

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Fitzgerald: Deborah, thank you guys. Good luck and we will see you in the future I'm sure.

Nelson: Thank you very much.

Dodson: Good night, everybody.

6. Public Hearing for Tetherow Crossing Subdivision (H-2020-0112) by Hayden Homes Idaho, LLC, Located Northeast of N. Linder Rd and W. Ustick Rd.

- A. Request: Annexation and Zoning of 7.58 acres of land from RUT in Ada County to the R-8 zoning district.
- B. Request: A Preliminary Plat consisting of 46 building lots and 8 common lots on 13.99 acres of land in the proposed R-8 zoning district.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, Joe. Okay. Moving on to the last -- second to the last item on the agenda, the Tetherow -- Tetherow Crossing Subdivision, file number H-2020-0112. Alan, I will let you take the lead on the staff report, sir.

Tiefenbach: Happy New Year, Mr. Chair and Members of the Commission. Can everybody hear me okay? Give me a thumbs up.

Seal: A little faint.

Tiefenbach: See my screen.

Fitzgerald: You're a little bit -- on your voice, sir. So, if you can get a little bit closer.

Tiefenbach: Wow. Sure. You're about the first people I have ever heard in my life that told me they can't hear me, so awesome. Usually my wife tells me to, please, keep it down. Is this better? Okay. Great.

Fitzgerald: That's good, Alan. Thanks.

Tiefenbach: So, this is an annexation, a zoning, and a preliminary plat. You said you could see my screen? Thumbs up, please, somebody? You can't see my screen?

Cassinelli: Can see it.

Fitzgerald: I can see --

Cassinelli: Oh, no.

Fitzgerald: I can see something. Is that yours?

Cassinelli: It says a Planning and Zoning Commission meeting.

Tiefenbach: Okay. All right. Fair enough. Okay. I was -- I was trying to be cool, but I guess it didn't work. But this is an annexation, zoning, and preliminary plat. The site consists of about seven and a half acres of land. It's zoned RUT in unincorporated Ada county. It's located on the northeast of North Linder Road and Ustick, but to the west of the property is zoned C-C. That went through a proposal for a townhouse development some time ago, which did not get approved. To the northwest up at the top is Eddington Commons, which you should remember and that was recently approved. To the east is the Woodburn West No. 2 Subdivision and to the south is the Creason Creek Subdivision. A little history on this property. In 2006 there was a proposal for this property. It was for 35 single family lots. That was not approved, but the Council denied that because they believed at that time that it wasn't ready, they didn't have the infrastructure, it was a leapfrog type development. Since that time it is mostly filled in and infrastructure has come out to the site. The property is zoned to medium density residential, which is eight to 12 dwelling units per acre. And, again, this is a proposal for annexation, a rezoning to R-8, and a preliminary plat to allow 46 building lots and eight common lots. I will go to the plat here. Okay. So, first of all, there is five points of access. I'm going to use the color plat, just because I think it's a little easier to see on a public screen. There is five points of access proposed with this. There is three stubs. So, this is the first stub here to the north, if you can see my pointer. This is the second stub here to the west. And down here to the east is a third stub. So, those three properties have not yet -- although -- although this one to the west here -- this is Eddington Commons and it is in the process of -- they just finished their final plat. So, you should see that develop very quickly. There are two existing points of access. The first is here. That is West Woodpine Street and that is the Wood -- or Woodburn West Subdivision. That's existing there now. There is a second point of access. Right now it's -- if you can see my pointer here it's actually called North Llama Road and it's a little over here to the west right now. It runs -- the road runs right directly through the middle of this. As part of this development the applicant is going to shift the whole thing over to the east and is going to have now what's called a new Northwest 12th Drive. You can't see it on this picture, but on the other side of Ustick, below here to the south, is an existing Northwest 12th Drive. Usually the city does not support taking access off of an arterial and we usually recommend that those go away. In this particular case ACHD supports this and the reason why is because the existing access off of North Llama does not line up with any other access. It's configuration. This particular access they are going to align this Northwest 12th with the Northwest 12th below it. Also, the spacing requirements from Ustick and Linder are supposed to be 1,320 feet. The existing access, the North Llama, doesn't come close to that. This one is shifting it over and picking up a couple of hundred extra feet. ACHD is supportive of the waiver to the policy of this, because it's increasing the intersection distance, even if it isn't meeting it, it's better than the existing situation. There isn't going to be any required road improvements along Ustick. It's already a five -- five travel lanes, a bike lane, and vertical

