



Memo

To: Mayor Davis and Members of the Council

From: Donna Phillips, Community Development Director

Date: May 14, 2026

Agenda Item: PZE-25-0080 Sycamore Valley Subdivision Preliminary Plat Written Decision

Agenda Item Location

Consent Calendar

Recommended Action or Motion

The City Council should approve the Written Decision attached if it is an accurate account of the decision of the City Council with respect to the request identified above.

Functional Impact of Authorizing

Should the City Council approve the Written Decision, then the applicant may enter into a Master Development Agreement for the project and submit construction plans in accordance with the decision.

Functional Impact of Not Authorizing

Should the City Council not approve the Written Decision, then the Council shall direct staff accordingly as to the revisions requested to memorialize the decision of the Council approving the request.

Fiscal Impact

Not Applicable

Budget Funding Source / Transfer Request

Not Applicable

Attachment

PZE-25-0080 Sycamore Valley Subdivision Written Decision

WRITTEN DECISION

RE: PZE-25-0080 Sycamore Valley Subdivision Preliminary Plat

The application of **Olson Engineering, Inc., on behalf of the owner, Kulka Land, LLC**, requesting approval to subdivide the 13.06 (+/-) acre property into 37 single family residential lots to be known as Sycamore Valley Subdivision located at the Northwest corner of West Miles Avenue and North Maple Street, Idaho was **APPROVED** with Conditions as amended by the Hayden City Council.

City Council Motion April 28, 2026: Council President DePriest moved and Councilmember Erickson seconded the motion, to approve with conditions as amended the file PZE-25-0080, finding that it **IS** in accord with the standards of Hayden City Code and the adopted comprehensive plan, based upon testimony received at the Planning and Zoning Commission Hearing and the City Council Hearing and the record of the request.

FINDINGS:

12-3-4(F) Standards of Approval: The applicant has demonstrated that all existing and proposed infrastructures meets or can be constructed prior to final plat or within the approval duration identified in 12-3-4(G) from the date of City Council approval of the master development agreement which approves the preliminary plat to meet the following standards:

HCC §12-3-4 (F) (1): Infrastructure can/cannot be constructed to function in a manner that promotes the public health, safety, and welfare.

HCC §12-3-4 (F) (2): Infrastructure can/cannot be constructed and located in an orderly manner that accommodates ongoing maintenance needs when taking into consideration collocation of other infrastructure.

Applicant: See applicant's narrative on page 35.

Staff: See Staff Analysis page 2.

CC Hearing:

Councilmember Roetter read into the record the second paragraph of the Kootenai County Sheriff Office's agency response regarding number of sheriff's officers and response times. He discussed the City's contract with Kootenai County for a reduced number of sheriff's officers since the time of the issuance of the agency response letter. Councilmember Roetter asked if this was considered. Mr. Terzulli identified that any cut in staff whether it was with the KCSO, the Public Works Department, the city, then response times would be lengthened. Mr. Terzulli went on to identify that these are proposed to be large lots, which generally does not have a large crime rate.

Rebuttal: Mr. Terzulli identified that with these homes, additional taxes will be collected to help potentially fund more officers.

HCC §12-3-4 (F) (3): Infrastructure is/is not or will/will not be in compliance with applicable city, state, and federal policies and regulations as follows:

a) Provisions have/have not been made for a water supply system that satisfies city, Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (IDEQ), and NLFPD requirements.

Applicant: See applicant's narrative on page 39. Avondale Irrigation District (AID) has provided a will serve letter. Water plans and fire hydrant spacing are subject to review and approval of AID, NLFPD, and IDEQ.

Staff: Avondale Irrigation District (AID) provided a Will Serve Letter dated October 30, 2024. See Staff Analysis beginning on page 3.

CC Hearing

Staff: AID Will Serve letter was updated on March 16, 2026.

Applicant: Jeramie Terzulli, presenting on behalf of Olson Engineering, identified that Northern Lakes Fire Protection District (NLFPD) had been missing prior to the Planning and Zoning Commission hearing, but that they had provided comments prior to this public hearing. Essentially a boiler plate response to provide for adequate access and fire flow.

b) Provisions have/have not been made for a public sewage system in accordance with the city and Hayden Area Regional Sewer Board's (HARSB) adopted sewer master plans, as amended, that satisfied city, HARSB, and IDEQ requirements and that the existing or proposed systems can accommodate the proposed sewer flows.

