcements, liaison reports, events, calendaring, citywide updates, concerns, questions, proclamations, notes and/or minutes from boards and commissions (20) **26-397**
Council Direction to staff (or take other appropriate action)

Attachments: IFDDC Minutes July 2026
IFDDC Minutes August 2026
10-6-26 PC Action
White Cane Safety Awareness Day 2026

B) **Community Development Services:**

- 1) Starter Home Subdivision Code Revision review (30) **26-406**
Council direction to staff (or take other appropriate action)

The Idaho Legislature passed Senate Bill No. 1352 relating to housing, which establishes provisions for starter home subdivisions. The legislation prohibits cities from enacting or enforcing ordinances that ban starter home subdivisions within residential zoning areas under their jurisdiction.

On August 27 and September 22, 2026, the City of Idaho Falls Starter Home Subdivision Committee met to discuss the legislation and assisted in developing an ordinance with staff to address the new requirements. The attached ordinance reflects the committee's work and recommendations for implementation within the City of Idaho Falls.

Attachments: Ordinance
Senate Bill 1352
Minutes 8-27-26
Minutes 9-22-26

C) City Attorney

1) Executive Session (40)

26-405

This executive session is to communicate with legal counsel for the City to discuss the legal ramifications of and legal options for pending litigation, or controversies not yet being litigated but imminently likely to be litigated.

Council will reconvene after this session.

Action Item(s):

To call an executive session pursuant to Idaho Code § 74-206(1)(f) to communicate with legal counsel for the public agency to discuss the legal ramifications of and legal options for pending litigation, or controversies not yet being litigated but imminently likely to be litigated.

2) Settlement Agreement for City v. Van Deventers (5)

26-413

Action Item(s):

Grant authority to the City Attorney to negotiate and authorize the Mayor and City Clerk to execute a settlement agreement with Karen and John Van Deventer *(or take other appropriate action)*.

3. Announcements

4. Adjournment

Memorandum

DATE: Monday, October 5, 2026

AGENDA: Work Session

FROM: Mayor Burtenshaw

DEPARTMENT: Mayor's Office

File # 26-397

Work Session

Title

Mayor and Council Reports: Announcements, liaison reports, events, calendaring, citywide updates, concerns, questions, proclamations, notes and/or minutes from boards and commissions (20)

Council Direction to staff (or take other appropriate action)



IDAHO FALLS DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

July 14, 2026

Date	July 14, 2026
Time	9:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.
Location	Idaho Falls Arts Council – Willard Arts Center, 498 A Street, Idaho Falls, ID, 2nd Floor
Called By	Chip Langerak, Board Chair
Prepared By	Kerry Hammon, Executive Director
Secretary	Jill Hansen, Board Secretary

Attendance

Board of Directors

Name	Role
Chip Langerak	Board Chair
Jill Hansen	Board Secretary

Kevin Cutler	Board Member, Immediate Past President
Mark Cornelison	Board Member
Justin Morris	Board Member
Brandi Newton	Board Member, Treasurer
Terri Ireland	Board Member
Gray Augustus	Board Member

Staff

- Kerry Hammon – Executive Director
- Juan Hernandez – Staff
- Geetika Gupta – Staff
- Cheryl Bailer – Intern
- Ian Hurst--Intern

City of Idaho Falls

- Caitlin Long
- Jim Francis

Guests

- Alexa Langerak

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Board Chair Chip Langerak. A quorum of board members was confirmed.

2. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

The minutes from the June 9, 2026, Board of Directors meeting were presented for review.

Motion: Terri Ireland moved to approve the June 9, 2026 meeting minutes as presented.

Second: Gray Augustus

Vote: No opposition. **Motion Approved.**

3. Approval of Previous Financials

The May 31, 2026, financial statements were presented for review by the Treasurer.

Motion: Brandi Newton moved to approve May 31, 2026, financials as presented.

Second: Mark Cornelison

Vote: No opposition. **Motion Approved.**

4. Merchant Association Update

An update on the Merchant Association was provided. Key items discussed:

- Merchant Association meetings will be held on the **1st Wednesday of each month, 10:00 – 11:00 a.m.**, in the conference room at **447 Park Ave** (next to Marcellar's).
- Downtown businesses are actively working to address graffiti problems, with a commitment to remove graffiti as soon as it is identified.

5. City of Idaho Falls Update

No formal City update was provided as Lisa was not in attendance at this meeting.

Caitlin Long distributed new brochures for the **Downtown Walking Tour**. A digital version of the walking tour brochures is forthcoming.

Board Action Items Summary

►BOARD ACTION — Approval of June 9, 2026, Minutes

Motion:	Terri Ireland
Second:	Gray Augustus
Vote:	Approved — No opposition

►BOARD ACTION — Approval of May 31, 2026, Financials

Motion:	Brandi Newton
Second:	Mark Cornelison
Vote:	Approved — No opposition

Next Meeting

The next Board of Directors meeting is scheduled for:

Tuesday, August 11, 2026 — 9:00 a.m.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 a.m.



Idaho Falls Downtown Development Corporation

Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

Date	August 11, 2026
Time	9:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.
Location	Idaho Falls Arts Council – Willard Arts Center, 498 A Street, Idaho Falls, ID, 2nd Floor
Called By	Chip Langerak, Board Chair
Prepared By	Kerry Hammon, Executive Director
Secretary	Jill Hansen, Board Secretary

Attendance

Board Members Present

Name	Role
Chip Langerak	Board Chair
Jill Hansen	Board Secretary
Justin Morris	Board Member
Brandi Newton	Board Member, Treasurer

Terri Ireland	Board Member
Gray Augustus	Board Member

IFDDC Staff

- Kerry Hammon - Executive Director
- Geetika Gupta - Staff
- Ian Hurst - Staff

City of Idaho Falls

- Lisa Farris
- Jim Francis

Guests

- Whitney Holmes
- Jim Fletcher
- Natalie Kern
- Alexa Langerak

Process Review

1 - Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 AM by Board Chair Chip Langerak. A quorum was confirmed present.

2 - Roll Call / Attendance

Board members present, absent, and guests were recorded as noted above.

3 - Approval / Amendment of Agenda

Chip Langerak moved to amend the meeting agenda as follows:

- Adding Elections as Item 5
- Moving the Financial Report to Item 6
- Moving the Executive Director's Report to Item 7
- Moving Public Comments to the end as Item 8

Motion: Chip Langerak | Second: Brandi Newton | Vote: Approved unanimously

4 - Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes

Brandi Newton moved to defer approval of the July 14, 2026, meeting minutes until a formal version is available for review.

Motion: Brandi Newton | Second: Justin Morris | Vote: Approved unanimously

Agenda Items

5 - Elections (Added per agenda amendment)

Chip Langerak moved to elect Matt Jacobsen as the new President of the Board of Directors, effective immediately. Chip Langerak will transition into the role of Past President; the Board will determine the full responsibilities and scope of that position.

Motion: Chip Langerak | Second: Brandi Newton | Vote: Approved unanimously

6 - Financial Report | Presenter: Brandi Newton, Treasurer

Brandi Newton reviewed the June 30, 2026, financials with the Board.

Motion: Brandi Newton moved to approve the financials as presented | Second: Matt Jacobsen | Vote: Approved unanimously

7 - Executive Director's Report | Presenter: Kerry Hammon, Executive Director

Update on organizational activities, programs, and initiatives since the last meeting:

- **501(c)(3) Foundation Update** (Geetika Gupta): Working with an artist to explore bringing two new art pieces downtown and identifying prime locations for installation. Work continues on the utility box wrapping project; applications are currently open for artists interested in having their artwork featured on downtown utility boxes.
- **Food Truck Committee:** Kerry Hammon will establish a committee for downtown food trucks, with Gray Augustus serving as the committee lead.
- **Way-Finding Signage:** Kerry is working on improving downtown way-finding signage to make navigation easier for visitors.
- **BID Advisory Group:** Kerry is working with the BID Advisory Group, which plans to meet twice monthly.
- **Parking Initiative:** The parking initiative is progressing. Kerry is actively utilizing the data system to analyze parking statistics and generate analytical reports.
- **Budget and Beautification:** The budget will be a primary focus. The Executive Board will review the budget prior to presenting it to the full Board. In October, Kerry will present quotes for the beautification project.
- **Events:** Footloose is going very well with high attendance; partnership and continuation with the program will continue.

8 - City of Idaho Falls Update | Presenters: Lisa Farris and Jim Francis

- **Facade Funds** (Lisa Farris): City Council approved \$32,000 for 2026 facade funds for new projects, with several signage projects currently in progress.
- **Parking Violations** (Jim Francis): Jim Francis is working with the City Attorney to establish a formal process for collecting outstanding parking tickets.

9 - Announcements

Board member announcements, upcoming events, and community updates.

10 - Next Meeting Date

Confirmed: Tuesday, September 8, 2026 - 9:00 AM - Idaho Falls Arts Council (IFAC)

11 - Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:10 AM.

Board Action Items Summary

Board Action - Item 3: Approval / Amendment of Agenda

Motion: Chip Langerak Second: Brandi Newton Vote: Approved unanimously

Board Action - Item 4: Defer Approval of July 14, 2026, Minutes

Motion: Brandi Newton Second: Justin Morris Vote: Approved unanimously

Board Action - Item 5: Election of Matt Jacobsen as Board President

Motion: Chip Langerak Second: Brandi Newton Vote: Approved unanimously

Board Action - Item 6: Approval of June 30, 2026, Financials

Motion: Brandi Newton Second: Matt Jacobsen Vote: Approved unanimously

Action Items

Action Item	Responsible Party	Due
Establish Food Truck Committee	Kerry Hammon	TBD
Lead Food Truck Committee	Gray Augustus	TBD
Executive Board to review budget before full Board presentation	Executive Board	Prior to next meeting
Present beautification project quotes	Kerry Hammon	October 2026
Establish formal process for collecting outstanding parking tickets	Jim Francis / City Attorney	TBD



MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable Mayor and Council

FROM: Wade Sanner, Community Development Services Director

DATE: October 7, 2026

RE: October 6, 2026, Planning Commission Action

Planning Commission took the following action during the October 6, 2026, meeting.