curb and gutter and detached concrete sidewalk. However, the applicant will be required to construct all the internal roads to a 33 foot ACHD template. As you can see on the color plat, there are sidewalks proposed on both sides of internal streets and there is one common driveway that is proposed. Can everybody still hear me okay? Thumbs up? Yep. Okay. Good. Open space and amenities. I will move on to this next screen. This development proposes a total of 15.12 percent of open space. This includes several small landscaped areas over here and down here. Those aren't really being proposed as qualified open space. What it also proposes is this 25 foot buffer that is down here to the north of Ustick. It proposes several pathways, which we will talk about in a minute. A central open space at the northeast side of the property. Over here this is an existing ditch and there is an existing pathway here that is maintained by this HOA over to the east. This proposal is tying in to that walkway. So, they are orienting all of their common open space over to this existing ditch and over to this existing walkway and they are connecting with a walkway here and they are connecting with a walkway there. So, again, just a little bit to talk about the qualified open space. Thirteen percent of this would meet the requirements for qualified open space. This includes the central park, which is pretty much close to the center of the development. It includes several pathway common lots. So, there is a pathway lot down here to the west. There is another dog park and a sitting area and a pathway lot here and there are two pathway lots -- two pathways, one here and one here, and both of those connect in to the existing pathway that's along the ditch. Also half of the buffer can be counted as a qualified open space. This would be required to provide one amenity per our regulations. They are actually providing a -- quite a bit more than that. So, first of all, they are -- they are -- they are giving us a park or an open space of at least 50 times 100 feet. So, that's one thing to be qualified as an open space. But in addition to that you can call it an amenity if there is an additional 20,000 square feet and in this particular case they are proposing 33,000. So, maybe three quarters of an acre. It's significantly more than they would be required. So, that -- that -- just that amount of open space would be called an amenity. In addition to that they are proposing a recreational amenity, which they can talk about. It's going to be a playground and a seating area. They are also proposing the two pathways and the way that our code works -- it says that these pathways are not required per the code, then, they will be counted as an amenity, as long as they meet the minimum landscaping requirements and that's a five foot landscape strip on either side and one tree per hundred. In this particular case they are proposing two pathway amenities. And, finally, they are proposing this dog park and this sitting area here. One thing I want to mention is about the trees. There is quite a bit of mature landscaping here. There has been some -- some discussions between the applicant and the arborist in regard to whether or not they can preserve those trees. The applicant hasn't really given us any details yet on the tree preservation plan, but we are recommending that as a -- as a condition of approval of the final plat, that the -- we get a tree mitigation plan. It would say which trees would be preserved and which would be mitigated. Finally, there are -- the applicant has submitted sample elevations of single family homes for this project, but these homes are depicted as two story structures with two car garages, a variety of architectural elements and finish materials, including gabled roofs, dormers, stone wainscoting, lap siding, exposed timber and scallop wood shingles. Those types of scallop we see back in -- if you can see my pointer there. These little tiles here, these like fish scale things are the scalloped wood shingles. Some of these houses

will be very visible from West Ustick Road. Therefore, staff recommended as a condition of approval that the rear and sides of these two story structures visible from West Ustick incorporate minimum articulation requirements. You will see that added to our recommendations for the development agreement. The last thing I want to talk about is there was a couple of clarifications that were made to the staff report. The first was on the original plat there is an easement that's shown there and it's -- it's kind of funky. There is a note there that says that, basically, the title work shows that there is an access easement there, but they couldn't find any evidence of that being actually recorded. So, staff had concerns -- the property to the north, we didn't want them to be cut off. We recommended as a condition of approval that the applicant provide us a recorded access easement to make sure that the property to the north has access. Since the time of the staff report the applicant has told us that they have gotten that access easement. It wasn't very clear on the plat, but they have given us the access easement and so staff is okay with that. So, you can actually strike that condition if you would like, that the access easement is no longer required.

Fitzgerald: Hey, Alan, what number is that?

Tiefenbach: Oh, boy. Let me --

Fitzgerald: Make sure I'm --

Tiefenbach: That would be -- give me one second here. That would be on 1-C in the development agreement conditions. Can you still see the screen or did it go away? Okay. Good. Because I backed out I wasn't sure. There is two clarifications and these don't really need any changes. The first is that there was a condition in -- from -- from water in regard to roadway extensions to West Oak Creek Drive and Dixie Avenue. Those aren't pertinent to this development. The public -- or water should have removed those. I will make sure those are stricken for the staff report to the Council. The second thing is the fire district. There is a typo in there that says that they cannot meet the targeted goal of 80 percent or greater, but, actually, they can. So, I will make sure that we -- we had Fire send us updated corrected comments, so you don't need to worry about that. With that staff recommends approval of the annexation and zoning and preliminary plat with the conditions listed in the staff report. It is my understanding that the applicant is in full agreement. They do have a presentation, however, and I will stand for any questions if the Commission would choose at this time. Thank you very much.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, Alan. Are there any questions for staff at this point?

Seal: Mr. Chair?

Cassinelli: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Seal, go right ahead.

Seal: I'm just -- in looking at the -- the open space kind of in that L shaped, do we know

how the subdivision basically to the west lines up to that? Is that open space in that adjacent subdivision or are their houses there? Just trying to get a sense of how -- if that's boxed in or more wide open.