Applicant: See applicant's narrative on page 39.

Staff: City of Hayden provided a Will Serve Letter dated September 3, 2025. The project site is wholly within the H-1 basin. See Staff Analysis beginning on page 3.

CC Hearing:

Applicant: This proposed subdivision is in a previously unserved area of the city. Service of sewer to this part of the city has required the extension of sewer in both Miles Avenue and in Maple Street to Dana Court. A subdivision which is on septic and dry-lined today. The Will Serve identifies that as of right now there is capacity to serve this project; however, there is no guarantee that sewer capacity will be available at the time of building construction.

Staff: The residence located at 385 E Miles Avenue shall be connected to the City sewer in accordance with Hayden City Code resulting from the boundary line adjustment.

c) Provisions have/have not been made for snow storage that satisfies the City Public Works Department as the design relates to snow storage and removal practices. If

- snow storage is proposed to be collocated with stormwater, it shall only be in roadside swale areas and not in regional detention basins unless approved administratively by the City Engineer who shall determine that the likelihood of flooding is minimal.
- d) Provisions have/have not been made for stormwater systems that satisfy the City and IDEQ requirements.
 - e) Provisions have/have not been made for streets that are consistent with the adopted transportation plan, as amended, and the transportation element of the adopted comprehensive plan, as amended and that satisfies the City, ITD, adjacent jurisdictions, and local highway district requirements. Where cul-de-sacs are proposed, they are required to be approved administratively by the City Engineer who shall determine that they are limited to portions of developments in which street continuity is not foreseeable due to property configurations and/or that they are needed to address site-specific conditions. A cul-de-sac shall be limited to 400' in length measured from the edge of adjacent street right-of-way to the back of the cul-de-sac, unless an exception to this standard is allowed by the City Engineer.

Applicant: See applicant's narrative on page 39.

Staff: See staff analysis beginning on page 4.

CC Hearing

Applicant: All proposed internal streets are in accordance with city standards. The City Engineer and Public Works Director have had an opportunity to review these. No cul-de-sacs or eyebrows. Stormwater/snow storage in street side swales. Multiple mailbox locations have been reserved within the subdivision. Right-of-way dedication and frontage improvements will be required on both Miles Avenue and Maple Street for the half width adjacent to their property. Mr. Terzulli went on to explain the standard width of the typical section to include the pavement section, curb, swale, sidewalk and the dry utility easements for both the streets on the external part of the subdivision and within the subdivision itself. He noted here the request from the Historic Commission and other residents, identified the sentimental value of the house to the area. The house is not in good shape, but the applicant has identified a triangle area at the corner of Miles and Maple to place a bench, a plaque, a location to put some information about the importance of this location to the community of Hayden. Additionally, it was identified that should the city decide to make some road improvements to this intersection, then this area could be used for that in the future as well.

Staff: No cul-de-sacs or eyebrows as proposed for road design at the request of the public works department. Road connectivity is possible to larger lots to the east (Pearl Avenue) and to the south. Roads will be widened for Maple and Miles. Council President DePriest asked if this was just their half of the roadway. Ms. Phillips confirmed that he was correct. Mayor Davis asked about the cul-de-sacs that were near the project site and when they were completed. As for the ones identified, all were completed prior to or in the same time frame as the late 1990s.

Dana Court was dry lined within the street for future connectivity to sewer when it was within Maple Street. Each home is on a septic system today, and paid capitalization fees at the time of building permit. Extension of the sewer beyond the subdivision's northern boundary is because it is consistent with the City's Sewer Master Plan as required.

Public Comment R. Stoker (For) – Non-resident: As owner of the project, he wanted to introduce himself to the City Council and stand for questions from the Council. Council President DePriest asked about the possibility of the owner participating in the traffic updates at Miles and Government Way. Mr. Stoker identified that he would be happy to help at Miles and Maple. No one has asked him to help with Government Way and Miles, and so he is unclear how he could help with that intersection. He is the owner of a geotechnical company in Coeur d'Alene, and he could pay that company with that work geotechnically if that was something that the city needed. Councilmember Roetter quoted PZC minutes related to this corner regarding Mr. Terzulli's comments regarding Hayden Urban Renewal Agency (HURA) funds for that intersection. Mr. Terzulli identified that his comments were from personal understanding related to property which he owned at the southeast corner of that intersection; and not specific to being tied to this project.

