

CITY OF SHELLEY
PLANNING & ZONING
MINUTES

May 20, 2026

PRESENT: Chairman: Josh Carrell

Vice Chairman: Shane Wootan (absent)

P&Z Members: Aaron Severinsen, Devan Dye, Paul Voelker, Lauren Cardon, Cam Hulse

P&Z Members (Absent):

Deputy City Clerk/Treasurer: Tori Pacheco

Building Inspector: Jordon Johnson

Josh called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

Public hearing on Platinum Real Estate Investments, LLC's application for rezone, and annexation and rezone, with consideration of future boundary line adjustments, for parcels RP2088862 and RP0478019, consisting of approximately 53 acres located south of West Fir, east of Longhurst Lane, north of 1200 North Baseline Road, and west of property owned by Shelley Joint School District #60.

Josh opened the public hearing and asked if everyone who wanted to make a public comment had signed in.

Bryan Sargent 1426 N 750 E Shelley, ID 83274. Mr. Sargent had a presentation on the board that he presented to the P&Z Commission. Mr. Sargent stated that there are approximately 53 acres within the city limits that he wants to rezone, and approximately 23 acres outside the city limits that he is proposing to rezone and annex. Mr. Sargent referenced the comprehensive plan map, which showed the property he is proposing as under residential zoning. The zoning that he is proposing includes R1, R1A, and RO. Mr. Sargent commented that the map he presents might be a little deceiving, as it is computer-generated, but may not reflect the exact outcome of the plans. Mr. Sargent talked about the access points for the properties. The access off of Fir Street is only 30ft wide. The desire for this parcel was originally Central Business (CB) to attract more businesses. This access is shared with the school. The frontage is not wide enough for the requirements of CB. With this, they feel that Residential Office (RO) would be a good transition between this and the subdivision. Mr. Sargent has been working with the school district. The school also owns 30ft off of Fir Street, but there is no shared access agreement. The school is not sure if a new school will be built. Mr. Sargent asked the school about access if they built a new school. One thing he is proposing to the school is to connect Robald St. to one of the streets or another access point. If Mr. Sargent does not work with the school, their only access would be through Robald St. if a new school is built. Mr. Sargent has been in discussion with the surrounding neighbors to show the Council that they are acting in good faith with their neighbors' concerns. The water and sewer connections are available next to or through the property. Mr. Sargent suggested that this shows future development was planned for. The water line is 10 inches. Josh explained that the city code is made up of zoning and use, and inquired about the intended use of these parcels. Mr. Sargent said that the bottom half (R1) and (R1A) are residential. The top portion is (RO); they are trying to give themselves the best guess of what could potentially be on this parcel. They would like to see businesses. If businesses are not interested, (RO) offers the option of residential use for half, the whole, or part of the property. Josh stated that (RO) cannot be subdivided. Mr. Sargent was already aware of this. Mr. Sargent could also return to the committee to request a reduction or addition to the zoning based on the school's plans. The superintendent has told Mr. Sargent that a planning and zoning recommendation would need to be completed before any discussion could take place. Josh asked what the purpose of the proposed twin homes would be. Mr. Sargent stated that they would act as a buffer for the school or potential future uses. The school has expressed concerns about the buffer fence between the school property and the apartments. Josh said that with the current use of athletic fields, there are already problems with the apartments. Cam asked if there were only two accesses for the properties? Mr. Sargent responded that there are only 2 accesses for the schools. The owners have more access. Cam asked about the plan with road width and access off of Fir St. Mr. Sargent mentioned that they would have to work with Jordon, the city building inspector. There would be water, sewer, and impact studies to be performed. This public hearing is just the first step to the process. A member of the public mentioned that during the last council meeting a member of the city council stated that no more water connections would be approved for new subdivisions. Josh was not aware of what was said but commented that by state law the council can not stop someone from using their property without compensation. Jordon said that a comment was made but thinks they may have spoken out of term. He also mentioned that, per