Tiefenbach: If you give me a second I will pull up the GIS and take a look at that for you, sir. If you have any other questions in the interim.

Cassinelli: Mr. Chair?

Holland: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Cassinelli, go right ahead.

Cassinelli: I kind of have a question that sort of piggybacks off that and that was that -- that mixed use parcel on the corner there, is that going to get -- will they get cross-access? I think the cross-access was lined up directly to where that shared driveway is. But correct me if I'm wrong there, Alan.

Tiefenbach: No, they are not proposing access to that commercial lot. I would assume that they probably don't want to have cars driving in and out from the commercial off of Linder. They are providing cross-access to the subdivision to the west through West Woodpine Street and I believe ACHD was okay with that. I'm -- go ahead.

Cassinelli: Is that going to be an issue, though, down the road in trying to develop that commercial piece on the corner without -- without proper cross-access?

Tiefenbach: Again, ACHD didn't have any concerns with that. The applicant has not proposed that. But I think -- we wouldn't really want to see cut through traffic coming through it. Right now it's zoned for commercial. It's not zoned for mixed use. If -- if townhouses or apartments went in there that certainly, I guess, there could be some -- some need perhaps for access, but if this is commercial it could serve as a cut through there. So, no, staff has not -- I'm not sure if I have a very good answer for that, other than staff has not perceived that for that particular reason.

Parsons: Yeah. Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Bill, go ahead.

Parsons: Yeah. I can elaborate on that a little bit for Commissioner Cassinelli. When we first started pre-app'ing with this applicant we had entertained the thought of maybe having some cross-access or at least a stub street to that property. Given the proximity to that intersection and the fact that, you know, as Alan alluded to, we didn't want to funnel commercial traffic in front of all of those homes to get them out to Ustick. So, we agreed to work with the applicant and have them at least stub a pedestrian connection and that's what you see on the north side of that common drive that's currently located in the southwest corner. Where I think some of that interconnectivity is going to be coming from

is this project does connect into Eddington Place. If you recall we did require a stub street as part of that project that does drop down into the commercial. So, yes, if there is commercial that goes on that corner they may have to go out to Ustick to get access to it or they could use that local street network and drive a little bit out of their way and go through the adjacent residential to the west to make that happen. But anything that goes on that corner I think is going to be a challenge and we just didn't want to burden this residential project with all of that commercial activity. So, essentially, staff made a concession, along with our partner ACHD, to allow a pedestrian only connection and at this point we don't know what's going to happen on that corner. It could be more residential. It could be commercial. As we discussed a few years ago, we all know there is a concept plan that shows all commercial on this site, but staff has met with a potential developer who is thinking about self storage and a commercial pad at the corner. So, if self storage goes on this it's more likely not going to get that interconnectivity that we desire, but it made sense to at least get a ped connection at this point. I don't -- I don't know what the long-term effects will be on that, but I think from -- I think when we went through that exercise of townhomes or four-plexes developing on that site and having a token commercial we will all agree it's just a tough corner. We just don't know at this point what's going to go on there. It may have a residential component with a small commercial aspect to it, just -- just don't know at this point. But more than likely there may be another access granted to that piece off of Ustick in the future, at least a right-in, right-out only.

Holland: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Holland.

Tiefenbach: I was going to -- sorry, Commissioner Holland.

Holland: Go ahead, Alan.

Tiefenbach: I was going to follow up -- I was going to follow up on the question in regard to the open space and the existing properties to the east. If you can see -- can you see that colored drawing that I have right now? This is a track that's owned by the HOA. So, this will be a track that's owned by the HOA of this particular development. This in here is a track that's owned by the existing HOA and, then, beyond that track are the backyards of houses. So, it won't be directly backing to the houses, it will be backing to the track of the HOA of what that ditch and that pathway runs through.

Seal: A follow-up question to that.

Fitzgerald: Go right ahead, Commissioner Seal. The -- so, the houses that backup to that, they have the visibility fence requirement; is that correct? The houses that are going in with this development would have the requirement. Correct. It would have to be either an open style fence, which would be -- open style or four feet opaque with two feet of lattice on top. I can't speak for the fences on the other side. I'm pretty sure that they are solid, but I don't know that for a fact. But, yes, correct, they would have to have -- for CPTED, Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design, they would have to have

visible fencing for that path.

Parsons: Mr. Chair? I did the site inspection for that subdivision. Right on that east boundary there is four foot fencing along that -- that pathway in Woodburn West.

Fitzgerald: You said four foot fencing?

Parsons: Four foot solid fencing. Yes.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Commissioner Seal, did you have follow up there?

Seal: No. Thank you for specifying that, Bill. That's -- I'm just trying to get -- it -- it's kind of boxed in back there, it creates a little private area that's -- would be kind of hard to monitor what was going on back there. So, knowing that that's open on the backside -- or to the east of it, I guess, would make that a moot point.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Commissioner Cassinelli, did you have any follow up on your question?