Councilmember Roetter identified the last paragraph of the KCSO response letter regarding additional traffic congestion on neighboring roadways could further burden the response time from the KCSO. Mr. Terzulli identified these comments are not generally received from Post Falls, Coeur d'Alene, or Rathdrum as they have their own police forces. The letter from the KCSO is like those that are within Kootenai County and other cities who use the KCSO for police service.

Rebuttal (Applicant): Mr. Terzulli, who is not a traffic engineer and has worked with others, mentioned sometimes it is a trip generation letter and sometimes it is a full-blown transportation impact analysis. He provided a summary of how a transportation impact analysis (TIA) is created. Maximum density in this zone on this site is 4 dwelling units per acre, and the project is looking at about 2.5 dwelling units per acre.

Councilmember Roetter asked what the rating was for Maple Street and Miles Avenue. Mr. Terzulli identified when a trip generation letter or TIA would be required. Ms. Jovick identified that this question may be better suited for staff.

Council President DePriest asked if the intersection of Government Way and Miles Avenue was at a tipping point. Mr. Terzulli said that a signal was in the design and/or construction. Staff had an opportunity to analyze that question.

Mr. Terzulli continued that plans will be reviewed by the city engineer and other agencies (Panhandle Health District, Idaho Department of Environmental Quality, Avondale Irrigation District, Northern Lakes Fire District, etc.). Engineer of Record will provide oversight and observation during the construction in accordance with the City's requirements. No additional studies were requested by the agencies. Fees will be assessed at the time of building permit for impact on traffic and parks.

Provided background regarding parkland which is usually done at the time of annexation agreement; however, in this case property is already within the City. Provided the opportunity to provide for parkland in this subdivision and provided some other possible alternatives in the nearby area. Mr. Terzulli identified the city chose not to participate in purchase of area within the were than he did. 2040 Parks Master Plan identifies that property should be purchased for the park. Mr. Terzulli gave some history regarding discussion about how to meet this requirement and possible opportunities regarding this property and other properties in the nearby area.

Councilmember Erickson: Asked about the possibility of a park going west of this project related to additional condition from the Planning and Zoning Commission related to connectivity. Mr. Terzulli identified that he wasn't at liberty to discuss where or if there was property for a park.

City Attorney: Fonda Jovick, City Attorney identified property west of the subdivision site was under contract with the City. She went on to state that he was at liberty to discuss possible ways to make that connectivity work. The City was not under contract at the time of the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting at, so it was not at liberty to discuss it at that time. Since that time, however, it has come under contract to purchase it and so it can be discussed.

Mr. Terzulli identified that they already have contact with the possible property owner at the northwest corner of the subdivision, but if that can't occur, then the connectivity could still occur through the north side of Miles Avenue with the addition of frontage improvements to the future park area. Mr. Terzulli did identify that it shouldn't be open-ended and that should the condition be amended, he would suggest adding a certain distance to the requirement.

Councilmember Erickson followed up on how this connectivity was envisioned to be constructed. Mr. Stoker identified that if the City became the owner of the property, then it would be easier. If we must obtain it, then we would like to put a road in and sell it like any other lot. Potentially through an easement to the area versus a roadway. He would prefer to see it through the north and make the connection; but don't know.

Mayor Davis asked about a statement by Mr. Terzulli regarding negotiation of park location. The parks master plan identifies a general location of where a future park is to be located. Lisa Ailport, City Administrator, identified that there is a need for a park in the northeast quadrant. Ms. Jovick identified the master plan comes from the comprehensive plan adopted by City Council. Developers, as a whole, don't get to negotiate what your master planning efforts have already resulted in. There are only specific times when you require the dedication of land and then there are other funding sources which can be used for parkland purchases. Councilmember Erickson identified the city has no way of requiring a park. Ms. Jovick noted the staff has brought forward a request from a developer which meets all requirements including the condition of approval to having them meet the requirement of a park in this quadrant potentially. It doesn't negate the ability for the City to negotiate with a developer through a master development agreement, but it isn't a standard of approval.

Public Comment – M. Sullivan (Neutral): Resident: Asked why the six lots in the center couldn't be utilized in the middle for this park area. Maybe the developer should not use the other property but use this property. Not opposed to not having any additional townhomes between my property and the existing townhomes, a park could be there. Not opposed to the size of the lots, just something to consider.

