1. Has the meeting started?
2. Do you have to annex to get a smaller park?
3. Where is audio?
4. How soon would it be before developer starts?
5. Hi Mary Pary!! :-)
6. No audio or video yet?
7. I do not hear anything!!
8. There is no video or audio.
9. Maples Ridge Estates present
10. Has the city previously attempted to annex land in this area?

Previously they did not want houses here because it is in the flightline from the airport. Why the change?

12. Is there enough land at the park location to build a golf course?
13. Why were we not told there would be a park here? Thanks!
14. Why were the birds not protected when the park was created?
15. Is there clear legal protection for animals?
16. How would we know in 1993, 1997 or 1998 that this property would be annexed?
17. What spaces would have a park and what spaces would not?
18. Jennifer, you are sharing the speaker slides, not the presentation view
19. We don't need any more development. We were told that we would have a park and the city has not held up to that promise.
20. If the City has nothing to do with this then why are they involved?
21. Can you share the full presentation screen? We are seeing the presenters screen.
22. Is the Mayor and City Council aware of the testimony given approximately 35 years ago regarding the city's request to trade land with BLM for foothills property in the north in return for the city giving BLM land for the abirds of prey project?
23. DO WE HAVE ANY SAY
24. Was there legal notice of this meeting?
25. So we have paid for this and now you want to basically screw us and just trade it off to a land developer.
26. Has the city already made a decision to annex?

I'm not opposed to annexation, since that's required to build the park. What I want to understand is how a land swap can occur. The Real Estate Purchase and Sale Agreement from late 1997/early 1998 (item 6f) prohibits city parks from using the property for anything other than a park. Resolution 14250 was approved by the mayor and council in 12/17/1996 is a Declaration of Restrictive Covenants (included in the purchase and sale agreement) states that there will be no residential development on the property. Section 4 of this document states the property must be used in perpetuity as open space.

28. Please no to the “Compact”. Leave it as a park
29. So you mean more homes?
30. What kind of housing would be built on park property? Would it be single family homes (not the best use of space), townhouses, row houses, apartments, etc?
31. Why are we just hearing about this now?
32. When is the planning and zoning meeting scheduled for?
33. How do we stop the city from taking away valuable green space we desperately need in south Boise.
34. Why has Parks and Recreation decided to present this proposal?
35. What about the Pearl Jensen Park? Waiting for that as well for decades...
36. Would the land swap protect the land in the foothills (keeping it wild) if the trade takes place?

The Mayor and Council can modify covenants by a resolution that removes the covenants

37. Has the meeting started yet?
38. In order to allocate any funding for a park, it must be annexed into city limits
39. we just started, hope you hear it now.
40. We do not know that. There are still many steps, this meeting is just the first.
41. No question
42. We are live now
43. We are live
44. We are on. Can you see and hear the presentation?
45. No question
46. live answered

We notified neighbors within 500 feet of the proposed annexed properties as required by city code.

48. Was there legal notice of this meeting?
49. No question
50. live answered
n/a

Public input will be taken at public hearings on the applications and the property surplus hearing

52. We notified neighbors within 500 feet of the proposed annexed properties as required by city code.

54. The land has not been publicly identified
55. We do not project the need for an additional golf course at this time
56. n/a
57. This is a neighborhood meeting to inform neighbors of the annexation and map amendment applications, there still needs to be a Planning and Zoning Meeting as well as City Council.
58. It was included in the City’s area of impact prior to 1993
59. can we get some volleyball courts in the park since there are none in South Boise? Thanks!
60. No question
61. live answered

We do not project the need for an additional golf course at this time

62. The land swap can occur. The Real Estate Purchase and Sale Agreement from late 1997/early 1998 (item 6f) prohibits city parks from using the property for anything other than a park. Resolution 14250 was approved by the mayor and council in 12/17/1996 is a Declaration of Restrictive Covenants (included in the purchase and sale agreement) states that there will be no residential development on the property. Section 4 of this document states the property must be used in perpetuity as open space.

The Mayor and Council can modify covenants by a resolution that removes the covenants

64. Those details are not available at this time

65. We are required to notify our neighbors prior to submitting application for annexation. There will be future public hearings on this matter when the application is submitted
66. Will be scheduled for August 9th.
67. All public comments for this meeting will be included in the annexation and comprehensive plan map amendment application to be submitted on June 29th for consideration by the Planning & Zoning Commission in August.
68. live answered

A link for the Pearl Jensen site can be found here: https://www.cityofboise.org/departments/parks-and-rec/park-sites/southwest-boise/pearl-jensen-park-site/. Like the Murguillo, although a master plan has been created for the site, no capital funds have been allocated for future development because it is currently situated outside city limits.

69. Yes
37. Why are we ignoring the land swap and development of this land?

38. How do we protest this decision? We do not want the swap and do want the park that was planned.

Please understand that there is much growth already in our area. Boise & Ada County have not prepared for this area's growth and we do not have the road system for the additional traffic either. There is already new housing going in at Lake Hazel and Cole. Please save this property for a community park and enhance our community by doing something to us that we all benefit form. More housing will create more issues that this area is not prepared for: Roads, schools.

40. What Marian Herz said!

41. Is there a plan to widen Maple Grove from Victory to Amity before a large subdivision is built?

42. Keep the covenants please.

43. Then what is the point of a covenant if you can do what you want?

44. So is City Council/Planning to remove the covenants?

45. Why not reimbursement of market value to the airport?

So wait if Boise breaks the covenants it reverts to the Boise municipal airport...owned by the city of Boise?

46. What is the point of the covenants?

47. Still the wrong mode for presentation

48. Where do the reimbursement funds come from? Who pays?

49. Should real estate professionals be aware this park (and related covenants) could be removed?

live answered

50. Many residents near the property are in the city limits and have been paying parks taxes.

Does this park have to have "greenup"? Could it be kept as open space with pathways or have another or new vision for the park applied?

51. if not in the capital plans, then why was there a 20+ year plan to create a park?

52. Parks are master planned to understand what amenities can be achieved on site.

53. WHY DID YOU PURCHASE IT & AGREE TO THE COVENANTS IF YOU "NEVER" WERE GOING TO GREEN IT UP? Use stormwater to help green up the area. We live in a desert and should have adaptive measures that are reflective.

54. If there was never a plan for the park by the city, why was there a master plan for the park posted on the city website for years now?