Cassinelli: No, other than -- I mean I can address it once we -- once we close it. My concern there is -- is that piece to the -- directly to the west that's commercial, we have had so much problem with it and, then, cutting out. I know originally we had talked about -- you know, had that gone in first there would have been cross-access through there and now it's going to make that piece even more difficult to develop.

Holland: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Holland.

Holland: My comments and question for staff are along that same lines that Commissioner Cassinelli just shared, too. I -- of all the projects we have looked at on this commission -- and we have looked at a lot -- this corner is the one that's giving me the most heartburn as a commissioner. We have looked at so many different projects and potentials for that -- that commercial piece and I really wish we had spent more time looking at it when we were doing the comp plan process, because I think we should have expanded the amount of commercial required there, because it's going to be a tough piece to fill, unless you just do something like storage and we have already approved a lot of storage on this corner. So, I would hate to see that happen there, because I think we have -- the northwest corner of Ustick and Linder also approved for a storage project. So, I would hate for it to be storage corner, because it's a great walkable corner with a lot of residential nearby, so it's just -- I don't know if there is -- I mean it's in the future use map it's medium density residential, but I don't know if -- if staff has any -- if they had any conversations with the applicant or if the applicant would be willing to entertain doing anything different -- adding some commercial components to their frontage there. That would make me feel a lot better if there was a possibility of doing that, so we would make that piece viable. But, again, that's redesigning an entire site plan. So, it's -- it's a tough piece, because I feel like while we are trying to follow what the future use map shows,

which is for medium density residential, we also try to make sure that the comp plan comes together in a way that supports overall development and I think by approving this -- and I had the same concern with the development that was to the north of that commercial parcel that we -- that went through the process, that by putting both of those first we box in that commercial piece and it's going to become unusable and becomes something that's not in the best interest of the city. So, that's my concern. I don't know if staff has any other comments about that. I don't know if we can make a request to have a better mixed use piece there that ties in with it, but I'm struggling with it just as much as Commissioner Cassinelli is.

Fitzgerald: But you said it more eloquently.

Tiefenbach: I don't think I can't add anything that -- that Bill has already -- hasn't already said. I mean it would certainly require a complete redesign, a whole new project for them. I don't think the applicant is proposing to do that. I would defer to them at this point to see if they really wanted to look at that. I'm reviewing the project based on what they gave us.

Parsons: Yeah. Mr. Chair, Commissioner Holland, I -- I think you bring up the same points I brought up back when we were looking at that four-plex on this site and, then, when Delano -- or Eddington Place came in and it just -- unfortunately I think we all wanted that mixed use to float either to the north or -- or to the east to try to blend in the commercial a little bit better with the surrounding residential uses. Unfortunately, the applicant that had a four-plex project, he just could not get all the parties to work together and have that come to fruition, because I think -- if I remember correctly this body wanted some of that commercial to float up along the Linder frontage and now we have kind of -- that -- that ship has sailed. We have approved a residential subdivision that butts up -- right up against C-C zoned property. I would share with the Commission that at least on the northwest corner, that storage facility is not moving forward. That gentleman never executed the development agreement and, therefore, it never gained any traction. So, it's still technically on the books approved for commercial across the street. It doesn't solve this problem, but rest assured I don't -- I think we are with you, we don't want to see -- for lack of a better term -- storage alley either on those two corners, because I think we want to have some of that walkability and some of that neighborhood serving commercial, because we are -- we have lost so much at the half mile even farther to the east. We want to preserve that. We do have a plan in the books with a development agreement that shows access coming off of Ustick and Linder for that site. So, although it may not mesh one hundred percent with these two developments, there is still something in a development agreement that -- at least that property owner is vested with and will have to come back and either develop it that way or work with the adjacent property owners to do that. But I'm -- I'm with Alan, let's -- let's get through our portion and let's open it up for the applicant and -- and see what they are willing to do and see if they are willing to make some kind of concession to either convert that common drive to a public street and -- and stub a street there. I mean that's certainly within your purview if you want that connectivity. I can assure you I have had these conversations with them and trying to figure out how we could better integrate that and, you are right, it doesn't always work to

have commercial directly integrating with a residential subdivision. Typically you have a -- a different zone or a different -- a higher density project to transition away from -- transition with. But, anyways, I -- that's -- there is my feedback. I'm certainly open to whatever the commission wants --

Fitzgerald: Hey, Bill --

Parsons: -- staff to look at or if the applicant is willing to make some minor -- minor changes.

Fitzgerald: Just -- I want to make sure we are real clear, because the -- so, the northwest corner cannot proceed forward with a project without coming back before us; is that correct? They can't put storage up without coming back through us; correct?

Parsons: You mean the --

Fitzgerald: The last -- I want to -- I want to understand that -- what you just said --

Parsons: Yeah. If they wanted storage they would need to do another DA mod and go through the Council and, then, come back to this body with a conditional use, just like the C-C that's adjacent to this property. Storage is a conditional use permit.