CITY OF SHELLEY
PLANNING & ZONING
MINUTES

the facility planning study, the city has adequate water for the next twenty years. The member of the public said that it may have been out of term, but it gave her comfort. Josh also said that the subdivision review would be a separate meeting. The purpose of this public hearing is to consider annexation and rezone of one parcel and rezone of the other parcel. Mr. Sargent stated that in the planning meetings held once a month the developers try to think of the community as much as they can. With the understanding that not all things can be accommodated. Mr. Sargent also mentioned that the city puts a lot of time and effort into the requirements and planning for the proposed subdivisions. The developers, in a lot of ways, do not care how and where the houses come together, and if the city and community have opinions, they try to consider those in the most economical way possible. It was asked if this were to be approved, when development would start? Mr. Sargent said they are looking for business interest for the residential office (RO) zoning, but this may take some time, so they would probably start with the single-family portion first. It would also be broken into phases. It was asked if it would start in 6-8 months. Mr. Sargent said it could take a year or two. Mr. Sargent referred to the comprehensive plan. The section of land he is proposing the annexation / rezone and rezone is referenced as residential growth.

Josh asked if there was any public comment.

Julie Z 1210 N 700 E Shelley, ID 83274. Mrs. Z commented that during City Council, someone said that no more subdivisions would be approved, and maybe they should not have said this. They did say it, and she would like it on the record that it was said. She is opposed to the proposed annexation/ rezone and rezone as she lives across from it. She moved from Idaho Falls to be out in the Country and not across from chaos. She also asked if anyone was interested in buying her property if this gets approved.

Public comment from Mr. Colby Hatton was presented via email and read during the meeting. "Good afternoon!

My name is Colby Hatton. I live at 825 Kelley Drive, Shelley, ID. I will be out of town today, but I would like to provide testimony for tonight's P&Z meeting for the Public Hearing on Platinum Real Estate Investments application for rezone. If this isn't the correct email address, could you shoot me the right one? Thanks!

Shelley is in the middle of a housing crunch affecting us young people. We absolutely need more housing to calm prices and provide places for new families to grow and allow those of us who grew up in Shelley to stay in our hometown. In addition, however, I am deeply concerned about the suburban sprawl the city has had over the past 3 decades. Single family suburbia simply isn't financially sustainable. Low density housing doesn't provide the taxes needed to maintain and upkeep the infrastructure it requires, from roads and pipes to schools and libraries. The solution to both of these issues is density. New developments in Shelley should be zoned as R2 at a minimum, and honestly should be RM or RO.

Denser housing is not only more sustainable for city finances, generating positive cash flow for the city instead of being subsidized by downtown like R1 zoning, but it also has several other benefits. Denser housing, especially with mixed use businesses, helps reduce car dependency. It's far more walkable and bikable, letting its citizens not be forced to drive for even the most basic of necessities. It's more affordable. It makes for a far greater sense of community than suburban sprawl. It's much better for the environment and protects our farmland.

With all this said, I am in favor of this development but wish to reemphasize my desire for it and other new housing and infill to build Shelley up instead of sprawling it out. Thank you.

-Colby Hatton"

Josh asked if there were any other public statements. There was none.

Josh closed the public meeting and opened for discussion among the committee.

Devan commented that the townhouses in the park subdivision work well as a buffer for Hobbs Middle School.

Josh mentioned that he does not think this is a buffer because it is R1 and R1 zoning. Is the buffer for the poor housing and the rich housing? He said that this does not seem necessary. Josh does not feel that a fence is sufficient as a buffer. As the track coach, he is seeing problems with

CITY OF SHELLEY
PLANNING & ZONING
MINUTES

equipment being thrown into the residential areas. Roads and green spaces would be more efficient buffers.

Devan mentioned that this makes it difficult for those who are paying for it.

Josh mentioned that R1 and R1A are not very different in terms of density. Using dense housing to separate is not very efficient.

Cam asked Mr. Sargent what size lots the houses would be on.