55. So what about the parks that are in the county, who covers those costs? Why can't we get this set as a regional park?

56. Ada County Parks and Waterways manages County parks, like Barber Park

57. The airport will be reimbursed the difference between the value when they purchased it and when it was transferred to park and rec.

58. Those parks are jokes. What happened to having at least 5.66 acres per 1000 ppl?

If you have to annex it to trade it away to develop it, why not annex it to build the park committed long ago?

59. Why are we ignoring the land swap and development of this land?

60. A link for the Pearl Jensen site can be found here: https://www.cityofboise.org/departments/parks-and-recreation/park-sites/southwest-boise/pearl-jensen-park-site/. Like the Murgolito, although a master plan has been created for the site, no capital funds have been allocated for future development because it is currently situated outside city limits.

62. Pearl Jensen Park?

All the other parks being mentioned are all north of the freeway. This would be the first one south of the freeway. 

63. Why doesn't the developer just go out and buy land?

65. Kent Smith, Molenaar Park is south of the freeway.

66. Between Overland and Victory

67. So is this a land swap meeting or an annexation meeting? Who's the applicant?

Those parks are small and our population is huge in SW compared to the North End. We may not be city limits but we vote as if we are.
Weren't the improvements suddenly approved for Molenaar, knowing the city was going to do a land swap down the road? So what type of housing would be build? Low cost? High density? How does this really help the housing shortage? Seems like you just want to trade it off.

Is Molenaar Island 30 then 7 a joke in the bucket? What about the Wildlife that is already there?

Why can't the desert be developed? Why build on the absolute last green and beautiful open space? This is all a joke.

The city claims to be committed to "preserving the rural nature of SW Boise"... this "compact" zoning does not meet that promise. How do you explain this conflict.

How do you just get to remove resolutions? We need a skate park in the area. The nearest one to SW Boise is in Kuna...7 miles away.

So you used tax payer funds to buy the land. But you cannot use tax money to develop it for a park? Why can't the desert be developed? Why build on the absolute last green and beautiful open space?

Thank you for your suggestion. No question.

Your team should be the ones to forward the emails where they need to go. Using multiple emails just makes it more difficult for the average Joe to keep up where to send everything.

To lie fallow? So now you wish to lower median housing stock prices... that means the cheapest houses taking off and landing than ever. So now, let's park more houses beneath the area that the airport wanted the airport purchased the land due to safety and being beneath the runway approaches. More planes associated cars. It is sad to hear that the only way the canal could be connected is with the land swap.

Amity Road DOES NOT go through to Maple Grove. If you build more homes in this area you have essentially made it even worse for those of us who live in this area. Traffic wise to move in and out of this area. What is the land to avoid development?

The foothills parcels have not been publicly identified. Why doesn't the developer build on Foot Hills property? How long has the developer owned the Foot hills properly?

Is any residential development on the site to occur, a traffic impact study would be required by ACHD. Why have the neighborhoods above the canal never been included in annexing plans? Wouldn't that help to balance the equation.

The Boise City P & R stated to channel 7 news that there were now sufficient sports fields in the city. It was just a few years ago that Lacrosse folks were petitioning the city for more Lacrosse fields...are there now sufficient Lacrosse fields? It is noted there were no Lacrosse fields built on Chuck McDowell Park as planned.

Was the original price low because the land was represented to be in the flight path, so the airport bought the land to avoid development? The foothills parcels have not been publicly identified. How long has the developer owned the Foot hills properly?

Why isn't a substitute park proposed for another area? Why not use that area for housing? If any residential development on the site is to occur, a traffic impact study would be required by ACHD.

City council decides? So there will not be a ballot amendment? Why have the neighborhoods above the canal never been included in annexing plans? Wouldn't that help to balance the equation.

The City has only been approached about the idea. There is no land swap agreement included with this annexation and comprehensive plan map amendment application. Elected officials would need to consider a separate action for any land trades that may occur in the future.

Will the public be able to give testimony here when this comes before P & Z or City Council? The City claims to be committed to "preserving the rural nature of SW Boise"... this "compact" zoning does not meet that promise. How do you explain this conflict.

The passing of this - 7 acres an embarrassment. Why have the neighborhoods above the canal never been included in annexing plans? Wouldn't that help to balance the equation.

For reference, Shoshone park is about 6-7 acres... For reference, Shoshone park is about 6-7 acres...

The city claims to be committed to "preserving the rural nature of SW Boise"... this "compact" zoning does not meet that promise. How do you explain this conflict.

Harris Family

No question.
102. If everything has a price, how do we preserve open space?
103. The 1998 said no housing, wrong of you to flip your agreement?
104. amendment? Some comments will not be part of the record for this first step?
105. land.
106. Where is the foothills parcel and who is the developer?
107. Is there a map of the proposed development?
108. included in the annexation?
109. have an option for protest and gathering community support?
110. What is the plan for the swapped area?
111. of southwest Boise?
112. What are the proposed traffic counts on S Cole and Maple Grove Road after development?
113. What is the comparison of parks between North end and east end compared to SW area?
114. We want the park! No land swap. We want the park in this space!

Shouldn't this activity be put on hold until we have a new slate of council persons elected from districts rather than at large whereby the southwest is guaranteed to have representation. Over the last many years, only no council person has come from south of the Boise river.

116. Are there any plans to mitigate the loss of this park space toward additional park space in sw Boise?
117. Who is the developer?
118. What does the city propose to do about the existing water issues, i.e. wells going dry, due to over-building in
119. existing building projects?
120. How will water be issued to new subdivision? well, city water
121. How will this affect Maple Grove school which I think is already at full capacity.
122. Does "houses below the median price" mean replacing a would-be park with cheap houses?
123. 1. There was a plan to develop this space into a park. Why did that never happen?
2. There is no open space or parks in this neighborhood so why not use this site?
3. There are plans and projects underway to build houses in this area now, how do you justify more development here.
4. Our children have nowhere to play that they can walk or bike to and your view is there are parks in Meridian they can use, really? How does driving to parks 10 to 15 miles away support you zero carbon goals?