1. **ANX26-009: ANNEXATION and INITIAL ZONING of I&M, Industrial and Manufacturing for approximately .440 acres in the SW ¼ of Section 36, Township 2 North, Range 37 East.** Located north of W 65th South, east of S 15th West, and south of Professional Way. On October 6, 2026, the Planning Commission unanimously voted to recommend approval of the annexation and initial zoning of I&M to the Mayor and City Council as presented.
2. **ANX26-010: ANNEXATION and INITIAL ZONING of R3, Multiple Dwelling Residential with the Controlled Development Airport Overlay Zone for approximately 35.867 acres in the SE ¼ of Section 23 and the NE ¼ of Section 26, Township 2 North, Range 37 East.** Located north of W 17th South, east of Grizzly Avenue, south of Pancheri Drive, and west of S Skyline Drive. On October 6, 2026, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of the annexation and initial zoning of R2 along the northern part of the annexation and with R3 along the southern portion to the Mayor and City Council with a vote of 4 to 3.
3. **PLT26-025: FINAL PLAT for Harvest Village Division No. 1. SE ½ of the SW ¼ of Section 30, Township 2 North, Range 38 East.** Located north of E 65th North, east of Glen Abby Lane, south of Commons Road, and west of the Idaho Canal. On October 6, 2026, the Planning Commission unanimously voted to recommend approval of the final plat to the Mayor and City Council as presented.
4. **PLT26-026: PRELIMINARY PLAT for EZ Exteriors Division No. 1. SW ¼ of Section 36, Township 2 North, Range 37 East.** Located north of W 65th South, east of S 15th West, south of Professional Way, and west of S Yellowstone Avenue. On October 6, 2026, the Planning Commission unanimously voted to approve of the preliminary plat as presented.

5. **RZN26-005: REZONE from RE, Residential Estate to RP, Residential Park. 1.062 Acres in the NE Corner of the NE ¼ of the SE ¼ of Section 31, Township 2 North, Range 38 East.** Located north of Castlerock Lane, east of Canterbury Way, south of Kinswood Street, and west of S Holmes Avenue. On October 6, 2026, the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of the rezone from RE to RP to the Mayor and City Council as presented with a vote of 5 to 1.
6. **RZN26-006: REZONE from LC, Limited Commercial to RMH, Residential Mobile Home Zone. SE ¼ of Section 6, Township 2 North, Range 38 East.** Located north of E 33rd North, east of N Boulevard, south of the Hatch Pit, and west of N 5th East. On October 6, 2026, the Planning Commission unanimously voted to recommend approval of the rezone from LC to RMH to the Mayor and City Council as presented.

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION: To receive recommendation(s) from the Planning and Zoning Commission pursuant to the Local Land Use Planning Act (LLUPA).



PROCLAMATION

- WHEREAS, by an October 6, 1964, joint resolution by the U.S. Congress, October 15 is designated as the day celebrating the independence, achievements, and safety of individuals who are blind or visually impaired; and
- WHEREAS, the white cane has become a symbol in society identifying individuals who are blind or visually impaired; and
- WHEREAS, White Cane Safety Day provides an opportunity to educate the public about the significance of the white cane to blind or visually impaired individuals and the importance of pedestrian safety and the rights of individuals traveling with white canes, or guide dogs; and
- WHEREAS, the white cane, and guide dog, allow blind or visually impaired persons to move freely and safely from place to place, making it possible to fully participate in and contribute to our community; and
- WHEREAS, the white cane, and guide dog, which every blind citizen has the right to utilize, demonstrates and symbolizes independence; and
- WHEREAS, Idaho law calls upon employers, both public and private, to be aware of and utilize the employment skills of our blind citizens by recognizing their productive capacities; and
- WHEREAS, Idaho law also requires that motorists and cyclists exercise appropriate caution when approaching a blind person carrying a white cane or utilizing a guide dog; and
- WHEREAS, the City of Idaho Falls would like to recognize the efforts of the National Federation of the Blind of Idaho Snake River Valley Chapter for their advocacy efforts and in promoting the safety, welfare, and independence of blind persons in our community.

NOW THEREFORE, I, LISA BURTENSHAW, MAYOR of the City of Idaho Falls, do hereby proclaim October 15, 2026, to be

White Cane Safety Awareness Day

in the City of Idaho Falls and encourage this community to promote accessibility, celebrate independence, and recognize the rights and contributions of our blind or visually impaired community members.



IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the City of Idaho Falls to be affixed on this 9th day of October Two Thousand Twenty-six.

Lisa Burtenshaw

Lisa Burtenshaw, Mayor
City of Idaho Falls

Memorandum

DATE: Thursday, October 8, 2026

AGENDA: Work Session

FROM: Wade Sanner, Director

DEPARTMENT: Community Development
Services

File # 26-406

Title

Starter Home Subdivision Code Revision review (30)

Council direction to staff (or take other appropriate action)

Description, Background Information, Purpose:

The Idaho Legislature passed Senate Bill No. 1352 relating to housing, which establishes provisions for starter home subdivisions. The legislation prohibits cities from enacting or enforcing ordinances that ban starter home subdivisions within residential zoning areas under their jurisdiction.

On August 27 and September 22, 2026, the City of Idaho Falls Starter Home Subdivision Committee met to discuss the legislation and assisted in developing an ordinance with staff to address the new requirements. The attached ordinance reflects the committee's work and recommendations for implementation within the City of Idaho Falls.

This item has been reviewed by the Mayor's Office.

11-2-3: ALLOWED USES IN RESIDENTIAL ZONES.

Table 11-2-1: Allowed Uses in Residential Zones

P = permitted use. C1 = administrative conditional use. C2 = Board of Adjustment conditional use. C3 = City Council conditional use. A blank denotes a use that is not allowed in that zone. *Indicates uses that are subject to specific land use provisions set forth in the Standards for Allowed Land Uses Section of this Chapter.								
	Residential							
Proposed Land Use Classification	RE	RP	R1	R2	TN	RMH	R3	R3A
Accessory Use	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Agriculture*	P							
Animal Care Clinic*					P*			P
Artist Studio					P*			
Bed and Breakfast*								P
Boarding /Rooming House							P	P
Day Care, Center*	C ₂	C ₂	C ₂	P	P		P	P
Day Care, Group*	C ₁	C ₁	C ₁	P	P	C ₁	P	P
Day Care, Home	C ₁	C ₁	C ₁	P	P	C ₁	P	P
Dwelling, Accessory Unit*	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Dwelling, Multi-Unit*				P*	P		P	P
Dwelling, Multi-Unit Attached*				P	P		P	P
Dwelling, Single Unit Attached*			P	P	P	P	P	P
Dwelling, Single Unit Detached	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Dwelling, Two Unit				P	P		P	P
Eating Establishment, Limited					P*			P
Financial Institutions					P*			P
Food Processing, Small Scale					P*			P
Food Store					P*			P
Fuel Station					P*			
Health Care and Social Services					P*			P
Home Occupation*	C ₁	C ₁	C ₁	C ₁	C ₁	C ₁	C ₁	C ₁
Information Technology								P
Live-Work*					C ₁			P
Manufactured Home*	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Mobile Home Park*						P		C ₂
Mortuary								P
Park and Recreation Facility*	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Parking Facility								P
Personal Service					P*			P
Planned Unit Development*	C ₃	C ₃	C ₃	C ₃	C ₃	C ₃	C ₃	C ₃
Professional Service					P			P
Public Service Facility*	C ₂	C ₂	C ₂	C ₂	C ₂	C ₂	C ₂	C ₂
Public Service Facility, Limited	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Public Service Use								P
Recreational Vehicle Park*						P		

Proposed Land Use Classification	RE	RP	R1	R2	TN	RMH	R3	R3A
Religious Institution*	C ₂	C ₂	C ₂	C ₂	C ₂	C ₂	C ₂	C ₂
Residential Care Facility							P	P
Retail					P*			C ₂
School	C ₂	C ₂	C ₂	C ₂	C ₂	C ₂	C ₂	C ₂
Short Term Rental*	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Starter Home Subdivision	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Transit Station								P

(Ord. 3218, 9-13-18) (Ord. 3358, 12-10-20) (Ord. 3451, 3-31-22) (Ord. 3458, 4-14-22)

(Ord. 3496, 12-8-22) (Ord.3574, 6-13-24) (Ord. 3619, 7-31-25)

11-2-4: ALLOWED USES IN COMMERCIAL ZONES.

Table 11-2-2: Allowed Uses in Commercial Zones

P = permitted use. C1 = administrative conditional use. C2 = Board of Adjustment conditional use. C3 = City Council conditional use. A blank denotes a use that is not allowed in that zone.					
*Indicates uses that are subject to specific land use provisions set forth in the Standards for Allowed Land Uses Section of this Chapter.					
	Commercial				
Proposed Land Use Classification	PB	CC	LC	HC	PT
Accessory Use	P	P	P	P	P
Accessory Use, Fuel Station*		P	P	P	
Accessory Use, Storage Yard*		P	P	P	
Amusement Center, Indoor		P	P	P	
Amusement Center, Indoor Shooting Range*		P	P	P	
Amusement Center, Outdoor*				P	
Animal Care Clinic*	P	P	P	P	
Animal Care Facility*				P	
Bed and Breakfast*		P	P		P
Boarding /Rooming House		P	P		P
Building Material, Garden and Farm Supplies			P	P	
Cemetery*		C ₂	C ₂	C ₂	
Club*		P	P	P	
Communication Facility		P	P	P	
Day Care, all Types*	P	P	P	P	P
Drinking Establishment		P		P	
Drive-through Establishment *	P*	P	P	P	P
Dry Cleaning				P	
Dwelling, Accessory Unit *		P	P	P	P
Dwelling, Multi-Unit*		P	P		P
Dwelling, Multi-Unit Attached*		P	P		P
Dwelling, Single Unit Attached*			P		
Dwelling, Single Unit Detached			P		
Dwelling, Two Unit			P		P
Eating Establishment		P	P	P	P
Eating Establishment, Limited	P	P	P	P	P
Financial Institutions	P	P	P	P	P
Entertainment and Cultural Facilities	P	P	P	P	P
Equipment Sales, Rental and Services			P	P	
Food Processing, Small Scale				P	
Food Store		P	P	P	P
Health Care and Social Services	P	P	P	P	P
Higher Education Center		P	P	P	P
Home Occupation*	P	P	P	P	P
Hospital*	C ₂	C ₂	C ₂	C ₂	C ₂