Rebuttal (Applicant): Mr. Terzulli noted the property owner had put the project on hold in the fall to try to address the concerns raised regarding the park and its location. They met with city staff and worked on an avenue to move forward with possible solutions to meet this requirement prior to bringing the request forward for the City Council consideration. No strong arming occurred by the city and just ideas bouncing back and forth, and some council like parks more than others. It is up to the City Council to determine if this standard has been met.

HCC §12-3-4 (F) (4): Provisions have/have not been made for erosion controls and geo-hazards stabilization both during construction and as needed for permanent controls to the satisfaction of the city.

HCC §12-3-4 (F) (5): Provisions have/have not been made for gas, power, telecommunications, mailboxes, and similar infrastructure.

HCC §12-3-4 (F) (6): Provisions have/have not been made for driveway locations that take into consideration the width and location of the driveway in relation to the location of snow storage, utility boxes, crosswalks, adjacent roads, mailboxes and the like.

Applicant: See applicant's narrative on page 40.

Staff: See Staff Analysis page 9.

CC Hearing

Applicant: Water and sewer are available to or near the site and will be extended. Dry utility coordination will occur during the final stages of construction plan development. Mailbox locations shall be placed on the internal streets. Large lots will give ample location for driveways to not conflict with other items of the road typical. Engineer oversight will ensure soil stabilization and erosion control are addressed with best management practices.

Staff: No individual access will be allowed from Maple Street or Miles Avenue. New mailboxes would be located on the internal public streets. All utility infrastructure shall be placed underground.

HCC §12-3-4 (F) (7): The area proposed for subdivision is/is not zoned for the proposed use and the use conforms to other requirements found in this code.

Applicant: See applicant's narrative on page 38.

Staff: See Staff Analysis beginning on page 9. As the purpose of the zoning ordinance is made in accordance with a comprehensive plan, the analysis includes much of the comprehensive plan.

This analysis begins on page 10 of the staff analysis. Additionally, as always, the full Goals and Policies may be found in the Appendix beginning on page 28.

CC Hearing

Applicant: As shown in the previous exhibits, the proposed uses conform to the underlying zones and meet all the performance standards of those zoning districts. The lots are very large and nearly 10,000 square feet on average and the lots match up to the lots to the north pretty much and are consistent with the developed neighbors in the area.

Councilmember Erickson identified this project is proposed to have much larger lots than the minimum lot size in this zone designation. Councilmember Erickson wanted to make the point that a future subdivision under a future zone designation could result in denser development.

Public Comment L. Cardenas (Against) – Resident: Across the street with a 2.5-acre lot and the neighbor with a 3-acre lot. She made the assertion that noticing was not done properly for the public hearing because neighbor did not receive the notice. [Staff provided publication dates in the CDA Press, the notices posted on the property, and the notice mailed to the property. No mailed notice for this address was received back to the city.] “Local planning affects our lives every day.” Ms. Jovick responded to the question, that the statute requires that proof of noticing occurred. The notice was mailed to the address provided by the title company. The notice was mailed in accordance with Idaho Code. Ms. Cardenas read the full letter into the record regarding a variety of ideas – not fully comparable to all the surrounding properties, transportation concerns, and ideas. Ms. Cardenas then provided her testimony regarding the following concerns: density, project out of context, loss of historic property, loss of open space, impact fees instead of providing the open space, request for building of single story homes with basements instead of two-story homes, increase in traffic on surrounding streets, signal at Government Way and Miles Ave, KCSO response time, and length of time for development of future lots. While she appreciated what was presented here tonight, she is still concerned regarding the timing of the future park area.

Rebuttal (Applicant): The underlying zone will dictate what will be able to be constructed, and the lots sizes are like the lots to the north, northeast, and the south. Well under the density cap for an R-1 subdivision. Idaho Statutes recognize the rights of a private property owner.

HCC §12-3-4 (F) (8): The developer has made adequate plans to ensure that the community will bear no more than its fair share of costs to provide services by paying fees, furnishing land, or providing other mitigation measures for off-site impacts to streets, parks, and other public facilities within the community. It is the expectation that in most cases, off-site improvements will be dealt with through the agreements.

Applicant: See Applicant’s narrative beginning on page 39

Staff: All on-site and off-site improvements shall be required of the Developer to include various agreements, infrastructure per the adopted City Code, standards, and plans.