5. Then there is the school and admin buildings, please explain why we don't need these facilities.
6. Which will we find out more about the land the city will receive for this swap?
7. So you wish to lower the median housing stock... That means garbage housing that will be a slum in ten years. Fuck you very much

125. so do the adjacent property owners really have any say in this
You mentioned that the city does not develop parks that are not within the city boundary. On the other hand, you are proposing to annex the land in to the city. It seems like the city would rather develop more park area in the foothills rather than wait for the southwest area of Boise's impact area to be annexed.
126. Where would future parks go in the southwest area if/when it is annexed into the city?
127. Who's the developer?
128. Who's the developer inquiring?
129. Are you guys concerned about increased traffic and congestion on Cole and Maple Grove?
130. Why is there the minimum acre park?
131. Has a project like this ever been able to be cancelled by the community it affects?
132. Yes
133. Is there already a study done on the impacts of traffic to an area that is already overwhelmed?
134. Exactly how many Homes and or Apartments are you talking???
135. Will you be holding another meeting for people unable to attend the internet meeting?
136 How many homes do they want to build? Why does the city always provide service and preservation for the North end, but treats the south/southwest end like red-headed step children?  
138 Can we have details on where the foothills land is? How much land and etc?  
139 Sleazy developers making deals with sleazy local officials, sounds like the treasure valley alright!  
140 What I was getting at is "What is in it for the city and its residents"?  
141 What foothills land is specifically being considered in this swap? With the growing TV, driving to our only regional parks grows by day due to traffic congestion. This regional park is desperately needed and there are plenty of Boise residents right near this park. Molenaar park, as you said is NOT a regional park. With all of our foundations and philanthropy in the valley, can't the city consider other means to fund the park?  
142 Would developers consider a park that is greater than 7 acres and is the best place to submit comments to the email under the land swap slide regarding ideas for what the community would like that park to have? What criteria was used to determine a few significantly smaller parks are a better choice than the open space the dozen or so square miles of land in the southwest Boise that are in the Boise impact area, but not considered? 
143 How many homes does the developer propose to build on the property? Will the city give details as to what the city will get in exchange for the land swap such as how many acres, specific locations, etc.? 
144 What does the land swap entail? Will we be able to get a copy of any of this presentation or the information provided in it? 
145 Please put the email address in the chat box-thanks. How can we be sure any park would not be controlled by the homeowners in the area, excluding the rest of the public? 
146 How many homes does the developer propose to build on the property? Who are the decision makers? Could it be community gardens, pollinator gardens, native plant restoration? What is the underlying motive for development? Could it be a smaller project instead of all or none? 
147 For your presentation, how is the land not protected in the north end right now? I'm sure there are other ways to protect North and assets without taking something from the south Will the city never do anything for the south/southwest end like red-headed step children? 
148 specific locations, etc.? 
150 Will we be able to get a copy of any of this presentation or the information provided in it? 
151 What does the land swap entail? Will the home being built be low income homes? 
152 We need parks in SW Boise, currently there is a disappointed amount of parks in North Boise. Jennifer, Do you personally support this proposal? 
153 Will the home being built be low income homes? 
154 We need parks in SW Boise, currently there is a disappointed amount of parks in North Boise. Jennifer, Do you personally support this proposal? 
155 Please submit comments to bpr@cityofboise.org. If any residential development on the site is to occur, a traffic impact study would be required by ACHD. 
156 What gives the City the right to remove covenants? Normally covenants cannot be removed. What is being done to support the South end of the Valley? 
157 Why does the city always provide service and preservation for the North end, but treats the south/southwest end like red-headed step children?  
158 Is there anything we can do to make the original park happen? This is great to know that the land in the foothills would be protected! I would rather have the foothills kept wild and beautiful than have a park 1.5 miles closer to my house than Molenaar Park. I support this land swap, especially since the housing would be (if I heard right) below the median price. Swap it! With the loss of this designated park space, are there any promises or changes in the park proposal north of Lake Hazel between 5 mile and maple grove? This too was promised, and apparently can be easily removed. If you implement this land swap, how do you plan ensure access and suitable land for public parks and open space the dozen or so square miles of land in the southwest Boise that are in the Boise impact area, but not yet annexed? Why does the city always provide service and preservation for the North end, but treats the south/southwest end like red-headed step children? 
160 removed. 
161 Yet annexed? 
162 Why does the council not want to keep it as open space? 
163 Would the entire murguito property be homes? or would there be a possibility for a smaller size park? Would individuals have an opportunity to oppose breaking the covenants? why can't you annex us and in exchange give us the park? Once we're annexed then we'll be valid taxpayers and you can start working on it by your own logic. 
164 What criteria was used to determine a few significantly smaller parks are a better choice than the open space the dozen or so square miles of land in the southwest Boise that are in the Boise impact area, but not yet annexed? 
165 How much land does the developer propose to build on the property? Who are the decision makers? Could it be community gardens, pollinator gardens, native plant restoration? What is the underlying motive for development? Could it be a smaller project instead of all or none? 
166 No question 
167 How would the traffic be accommodated with the increased housing? Why does this property have to be developed? Is this going to be another grouping of high density housing and no improvement on infrastructure? 
168 Why a land swap, why not auction off the property per the Idaho Statutes? 
169 No question
There are a lot of disappointed families around here with this proposal. We have been waiting for this park. No question

Was ACHD aware of this when Cole road was updated and can the road handle increased traffic? No question

Does city planning have a ratio of park acres to population relative to the area of the parks placement in the city? Yes

We already have a traffic issue and that's not under control also CBH is already building 2500 homes on Cole and Lake Hazel. We need a decent park on our side of town! Lived here since 1989

Please answer - TRAFFIC if you do this land swap

Amity Road DOES NOT go through to Maple Grove. If you build more homes in this area you have essentially made it even worse for those of us who live in this area. What is the proposal for this to be fixed? Desert is not necessarily an option because that goes backwards. Why did you remove all the original information for this future park from the City website?

Can there be a middle ground met, so we annex it but then sell half and keep the rest for a park.

If it was never slated to be developed then why were plans developed and circulated? when my family sold this land, they were told it was due to the noise complaints from airplanes. are those complaints still a concern?

Agreed with Kent. Then why were plans drawn up originally? Could donations and volunteers be employed to make it what it was originally designed for.

I have documents that contradict what you have said. Who do I share these with? you do have people within the city limits about a mile south that would use it. The city is starting to surround that area.