Fitzgerald: Okay.

Parsons: So, it's not -- it's not by right, they still -- there is still a public hearing involved and they would have to modify their DA as well, because the -- the original -- a DA that was approved for that site in 2014 showed three commercial pad sites --

Fitzgerald: Yeah.

Parsons: -- on that corner.

Holland: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: That makes me really happy, because I hated storage on that corner. I think I -- I don't know if I -- I think I was chair, so I didn't vote, but I was like, please, God, no. So, that makes me happy. Commissioner Holland, go right ahead, ma'am.

Holland: I would echo that, Mr. Chair. It kept me up all night for sure.

Fitzgerald: Yeah.

Parsons: Well, the other -- the other thing we tried to get the applicant to do was have a shared access to Ustick on their -- their west boundary -- shared with that commercial so it would not go through the residential, but it would just be used -- almost like the Maverick on McMillan and Locust Grove where they built that road into the commercial and you

had the residential on one side and you turn into the commercial on the other side.

Fitzgerald: Yeah.

Parsons: That's something, again, the applicant could pursue with ACHD. I'm not sure if they are going to support that, given the offset of those access points onto Ustick. It just doesn't meet any of their policies. But those are conversations that we definitely had with them as well.

Holland: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Go right ahead.

Holland: My follow-up question is are we still having active conversations with anyone on that commercial C-C parcel?

Parsons: Again, the last pre-app we had was several months ago and it showed a multi-tenant building on the corner and, then, some storage that wrapped around that and we told them -- we had talked with the applicant about this project, because I -- it was in the process and we told them at a minimum you are going to need to provide pedestrian connection to that neighborhood and, then, figure out how to bring that other street into the -- that stub to your north boundary into the site and provide that connectivity. We told him we would entertain a small segment of storage. It couldn't all be storage, but if -- if they wanted to create a buffer from the multi-tenant building and maybe develop the northern half with some flex buildings and some self storage to go along with that we could be supportive of that, but they really needed to work with ACHD on access and try to integrate with the surrounding development as far as architectural style and walkability and even to that point of some kind of access or connectivity to one of the neighborhoods. So, it is somewhat consistent with our mixed use standards.

Holland: Thanks, Bill. Appreciate it. No more questions.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, Bill. That was hugely helpful. Commissioner Cassinelli, did you get all your questions squared away?

Cassinelli: Yeah. Yeah. I'm good.

Fitzgerald: Cool. Okay. Any other questions for anybody right now? If not we will bring up the -- or Mr. Erickson take over and hear from the applicant. Ross, are you with us? I think? Maybe?

Erickson: Can you guys hear me?

Fitzgerald: Yeah. Go right ahead.

Erickson: So, I believe, actually, Tim Mokwa had a presentation prepared for this product.

He was more of the resource for technical or engineering questions, so --

Fitzgerald: Tim, are you available?

Mokwa: I am available. Can you hear me okay?

Fitzgerald: Yes, sir. Please state your name and your address for the record and the floor is yours, sir.

Mokwa: Okay. Thank you. This is Tim Mokwa with Hayden Homes. 1406 North Main Street, Suite 109, Meridian. 83642. And what I'm trying to do is share my screen. Can you see the little cover page of a PowerPoint there?

Fitzgerald: We got you.

Mokwa: So, I will try to be brief. I suspect there is going to be more question -- more value in question and answer than there would be in a long drawn out presentation and I think Alan did a good job of covering the project and the staff report is very detailed as well. So, as was mentioned we are proposing an annexation with a zone of R-8. This property is an in-fill parcel surrounded by R-8, as well as the R-15 Eddington, and, then, the project -- the parcel we have been talking about here at the corner. I have had conversations -- it was probably around the same time that this potential applicant was meeting with staff for a pre-app and they -- we did discuss the potential for cross-access here, as well as a potential shared access on the property line. They were opposed to that and we were opposed to that as well. This is a seven and a half acre site that we are working with and to introduce potential storage unit traffic through here or commercial that we have no idea what it's going to be, it just doesn't seem like this seven and a half acre residential site is a contiguous -- or a consistent use with that commercial at that corner. They do have an access from Eddington Common -- Commons that was approved and it's up here and we are providing an interconnectivity with Eddington as well. There is also a -- and I know -- you know, I don't know the details of this, but there is a Ustick Road north -- the north boundary or north improvements there is a curb cut to this existing parcel. I don't know that ACHD would stand by that, depending on -- I guess on what the use and what the site layout look like. I'm jumping around here. I'm trying to think of what questions were asked. Let me -- let me get back on point here. So, we are proposing 46 building lots in here, eight common area lots. Our average lot size is 4,236 square feet. We did work with staff. We revised this area quite a bit. Can you see my cursor? Okay. So, we have revised this area quite a bit to make this a larger central play area. Originally we had our -- had a play area down here, which was about the size of one lot. So, we have -- we have consolidate -- consolidated that into a more central area. I wanted to talk just briefly about some of the communication that we have had with our -- our neighbors, particularly the neighbor to the -- the neighbor to the north. This is going to remain a county RUT parcel and, then, the neighbors to the east of us -- this existing Woodburn Subdivision. So, with the owners of the north, Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd, we had several meetings and eventually became to some agreements here. Staff mentioned that there is an existing access easement that runs right -- roughly right through the center of