Proposed Land Use Classification	PB	CC	LC	HC	PT
Industry, Craftsman	P	P	P	P	
Industry, Light		P		P	
Information Technology	P	P	P	P	P
Live-Work*	C ₂	P	P	P	P
Lodging Facility		P	P	P	P
Mortuary				P	P
Parking Facility		P	P	P	P
Pawn Shop		P			
Personal Service	P	P	P	P	P
Professional Service	P	P	P	P	P
Planned Unit Development*		C ₃	C ₃		C ₃
Public Service Facility*	C ₂	C ₂	C ₂	C ₂	C ₂
Public Service Facility, Limited	P	P	P	P	P
Public Service Use	P	P	P	P	P
Recreation Vehicle Park*				P	
Religious Institution*		P	P	P	P
Residential Care Facility	P	P	P	P	P
Retail		P	P	P	P
School		P	P	P	P
Short Term Rental*		P	P		P
Fuel Station		P	P	P	
Fuel Station, Super		C ₂	P	P	
Starter Home Subdivision		P	P		
Storage Facility, Indoor		P	P	P	P
Storage Facility, Outdoor				P	
Storage Yard*				P	
Transit Station		P	P	P	P
Vehicle Body Shop				P	
Vehicle Repair and Service		P	P	P	
Vehicle Sales, Rental and Service		P		P	
Vehicle Washing Facility		C ₂	C ₂	P	

(Ord. 3210, 8-23-18) (Ord. 3218, 9-13-18) (Ord. 3233, 12-20-18) (Ord 3277, 10-10-19)
(Ord. 3358, 12-10-20) (Ord. 3451, 3-31-22) (Ord. 3574, 6-13-24)

11-2-6: STANDARDS FOR ALLOWED LAND USES.

(A) Accessory Use, Fuel Station

(B) Accessory Use, Storage Yard

(C) Adult Business

(D) Agriculture

(E) Amusement Center, Indoor Shooting Range

- (F) Amusement Center, Outdoor
- (G) Animal Care Clinic
- (H) Animal Care Facility
- (I) Bed and Breakfast
- (J) Cemetery
- (K) Club, and Religious Institution
- (L) Day Care, Center and Day Care, Group
- (M) Drive-through Establishment
- (N) Dwelling, Accessory Unit
- (O) Dwelling, Multi-Unit
- (P) Dwelling, Single Unit Attached
- (Q) Hazards and Nuisances
- (R) Home Occupations
- (S) Hospital
- (T) Live-Work
- (U) Manufactured Home outside a Manufactured Home Community
- (V) Mobile Home Park
- (W) Planned Unit Development
- (X) Public Service Facility
- (Y) Recreation Vehicle Park
- (Z) Salvage Yard & Recycling Centers
- (AA) Short Term Rental
- [\(BB\) Starter Home Subdivisions](#)
- ~~(CC)~~ ~~(BB)~~ Storage Yards
- ~~(DD)~~ ~~(CC)~~ Temporary Construction
- ~~(EE)~~ ~~(DD)~~ Temporary Land Use
- (P) Dwelling, Single Unit Attached, ~~and Multi-Unit Attached.~~

(1) Every lot upon which an attached dwelling is located shall have frontage upon a dedicated public street.

(2) No attached dwelling shall be located above another dwelling unit, either in whole or part.

(3) Each attached dwelling shall have at least one (1) direct pedestrian access from the interior of the dwelling to the exterior boundaries of the lot. ~~No pedestrian access to an attached dwelling unit may be held in common with any other attached dwelling unit.~~

(4) Except as noted below, an attached dwelling shall have no facilities or property in common with

any other attached dwelling and all such dwelling units shall be structurally and functionally

independent from another. All attached dwellings shall have separate electrical service, water

service lines and sanitary sewer service lines from all other of such dwellings. Common facilities

or property are allowed for the following:

(a) Common party walls constructed in accordance with the International Building Code.

(b) Foundations supporting attached or party walls.

(c) Flashing at the termination of the roof covering any attached walls.

(d) Roofs.

(e) Vehicular access to a dedicated street from off-street parking facilities or garages.

(5) Reserved. ~~No building permit shall be issued for the construction of an attached dwelling unless a common facilities agreement or party wall agreement for Declaration of Condominium has been filed~~

~~with the Bonneville County Recorder's Office for each such dwelling which shares common~~

~~facilities with another unit. Such agreement shall include a legal description of the lots sharing~~

~~common facilities and shall allocate responsibility between the owners of such lots the use,~~

~~maintenance, and ownership of all common facilities.~~

(6) All attached dwellings shall meet the dwelling unit separation requirements of the officially

adopted and applicable building codes of Idaho Falls.

(7) A lot upon which an attached dwelling is located need not comply with the zone's minimum area and width requirements, provided such lot complies with the zone's location of buildings.

- (8) The gross density of attached dwellings shall not exceed the density allowed in the zone where it is located. Public rights-of-way shall be excluded when calculating gross density.
- (9) An interior attached dwelling shall be allowed to increase the maximum lot coverage by ten percent (10%).

(BB) Starter Home Subdivisions

- (1) Purpose. A residential subdivision that is designed to provide small lots and compact home sizes.
- (2) General Requirements
- (a) Starter Home Subdivisions shall be a permitted use in all zones that permit residential uses.
 - (b) Shall apply to parcel(s) that are four (4) acres or larger in all residential zones planned as one development. If located in the following zones, the minimum acreage can be reduced to 2 acres: R2, TN, R3, R3A, RMH, LC or CC.
 - (c) Permitted uses shall be Dwelling, Single Unit Detached or Dwelling, Single Unit Attached.
 - (i) In the CC Zone, Dwelling, Single Unit Detached or Single Unit Attached shall only be permitted in the Starter Home Subdivision.
 - (ii) In the RE and RP Zones, only Dwelling, Single Unit Detached shall be permitted, per the underlying zone.
 - (d) Front setback shall be a minimum fifteen (15) feet, the rear setback a minimum ten (10) feet and the side setback shall be a minimum five (5) feet.
 - a. The rear yard setback may be reduced to three feet (3') on lots in any residential zone in which the rear yard is contiguous to a public or private alley.
 - (e) Lot sizes shall be sized in order to accommodate the required setbacks. If a corner lot, the lot will accommodate two (2) front setbacks for each public right of way of fifteen (15) ft.
 - (f) Maximum lot coverage for Starter Home Subdivisions shall be eighty (80) percent, which will only include those areas under roofs.
 - (g) Maximum density shall be 15 units per gross acre or the density of the underlying zone if greater.
 - (h) Parking Requirements:

- a. Parking shall be two parking spaces per lot, at the standard parking stall size of ten (10) feet width by twenty (20) feet in length. Parking may be tandem on an approved driveway that leads to either a garage or a parking stall behind the front setback
- b. If a private alley is included on or adjacent to the lot, parking may be reduced to one parking stall accessed from the private alley.
- (i) Accessory Structures on lots in Starter Home Subdivisions shall have the following setbacks if the accessory structure wall height is less than twelve (12) feet, it can have a fifteen (15) front setback and a zero (0) rear and side setback. If the wall height is greater than twelve (12) feet, it must follow the primary setbacks of Starter Home Subdivisions as outlined in this code. An accessory structure contributes to the maximum lot coverage.
- (j) Height requirements shall be the height requirements per the underlying zone.
- (k) Approval Process. Starter Home Subdivisions will follow the platting process as outlined in the Subdivision Ordinance.

11-7-1: DEFINITIONS.

Starter Home Subdivision: A residential subdivision that is designed for compact home sizes on small lots that have frontage on a public street.

Dwelling Unit A single unit providing complete independent and self-contained living facilities for one (1) or more persons, including permanent provisions for living, sleeping, eating, cooking and sanitation, ~~A structure(s) designed for or occupied exclusively by one (1) "household," for living or sleeping purposes and having one (1) kitchen or set of cooking facilities~~ or group residence in which eight (8) or fewer unrelated persons with disabilities, elderly persons, or minors when in a facility licensed by the State of Idaho and who are supervised at the group residence in connection with their disability or age related infirmity under the following conditions: 1. Resident staff, if employed, need not be related to each other or to any of the persons with disabilities, elderly persons, or minors residing in the group residence 2. No more than two (2) of such staff shall reside in the dwelling at any one time. The term dwelling does not include boarding /rooming house, lodging, residential care facility or recreational vehicle.

~~**Dwelling, Multi Unit Attached** A structure containing more than two (2) dwelling units attached by a~~

~~common wall or walls, where each dwelling unit is located on a separate lot and each unit has open space on at least two (2) sides.~~

Dwelling, Single Unit Attached A structure containing dwelling units where each dwelling is attached to another single-unit dwelling(s) by a firewall(s) that extends from foundation to roof. ~~A structure containing three (3) dwelling units attached by a common wall or walls, where each dwelling unit is located on a separate lot.~~

Dwelling, Single Unit Detached: A structure consisting of only a single one (1) dwelling unit separated from all other dwelling units by open space.

Dwelling, Two-Unit A structure consisting of two (2) dwelling units which may either be attached side by side or one (1) above the other, where all such units are located on the same property and not separated by a firewall and not capable of separate ownership.

Dwelling, Multi-Unit A structure(s), or portion thereof, that contains ~~four (4)~~ three (3) or more dwelling units, where all such units are located on the same property.

Live-Work Unit A property designed for principal non-residential uses, allowed in the zone where the use(s) is located, and where accessory residential dwelling uses are permitted. The non-residential use(s) is for the use of the vocation of the resident of the dwelling unit(s). ~~The use of a site for commercial or small scale manufacturing activity and dwelling unit(s) located within, near or contiguous to the working space.~~

LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF IDAHO
Sixty-eighth Legislature Second Regular Session - 2026

IN THE SENATE

SENATE BILL NO. 1352, As Amended

BY STATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

AN ACT

RELATING TO HOUSING; AMENDING CHAPTER 65, TITLE 67, IDAHO CODE, BY THE ADDITION OF A NEW SECTION 67-6541, IDAHO CODE, TO ESTABLISH PROVISIONS REGARDING STARTER HOME SUBDIVISIONS AND TO PROVIDE A DEFINITION; PROVIDING SEVERABILITY; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Be It Enacted by the Legislature of the State of Idaho:

SECTION 1. That Chapter 65, Title 67, Idaho Code, be, and the same is hereby amended by the addition thereto of a NEW SECTION, to be known and designated as Section 67-6541, Idaho Code, and to read as follows:

67-6541. STARTER HOME SUBDIVISIONS. (1) No city shall enact or enforce any ordinance within its jurisdiction that bans starter home subdivisions in any residential zoning area. "Starter home subdivision" means a residential subdivision on at least four (4) acres of land that is designed to provide attainable homeownership opportunities with single-family detached dwellings on smaller lots that are no greater than one thousand five hundred (1,500) square feet per lot, have compact home sizes, and have efficient site design that reduces development costs while maintaining compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods.