But at some point we will be annexed, so long term this area will be in the City. SO YOU ONLY WANT TO ANNEX WHAT YOU CAN SELL BUT NOT ALL OF OUR RESIDENCES SO WE CAN CONtribute

If the park is not built and homes are built instead, would the 7 acre park include a large pond? The park with ponds with water from the canal would be beneficial to existing homes in the area due to recharging the aquifers.

Has the City considered turning it into park space similar the foothills and North End? There is no access to something as vast in this area. It would seem such a park would provide more to this end of the city instead of increasing density with the short-sighted thought of "housing shortage".

The Syringa development is in the city limits. South Cole and Lake Hazel. Why is ACHD currently surveying Maple Grove Rd?

Was ACHD aware of this when Cole road was updated and can the road handle increased traffic? The surrounding neighborhoods must be annexed to support the funding of the park. Is the city willing to attempt annexing the SW area again?

So the city never planned on an annex of south Boise areas?

Molenar is a much smaller area and is not a replacement for this park.
Shouldn’t the business of Parks and Recreation be developing and expanding the park system, not giving potential park sites away?

We really want a park and do not want homes. Is the $30 million estimate a worst case scenario? Can we look at more affordable options where the greenery and the open space is preserved?

When did this idea first come about? When did the developer approach the city?

What is the proposed density by the developer?

Back in the 90’s there were plans to develop and make little league fields and materials were being donated.

What happened to those plans?

The business of Parks and Recreation is maintaining parks throughout the City of Boise and providing recreational opportunities for children and adults.

The cost estimate is based on our most recent bids greening up parks.

unknown at this time.

Those plans never came to fruition.

Fire stations located outside of city limits are operated through a joint agreement with the Whitney District. Sewer was extended due to septic failures and groundwater contamination.

The site must be annexed regardless of what future plans take shape. No private properties are a part of this annexation and comprehensive plan map amendment application to be submitted on June 29th for consideration by the Planning & Zoning Commission in August.

Harris family.

We had a masterplan however no funding was ever identified in our Capital Plan.

No question.

We are applying to annex city property and school district property only at this time. We are required to notify our neighbors prior to submitting application for annexation and comprehensive plan map amendment to the Planning and Zoning Commission. There will be future public hearings on this matter once the application is submitted.

No question.

The applications will be before the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council. If the land swap moves forward there will be a surplus public hearing.

No question.

The proposal is to trade foothills land for this site.

unknown.

The City Council is evaluating all avenues for addressing our housing crisis.

City staff are initiating the annexation and comprehensive plan map amendment application process.

No question.

nA.

Harris Ranch is the developer.

No question.

The applications will be before the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council. If the land swap moves forward there will be a surplus public hearing.

No question.

The proposal is to trade foothills land for this site.

unknown.

The proposal is to trade foothills land for this site.

unknown.

The proposal is to trade foothills land for this site.

unknown.

The proposal is to trade foothills land for this site.

unknown.

The proposal is to trade foothills land for this site.

unknown.
No question

The city periodically reviews annexation of the southwest but has never moved forward with it.

Regional parks serve the entire city. There is no timeline for annexation of the southwest. The only part of the southwest in City limits is north of Victory. The city periodically reviews annexation of the southwest but has never moved forward with it.

Why not annex this area defined and develop the park?

Annexation is looked at internally by the city every few years. The city council is charged to meet the needs of ALL the residents of Boise—not just north enders—what about giving SW residents a park?

Seems a lot cheaper option and the south end dwellers could enjoy it.

Why couldn’t you create a nature reserve type of area, simple pathways and let nature/wildlife take it over?

So the legislature’s stoppage of the impact fees we’ve always requested is part of the reason we can’t afford to keep this as a park?

How much money has been collected from leasing it to farm for the last 25+ years?

Regional parks serve the entire city. There is no timeline for annexation of the southwest. The only part of the southwest in City limits is north of Victory. The city periodically reviews annexation of the southwest but has never moved forward with it.

No question

No question

No question

No question

No question

No question

No question

Why are there many more parks on the northside … a decided inequity exists.

Agree with Karen.

But you have plenty of funding for other parks on the other end of town…

Land is a nominal cost in construction these days.

I realize you are asking just to annex this property, but the City wants to annex the property for the sole purpose of swapping it. Therefore, the details of the land swap is very important when making a decision for or against annexation.

A comment rather than a question: I realize you are asking just to annex this property, but the City wants to annex the property for the sole purpose of swapping it. Therefore, the details of the land swap is very important when making a decision for or against annexation.

A comment rather than a question: I realize you are asking just to annex this property, but the City wants to annex the property for the sole purpose of swapping it. Therefore, the details of the land swap is very important when making a decision for or against annexation.

Annexation is looked at internally by the city every few years. The city council is charged to meet the needs of ALL the residents of Boise—not just north enders—what about giving SW residents a park?

For any land trades that may occur in the future.

No economic impact studies to neighboring properties has been performed.

We intend to annex the city and school district properties and if a future land swap occurs, a park would be included in any future development of the land.

The north and east side has many areas already

If current needs are being met for sports fields, why is there no plan to include future sports park needs?

With the previously approved 2,000 homes approved on S. Cole, is the pathway to annex SW Boise stronger?

With the previously approved 2,000 homes approved on S. Cole, is the pathway to annex SW Boise stronger?

The north and east side has many areas already

Any question

No question

No question
Comment for record, no response needed: The city should either annex the space then build the park as intended, or leave it as is. Even now the farmed open space is of greater value than housing. There is no shortage of land for developers outside of Boise or Ada county, so it seems this is a plan to grow the city's population rather than creating housing opportunities in the area.

The foothills parcels have not been publicly identified but if traded for the Murgoitio parcel, the foothills land would be preserved as open space. 

The foothills parcels have not been publicly identified but if traded for the Murgoitio parcel, the foothills land would be preserved as open space.

If the parks north of the freeway serve all of Treasure Valley, why not annex the property to develop the park so you have something south of the freeway for the entire Treasure Valley?

I was trying to piggy back on the comment about roadways, but I can't find it. Anyone who lives out here (or even drives out here) knows Southbound Maple Grove cannot reasonably handle another high density housing project. Paving sidewalks is not sufficient as it doesn't reduce the number of vehicles on an already too busy road. Our roadways are at least 10 years behind our growth.