the site and tied into his driveway access right here. This access -- we believe that we have the right to vacate and access as long as we are not land locking him and we are providing him some public right of way access to his property. You know, we -- we had a little bit of a difference of opinion initially, but we were able to work through some of those issues and come to an agreement that he would not challenge vacation of this easement provided we met a couple of conditions, specifically that we locate this Llama Way stub at the location that currently meets his access point to his property. The reason that that was important -- it saved a berm and some landscaping along this boundary and it just worked well with the way his property is currently set up. We also agreed with him that we would -- which we are going to be required to by code anyway, but that we would install this six foot solid vinyl fence prior to doing any home construction. We -- there is an existing large -- I would say it's at least 20 -- maybe 30 inch caliper or more willow tree that's a quality tree on his property, but we agreed to hold our house back and our fence back, so that we can create an easement on this Lot 5 of Block 2 to protect the root zone of that tree and, then, lastly, we agreed that Lots 2 through 5 would be limited to single story to prevent some of the impacts on his adjacent property. So, that was one of the areas. The other one was with work -- in working with the HOA management people for the Woodburn Subdivision. They were in agreement if you -- if you follow this tree line there is an existing ditch there that is a -- it's just kind of a skunky stagnant water ditch with a lot of volunteer overgrown shrubbery. It's in both of our interest to clean that area up. So, our -- our proposal to them was that we would remove this existing -- there is -- they had fencing along their back -- their lot, as Bill mentioned, but there is an existing chain link on the east side of this ditch as well. So, we would remove that. We would tile that ditch and fill it in and, then, landscape this area, including even -- even a little on their side where we are, you know, having to fill in that ditch and I think it makes for a much better landscaped common area and appearance from both subdivisions. One of the factors, though, was that Bill -- Bill or Alan mentioned there is a lot of existing trees along here. Many of them are dead within the ditch itself, so we -- I met with the forester out there. Matt went through and flagged up all of the existing trees that are worth saving and so we surveyed those in and when we are doing our design for the tiling of this ditch we are going to save as many of those as we can and where we can't we will -- or per what staff mentioned here -- as Matt mentioned here, this 346 inches of tree mitigation required, that would be required if we removed every one of those trees that he flagged up. Our intent is to save as many of those as we can. So, anyway, back to the overall. You know, there is really not a lot that I wanted to add beyond -- you know, we are meeting the comp plan. The six units per acre seems to be a good transition from the higher density of the Eddington to the R-8 here. We have met the city's requirements for -- and exceeded the city's requirements for common area and amenities and qualified open space. But I guess I would just be happy to answer your questions, if I can expand on some of that a little bit.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, Tim. We appreciate it. And we appreciate the efforts to work with the neighbors and bring that into -- and that's not always an easy thing. So, thank you for that. Any questions for Tim at this time?

Tiefenbach: Mr. Chair, this is Alan. Staff.

Fitzgerald: Go ahead.

Tiefenbach: Sorry to interrupt. I wanted to note that this is the first time we have been told about the agreement with the applicant and the homeowner regarding the one story requirement on the north side and the fencing. I think it's important that that be added to the DA if -- if we are going to go forward with that. If -- we don't have that in the DA or the conditions of approval and that doesn't exist, because we have not heard this before.

Fitzgerald: Got it. Thanks, Alan. And, Tim, you're -- you're fine with adding to the DA?

Mokwa: I would be happy to add that to the DA, because we are required to do that as part of our agreement that both us and the neighbor to the north signed. So, yes.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Thank you. Commissioners, do we have any questions for the applicant on -- especially the commercial questions you had. Anybody want to discuss that with -- with Tim at this point? Commissioner Holland or Commissioner Cassinelli, do you guys have a question?

Cassinelli: No. I'm good. Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Holland?

Mokwa: Could I add one more point?

Fitzgerald: Oh, yeah. Go ahead, Tim.

Mokwa: Okay. I just wanted to tell you -- back to this issue about an additional access or making this a vehicular. I -- you know, I have worked on a lot of projects. This is a seven acre site with five access points right now. So, I think -- I think the amount of interconnectivity that we are already providing, both, you know, vehicular and pedestrian is -- it's pretty high for a site -- in-fill site this small. So, I hope you will take that into consideration when -- if you are considering asking for another access point here.

Fitzgerald: Appreciate that. Commissioner Holland, go right ahead.