CC Hearing

Applicant: Provisions have been made such that all infrastructure required to serve this project will be provided by the developer and that any off-site impacts will be mitigated through impact fees as is typical in the City of Hayden.

Staff: Noted the applicant will be extending sewer to Dana Court and will be providing connectivity to the future park.

Northern Lakes Fire Protection District letter came yesterday or today. Staff strive to get all the comments received into the hands of the Commission for the public hearing. No additional public comments between those received prior to the memo to Boardbook.

Deliberations:

Councilmember Roetter wants coordination regarding what the plan is for connectivity and a trip generation letter and would like to delay for that reason.

Councilmember Erickson asked what the timeline was with respect to escrow. Ms. Ailport identified that it had been opened and that it might be completed by the end of July. He would like a clear resolution on the escrow process and provide clarity on what connectivity would look like. Councilmember Erickson had questions for the staff regarding the staff analysis and asked if there were some details that should have been included.

Dulci Kau, City Engineer, stated she looked at Miles Avenue and Maple Street and that at the time of the transportation plan the intersection functioned at a level of service "A" in 2018. Mayor Davis clarified for the public that Level of service "A" is the best. Ms. Kau went on to state the development is well below the model assumptions for this location. Short term is 2035, and 2040 is long term would have been failing. The growth projections were 4%, and globally the city hasn't seen the in-fill development that the model anticipated. Council President DePriest asked what a trip generation letter would show. Ms. Kau noted a trip generation letter would show how many trips went in and/or out of the subdivision. Councilmember Erickson believes that most of the impact from this subdivision would be to the southwest entrance and not to Maple and Miles intersection. Councilmember Roetter identified the pedestrians that are walking on those streets and the safety of the streets. Maple is not a safe road for pedestrians to be walking on today. Need to see where we are at and the safety of Miles in general. Mayor Davis asked if the subdivision included sidewalks. Staff confirmed.

Ms. Jovick identified that if the City Council directs staff to gather more information, then the new information would necessitate a public hearing. Then the City Council shouldn't deliberate now but wait until the new information is gathered and a public hearing is noticed.

Councilmember Roetter motioned to postpone the decision and not deliberate to another meeting to receive information on park connectivity and the trip generation letter and to look at it in more detail. Council President DePriest seconded. Councilmember Erickson sympathized with the members of the public, walking pedestrians on Maple, etc. This proposal is already

improving the roadway for pedestrians, but if left undeveloped it is not improving safety. Councilmember Roetter disagreed.

Council President DePriest acknowledged the developer working with the City and about their concerns related to Maple and Miles, the signal date at Miles and Government Way. Alan Soderling, Public Works Director, identified the capital improvement plan showed it to be completed in the next three to four years. Ms. Kau provided additional specificity in the design has been completed and the city is moving into the acquisition of right-of-way phase of the project. Folks are using Maple Street as an alternative to using Government Way. A trip generation letter does not require traffic analysis is what is most likely going to be the case. The Council sympathizes with the neighboring property owners, and if they owned the property, they may be thinking something differently. They are the owners, they are within the comprehensive plan, and I struggle after hearing from our staff that the trip generation isn't going to change this.

Vote: No, No, and Yes

Councilmember Erickson stated that even if the traffic analysis was done, the development provides a wider street and sidewalks. Pedestrian safety is one focus, but another area of concern is Miles Avenue and Government Way which are being addressed. Ms. Jovick identified the project will also pay impact fees. Additionally, the project will provide connectivity through sidewalks and paths to the possible future park.

Council President DePriest motioned to approve the project with the recommended conditions of approval as amended with consideration as park connectivity by the City Council. Councilmember Erickson seconded.

Vote: No, yes, yes – motion passes.

Staff Recommended Conditions of Approval (begins on page 13 of the staff analysis):

General Conditions of Approval:

1. The Developer shall be required to reflect all necessary permanent dedications and/or easements (to include but not be limited to avigation, odor, sewer, stormwater, water, utilities, etc.) on the face of the final plat of the subdivision and to record as a separate document all necessary temporary easements and to identify to whom the dedication and/or easement is to be granted and for what purpose.
2. All permits from outside agencies (ie. CDA Airport, HARSB, AID, IDEQ, IDWR, NLFPD, and PHD) shall be obtained prior to construction of any future development or building permit issuance.
3. This approval shall run with the land for the term approved herein regardless of whether the property ownership, applicant and/or design professionals noted herein remain the same, whether collectively or individually.