(2) By February 1, 2027, by resolution or ordinance adopted, amended, or repealed in accordance with the notice and hearing procedures provided in section 67-6509, Idaho Code, each city governing board shall amend its comprehensive plan and land use regulations to allow starter home subdivisions in residential zoning districts, except for lands falling within an area defined as a historic district in section 67-4607, Idaho Code, or designated as a historic property pursuant to section 67-4614, Idaho Code. For starter home subdivisions, a city's comprehensive plan and land use regulations shall be amended to:

(a) Prohibit requiring minimum lot sizes exceeding one thousand five hundred (1,500) square feet for lots located in starter home subdivisions unless infrastructure limitations, lot configuration, or environmental constraints make it unfeasible;

(b) Prohibit requiring front or rear setbacks exceeding fifteen (15) feet or side setbacks exceeding five (5) feet for a primary residential structure on a lot, provided, however, that setbacks along the perimeter of a project may be required to match setbacks of abutting zoning districts;

(c) Prohibit requiring lot front widths exceeding thirty (30) feet for narrow lots;

(d) Prohibit requiring lot depths exceeding seventy (70) feet, unless overall lot shape, topography, or environmental or infrastructure constraints require it; and

1 (e) Prohibit imposing permit fees, development impact fees, or util-
2 ity connection fees for starter home subdivisions exceeding those that
3 would be imposed on other single-family home subdivisions. A local
4 government may provide incentives to builders through fee reductions or
5 waivers for compliance with smaller lot and setback options.

6 (3) The provisions of this section shall not supersede state or local
7 laws that protect public health, safety, and welfare, including:

8 (a) Building codes, fire safety standards, and flood plain regula-
9 tions;

10 (b) Laws regarding water, sewer, storm drainage, road access, roadway
11 classifications or conditions, infrastructure capacity constraints,
12 and utility services necessary to support the required density;

13 (c) Laws regarding environmental hazards, aquifer recharge zones,
14 steep slopes, or critical habitat protections; and

15 (d) Laws and regulations regarding setback requirements for rights-of-
16 way and easements.

17 (4) The provisions of this section shall apply only to cities with a
18 population greater than ten thousand (10,000).

19 (5) Cities may condition or deny approval of a starter home subdivision
20 where the city determines that existing or planned infrastructure is inade-
21 quate to support the subdivision, to the same extent and under the same stan-
22 dards the city applies to other residential subdivisions.

23 (6) Nothing in this section shall prohibit a city from enacting regula-
24 tions, standards, or conditions that are less restrictive than the require-
25 ments provided in this section.

26 SECTION 2. SEVERABILITY. The provisions of this act are hereby declared
27 to be severable and if any provision of this act or the application of such
28 provision to any person or circumstance is declared invalid for any reason,
29 such declaration shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of
30 this act.

31 SECTION 3. An emergency existing therefor, which emergency is hereby
32 declared to exist, this act shall be in full force and effect on and after
33 July 1, 2026.



City of Idaho Falls Starter Home Subdivision Committee Minutes

Thursday, August 27,

12:00

Annex Conference

MEMBERS PRESENT: Council President Jim Francis; Brian Cunningham, Assistant PW Director; Forrest Ihler, Planning Commission Chair; Matthew Meehan, Planning Commission Vice-Chair; Heather McBride, Ammon Assistant Planner; Heidi Boyle, Ammon Council Member; Barry Bame, Krossroads Engineering; Steve Heath, Mountain West Engineering; Aaron O'Connor, RPI Construction; Jeremy Westwood, Alta Project Services; Neil Humphreys, Eagle Rock Engineering

MEMBERS ABSENT: Councilor Brandon Lee; Luke Bloxham, Bloxham Realty

ALSO PRESENT: Kerry Beutler, Assistant Planning Director; Wade Sanner, Planning Director; Caitlin Long, Planner; Ann Peterson, Recording Secretary

CALL TO ORDER: Beutler called the meeting to order at 12:15 p.m.

STARTER HOME SUBDIVISION: Senate Bill No. 1352 – Starter Home Subdivision

Staff discussed the implementation of Senate Bill No. 1352, which is required to be implemented by February 1, 2027. The bill defines a “starter home subdivision” as a residential subdivision on at least four (4) acres of land designed to provide attainable homeownership opportunities through single-family detached dwellings on smaller lots. Lots may be no greater than 1,500 square feet, with compact home sizes and efficient site design intended to reduce development costs while maintaining compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods. The provisions will apply to all residential zoning districts throughout the City.

The statute establishes the following requirements for a starter home subdivision:

- Minimum of four (4) acres of land.
- Single-family detached dwellings.
- Maximum lot size of 1,500 square feet.
- Front and rear setbacks may not exceed 15 feet.
- Side setbacks may not exceed 5 feet.
- Lot widths may not exceed 30 feet.
- Lot depths may not exceed 70 feet.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:

The Committee discussed the proposed requirements for setbacks, public utility easements (PUEs), and lot sizes for starter home subdivisions. It was clarified that no portion of a structure may be located within a 15-foot easement. Questions were raised regarding whether eaves could encroach into the easement and how the easement requirement would affect the practical front setback. Although the City cannot require a minimum front setback greater than 15 feet, a structure must still remain outside of a

PUE, which could result in an effective setback of 16 feet or more depending on the location of the easement.

The Committee also discussed the apparent contradiction in the state statute regarding lot sizes. One section states that lots may be “no greater than 1,500 square feet,” while another provision indicates that cities cannot require minimum lot sizes exceeding 1,500 square feet. It was noted that the State has been asked to provide an interpretation, and the language may allow lots as small as 1,500 square feet rather than establishing 1,500 square feet as an absolute maximum. Several members expressed concern that, without a maximum lot size, the purpose of the starter home subdivision provisions could be undermined. For example, allowing substantially larger lots, such as 3,000 or 4,000 square feet, could make the development comparable to standard zoning rather than achieving the intended goal of smaller, more attainable lots. The Committee generally agreed that if maximum lot sizes are established, they should be carefully considered and potentially set at a larger threshold to provide flexibility.

It was also noted that, with the Planned Unit Development (PUD) ordinance potentially being removed, these provisions may be used in various ways to provide flexibility similar to what was previously available through the PUD process. The Committee discussed the importance of maintaining flexibility within the proposed starter home subdivision standards. City staff may be asked to remove the Planned Unit Development (PUD) provisions from the code; however, this does not necessarily mean the PUD process will be permanently eliminated. Additional public hearings and discussion will be required, and the final decision may result in a revised or replacement process. It was explained that the intent of revising the PUD process is to address concerns regarding inconsistent application, which has created challenges for developers, City Council, and the community. The goal is to improve and clarify the process rather than eliminate development flexibility altogether.

The Committee also discussed whether perimeter buffering, or additional setbacks should be required where starter homes are adjacent to existing residential development. Staff noted that the city does not typically require buffers between detached single-unit residential uses, regardless of lot size or residential zoning district. Buffering between residential uses has primarily been required through the PUD process. Because starter homes would consist of detached single-unit structures and would be permitted within existing residential zones, staff indicated that additional buffering may not be necessary when the development is adjacent to similar residential uses. It was clarified that starter homes could be developed adjacent to, or within, an R1 zone, provided all applicable development standards are met. The proposed use would not create a separate zoning district but would instead be a permitted use within the City's residential use tables.

The Committee expressed concern about eliminating the PUD process before a replacement process is established. They emphasized the importance of ensuring developers are not left without a mechanism for flexible development while the City develops new regulations.

The proposed state requirements do not specifically address density or lot coverage, meaning those and other applicable development regulations would still need to be considered as part of the development process. Additional development standards that could create challenges for starter home subdivisions are parking requirements. Current City standards generally require two parking spaces per dwelling unit. Tandem parking is not permitted, on-street parking does not count toward the required

parking spaces for residential uses, and parking within the front setback is only permitted in an approved driveway leading to a parking space. It was also clarified that a garage may count as a parking space; however, a garage space and a parking space directly behind it cannot both be counted toward the parking requirement. Participants identified parking as a significant issue for smaller lots. Some suggested that tandem parking, particularly a garage with a vehicle parked in the driveway behind it, should be allowed for this type of development. It was noted that tandem parking is common in some existing neighborhoods and has previously been allowed through certain PUD approvals without significant issues. Staff explained that many of the development standards being discussed, including certain street, utility, power, and public works requirements, fall outside the direct authority of Planning and Zoning. Changes to those standards would require coordination with other City departments. However, the zoning standards under the authority of Community Development Services, including density, lot coverage, and certain parking requirements, could be evaluated and amended.

The Committee emphasized that simply adopting the minimum state requirements without addressing other local development standards could make starter home subdivisions impractical. For example, retaining a density limit of six units per acre in an R1 zone could prevent the efficient development of 1,500-square-foot lots. Similarly, existing lot coverage requirements could significantly limit the size of a structure on a small lot. The purpose of the working group is to identify these barriers and determine what adjustments may be necessary to create a development option that is both compliant with state law and practically achievable.

Staff asked whether they had previously developed lots of a similar size and whether there is market demand for this type of housing. Developers indicated that some of the smallest lots they had developed were approximately 3,000 to 6,500 square feet, including smaller twin home and “skinny” home products. Participants generally agreed that developing detached homes on lots between approximately 3,000 and 4,000 square feet would make it difficult to accommodate a garage while also meeting applicable setback and parking requirements.

One developer noted that approximately 5,000 square feet was the smallest lot size they had found practical for a particular housing product due to side setback requirements. Another participant identified lot coverage requirements as one of the largest barriers in developing smaller lots.

The Committee also discussed whether a detached single-family home without a garage would be marketable in Idaho Falls. Some participants expressed concern that buyers may expect a garage, particularly for a single-family detached home. Others noted that marketability could depend heavily on the price point, and a smaller two-bedroom, two-bath home without a garage could appeal to buyers if offered at an affordable price.