Holland: Mr. Chair, I -- Tim, I think you heard some of my comments before we -- we listened to yours and I appreciate that this is a -- it's a tough site and I know you guys -- you guys create great product. I have seen some of your product where it does interface with commercial in some other neighborhoods that you guys have developed, too, and I wish that there was a win-win here and I know that it's -- it's not your responsibility to develop that site that's adjacent to you, but I'm still trying to figure out a way that we can help make it successful in the future. I would hate to see storage be on a hard corner. I think this commission in general has that comment every time there is a storage facility that comes in on a hard corner. So, I think it would be our hope that whatever comes forward we might push back to have maybe some sort of office use or something that's maybe not a retail use that has a lot of traffic going through it, but maybe there is some

sort of win-win in how we can develop that to be -- you know, maybe it's a hair salon type thing or it's a doctor's office, dentist, those kind of things that could go in there. Some of that kind of neighborhood commercial. But I -- I still don't like the -- even if that doesn't go through, having a shared drive kind of going in there, where it could have been a full access going through, it -- it's still a tough layout for me just in that piece and I don't know if there is anything we can do to make a compromise that would give a little more visibility there and I understand your comment about having five access points and certainly don't want to make you have another one, but I would sure like to see that road go through, even if it was -- I don't know exactly how we can change it, but I just don't want to pigeon hole that other commercial development so they can't develop it as anything but storage.

Mokwa: Yeah. I don't -- I don't know what I can say. I mean I really -- I mean we would -- we would certainly consider if it's -- if it's a condition of getting our project approved. I -- I really don't like it for -- for our purposes, which is what I have got to be concerned with. I -- you know, I -- I understand where you are coming from and I -- I definitely can see your point. Part of why we put the shared driveway with the pedestrian pathway there, because we thought that having the pedestrian connection to an -- to an ultimate commercial, hopefully, was a good, you know, interconnectivity. But just the -- just the idea of inviting additional commercial traffic through this small area, I just -- I have my reservations. So, I'm sorry, I don't know what to propose to -- to help there.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Holland, go right ahead if you have follow up.

Holland: That's all I have got for now. I just wanted to make those comments.

Fitzgerald: Okay.

Holland: Thanks, Tim.

Mokwa: Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Any additional questions for Tim? Okay. Tim, we will come back to you in a minute after we take any public testimony and let you close.

Mokwa: Okay.

Fitzgerald: Thank you, sir. Madam Clerk, do we have anyone in the audience or online that would like to testify on this application?

Weatherly: Mr. Chair, we do have one person signed in wishing to testify and he's here in house with us and that's Rick Wagner.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Mr. Wagner, if you will come and join us at the podium, please, sir. And, please, give us your name and your address and the floor is yours when you are ready, sir.

Wagner: My name is Rick Wagner. I live at 1250 West Ustick and I have the property to the east of this development. I have two concerns. One of them is that I noticed that one road is going to go -- it looks like it's going to go right through my house when they extend it. That one. Right there. Yes. And so I would like, you know, a barrier along that whole property line. Vinyl six foot solid fence. I get enough problems with the subdivision to the north. They use my property as a thoroughfare to Ustick. So, I would like something to stop that from your subdivision. The other thing is that there is a ditch in the front that runs along Ustick. It's a Nampa-Meridian Irrigation ditch. I use that for flood irrigation on my property. I know that the City of Meridian is going to require pressurized irrigation. I got a question. What's going to happen to my ditch? That's two things I have got.

Fitzgerald: And, Mr. Wagner, we will make sure that Tim clarifies that when he -- when he closes, but I know that they have to keep your water -- they have to keep your access to your water, so that -- that will be maintained no matter what. That's a requirement of development. So, we will make sure that that -- and Tim can talk about that, but we will make sure you are covered on the water side, because that's a requirement. They have to make sure your ditch rights and your water rights are maintained.

Wagner: Thank you. How about a fence?

Fitzgerald: Let me let Tim talk about that. If you want to take a seat I will have him close, if he's willing to take that on. But I know there will be a sign that stubs -- at least a barrier of some kind, but I will let him do that when he closes.

Wagner: Okay. Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, Mr. Wagner. We appreciate you being here tonight. I don't see any other attendees. Madam Clerk, is there anyone else who would like to testify?

Weatherly: Mr. Chair, I don't have anymore information on anybody wishing to testify.

Fitzgerald: Tim, do you want to answer Mr. Wagner's question and, then, close when you have a chance?

Mokwa: Certainly. So, first on the fence we would install a six foot solid vinyl fence along this entire common property line, including across the stub street and the barricade or the standard ACHD -- this road is intended to be extended in the future sign would be mounted on that six foot vinyl. So, sometimes you will see where they will -- they will put the vinyl fence along the property line and leave this gap open. We will fence right -- right across the road. So, this entire property will be separated by that. Secondly, my answer on the irrigation would be the same as yours, Mr. Chairman, is that per Idaho Code we are required to -- you know, we can't impede anyone's water right or their ability to drain their -- their flood irrigation water. So, if that's what's happening along the ditch along Ustick Road now, we are required by Idaho Code to maintain that.