Access Conditions of Approval:

4. All lots shall be accessed from the internal roads of the subdivision. No lot shall have any form (primary, secondary, for accessory buildings, etc.) of direct individual access onto Miles Avenue or Maple Street. The final location of all driveway locations shall be subject to the review and approval of the City. Particular attention will be paid to location of utility pedestals in relation to driveway and snow storage needs and to those lots at intersections to avoid conflict with the required traffic flow.

Construction Plan Requirements:

5. The construction plan submittal shall include those requirements as identified in Hayden City Code §12-6 and more specifically as follows:
 - a. The Developer shall be required to construct the internal streets to a local street section per ST-111 and ST-111A. As proposed the Internal road typical section shall be 36' face of curb to face of curb to allow for parking on both sides of the road, 10' swales to include Type Iv landscaping, 5' sidewalks for a right-of-way width of 68'.
 - b. The site topography is relatively flat; however, erosion control measures shall be addressed with Best Management Practices (BMP).
 - c. The Developer shall use the City of Hayden Sanitary Sewer system to serve future development in accordance with the adopted Sewer Master Plan. No cross country sewer alignments are allowed.
 - d. A letter (e-mail) from the US Postal Service with respect to mailbox locations shall be provided with the intent to place the mailboxes within the subdivision on the internal street and not on the collectors or arterials.
6. Landscape Plans: Detailed landscaping plans conforming to the requirements of City Code, shall be submitted for the entire development with construction plans for required subdivision improvements for review and approval by the City. All disturbed areas shall be stabilized with dryland grass or other approved BMP.
 - a. Individual Lots: The landscape plans shall include a dryland grass mix shall be applied until individual lots are constructed and the hydro-seeding, installation of the irrigation system and required landscaping are completed.
 - b. Street Frontage: Along all street frontages shall be included within the landscaping plan submittal, with actual street tree placement to be completed at the time of building permit for all lots, with the exception of landscaping required with the Greenway tracts and/or multi-modal pathways.

Requirements of the Final Plat:

7. All public road right-of-way shall either be dedicated on the plat or by separate document at the time of the final plat.
8. All utility easements required and/or as identified on the typical section shall be granted on the plat or by separate document at the time of final plat.

Requirements requested by other Agencies:

- 9. The Developer shall comply with the requirements from the Northern Lakes Fire Protection District agency comments.
- 10. The avigation easement requested by the Coeur d’Alene Airport shall be recorded and shall be referenced on the final plat of the subdivision.

Additional Requirements:

- 11. The developer to the satisfaction of the City Council shall develop and construct connectivity to the future park as a requirement prior to final plat as a condition of this approval.
- 12. A historical interpretative sign shall be constructed in accordance with the adopted sign structure type with the sign content to be provided by the City Historical Preservation Commission and the sign shall not be placed within the City’s right-of-way, but shall be placed within a dedicated easement or tract at the corner of Maple Street and Miles Avenue.

With this decision, there are a number of conditions with specific components. The specificity does not preclude the City from exercising its right to require compliance, or demonstrate compliance, with any condition at any time, as well as any other applicable requirements whether or not specifically articulated herein.

NOW THEREFORE IT IS THE FINDINGS of the Hayden City Council that the Sycamore Valley Subdivision preliminary plat request PZE-25-0080 be approved.

Any applicant or affected person seeking judicial review of compliance with the provisions of Idaho Code Section §67-6535 and Hayden City Code §1-1-6 must first seek reconsideration of the final decision from the Hayden City Council within fourteen (14) days. Such written request must identify specific deficiencies in the decision for which reconsideration is sought as identified in Hayden City Code §1-1-6(A) (1) (a-f).

The applicant has the right to request a regulatory taking analysis pursuant to Idaho Code Section §67-8003. Any affected person aggrieved by a final decision concerning matters identified in Idaho Code section §67-6521 (a) (a) may, within twenty-eight (28) days after all remedies have been exhausted under local ordinances seek judicial review under the procedures provided by Chapter 52, Title 67, Idaho Code.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION APPROVED on the _____ day of May 2026.

CITY OF HAYDEN, IDAHO

By: _____

Alan Davis, Mayor

ATTEST:

Abbi Sanchez, Clerk