Participants questioned the rationale for prohibiting tandem parking and discussed whether vehicles parked in a driveway behind a garage should count toward the required parking spaces. Staff explained that the current restrictions were developed in response to concerns and complaints regarding vehicles parked improperly, double parking, parking in front of neighboring properties, and vehicles blocking sidewalks due to short driveways. It was noted, however, that tandem parking has been permitted in some PUD developments and has not appeared to create significant problems. Several participants supported reconsidering the prohibition for starter home developments, particularly because providing two separate non-tandem parking spaces on a very small lot may be impractical. Small-lot

developments in Texas, including homes as small as approximately 300 to 600 square feet on lots of approximately 1,300 square feet were reviewed. In those examples, parking was accommodated within the front setback area. Staff noted that allowing this approach locally could create additional challenges, as a deeper setback may be necessary to ensure parked vehicles do not block the sidewalk.

Rear-loaded housing with private alleys was discussed as another potential solution for parking and access. Participants noted that this approach could provide space for parking while allowing the front of the homes to maintain a more attractive residential appearance. However, rear-loaded development would require both a public street and an alley, potentially reducing the number of units that could be developed and increasing infrastructure requirements. It was noted that alleys can also provide an additional location for utilities, including power, water, secondary irrigation, and stormwater infrastructure. This can be an advantage where limited space is available within the public street right-of-way. A width of approximately 26 feet may be required where the alley is needed for fire access; however, the fire code may allow a narrower, approximately 20-foot alley where emergency response access is not necessary because adequate access is provided from the public street. Participants noted that similar parking and access challenges have been encountered in other local developments, including River Hollow, and suggested that those experiences may provide useful examples as the city evaluates standards for starter home subdivisions. Participants discussed alley design requirements, including the need for a hard-surfaced alley and adequate drainage. Because starter home developments would not be developed through the PUD process, private streets would not be an option. Any development would need to be designed around public street standards. Where a property abuts an alley, the applicable setback may be reduced to three feet, providing additional flexibility for building placement. One suggestion was to establish a maximum lot size and require an alley for lots below a certain size. Staff noted that state law may limit the City's ability to require alleys specifically for starter home developments if the City does not impose similar requirements on other residential development. However, due to the challenges associated with accommodating utilities, parking, driveways, and access on smaller lots, the group recognized that smaller lot development may naturally lend itself to a rear-loaded product.

The Committee discussed removing or modifying the prohibition against parking within the front setback. Allowing parking in the front setback could make it possible to accommodate a one-car garage with an additional vehicle parked in the driveway or provide additional guest parking. Staff noted that reducing the required number of parking spaces from two spaces per unit to one may be easier to justify in a rear-loaded development without front curb cuts. In that configuration, more uninterrupted curb space could be available for on-street parking, potentially providing an additional parking option for residents and guests. This could create a reasonable connection between reduced on-site parking requirements and available on-street parking. Conversely, front-loaded development with numerous curb cuts would reduce the amount of available on-street parking. Participants acknowledged that City Council may be less willing to reduce the parking requirement from two spaces to one without a clear alternative for resident and guest parking. It was also noted that only one parking space per unit is currently required in the CC zone. The Committee discussed how the characteristics of the CC zone, including the presence of streets and alleys, may provide an example of how reduced parking requirements can function where on-street parking and rear access are available.

The Committee then reviewed potential development scenarios using example properties to better understand how the proposed standards could work in practice. The first example involved a four-acre property with approximately 225 feet of frontage on Holmes Avenue, an arterial roadway. Because the property fronts an arterial, access would be limited, and only one access point would be available unless additional access could be obtained. Developments exceeding 30 units would generally require a second access point. Participants discussed several potential options, including extending a road north to connect with adjacent properties, extending south to connect with another roadway, or constructing a bridge. However, each option presented significant challenges involving surrounding property ownership, street length limitations, cost, and development feasibility. A cul-de-sac street would also be limited in length and could require additional infrastructure. The group generally concluded that the site would be difficult to develop for this type of starter home product and may not be a practical example. It was noted that a PUD could provide flexibility for narrower roads and alternative layouts; however, even with that flexibility, the site's arterial access limitations would remain. Participants indicated that the site would likely be more difficult to develop as a small-lot single-family subdivision.

A second example consisting of approximately 13 acres with access from Eliza Joy and Alley Rose, both public streets was reviewed. Eliza Joy currently has a 50-foot right-of-way, with the expectation that an additional 10 feet of right-of-way would eventually be dedicated to accommodate sidewalk improvements. Alley Rose was identified as a full public street. Because the property has access to two surrounding public streets, the group discussed whether direct access to individual homes should be limited along certain street frontages. A loop road or other internal circulation system would likely be necessary to provide appropriate access. Participants considered the dimensions of the site and the feasibility of fitting multiple public streets and rows of small lots within the available depth. Based on preliminary calculations, constructing two internal roads could significantly reduce available lot depth. If the remaining property depth were divided among multiple rows of lots, individual lot depths could be less than 100 feet, potentially resulting in lots approximately 75 feet deep. They noted that 75-foot-deep lots could be difficult to develop when accounting for 15-foot front and rear setbacks. At the same time, providing only one internal road could result in excessively deep lots. It was recognized that the additional depth could potentially accommodate a rear alley, allowing for more efficient lot layouts and rear-loaded access. Several potential configurations were discussed, including layouts with three or four rows of lots, frontage along an existing public street, and internal roads or alleys. Some configurations would require a combination of front-loaded and rear-loaded homes.

Existing driveway and curb-cut standards and their impact on small-lot development was reviewed. While local roads such as Eliza Joy do not have the same driveway spacing requirements as arterial roads, other standards still apply. These include limitations on the portion of a lot frontage that may be occupied by driveways, minimum spacing between driveway curb cuts, and required separation between curb cuts and property lines. It was concluded that these requirements would make direct driveway access from a public street extremely difficult on lots as small as 1,500 square feet and challenging even on lots of approximately 3,000 square feet. As lot sizes decrease, rear access or alternative parking arrangements may become increasingly necessary. The Committee agreed that parking requirements remain an important issue for further discussion. Allowing a one-car garage and an additional tandem space in the driveway was identified as one potential option that could provide greater flexibility. Participants also discussed potential layouts using a combination of public streets and

alleys to accommodate multiple rows of smaller lots while maintaining reasonable lot depths and access.

The Committee continued discussing potential site layouts involving public streets and rear alleys. One possible configuration included a public road with alternating lots and alleys; however, participants noted that constructing both a public road and an alley would substantially increase infrastructure costs. It was estimated that the additional road improvements could add approximately \$6,000 to \$8,000 per unit. Several participants emphasized that infrastructure costs must be carefully considered if the goal is to create truly affordable starter homes. Concerns were raised that requiring alleys could increase development costs and ultimately affect home prices. Alternatives discussed included narrower public rights-of-way, allowing on-street parking, or permitting private streets. It was suggested that reducing the width of a public right-of-way could make small-lot development more feasible. A narrower street without on-street parking, combined with rear alley access, could potentially provide a more affordable development option. However, staff noted that the City has previously discussed a 50-foot private road standard and encountered difficulty obtaining support for that approach. The Committee also discussed whether starter home subdivisions could be allowed to use private streets. It was noted that Idaho Falls currently requires lots to have frontage on a public street, although the state statute itself does not specifically require public street frontage. Private roads account for much of the flexibility historically provided through the PUD process and suggested that eliminating the PUD process without considering an alternative for private streets could limit development options.

Discussed was whether private roads would result in lower housing prices. One participant noted that, while private roads may reduce construction costs, those savings may not always translate directly into a lower sales price on a per-square-foot basis. Others emphasized that infrastructure savings become increasingly important when attempting to develop homes at lower price points. While the difference between public and private infrastructure may have less impact on homes selling in the mid-\$300,000 range, every additional cost becomes more significant when the goal is to develop homes priced below \$300,000. One participant provided an example of townhomes selling for approximately \$285,000 that were made possible, in part, through the use of private roads. Private infrastructure may result in ongoing homeowners association fees. An example HOA fee of approximately \$60 per month was discussed, and participants agreed that recurring HOA costs must be considered when evaluating overall housing affordability.

The Committee discussed an appropriate density range for starter home subdivisions, with preliminary consideration given to approximately 12 to 15 units per acre. Participants agreed, however, that increasing the allowable density alone would not solve the development challenges created by existing parking requirements. Under current standards, the two-parking-space-per-unit requirement could significantly limit the number of units that could be developed, regardless of the density allowed. Participants discussed whether parking requirements could be reduced or made more flexible, including a potential requirement of 1.5 spaces per unit or a parking standard based on the number of bedrooms. It was noted that current standards allow reduced parking requirements for certain one-bedroom residential units. It was questioned whether a bedroom-based parking requirement would be practical for detached starter homes, expressing concern that developers could respond by designing rooms as offices or other spaces that could later function as bedrooms. There were also concerns that this approach could encourage efforts to work around the intent of the code.

Participants discussed whether there is sufficient demand for one-bedroom detached homes. They acknowledged that one-bedroom homes do exist and can be affordable, often selling in the high-\$100,000 to low-\$200,000 range. However, the market was generally described as limited. Some participants suggested that many buyers interested in a smaller one-bedroom home may instead choose to rent an apartment with additional amenities. Others noted that there are still individuals who specifically prefer owning a small, detached home rather than renting, including single-person households and older buyers. Overall, the group characterized the demand for one-bedroom detached homes as a niche market. Participants generally agreed that a minimum of two bedrooms would likely appeal to a much broader segment of potential buyers. It was also noted that smaller homes without garages could potentially provide an affordable ownership option, similar to older post-World War II neighborhoods that contain modest homes with relatively simple and efficient floor plans.

The group discussed whether a starter home subdivision could include a mix of one-, two-, and three-bedroom homes and varying lot sizes. From a planning perspective, a mix of housing products, price points, and unit types was viewed favorably because it could create a more diverse neighborhood. Developers noted, however, that mixed housing products can create challenges in subdivision design and construction. Many developments are built around a consistent housing product because standardized lot layouts, road configurations, and construction methods are more efficient. Introducing multiple housing types can result in additional design complexity and unused space. One participant noted that some developments have successfully incorporated several different building types. However, smaller two-bedroom units in one example development struggled in the market. As a result, the developer indicated a preference for avoiding one-bedroom units because of the perceived market risk. It was noted that an earlier phase of the development included a diverse mix of housing products, while a subsequent phase was designed with a more uniform product based on market experience.

