

General Overview

- **Case Summary:** This was a public hearing before the Canyon County Board of Commissioners on April 14, 2026, regarding an appeal (Case CU2025-002-APL) filed by Big Horn Traffic Services. The applicant appealed the Planning and Zoning (P&Z) Commission's December 18, 2025, denial of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a contractor shop and staging area on a property located at 5023 East Victory Road. The applicant's representative argued that the denial infringed on property rights and was not supported by evidence, as county staff and reviewing agencies had recommended approval with conditions. Members of the public testified in opposition, citing concerns about traffic safety on an already dangerous road, noise and light pollution, and the incompatibility of a commercial business with the area's rural residential and agricultural character. County staff presented their report, which detailed the P&Z Commission's reasons for denial and the conditions that had been proposed for approval.
- **Speaker Background:**
 - **Brad Holton, Zach Brooks, Leslie Van Beek:** The presiding Chairman and Commissioners of the Canyon County Board of Commissioners.
 - **Connor Gray:** The project manager and representative for the applicant, Big Horn Traffic Services.
 - **Arbai and Dan:** Staff members from the Development Services Department (DSD) who presented the staff report and answered technical questions.
 - **John McLean, Renee Kelly, Sean Kelly, Gary DeBoer, Tina DeBoer:** Local residents who testified in opposition to the appeal, citing various negative impacts on the neighborhood.
 - **Jeff Dancer:** The president of Big Horn Traffic Services, who testified in support of the application.

Key Points

- **Applicant's Argument (Connor Gray):** The representative for Big Horn Traffic Services argued that the case was a fundamental property rights issue. He stated the P&Z Commission's denial disregarded the county code, which allows for the proposed use with a CUP, and ignored the recommendations for approval from county staff and other agencies. He contended the denial was based on speculation rather than substantial evidence. He challenged the P&Z's findings that the use would negatively alter the area's character, pointing to its proximity to Nampa city limits and future industrial land-use plans. He also disputed the finding of "undue interference" with traffic, noting that neither the Idaho Transportation Department nor the highway district had raised safety or capacity concerns.

- **DSD Staff Report (Arbai):** The staff report summarized the case history and outlined the two criteria the P&Z Commission found the proposal failed to meet: 1) that the use would be injurious to other properties and negatively change the essential character of the area, and 2) that it would create undue interference with existing and future traffic patterns. Staff presented the 13 proposed conditions for approval, which included limits on hours of operation, number of employees (40) and vehicles (30), as well as requirements for fencing and lighting. Staff also confirmed a previous code enforcement violation on the property for operating without a permit, which was closed after the business ceased operations pending the application process.
- **Opposition Testimony (Residents):** Neighbors testified that Victory Road was already extremely dangerous, with a blind corner and frequent accidents, and that the addition of 20-30 daily commercial trips would exacerbate the problem. They raised concerns about constant noise from backup beepers on commercial vehicles, light pollution in a currently dark rural area, and a potential decrease in their property values. They argued that a commercial/industrial operation was incompatible with the established agricultural and rural residential character of the neighborhood. One speaker noted that the applicant had a prior code enforcement violation and questioned their honesty.
- **Supporting Testimony (Jeff Dancer):** The president of Big Horn Traffic Services, Jeff Dancer, stated the company was employee-owned and needed to expand from its current location. He clarified that the company's vehicles were primarily F-150 pickups, most of which did not have backup alarms. He explained that a mention of 70 vehicles at a prior hearing was a hypothetical for a company-wide emergency stand-down, not a normal operational number. He stated they were led to the property because it was listed with "commercial development opportunities" and that they intended to be a good neighbor.