I'm trying to piggyback on the comment about roadways, but I can't find it. Anyone who lives out here (or even drives out here) knows Southbound Maple Grove cannot reasonably handle another high density housing project. Paving sidewalks is not sufficient as it doesn't reduce the number of vehicles on an already too busy road. Our roadways are at least 10 years behind our growth.

If there are not enough impact fees to develop the current park property, would the swapped property be developed?

We do understand the difference.

wee Why does the city not understand that there is a huge difference between 160 acres and a 7 acre park.

We have been looking forward to this park for years. Please do not put in more houses that the infrastructure can not handle.

We have been looking forward to this park for years. Please do not put in more houses that the infrastructure can not handle.

Less parks for more people makes no sense.

The city owns the land. It must be annexed to be considered for any future development or change in use.

You didn't have impact fees to purchase it. Sounds like Boise made a mistake. Sounds like the city should uphold their end of the bargain. Policy does not trump statute.

You didn't have impact fees to purchase it. Sounds like Boise made a mistake. Sounds like the city should uphold their end of the bargain. Policy does not trump statute.

If you are still looking for more land why not develop what you already own?

If you are still looking for more land why not develop what you already own?

This proposed application is to annex school district and city properties. The city periodically reviews annexation of the southwest but has not moved forward with it.

The city is exploring all possible options to address the housing shortage and this is one proposal

The city is exploring all possible options to address the housing shortage and this is one proposal

An example of compact housing is homes on smaller lots, townhouses or attached homes.

An example of compact housing is homes on smaller lots, townhouses or attached homes.

The city owns 3 parcels of 'undeveloped' land in the Southwest planning area. Murgoitio, Pearl Jensen and Wrigley sites are all currently situated outside of city limits.

The city owns 3 parcels of 'undeveloped' land in the Southwest planning area. Murgoitio, Pearl Jensen and Wrigley sites are all currently situated outside of city limits.
You say the southwest is outside of the city limits. But please note that Many living within the city limits and near this planned park would utilize it rather than driving across town rather than contributing to the traffic and people congestion on those popular areas across town. The demographics of the area (especially south of Amity) have changed drastically in the last 10 years. Why aren't people interested in annexing this area? You need to bring in new people and by annexing it you can help with that. The city periodically reviews annexation of the southwest but has never moved forward with it. It's a given that the city will annex south of Victory in time, so why keep using that as an excuse?

The city does not develop parks outside of city limits. We rely on property taxes to fund ongoing maintenance and operations. Boise School District reviews plats for impact to schools. If the land is used for housing, will those homes have access to canal water?

The masterplan was developed however the parcel was never placed in a capital plan so no impact fees were ever collected to pay for construction. The park proposed with the potential land swap would be a public park accessible to anyone who wishes to use it. They need not live in the subdivision to use it. Any residential development of the property would require the developer create 'off-street' pedestrian and bicycle trails throughout the subdivision. You keep saying that you can't build the park because there aren't enough people that want to be annexed into the city. You also said that the last time people were asked about it was 20 years ago. Can you explain how the city planned a park and published a map but apparently had no intention of creating a park since it wasn't yet annexed? Am I correct in assuming that the only reason annexation is being considered is so that a swap could then be arranged with this developer?

The city periodically reviews annexation of the southwest but has never moved forward with it. If the developer builds homes, where will these kids go to school? The district is selling off their parcels. 7 acres is not near equitable. We would probably rather keep it a farm if nothing else. People whose water wells have already dried up from new development dropping the water table, how are you going to support schooling for all of these new homes if we already have a deficit in student demographics of the area (especially south of Amity) have changed drastically in the last 10 years. Why aren't people interested in annexing this area? You need to bring in new people and by annexing it you can help with that. The city periodically reviews annexation of the southwest but has never moved forward with it. It's a given that the city will annex south of Victory in time, so why keep using that as an excuse?

The city does not develop parks outside of city limits. We rely on property taxes to fund ongoing maintenance and operations. Boise School District reviews plats for impact to schools. If the land is used for housing, will those homes have access to canal water?

We do not allocate any capital funding to a park property that is not in city limits. If annexation of the school district and Murgotio properties are approved, the city limit lines would be expanded. The park proposed with the potential land swap would be a public park accessible to anyone who wishes to use it. They need not live in the subdivision to use it. Any residential development of the property would require the developer create 'off-street' pedestrian and bicycle trails throughout the subdivision.
Currently, the parcel is leased to a farming operation to ensure the land is maintained and used according to its current zoning designation within Ada County. We could surplus it and sell it to the highest bidder but am not sure where Ada County stands. An Environmental study was done when the city purchased the property in 1992, but not since that time.

Thank you for your comments. This application would seek to only annex school district and city property. No private lands are being annexed with this application.

What is the Comprehensive Plan designation the city is going to request as well as the zoning? I believe you said Compact and R-1C, is that correct?

No question. The comprehensive plan map amendment request would be for a ‘compact’ designation. We are requesting A-1 zoning so that if the land swap is approved, the developer can rezone it to a zone that will accommodate their plans for the swap, it would be left in its current state for conservation.

The location and arrangement of neighborhood and community parks are designed to best serve Boise residents and its area of impact when those areas are annexed. This application would seek to only annex school district and city property. No private lands are being annexed with this application. The masterplan is not the same as a capital plan. The parcel was never included in any capital plan so no impact fees were collected for it. In regards to foothills land proposed for the swap, the land is currently being used for agriculture. This park is needed for this area. How much land needs to be annexed. The whole of SW Boise, or just the area near the park? There are many people who live in the city that want this park as well. If you are looking for more land why not use what you own now?

Yes, bpr@cityofboise.org

The North End neighborhood is well served by existing city parks and access to the Ridge to Rivers trail system. Compact is a designation that means detached single-family homes are predominant but a variety of housing types including duplexes, triplexes, townhomes, apartments and condominiums could be allowed. No, the city does not have the funding to construct the park in its current configuration. HUD defines an “affordable dwelling” as one that a household can obtain for 30 percent or less of its income. Why didn't the Parks Department engage with the community before making this decision?

The Parks Department is not looking to acquire any property with this annexation application. The city is exploring all possible options to address the housing shortage and this is one proposal. An Environmental study was done when the city purchased the property in 1992, but not since that time. No question.

Affordable - does that mean lower income or subsidised?

No question. These details are not available at this time.

