

City of Eagle Foothills Planning: State of the Plan Review

Guide to color coding: Consistent with community input
 On the right track, but questions remain or better response needed
 Inconsistent with community input; unresponsive to foothills resources or high potential for impact to community

Plan Version:	May, 2007 (Emerging from City public involvement process)		July, 2007 (current version as of this review) (Emerging from the P&Z Commission hearings)
Concept/Objective/Guideline:	Summary	NACFA Observations	Current Status
1. Development Patterns (i.e. commercial & residential)	A. Concentrate most development near the highways (SR 16 and 55).	A. Excellent, very responsive to community values, both for the foothills themselves and to minimize impact on the existing community. B. & D.	A-D: Essence and intent of all development pattern concepts voided/superseded by precedents set in new M3 Eagle Planning Area: - Most intense development--foothills wide--would be allowable in the center of the foothills if developer chose to do so; - Community Centers as the most intense development anticipated in the foothills is superseded by the M3 Village Center (far larger and more intense than the Community Center concept--including residential up to 20 units/acre); - Transect pattern not followed in M3-Eagle: ~84% of M3-Eagle land area within development; Overall, while all four Development Patterns concepts/objectives/guidelines are still included in the "Foothills Planning Area", allowing the M3-Eagle Planning Area to deviate as summarized above, sets precedent for all foothills landowners/developers.
	B. Community Centers = The most intense form/concentration, with all located along Hwys 16 & 55.		
	C. Neighborhood Centers = Less intense than Community Centers, allowable in central foothills, locations undetermined.	C. Plan calculations suggest that nearly half of development would be in Neighborhood centers; thus concept of concentrating most development near/along the highways may not actually be achieved; questions remain on intensity and location of development in the center of the foothills.	
	D. Transect Patterns: Reducing density of residential development as distance from Community and Neighborhood centers increased; one result is "hamlets" of development separated by natural open space.		
2 Development Intensity/Density (review focuses on foothills area defined as between Hwys 16 and 55, Homer Road and the North Ada County Line)	Plan estimates approximately 12,500 dwelling units total within the 30,000+ acre area, but leaves uncertain the actual maximum build-out number (due to unquantified density bonuses and ability of landowners to demonstrate that higher intensities/densities are allowable due to "site-specific" conditions).	Workability and acceptability of 12,500 unit estimate unknown. Traffic studies, public service studies, confirmation of economic/fiscal feasibility are either incomplete or not yet done. City should set a maximum build-out ceiling, after all bonuses, etc., a ceiling on which all infrastructure planning and community impact analysis is based.	All reference to development intensity/density removed from "Foothills Planning Area" narrative (due to P&Z Commission recognition that insufficient information and plan/impact analysis has been done on which to base a sound decision). Addition of M3-Eagle Planning Area conflicts with the above P&Z Commission recommendation. Regardless of semantics, M3-Eagle is a part of the foothills. Allowance of up to 8,100 units on 6,000 acres in M3 de facto sets new benchmarks for development allowable foothills-wide. NACFA analysis of the implications of this M3 approval precedent (proposed to be codified via the parallel development agreement) suggests that the ceiling for foothills development would be at least 22,000 units, perhaps beyond 25,000 units.*

* NACFA would be pleased to discuss with interested parties the assumptions and method used to reach this conclusion.

City of Eagle Foothills Planning: State of the Plan Review

NACFA, September 15, 2007
2 of 2

Plan Version: Concept/Objective/Guideline:	May, 2007 (Emerging from City public involvement process)		July, 2007 (current version as of this review) (Emerging from the P&Z Commission hearings)
	Summary	NACFA Observations	Current Status
5 Traffic/Roads	A. Eagle Road/Willow Creek: City asserts Eagle Road can remain 2-3 lanes, with 2 lanes coming out of the foothills into Eagle on Willow Creek Road.	A. Traffic studies purportedly demonstrating these assertions are not complete, not documented, and/or simply not credible. If these assertions are borne out by more complete and documented analysis, we are on the right track... B.	<p>A-C: Traffic studies done to date are now not applicable, even if they were credible. With the M3-Eagle precedent opening the door for 22,000 to 25,000+ dwelling units, we are very possibly back to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 4-5 lanes on Eagle Road through downtown - 4-5 lanes on Beacon Light Road through to HWY 55 <p>Do we have evidence of this? No, but there ARE NO TRAFFIC STUDIES TO CALM THESE FEARS...and remember the prior study of 20,000 dwelling units (done by M3); that study is where the "5 lanes through downtown" alarm came from...</p> <p>Regarding the other major road requirements, a doubling of dwelling units make these requirements larger and their funding even more in doubt.</p>
	B. Beacon Light Road: City asserts Beacon Light Road can remain 3 lanes east of Linder to Hwy 55.		
	C. Other: Major expansions to Linder, Hwy 55, Hwy 16, and Hwy 44 needed.	C. There simply is NO MONEY to accomplish these expansions, nor related expansions south of Hwy 44/State St. No land use decisions making these expansions necessary should be made until funding is assured.	
2. Open Space/Habitat	A. 40% of land to be in open space	A. 40% open space sounds good, and the derivation of the Open Space Overlay area is consistent with community input. However, Plan appears to allow 25% to be developed (within the developed area) and only 15% natural open space outside the developed area. This will not achieve the intent of B. & B.	<p>A. M3-Eagle sets new precedent/standard for foothill development: Allows/specifies 25% of land to be in open space, all of which can be within developed area (i.e. golf coursed, schools, medians, fragmented undeveloped open space within residential neighborhoods). Developer must receive compensation for any land placed in open space outside the developed area (i.e. through trade for public land or via tax credits = to "fair market value").</p> <p>B. M3 Eagle sets precedent within "Potential Regional Open Space Overlay" area: Even the most intense development can occur in this area.</p>
	B. High priority on retention of a significant, contiguous, sustainable natural open space/habitat complex; candidate area for this complex shown as "Potential Regional Open Space Overlay"		
3. Public (Regional) Recreation	A. Provide for/create/retain major regional recreation area, with used centered on and compatible with natural open space—per 2B, above.	A. Both concepts accurately reflect community values, desires and goals. However, with only 15% of land to be left in natural open space outside of development, ability to achieve these concepts is questionable. & B.	<p>A & B: M3-Eagle precedent forecloses or severely constrains ability to achieve either intent. As noted, unless compensated, developers have no requirement to contribute to regional open space/recreation area. Trail system shown for M3-Eagle (thus the same rules for other developers) is focused within the developed area, with main routes often shown along roadways, inconsistent with community intent/values, and likely severely limiting true public/regional use/access.</p>
	B. Provide for/create/retain major regional recreation trail system, within and compatible with natural open space—per 2B, above.		