Notable Quotes

- **(7:59) Connor Gray, Applicant Representative:** "This is not about a contractor shop or staging area. This is fundamen- fundamentally a property rights issue. This is, uh, this is about whether a property owner who's proposing a use that is expressly allowed under the county's code can rely on that code, follow the process, meet the criteria, accept the conditions, and still be denied based on speculation rather than evidence."
- **(13:12) Connor Gray, Applicant Representative:** In reference to the P&Z Commission's suggestion to seek annexation into the city of Nampa: "So the logic here is that this use here today is deemed to, is, is deemed to be too, uh, impactful under county jurisdiction, yet they're telling us to go over to the city where more intensive uses would be allowed and have less restriction. Anne- annexation does not reduce impact. It removes the ability of the county to condition it."
- **(37:46) John McLean, Resident:** "Noise, these vehicles are commercial, so they are required to have backup, uh, beepers, and that's what we're gonna be hearing all day long. As they

move these vehicles around, back them in, maneuver them, uh, load, unload, it's just gonna be beep, beep, beep, beep, beep all day long and possibly into the night..."

- **(49:35) Renee Kelly, Resident:** "They spent much of their time at the planning and zoning meeting, claiming that they were Idaho owned when in fact their parent company is Utah owned. They are owned by Whitaker Holdings out of Brigham City."
- **(57:45) Tina DeBoer, Resident:** "Compatibility is not defined by the most intense use nearby. It's whether a use fits the existing character without harming it. The commission determined that it does not, and that matters because approving this sets a precedent. This is how communities are slowly lost, one exception at a time."

Detailed Insights

1. Main Arguments

- **Applicant:** The applicant's core argument was that the P&Z Commission's denial was arbitrary and not based on substantial evidence, thereby violating the landowner's property rights. They argued the proposed use was compliant with county code, supported by expert agency review (staff, ITD, Highway District), and that all potential impacts could be mitigated through the proposed conditions. [\(7:59, 14:16\)](#)
 - **Opposition:** The residents' main argument was that the proposed commercial use was fundamentally incompatible with the existing rural residential and agricultural character of the area. They contended it would introduce unacceptable levels of traffic danger, noise, and light pollution, thereby being injurious to their properties and quality of life. [\(37:19, 47:24, 56:00\)](#)

2. Supporting Evidence

- **Applicant:** The applicant cited the county staff report recommending approval, the City of Nampa's comment in support of the project, and the lack of objections or required traffic studies from the Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) and the local highway district as evidence that the project's impacts were minimal and manageable. [\(9:06, 11:24, 14:28\)](#)
 - **Opposition:** Residents provided personal testimony about the existing dangerous conditions on Victory Road, including a recent accident. They referenced a prior code enforcement violation against the applicant for operating without a permit as evidence of their potential to be a bad neighbor. They also pointed to the lack of other commercial businesses on the six-mile stretch of road as evidence of the area's established character. [\(37:19, 48:14, 50:30\)](#)

Context and Background

1. **Contextual Information:** The hearing was an appeal of the P&Z Commission's denial of a Conditional Use Permit for a contractor shop and staging area on an agricultural-zoned

parcel. The property is located at 5023 East Victory Road, near the Nampa city limits and within the Nampa Airport's area of impact. The area is characterized by a mix of agricultural land and rural residential properties.

2. **Related Events:** The original CUP application was denied by the Planning and Zoning Commission on December 18, 2025. County staff confirmed that a code enforcement violation was issued against the property in March 2025 for operating the business prior to receiving a permit; the violation was closed in May 2025 after operations ceased.
3. **Potential Impact:** The Board's decision to either uphold or overturn the P&Z Commission's denial would directly affect the applicant's ability to operate at this location and the neighboring residents' quality of life. The outcome could also set a precedent for how similar applications are handled in areas of the county that are transitioning from agricultural/rural to more industrial or commercial uses, particularly in areas of city impact.

Argumentative Behavior

- No speaker engaged in hostile, defiant, or uncooperative behavior. The applicant's representative, Connor Gray, systematically challenged and disputed the P&Z Commission's findings regarding the area's character and traffic impacts, which is the standard function of an appeal. He questioned the logic of the commission's suggestions but maintained a professional tone. Residents who testified in opposition expressed frustration and emotion but answered all questions and did not attempt to redirect the conversation or challenge the legitimacy of the commissioners.