The Committee discussed the flexibility needed to make starter home subdivisions financially feasible while still producing homes that meet market demand. One participant noted that a 5,000-square-foot lot can accommodate a three-bedroom, two-bath, approximately 1,500-square-foot home with a two-car garage and described that lot size as an ideal product for the current market. Based on current development costs, participants estimated that reducing lot costs could potentially make it possible to offer a similar home for less than \$300,000. Participants generally identified the \$300,000 to \$315,000 range as an important affordability threshold for many first-time homebuyers. Smaller lots and yards were viewed as acceptable tradeoffs for buyers seeking a single-family home at a lower price point.

The Committee continued to identify parking as one of the primary barriers to smaller lot development. Several participants strongly supported allowing tandem parking and parking within the front setback as alternatives to constructing rear alleys, which can add significant infrastructure costs. One proposed approach would retain the requirement for two parking spaces per unit but provide greater flexibility in how those spaces are accommodated. For example, a one-car garage with a parking space in the driveway could satisfy the two-space requirement. Participants emphasized that changing the configuration of required parking may be more practical than reducing the overall number of required spaces. The group also discussed the City's limitation on the percentage of lot frontage that may be used for driveways. Increasing the allowable driveway width from 50 percent to two-thirds of the lot frontage was identified as another potential option. However, concerns were raised regarding snow storage and removal, particularly where large portions of a small lot are paved. The discussion considered how tandem parking and smaller lot widths could allow development on lots as small as

approximately 2,000 square feet. Participants also discussed expanding the proposed standards to allow attached housing or allowing housing types otherwise permitted in the underlying zoning district. It was noted that the state requirements are intended to facilitate detached housing but may allow local governments to adopt less restrictive standards. Allowing attached housing could provide additional flexibility, improve the ability to meet parking and setback requirements, and potentially reduce construction costs. Participants discussed examples of shared driveways where a narrower driveway entrance widens behind the homes to provide access to garages and additional parking. This approach could reduce the amount of pavement and curb cuts along the street while still accommodating necessary parking. The group also noted that similar development patterns exist in older parts of Idaho Falls, including small original lots, shared driveways, and narrower streets. These existing neighborhoods were identified as examples demonstrating that smaller-lot development is not entirely new to the community.

An existing subdivision outside the City was discussed as an example of smaller single-family lots and homes. The development includes lots generally ranging from approximately 6,000 to 6,500 square feet and demonstrates the potential market demand for smaller single-family homes. One developer explained that they had adapted the design and features of a townhome product into a detached single-family home with a target sales price of approximately \$350,000. The product had performed well, and the developer indicated that they would consider developing a similar product within Idaho Falls if local development standards allowed it. Participants noted that existing zoning, lot coverage, and land costs can make similar development difficult within the City. The group discussed lot coverage as another significant barrier to starter home development. Current lot coverage requirements vary among residential zones, with some zones allowing substantially greater coverage than others. A preliminary recommendation for starter home subdivisions was to allow up to 80 percent lot coverage, which participants believed could provide the flexibility needed to accommodate smaller lots and practical housing designs.

Questions were also raised regarding the type of housing most appropriate for the starter home concept. Participants discussed single-story, slab-on-grade homes, two-story homes, and homes with basements. While smaller one-level homes may appeal to some older buyers, others noted that multi-story homes can make more efficient use of a small lot. Market experience was discussed regarding smaller two-bedroom and one-bedroom homes. Participants indicated that one-bedroom homes serve a limited market and may be more difficult to sell, while two- and three-bedroom homes generally have broader appeal.

The group clarified the distinction between attached garages and attached dwelling units. Participants noted that attaching a garage to a home is generally more cost-effective than constructing a detached garage because a detached garage requires separate foundations, exterior walls, utility connections, and additional construction.

Several participants identified two potential changes that could substantially improve the feasibility of starter home development: allowing tandem parking and allowing attached housing. These changes could provide greater flexibility in site design, reduce infrastructure and construction costs, and make smaller lots more practical. Concerns were also expressed about allowing larger attached housing types, such as fourplexes or sixplexes, under the starter home provisions. Some participants wanted to maintain the intent of creating a neighborhood character similar to traditional single-family development

and avoid using the standards solely as a mechanism for increasing density. As a potential compromise, the group discussed allowing attached housing but limiting it to twin homes or duplexes. This approach could provide some of the cost and land-use efficiencies of attached development while maintaining a lower-density residential appearance. The group noted that the overall intent of the state legislation appears to be reducing housing costs. Participants generally agreed that achieving lower price points may require flexibility beyond detached homes on extremely small lots. While an 800-square-foot or smaller detached home may be possible, there was concern that this type of product may have limited demand in the local market. Participants indicated that attached housing with features such as two-car garages and three bedrooms may better meet current buyer demand while still providing a more attainable price point. They considered whether an approximately 800-square-foot, two-bedroom, single-level home with a one-car garage and driveway could be a viable detached product. Some expressed concern about the marketability and financial risk of offering a one-car garage product, while others believed a smaller, more affordable home could appeal to certain buyers. A significant portion of the discussion focused on whether allowing attached housing would provide the flexibility necessary to make the new regulations successful. Some participants believed that attached units could help address lot size, parking, setbacks, and construction costs. Others expressed concern that, if attached housing were broadly allowed, developers might primarily use the new provisions for attached products rather than the detached single-family homes they believed were the intent of the state legislation. It was clarified that one potential approach would be to allow attached housing only where it is already permitted in the underlying zoning district. This could help avoid creating isolated areas of attached housing while providing additional flexibility in appropriate residential zones. Participants also discussed limiting attached housing to twin homes or duplexes as a possible compromise.

Participants discussed changing housing preferences and the challenges of providing attainable homeownership opportunities. Some noted that many buyers, particularly younger first-time homebuyers, are already purchasing townhomes and attached housing because these products provide one of the more accessible paths into homeownership. Others emphasized that Idaho Falls residents have traditionally preferred detached homes and that some buyers, particularly those looking to downsize, may be reluctant to share a wall with a neighboring unit. However, participants generally agreed that housing preferences and market conditions may continue to change and that long-range planning should consider future housing needs.

The group also discussed broader factors affecting housing affordability, including interest rates, limited housing inventory, and the difficulty many residents face in purchasing homes. Participants noted that housing affordability is influenced by numerous factors and expressed concern that changes to only a few development standards may not, by themselves, substantially improve affordability.

Participants again expressed strong concern about removing the PUD process before a replacement process or alternative development standards are in place. Several participants stated that PUDs currently provide important flexibility for attached housing, private roads, infill development, mixed housing types, and other development configurations that may not be possible under standard zoning. Developers noted that townhomes continue to sell and provide an important housing option, particularly for first-time homebuyers. Some participants believed that eliminating the PUD process without another mechanism for flexible development could significantly reduce the availability of attached and other attainable housing products. It was suggested that the PUD process should be

reformed rather than eliminated outright. A Council representative clarified that no immediate action was being taken to eliminate the PUD process. Rather, the anticipated action would direct staff to begin evaluating and revising the regulations. The stated goal was to develop clearer standards that better reflect Council expectations and provide a more predictable process for both developers and the City. Participants discussed whether clearer, objective standards could reduce the need for a discretionary hearing process. One suggestion was to establish specific development standards that developers could meet by right, allowing projects that comply with those standards to move forward without uncertainty over discretionary requirements.

The Committee discussed the requirement that sellable lots have frontage on a public street. Participants noted that this requirement is one of the primary reasons many developments currently use the PUD process, particularly where private roads are proposed. It was suggested that removing or revising the public street frontage requirement could significantly reduce the number of developments needing a PUD. Private roads can allow more efficient site layouts by reducing the amount of land dedicated to public rights-of-way and providing flexibility for townhomes, twin homes, single-family homes, and mixed housing developments. It was noted that developers are interested in providing a mix of housing products when regulations allow practical and financially feasible site designs. The group discussed the possibility that greater flexibility in standard zoning regulations could reduce reliance on the PUD process while still allowing diverse housing types and development patterns.

Next Steps

With limited time remaining, the group discussed next steps. Staff indicated that they would begin drafting possible code language based on the discussion and would circulate the draft to participants for review. Participants were asked whether feedback could be provided by email or whether another meeting would be more beneficial after everyone had an opportunity to review the proposed language, evaluate potential site layouts, and test the standards against actual housing products and floor plans. Staff indicated that one or possibly two additional meetings may be scheduled. Staff also noted that they are reviewing how other Idaho communities are implementing similar starter home provisions. At the time of the discussion, Pocatello was identified as one of the few communities actively developing regulations for this type of housing. Pocatello was also considering additional options, including cottage court development, where smaller homes would be arranged around a shared central courtyard.

The group discussed whether allowing smaller starter home developments on sites of less than four acres could be beneficial, particularly for infill properties. Participants generally supported exploring this option, noting that many smaller infill sites could benefit from additional flexibility. Cottage court development was also viewed as a potentially attractive option because it could provide shared, usable outdoor space and create a stronger neighborhood feel.

Staff anticipated preparing a draft of the proposed regulations within the next several weeks and distributing it to the group for review. Participants would be encouraged to evaluate the draft, sketch potential site layouts, and test the proposed standards against actual housing products and floor plans before the group reconvenes for further discussion.

Adjourned at 1:57 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

Ann Peterson, Recorder



City of Idaho Falls Starter Home Subdivision Committee Minutes

Tuesday, September 22,

9:00 AM

Annex Conference

MEMBERS PRESENT: Council President Jim Francis; Brian Cunningham, Assistant PW Director; Forrest Ihler, Planning Commission Chair; Matthew Meehan, Planning Commission Vice-Chair; Heather McBride, Ammon Assistant Planner; Heidi Boyle, Ammon Council Member; Barry Bame, Krossroads Engineering; Aaron O'Connor, RPI Construction; Neil Humphreys, Eagle Rock Engineering

MEMBERS ABSENT: Councilor Brandon Lee; Luke Bloxham, Bloxham Realty; Steve Heath, Mountain West Engineering; Jeremy Westwood, Alta Project Services

ALSO PRESENT: Kerry Beutler, Assistant Planning Director; Wade Sanner, Planning Director; Caitlin Long, Planner; Ann Peterson, Recording Secretary

CALL TO ORDER: Long called the meeting to order at 9:08 p.m.