Why can't all the money being spent on the parks in north Boise be saved or put into a similar park system in south Boise? Just by annexing the south into Boise the tax base would be there to help accommodate a park there just as nice as the greenbelt.

I am not understanding it WILL be in the city when annexed and was in the long term plans until recently so why not green it up? Will the land swap in the foothills not be “greened” up. One side of the foothill can not have neighborhoods either. So you used tax payer money to buy all these parcels but refuse to maintain them because you do not collect impact fees?

This park is needed for this area. How much land needs to be annexed. The whole of SW Boise, or just the area near the park? There are many people who live in the city that want this park as well. If you are looking for more land why not use what you own now?

Where is the support for this coming from then? Just the City trying to pat themselves on their back for something they have no control over. Why not green it up? Will the land swap in the foothills not be “greened” up. One side of the foothill can not have neighborhoods either. The Parks Department is not looking to acquire any property with this annexation application.
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Could you please break down to the lowest common denominator as to how to voice our opinion? Who do you contact, where do we send our concerns?

Why not leave the area alone and continue to farm it?

If you wanted us to participate, why the minimum notice which only mentioned the annexation?

why are you dismissing me

you mention the southwest is not in the city limits but actually a great deal of south of overland is in the city. "The area off-f the south CCoke and lake hazel with thousands of dwellings and business is slated to all be in the city. Why add more foothills land when the only way it is accessible for those south of the river is to drive to the foothills and search for parking, before hiking. time for land south of overland for multi use Why does Boise purchase properties outside of the city limits with expectations to develop as parks similar to the Murgoitio property but then decide to use differently? What commitments can we get from Boise that they’ll follow through?

But you can spend over 100 million to develop the white water park! Not everyone likes water! Some of us

want trails to walk or ride horse

Why can you not tell us who the developer is and where the land is in the North End?

Will this land be annexed once the housing is built?

Why is the city of Boise required to provide affordable housing? What is the City actually receiving from developer (???)

The City will have the impact fees from Locale and Murio Farms. These fees can be applied to Murgoitio Park.

Has the city considered developing the park in phases utilizing funding they have now and continue to expand in the future?

You keep saying that it will create affordable house but also mention that housing will be sell at market value so how is that affordable?

if we can go put grass on it will you all just leave the park alone? I’m sure everyone will chip in and we can score donations.

Thank you Jennifer Hall

if you don’t have the money to develop the regional park why not just wait until we do have the funds?

Anything is possible with solid public support.

370 So the parks won’t fence parks but they will gladly over water and ruin my fence...

371 Sign the petition to Save Murgoitio Park from Development;

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSfqN7-

372 Is there currently discussion around alternate proposals… for example a 80 acre residential development and 80 acre park vs 15/37 acre residential/park split. alternatively keeping the 160 acre park, but develop in stages so the $30M+ funding is spread across multiple years/decades.

I have observed extraordinary effort and ingenious approaches by the city to continuously expand recreation in the foothills, near a significant amount of existing recreation opportunities. I request a similar vision and commitment by our city leaders to create a unique, large and diverse regional recreation area more accessible to the portion of our populace that lives far from the north side opportunities. This is an opportunity that should not be lost.

how do we have representation in city council if we live outside city limits? Why would the city council listen to us, even though this project directly impacts us? I feel we have no voice.

375 WHY WOULD WE WANT TO BE ANNEXED AND THEN YOU FOXS JUST DO WHAT EVER YOU WANT

376 our beautiful state is turning into a cement jungle

377 What about air quality issue? Projects like this kick up a lot of air born contaminents.

Super early in the process seems to be the response for many questions, seems that more transparency and knowledge of the history - it seems that statement we couldn’t greenup before it was annexed,so city wants to annex it now - it could be annexed and developed as a park now.

7 acres park vs 160 acre recreation complex is not comparable.

378 Who neighbors will be notified when the hearing is?

These neighborhood parks, such as the Peppermint park, are in subdivisions. The residents in the subdivisions do not allow people who do not live in the subdivision to utilize the park. So it is concerning that the city states we have access to parks but in reality we do not.

Comments will be submitted with the applications for annexation and map amendment

These decisions were made in the 1990’s and were never acted upon. Without funding, we are considering options for addressing our critical housing shortage

The whitewater park did not cost 100 million

Harris Family

We intend to submit an application to annex this month. It will take several months to work through that process

360 why are you dismissing me

WHY WOULD WE WANT TO BE ANNEXED AND THEN YOU FOLKS JUST DO WHAT EVER YOU WANT

We are required to notify our neighbors prior to submitting application for annexation and comprehensive plan map amendment to the Planning and Zoning Commission. There will be future public hearings on this matter once the application is submitted.

Incendiary comments are dismissed as they are not questions

371 kVydQJ9Bm3wqjWjQf9B9a80e42_nngKVsQ8xYyTA/viewform
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Boise is about to annex this land for development but won’t consider annexing it for the park that was planned over 20 years ago?? Why not???

Why does the city need to swap this land? I understand that city cannot green it because it is not annexed by city and the cost is high, why not leave it the way it is and later when city starts annexing rest of SW and have the funds the build the park as it was planned. We really need a nice park in this area and we can wait a little longer when we have waited for the last 30 years.

Yes Debra, ... seems like a raw deal for us residents.

You cannot just create "affordability"? It will be sold at market rate like anywhere else! It is just a "gouge" term for compact and cheap housing that nobody out there actually wants.

NEAR THEM!

Boise created the AOI through their comprehensive plan. The county approved of it. However the City needs to take responsibility for what they helped create and keep their promises.

I invite all committee members to come take a drive around Overland/Cole/Lake Hazel/Maple Grove/S/Mile/Cloverbale especially around 4 to 6 pm...since none of them live even close to this area. They have no idea how much build up has happened. We need the green space!

Maybe the city could consider developing the park in phases utilizing funding they have now and continuing to expand in the future. We want the park!

It seems that while many of us not in the City ... the City Council has a great deal of power over our community and our quality of life ... this needs to change.

Why does this have to be swapped now? It’s been farmed for thirty years; why the rush?

https://www.change.org/p/boise-residents-save-murgoitio-park-from-development

The city is considering all options for addressing our critical housing shortage

DOES THE CITY TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE 2,000 HOMES GOING ON SOUTH COLE

Looking at selling the school property or actually building a park?

space? The southwest area can’t support any more high density housing. Wells are going dry.