Mr. Sargent said they would be ¼ to ½ acre. The townhomes could be as little as 10,000 sq ft per 2 doors, per city code. Mr. Sargent mentioned that it is unknown what the school plans to do with the empty ground. It could be a parking lot, and the decision should be made based on the information presented now. Josh mentioned that he is in discussions to serve as the architect for the school, and they are not ready to make a decision yet. Mr. Sargent argued that the buffer makes sense as proposed because they do not know what the future use will be. Josh said the committee is trying to prognosticate, and he will always go to the worst-case scenario. Mr. Sargent and Josh discussed other subdivisions and possible outcomes. Mr. Sargent reiterated that the decision must be made based on the information presented today. Josh said that the decision has to be based on the code, and the code requires the committee to consider what is currently there and what will be compatible. Josh has no problem with the proposed zones. His issue is with the proposed layout as he does not feel it creates a buffer. Mr. Sargent stated that the layout is not relevant. Josh does not see the necessity of the density layout. Economically, he can see that more housing would be more profitable.

Josh asked if there were any more comments from the committee.

Devan moved and Aaron seconded to recommend approval of Platinum Real Estate Investments, LLC's application for rezone, and annexation and rezone, with consideration of future boundary line adjustments, for parcels RP2088862 and RP0478019, consisting of approximately 53 acres located south of West Fir, east of Longhurst Lane, north of 1200 North Baseline Road, and west of property owned by Shelley Joint School District #60 to City council. Five in favor, one absent, approved unanimously.

Call for public hearing on Orlando Obeso-Angulo special use permit application for 370 N State St., Shelley, ID 83274, with consideration to allow use of property as residential in a heavy commercial zoning.

Orlando Obeso-Angulo 370 N State St Shelley, ID 83274. Mr. Obeso-Angulo and his father own a painting company. They are trying to expand the business to the East Idaho area. In the past, he has rented hotels and provided per diem for his crew who travel to Idaho for jobs. This is why they purchased the property. They plan to use this for housing for their employees and as a business location or second office. This will allow them to work with businesses and residents in the area. Josh stated that the application states that the property is to be used as a rental. Mr. Obeso-Angulo said they would use it as a rental, possibly for employees. If there were private renters at the property, they would not use it for their employees. It was clarified what property is applying for the special use permit. Jordon commented that the application says "single-family." Devan moved, and Cam seconded, to call for a public hearing on Orlando Obeso-Angulo's special use permit application for 370 N State St., Shelley, ID 83274, with consideration to allow residential use of the property in a heavy commercial zoning district. Five in favor and one absent approved unanimously.

Call for Public hearing for consideration of major revision to City Code Section 10-9-4(N) "Home Occupation" to state the purposes of the new ordinance; to define the new terms used, including sub-categories of home-based businesses as home occupations and major and minor cottage industries; to establish applicable zoning and special use permit requirements; and to set forth residency, set back, parking, equipment and vehicle storage, and other standards.

Devan moved and Cam seconded to call for public hearing for consideration of major revision to City Code Section 10-9-4(N) "Home Occupation" to state the purposes of the new ordinance; to define the new terms used, including sub-categories of home-based businesses as home occupations and major and minor cottage industries; to establish applicable zoning and special use permit requirements; and to set forth residency, set back, parking, equipment and vehicle storage, and other standards. Five in favor, one absent, approved unanimously.

Call for Public hearing to discuss future planning based on the comprehensive plan.

CITY OF SHELLEY
PLANNING & ZONING
MINUTES

Shane was the member who requested this item, and it was unclear why it was added to the agenda. If the reason was a change to the comprehensive plan or zoning code, clarification was needed. With Shane absent, it was decided to table it for clarification. Paul moved, and Devan seconded to table the agenda item Five until the June meeting. Five in favor and one absent approved unanimously.


Approval of prior P&Z Minutes – March 18, 2026

Cam moved, and Devan seconded to approve the P&Z Minutes from March 18, 2026, as written. Five in favor, one absent, approved unanimously.

Approval of prior P&Z Minutes – April 15, 2026

Cam moved, and Devan seconded to approve the P&Z Minutes from April 15, 2026, as written. Five in favor, one absent, approved unanimously.

Adjournment – 7:33 P.M.

APPROVE:  ATTEST: 