STARTER HOME SUBDIVISION: Senate Bill No. 1352 – Starter Home Subdivision

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:

Staff stated that, in preparation for the meeting, feedback from the previous meeting had been reviewed, along with recent legal opinions, including an opinion issued by the State. Based on that information, staff drafted proposed code language for Starter Home Subdivisions and provided the draft to the Board in advance. Staff explained that the presentation would follow the proposed code point-by-point, providing background on the proposed provisions and seeking feedback from the Board. Staff explained that a Starter Home Subdivision would be established as a separate permitted use in zones that allow residential uses. The proposed code includes additional standards and requirements specific to Starter Home Subdivisions. Staff reviewed the proposed general requirements, noting that a Starter Home Subdivision would be an allowed use in all residential zones, consistent with state requirements. The proposed code would apply to parcels of four acres or larger. Staff explained that multiple parcels could potentially be combined and replatted as one development, with the four-acre minimum applying to the overall development. Staff also proposed reducing the minimum acreage requirement to two acres in certain zones, including TN, R3, R3H, RNH, LC, and CC.

Discussion followed regarding the terminology "residential zones." A concern was raised that LC, Limited Commercial and CC, Central Commercial are not technically classified as residential zones, although residential uses are permitted in those zones. Members discussed whether the language should instead refer to zones that allow residential uses to avoid ambiguity or potential legal challenges. The Committee discussed whether allowing Starter Home Subdivisions in commercial zones such as LC and CC could result in increased residential development or greater concern from neighboring residents. Staff noted that residential uses, including higher-density development, are already permitted in certain commercial zones. It was also noted that the proposed Starter Home Subdivision standards would provide an additional development option and could result in less density than what is currently permitted in some of those

zones. The Committee discussed whether reducing the acreage requirement in these zones was appropriate. It was expressed that a two-acre Starter Home Subdivision could provide a reasonable option for smaller-scale development and may be preferable to developing larger parcels with more intensive housing. Concern was expressed primarily about the potential for very large developments consisting entirely of Starter Home Subdivisions rather than smaller-scale developments.

The Committee discussed how the proposed Starter Home Subdivision standards would differ from the existing Planned Unit Development (PUD) process, particularly for developments between two and four acres. Staff explained that the primary differences are that a PUD may include private streets and requires common open space, while a Starter Home Subdivision would require public streets and would not have the same common-space requirement. Staff noted that smaller lots can already be achieved through the PUD process, but the proposed Starter Home Subdivision would provide a different development option with additional flexibility.

Staff reviewed the proposed permitted uses and noted that both detached and attached dwellings would be allowed in a Starter Home Subdivision, subject to the applicable standards. Staff explained that single unit detached dwellings are currently not permitted in the CC zone, although other residential uses are permitted. The proposed code would allow single unit detached dwellings within a Starter Home Subdivision in the CC zone. Staff also proposed limiting Starter Home Subdivisions in the RE, Residential Estate and RP, Residential Park zones to detached dwellings only. This would maintain consistency with the underlying zoning districts while still allowing Starter Home Subdivisions. Staff explained that this could provide some limitation on the type of development that could occur when property is annexed and developed under those zoning designations.

The group discussed the potential number of attached dwelling units that could be included in a development. Staff explained that the proposed code does not establish a specific limit on the number of attached units. The number of units would primarily be determined by applicable fire access requirements and the configuration of the development. Depending on the layout, fire access, alleys, and streets, a development could accommodate approximately four to six units in some configurations, while other configurations could accommodate larger numbers.

Staff reviewed the proposed setback requirements. The proposed front setback is a minimum of 15 feet, consistent with the state requirements and considerations related to utility and fire access. The proposed rear setback is 10 feet rather than the 15 feet provided in the state code. Staff explained that the 10-foot setback was intended to provide consistency with existing development standards and provide additional flexibility for Starter Home Subdivisions. A provision was also discussed that would allow the rear-yard setback to be reduced to three feet when the rear yard abuts a public or private alley, consistent with a provision previously adopted in the City's code.

Staff discussed the uncertainty surrounding the state requirements for lot sizes. Two legal opinions have addressed whether the 1,500-square-foot standard should be interpreted as a minimum, maximum, or as allowing flexibility above and below 1,500 square feet. Because of the differing interpretations and the possibility that the Legislature may further clarify the definition, staff proposed not establishing a specific minimum or maximum lot size in the City's code. Instead, lots would be required to accommodate all applicable setbacks. Staff explained that this approach would also address the City's existing requirement for corner lots to be larger, since corner lots must accommodate two front setbacks. The proposed

approach would provide flexibility for developers to create varying lot sizes and housing products while still ensuring that the required setbacks can be met. The group discussed whether eliminating a specific lot-size requirement could create issues for future homeowners whose homes may not fit appropriately on an unusually shaped or small lot. Staff indicated that development would generally be planned as a comprehensive project and that the subdivision and building review processes would provide opportunities to identify those issues before construction.

Staff reviewed the proposed maximum lot coverage of 80 percent. It was clarified that, under the City's definition, lot coverage generally refers to roofed structures rather than paved areas such as driveways. The Committee discussed whether the definition of lot coverage applicable to residential zones also applies to the proposed Starter Home Subdivision and whether the standard should instead be specifically addressed within the Starter Home Subdivision provisions. The group discussed whether an 80-percent maximum lot coverage could provide sufficient flexibility for attached housing, particularly where an alley is located at the rear of the property and rear-yard setbacks can be reduced. Examples of attached housing with garages or carports at the rear were discussed. Staff noted that the TN, Traditional neighborhood zoning district has different lot-coverage provisions and that the proposed Starter Home Subdivision standard could result in substantially greater coverage. Questions were raised regarding stormwater management and the amount of impervious or developed area that could result from the proposed standards. Staff agreed to review the applicable lot-coverage provisions and determine whether the 80-percent standard should apply specifically to Starter Home Subdivisions or be revised to ensure consistency with the City's existing zoning provisions.

Staff proposed a maximum density of 15 units per gross acre. Staff explained that the proposed density was based on the density allowed in the TN zone and had been increased from an initial proposal of 13 units per acre. The group discussed how the proposed 15-unit-per-acre standard would interact with the density allowances of the underlying zoning district. Staff clarified that the Starter Home Subdivision standard would establish a 15-unit-per-acre maximum where applicable, even if the underlying zoning district could otherwise allow greater density. For example, R3 and R3A may allow greater density, but a Starter Home Subdivision would remain subject to the proposed standard. The group noted similarities between the proposed Starter Home Subdivision standards and the TN zone, particularly the emphasis on smaller lots, while recognizing that the proposed Starter Home Subdivision would allow greater lot coverage.

Staff reviewed the proposed parking requirements, which would require two parking spaces per lot. A standard parking space would be 10 feet wide by 20 feet long. Parking could be provided in tandem on an approved driveway leading to a garage or parking area located behind the required front setback. Staff clarified that parking would not generally be permitted within the front setback except where allowed as part of an approved driveway. If a private alley is included on or adjacent to the lot, the parking requirement could be reduced to one parking stall with access from the private alley. Staff explained that this would allow, for example, a one-car garage or parking stall accessed from the alley, with additional parking potentially occurring on the street. The Committee discussed whether the proposed standards could inadvertently allow excessive parking within front yards. Staff explained that the intent was to allow some flexibility for tandem parking while preventing front yards from becoming predominantly parking areas. Public Works requirements regarding driveway spacing would also continue to apply. Shared or combined driveways between adjacent lots were discussed. It was noted that shared driveways could

provide benefits for snow removal, utility placement, and construction costs. Staff indicated that the existing requirements would generally encourage shared driveways without necessarily requiring them.

Staff reviewed proposed standards for accessory structures. The provisions would be similar to existing accessory-structure setback requirements in the City's code. For accessory structures with a wall height of less than 12 feet, the applicable primary setbacks would apply, including the required front setback and applicable rear and side setbacks. Height requirements would continue to be governed by the underlying zoning district. The group discussed whether accessory structures should be specifically addressed in the Starter Home Subdivision standards or incorporated into the City's existing accessory-structure table. Staff confirmed that accessory structures would count toward the maximum lot coverage. The treatment of accessory dwelling units (ADUs) and their relationship to lot coverage and density was also discussed.

Staff noted that Starter Home Subdivisions would remain subject to the City's applicable planning and subdivision review processes and the subdivision ordinance. The proposed definition was discussed as describing a residential subdivision designed for compact homes, smaller lots, and frontage on a public street. Staff emphasized that the proposed code is new and is intended to determine whether the development standards are practical and buildable. Staff explained that the proposal is intended to provide flexibility for developers to work around public works requirements, easements, access, and other site constraints. Staff also acknowledged that adjustments to the code may be necessary after actual developments are constructed and reviewed.

The Committee asked how a Starter Home Subdivision would be identified during the subdivision and platting process and how the City would ensure that the reduced setbacks and other standards were not used on developments that did not qualify. Staff explained that the development would be reviewed through the preliminary plat process and that the plat would likely identify the development as a Starter Home Subdivision so the applicable standards could be applied. The Committee talked about whether a developer could use the Starter Home Subdivision designation on a larger lot simply to obtain the reduced setbacks. Staff noted that the development would have to meet the applicable acreage and subdivision requirements and would need to be established as a Starter Home Subdivision through the preliminary plat process. Discussion also addressed whether a developer could use the designation for a larger-lot development while still taking advantage of the reduced setbacks. Staff acknowledged that the proposed standards could allow larger lots within a Starter Home Subdivision because the current proposal does not establish a maximum lot size. The group discussed whether a maximum lot size should be considered to ensure that the reduced setbacks remain associated with the intended compact housing concept. Staff noted that the absence of a maximum lot size could provide flexibility for different housing products and could potentially accommodate residents who prefer a smaller yard while maintaining a larger home.