We want green, no further housing, no swapping!

Looking at selling the school property or actually building a park?

You’re swapping 160 acres for 43 acres? Seriously?

No question

Applications will be submitted as presented with the addition of public comment

What does this land swap actually provide for the residents that have lived in the southwest with the idea they would have a Regional Park in this location and promised by a depiction that has been in place for many years, showed at many Neighborhood mtgs by developers to give support to their projects?

The city periodically reviews annexation of the southwest but has never moved forward with it.

The city has been successfully annexing large parts of the area. All land between Cole and Maple Grove South of Lake Hazel will be annexed in a few months.

Can we who live in the impact be considered part of the Boise impact area instead of the evil stepchildren of the Cory and the county.

The city periodically reviews annexation of the southwest but has never moved forward with it.

The proposal provides off street pathways and a neighborhood park

The city periodically reviews annexation of the southwest but has never moved forward with it.

The school district is/has planned for future growth in this area.

The acreage of the foothills property has not been made available at this time

We could surplus it and sell it to the highest bidder but am not sure where Ada County stands with the planning.

We have no idea how much build up has happened. We need the green space!
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compact is a land use designation that allows medium density residential and a range of housing types including single-family, townhomes duplexes and apartments.
When you say a 7 acre "neighborhood" park, does that mean that only the residents in that development/neighborhood can utilize it... will it be open to the public to use? It will be open to the public.

Would the low income housing be restricted to home-owners only, no airbnb, and no out of state REIT owners? Those details are not available at this time.

Boise parks and rec - we need local parks in this area. A comment were made that sports complexes were not needed here. We have always had to travel miles for our children to compete in sports. It seems like the rich areas have more city support!

I know the costs to develop the regional park are high, but has the City considered, as the City of Meridian does, the establishment of public/private partnerships in building parks to lower the buildout costs?

The developer just doesn’t want the hate and that’s why they’ve asked to remain private. This is not a public hearing. It is a neighborhood meeting that is required of us prior to submitting application.

The developer wants to remain private, yet it’s a public hearing. Would the city consider other amenities at this site instead of housing? Indoor sports complex, a swimming pool, or a boys and girls club? The city would consider proposals that furthers the goals and objectives set by leadership.

The way she mumbles the questions and answers are not professional and not clear. This can not be the way to satisfy the residents who will be negatively impacted by the city’s decisions. This is purely disrespectful to the residents in SW Boise.

What power do residents outside of Boise city limits have to effect any change aside from voicing their concerns via email and during meetings?

If SW Boise is in the area of impact to be annexed and we are seeing encroachment circling around this area, it seems like poor planning to not plan for adequate open space and parks that a development on this property would result in.

How do we "reach a compromise" on this proposal we can’t see before June 29? Clearly, this topic has brought up a lot of public opinion. It sounds like the city should get new and more recent data on what the people of SW Boise want to do in terms of being out of city limits. If Parks and Recs wants to sell this land, there will always be a buyer. Why can’t the city get new data and feedback and talk to the community to see if the people want to get annexed in? And then make decisions on selling it to a developer?

For the record, the standard 300 feet or 500 feet distance to notify neighbors for any city change is crazy for large developments or large tracts of land that will affect people in the 2 miles near those properties.

Sell the land to the county? I was at the meeting at Amity Elementary school when it was announced the land was purchased for a park. A question asked was "What will the park be named". Answer was "Write us a check for $1,000,000 and we will name it after you".

Why can’t there be a compromise. Make half the land a park and half housing? The city is considering all options for addressing our critical housing shortage, no decision has been made.

Are you holding a meeting for people unable to attend this internet meeting? This meeting is the first step in the application process.

It seems our Parks & Rec Dept. is more concerned about "low cost housing" and packing more housing into our neighborhood than it is about parks.

Sure sounds like an excuse. The city is exploring all possible options to address the housing shortage and this is one proposal.

This is a real waste of my time... It is 1 hour of my time I will never get back.

why can’t impact fees be used from Locale and the other proposed master plan to help pay for this park? The city is collecting impact fees from Syringa and Locale developments as these lands have been annexed.

Is the builder Toll Brothers? Harris Ranch.

I don’t understand why we hear the answer that there is no plan to annex the land to create the park, yet there is a plan to annex the land to develop it. Sounds like semantics. How do we push to get the city to respond?

If anything is to become of this site, it must be annexed first.

annex the land for finishing the park. If yes it will be on our website. cityofboise.org/parks search for murgotio

Will the presentation be posted somewhere for the people that were late or could not attend? Yes on our website at cityofboise.org/parks

Will additional city utilities be brought out to accommodate the development (city water, etc.). The site needs to be annexed first before anything can be done.

It seems this meeting started a long time ago, not the 7pm time. I also see it is being recorded. Where will the presentation be posted.

I will see this from the beginning? The meeting began at 6 pm. It is available on our website.

Why does the Southwest need to have all the high density compact housing for the city? We have Syringa and Locale. Why more? What will it be to do our house valuation?

Any development must bring the utilities to service it.

If people want to tell us, we will name it after them. A question asked was " What will the park be named". Answer was "Write us a check for $1,000,000 and we will name it after you".

Please be specific about what COMPACT zoning means .... Detached single-family homes are predominant but a variety of housing types including duplexes, triplexes, townhomes, apartments and condominiums could be allowed.

How do we "reach a compromise" on this proposal we can’t see before June 29? Clearly, this topic has brought up a lot of public opinion. It sounds like the city should get new and more recent data on what the people of SW Boise want to do in terms of being out of city limits. If Parks and Recs wants to sell this land, there will always be a buyer. Why can’t the city get new data and feedback and talk to the community to see if the people want to get annexed in? And then make decisions on selling it to a developer?

I was at the meeting at Amity Elementary school when it was announced the land was purchased for a park. A question asked was "What will the park be named". Answer was "Write us a check for $1,000,000 and we will name it after you".

Why can’t impact fees be used from Locale and the other proposed master plan to help pay for this park? The city is collecting impact fees from Syringa and Locale developments as these lands have been annexed.

Yes it will be on our website. cityofboise.org/parks search for murgoitio
a 20 acre Molinar park compared to this 160 acre park are night and day if we are to believe that is all the
park we need in the south
molinar park is dog crap every where you walk
But you have funding for other projects... you don't have to green it up now. It can be 5,10,15 years down
the road
You keep stating you don't have the funding to green it up, but didn't the Simplot and Albertsons
foundations award millions for those parks?
What price range is the developer targeting for these new homes?
Thank you for your explanations and efforts.
You don't have the funding to "green it up"? How does that work? That can be reevaluated if deemed
necessary!
the city does not have the funding to develop the park as outlined in the masterplan. This proposal will provide a neighborhood public park
Sell to the county with the covenant attached
really? I didn't know there was a shortage of land. technically speaking this landing isn't in boise yet either
If it is swapped, why would it be zoned compact? That zoning does not follow the zoning for the area?
you may want to hold the hearing at an event center as many people will want to be there in person.
A Comprehensive plan map amendment is proposed for the compact designation.

compact is the land use designation that is being proposed. The property would be annexed with A-1 zoning and then if the land swap goes through the developer would rezone it
to accommodate the number of units they proposed.

competing for the vacant 15 acres that front on victory. their proposals are due in july.
the school district currently has a call for proposals for the vacant 15 acres that front on victory. their proposals are due in july.

the number of units isn't available at this time. 7 acres is the size of a standard neighborhood serving park for residents within 1/2 mile of the site
thank you clyde!

the city does not have the funding to develop the park as outlined in the masterplan. This proposal will provide a neighborhood public park

the number of units isn't available at this time. 7 acres is the size of a standard neighborhood serving park for residents within 1/2 mile of the site
thanks clyde!

the city does not have the funding to develop the park as outlined in the masterplan. This proposal will provide a neighborhood public park

the city does not have the funding to develop the park as outlined in the masterplan. This proposal will provide a neighborhood public park

the number of units isn't available at this time. 7 acres is the size of a standard neighborhood serving park for residents within 1/2 mile of the site
thank you clyde!

The Simplots and Albertsons contributed to the funding of those parks
live answered
thank you!
Greening-up a park amounts to landscape design plans and the costs of construction of irrigation infrastructure, installation and establishment of sod, trees, providing paved
pathways and accessible restrooms.
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The city does not have the funding to develop the park as outlined in the masterplan. This proposal will provide a neighborhood public park

thank you!

The Simplots and Albertsons contributed to the funding of those parks
live answered
thank you!
Greening-up a park amounts to landscape design plans and the costs of construction of irrigation infrastructure, installation and establishment of sod, trees, providing paved
pathways and accessible restrooms.

thank you!

The city does not have the funding to develop the park as outlined in the masterplan. This proposal will provide a neighborhood public park

thank you clyde!

The Simplots and Albertsons contributed to the funding of those parks
live answered
thank you!
Greening-up a park amounts to landscape design plans and the costs of construction of irrigation infrastructure, installation and establishment of sod, trees, providing paved
pathways and accessible restrooms.

thank you!

The city does not have the funding to develop the park as outlined in the masterplan. This proposal will provide a neighborhood public park

thank you clyde!

The Simplots and Albertsons contributed to the funding of those parks
live answered
thank you!
Greening-up a park amounts to landscape design plans and the costs of construction of irrigation infrastructure, installation and establishment of sod, trees, providing paved
pathways and accessible restrooms.

thank you!

The city does not have the funding to develop the park as outlined in the masterplan. This proposal will provide a neighborhood public park

thank you clyde!

The Simplots and Albertsons contributed to the funding of those parks
live answered
thank you!
Greening-up a park amounts to landscape design plans and the costs of construction of irrigation infrastructure, installation and establishment of sod, trees, providing paved
pathways and accessible restrooms.

thank you!

The city does not have the funding to develop the park as outlined in the masterplan. This proposal will provide a neighborhood public park

thank you clyde!

The Simplots and Albertsons contributed to the funding of those parks
live answered
thank you!
Greening-up a park amounts to landscape design plans and the costs of construction of irrigation infrastructure, installation and establishment of sod, trees, providing paved
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thank you!

The city does not have the funding to develop the park as outlined in the masterplan. This proposal will provide a neighborhood public park

thank you clyde!

The Simplots and Albertsons contributed to the funding of those parks

Greening-up a park amounts to landscape design plans and the costs of construction of irrigation infrastructure, installation and establishment of sod, trees, providing paved
pathways and accessible restrooms.

thank you clyde!

Thank you for attending
We also have no representation when it comes to voting in the City of Boise elections, which means we have no voice.

Molenaar is clearly in the 20 stage plan. Molenaar amenities are currently being constructed.

Thank you Jennifer. Your efforts are appreciated!

Why doesn’t the developer just build homes in the foothills? We do not have those details at this time.

Thank you for working through this with us. This is a large meeting to handle on your own.

The location of the foothills property is not available at this time.

Would it be possible to “green” it by giving it some use access? Like a dirt parking lot with low improvement? City Council is the decision making body for this project.

Molenaar is clearly in the 20 stage plan. Molenaar amenities are currently being constructed.

The location of the foothills property is not available at this time.

Thank you Jennifer. Your efforts are appreciated!

Why doesn’t the developer just build homes in the foothills? We do not have those details at this time.

more development is antithetical to our values

Why are there NOT discussions for ALTERNATE proposals? This is the proposal that the city has before it. No other proposals have been brought to the city.

Can this be stopped? Can you also notify us via Next Door app? Yes it will as well as the presentation recording

Can we go down and crime rates will go up. City Council is the decision making body for this project.

Every other annexation in the area had detailed development plans at the time of annexation. You should wait on annexation until those details can be made public.

Why is the City responsible for changing the Covenants and Restrictions when the land is in the County? Regardless of whether the land is in city limits, it is owned by the city. The City Council approved the original Covenants and Restrictions, so the same entity can modify/remove them.

Whose fault is it that the property remained vacant for so long? Where was government support? That city has owned the land for many years. The site is not ‘vacant’ but rather being leased to a farming operation at a cost savings, as the lessee manages weeds/pests, ditches and irrigation water, other costs and maintenance activities that would normally be required when land is left fallow and not used for any purposes.

If you want to create a city for everyone, why does the city continue to remove simirural areas. Regardless of size, a park will be provided with the proposed swap.

This park was approved in the 90’s yet you refuse to address the 90’s? The masterplan was development in the 90’s however the property was never included in any capital plan, so no funding has been set aside for development.