The Committee revisited the proposed reduction of the minimum acreage from four acres to two acres in certain higher-density or mixed-use zones. Staff explained that the rationale for the two-acre allowance was to encourage this type of development in areas where greater density is already contemplated, particularly within the City, rather than encouraging similar development on larger parcels at the City's edges. Staff stated that a two-acre development could provide a smaller infill opportunity and may be preferable to a four-acre development in areas without convenient access to goods and services. It was discussed whether reducing the minimum acreage would actually make development easier, particularly given the challenges associated with providing public streets and required access. Staff explained that the

feasibility would depend heavily on the characteristics of the individual parcel and that the two-acre provision was intended primarily to provide additional flexibility.

The group reviewed examples of undeveloped and partially developed property in the CC zone to consider how a two-acre Starter Home Subdivision might function in practice. Discussion focused on access, lot configuration, frontage, and the potential number of units that could reasonably be developed on smaller CC-zoned parcels. Staff noted that direct access to certain major roadways would not be permitted, which could require rear-loaded development, shared access, or an alley. The group discussed whether a two-acre Starter Homestead Division in a CC zone would be financially competitive with other development options. It was noted that developers may instead choose townhomes, multifamily housing, or other higher-density development where those options produce a greater number of units on the same land. It was noted that the proposed standards would nevertheless create an additional development option for property owners and developers, even if the market ultimately makes other forms of development more attractive. They also discussed the possibility of more urban-style single-family development, including taller homes on smaller lots with reduced setbacks. Examples from other Idaho communities and other urban areas were discussed. The Committee noted that acceptance of this type of development may vary depending on the surrounding neighborhood and context. The discussion concluded with recognition that one of the goals of the proposed Starter Home Subdivision standards is to provide additional housing options and potentially help reduce housing costs.

The group discussed the proposed allowance for single-unit attached dwellings within a Starter Home Subdivision. Staff clarified that "attached" refers to side-by-side dwelling units and would not include separate dwelling units located above one another. A separate dwelling located above another unit would generally be addressed as a condominium or other multi-unit arrangement under the applicable building and zoning regulations. Accessory dwelling units (ADUs) would remain subject to the City's existing provisions. They discussed the potential impact of Starter Home Subdivisions on existing neighborhoods zoned RE and RP. A concern was raised that property owners in partially developed areas could see a future development of four or more acres occur, potentially resulting in smaller lots and a development pattern different from what surrounding residents anticipated. Staff explained that the Starter Home Subdivision would be a permitted use by right when the statutory requirements are met and would not require a discretionary zoning approval by the City Council. The preliminary plat would provide an opportunity for public participation, but the City's discretion would be limited because the use is required by state law. The importance of making the public aware of the state requirements and the potential development implications. It was noted that the City would be required to adopt code provisions implementing the state legislation by February 1, and that any changes to the state law would need to come from the Legislature. Staff indicated that there did not appear to be many existing four-acre parcels within the City that are currently zoned RE or RP. Discussion also noted that future annexations could create situations where the Starter Home Subdivision standards would apply, including properties annexed and developed under residential zoning.

The group discussed whether the City could require or encourage variation in building elevations and housing types within a Starter Homestead Division. Staff explained that requiring architectural variation would be difficult because the City's existing code generally does not impose such design requirements and architectural standards can be subjective and could add additional review time. It was noted that developers seeking to create a higher-quality development could voluntarily provide multiple housing types or elevations. The group discussed whether additional development incentives, such as increased

density, could be used to encourage greater variety in housing design. Staff noted that the state statute provides relatively limited flexibility for adding additional requirements and standards beyond allowing smaller lots.

A Committee member asked whether the group could continue meeting after the Starter Home Subdivision code is completed to review existing zoning regulations and identify other changes that could improve development flexibility. Discussion included issues such as tandem parking, minimum lot sizes, and other development standards that could potentially be adjusted based on feedback from developers and other participants. It was noted that the group's discussions could provide useful information to the City Council and Planning and Zoning Committee as they consider future zoning and development-code amendments. Any future meetings involving City Council members would need to comply with applicable open meeting requirements.

The group discussed concerns raised by City Council regarding private streets in Planned Unit Developments. Concerns included emergency access, illegal parking, long-term maintenance, and how private neighborhoods would finance major road repairs in the future. Staff explained that permit fees are intended to cover the City's cost of providing permitting services and generally would not be an appropriate mechanism for funding long-term infrastructure maintenance. Impact fees were discussed as a potential mechanism, subject to applicable legal requirements.

The distinction between public and private streets was discussed. In a typical subdivision, property taxes contribute to the City's infrastructure system while the City is responsible for maintaining public streets. In a PUD with private streets, property owners are responsible for maintaining their own streets while continuing to pay property taxes. The group discussed whether this difference should be considered when evaluating the City's policies regarding private streets. Staff and participants discussed whether a narrower public street section could be developed that would reduce the right-of-way requirements while maintaining adequate emergency access and utility infrastructure. The concept of a narrower street without on-street parking was discussed. Snow storage was identified as a significant consideration. Examples from other communities and private-street developments were discussed, including designated snow-storage areas within developments. Staff noted that utility easements, water and sewer requirements, stormwater, power, gas, and other infrastructure requirements would also need to be accommodated even with a narrower street section. Conversation was had as to whether PUDs remain appropriate for certain infill properties, particularly small or unusually shaped parcels where construction of a standard public street may not be practical. Participants noted that PUDs can provide a useful development tool for infill properties and that eliminating private streets entirely could make some difficult-to-develop properties infeasible. Examples of existing infill developments were discussed. There was discussion that the City could potentially retain PUDs for smaller or unusual infill properties while creating alternative development standards for larger properties where a conventional public-street subdivision would be more practical. The group discussed the possibility of modifying the PUD regulations rather than eliminating PUDs entirely. One concept was to limit PUD eligibility to qualifying infill properties while requiring larger developments to comply with revised subdivision standards. The Committee discussed the potential timing and consequences of making significant amendments to the PUD regulations. Members expressed concern that eliminating PUDs or private streets immediately could negatively affect developers who have already purchased property or begun planning projects under the existing regulations. The possibility of temporarily retaining the current PUD regulations while the City develops comprehensive amendments was discussed. This could allow staff and the City Council time to consider multiple proposed changes

together rather than making individual amendments at different times. It was noted that making changes to private-street standards could require developers to substantially redesign projects and could affect the financial feasibility of projects already under development. Staff also noted that leaving the current PUD process available while changes are being considered could result in an increase in PUD applications as developers attempt to proceed under the existing regulations before any amendments take effect. A potential approach discussed was to retain PUDs under the existing standards for qualifying infill properties while evaluating amendments for larger developments. It was noted that a clear definition of "infill" would be necessary, potentially based on parcel size, location, or other characteristics. The Board discussed whether larger developments should continue to qualify as PUDs. Members expressed the view that properties surrounded by existing development on most sides could reasonably be considered infill, even when the acreage is substantial. The example of a large property located within the City was discussed as an example of development that could help address infill and reduce development pressure on areas outside the City. The group also discussed the possibility that an acreage limitation could be circumvented by dividing a larger property into multiple smaller PUDs. Members noted that any amendment would need to be structured carefully to avoid creating unintended workarounds. Discussion continued regarding the relationship between PUD requirements and housing development. Members expressed concern that certain PUD requirements may make individually owned housing less feasible and could result in more rental development. The group discussed whether changes to public street requirements, road standards, or other development requirements could provide greater flexibility while still supporting individually owned housing. This discussion concluded with interest in continuing to evaluate the PUD regulations, private-street standards, and infill development options rather than eliminating the PUD process without an alternative framework.

The Committee discussed the concept of allowing private streets in certain circumstances. One suggestion was to require a homeowner's association or similar agreement to establish a mechanism for collecting funds specifically for long-term private roadway maintenance. Members noted that some municipalities address private-road maintenance through covenants, conditions, and restrictions (CC&Rs). Staff expressed concern regarding the City's ability to regulate or modify private agreements and the potential legal implications of requiring such provisions. Staff indicated that the issue would be discussed with the City's legal department. Another potential approach discussed was modifying other PUD requirements in exchange for requiring public streets. The example of reducing the required percentage of common landscape area was raised as a possible tradeoff. The discussion emphasized the concept of identifying what flexibility could be provided while maintaining appropriate public infrastructure requirements.

The group discussed establishing a recurring meeting or review process focused specifically on subdivision and zoning regulations. Staff noted that Public Works currently conducts periodic discussions with engineers and developers regarding process and code changes, and members indicated that a similar discussion focused on planning, zoning, and subdivision regulations could be useful. The proposed format would allow participants to discuss what is working, identify challenges, and share ideas or practices used in other communities.

The Committee briefly discussed the applicability of the new state requirements to smaller cities and whether some communities may not yet be aware of the requirements. The discussion referenced population thresholds and the applicability of the legislation to cities meeting those thresholds.

Staff and participants also discussed the population living in unincorporated Bonneville County. It was noted that a significant portion of the county's population resides outside incorporated city limits, including areas within existing water and sewer service districts. The discussion highlighted the scale of development occurring outside municipal boundaries and its relationship to regional planning.

Next Steps

Staff advised that the draft Starter Home Subdivision code would likely be presented to the Planning Commission with additional clarifications and potentially other related code amendments in October and City Council in November or December. Staff noted that the goal would be to make the various provisions as cohesive as possible.

Adjourned at 10:38 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted

Ann Peterson, Recorder

Memorandum

DATE: Wednesday, October 7, 2026

AGENDA: Work Session

FROM: Zachary Jones, City Attorney

DEPARTMENT: City Attorney

File # 26-405

Title

Executive Session (40)

Action

To call an executive session pursuant to Idaho Code § 74-206(1)(f) to communicate with legal counsel for the public agency to discuss the legal ramifications of and legal options for pending litigation, or controversies not yet being litigated but imminently likely to be litigated.

Description, Background Information, Purpose:

This executive session is to communicate with legal counsel for the City to discuss the legal ramifications of and legal options for pending litigation, or controversies not yet being litigated but imminently likely to be litigated.

Council will reconvene after this session.

This item has been reviewed by the Mayor's Office.

Memorandum

DATE: Thursday, October 15, 2026

AGENDA: Work Session

FROM: Zachary Jones, City Attorney

DEPARTMENT: City Attorney

File # 26-413

Title

Settlement Agreement for City v. Van Deventers (5)

Action

Grant authority to the City Attorney to negotiate and authorize the Mayor and City Clerk to execute a settlement agreement with Karen and John Van Deventer *(or take other appropriate action)*.

This item has been reviewed by the Mayor's Office.