Fitzgerald: Perfect. Thank you, sir. Do you want to close? Any further comments?

Mokwa: No. Just that, you know, we -- we have taken quite a while to get here to this point. You know, this -- this -- discussions with the property owner to the north and the access to Ustick and the alignment here, I mean we have had so many meetings and conversations with ACHD and a couple with Meridian staff. That all evolved from our discussions with Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd to the north and I think we were able to come to a solution that they were happy with or at least -- I mean their preference would be that this would stay an open field, but in the absence of that I think they are happy with the solutions that we worked out and we tried to be accommodating with them. ACHD was happy with our access plan here in that, you know, there is an existing 11th Street, I believe it is, that -- that borders Mr. Wagner's property over on the east side of his property. That's what drove this stub street connection here, is that that, then, provides an opportunity for, you know, cross-access with this piece, should it ever redevelop, and our property to a one safer aligned intersection on Ustick Road. So, those were some of the -- some of the things that led to the sign that you are looking at tonight and so, you know, is it perfect? Probably not, but we tried to be as accommodating as we can and also to do what we feel like is going to be a good project. So, with that I -- I'm done.

Fitzgerald: Thank, Tim. We appreciate it. Further questions for Tim at this point? Okay. Hearing no further questions, can I get a motion to close the public hearing?

Seal: So moved.

Grove: Second.

McCarvel: Second.

Fitzgerald: I have a motion and a second to close the public hearing. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Okay. Motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Fitzgerald: Anyone want to lead off?

McCarvel: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Go right ahead, ma'am.

McCarvel: Alan, can we get that one picture back up on how this connects to everything around it?

Tiefenbach: Which --

McCarvel: You had a good -- you had a picture during your presentation.

Tiefenbach: Oh, let's take a look here.

McCarvel: Okay.

Seal: I think it was GIS data.

McCarvel: And while you are looking for that --

Tiefenbach: Yeah. Oh, was it? Bill, can you bring that up? Because I can't do that from my end here.

McCarvel: Okay.

Holland: It might have been the one from the applicant.

Tiefenbach: Bill -- Bill, I can't get to the computer at work from where I am right here, I will have Bill share it.

Parsons: Yeah. It was the applicant's presentation.

McCarvel: Oh, was it? Okay.

Parsons: So, you can -- you can give him the right and he can probably just bring it back up.

McCarvel: Okay.

Parsons: I noticed that, too. I was like that's a great graphic. I wish I had that in my presentation. And it does -- it does show how it interconnects with all the adjacent properties --

McCarvel: Yeah.

Parsons: -- and what's happening in the area. I think that's critical for you all tonight.

McCarvel: Yeah. And --

Fitzgerald: Madam Clerk, can you bring Tim back into the panelist side, so we can ask him to --

Parsons: Bring up his presentation.

Fitzgerald: -- bring up his presentation again.

Seal: She had to step out for just a second, so as soon as she comes back in I will let her know.

Fitzgerald: Oh. Okay.

McCarvel: Okay.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel, do you want to go right ahead with your comments.

McCarvel: Yeah. In the meantime, yeah, we can take a look at how that all connects again. But, otherwise, I really appreciate this applicant working so well with the neighbors and going the extra mile and some of those details. Of course, I always like to see a little bit bigger corner lots, instead of those common drives, but for a small site I think there is a lot to like about what they have done with the pathways connecting to the subdivision to the east and just in general keeping that open space more centralized and utilizing that well. Yeah. I don't think we have ever seen a seven acre site with five accesses. So, yeah, I mean in general we like it. I -- I like it. But, yeah, if we can -- if -- I guess this is our one stab to see if there is anything that can be done with the site to the west on the corner, but, then, again, it's not this applicant's problem to solve, unless it -- you know, there is something that makes sense.

Fitzgerald: Yeah. I'm kind of -- I have a tough time with this one, because I -- I think there is -- we are asking a lot of the applicant. I remember one day when I was on the other side of the dais where I am now when we were asked to masterplan a giant, you know, section around us and after spending all that money and doing that it was denied anyway. I understand the desire to not pigeonhole one square, but we are putting the -- that onus on the applicant and I think that's -- that could be a little bit brutal. But I know that -- that's where it's never going to be easy. It's not now or will it be in the future, whether we have cross-access or not, just because of the way it runs and there is a giant lateral that runs through it. So, I -- and I think we got to be -- we got to be cautious about how we approach this, because I mean there are small businesses, like little coffee shops or some that can use -- that don't have a ton of traffic, but I -- I understand that we have looked at this corner 40 times, so -- and I think we asked Steve Arnold to redesign it four times. So, I get the concerns, because I think they are all there. But I do like the effort that -- that they have put into making this work and I know the -- especially the RUT piece to the north, we have heard from that homeowner several times in different applications and I appreciate that -- the work that went into doing that. They are making it so it would work for his family, so it's tough. It's not an easy one for me either. And it is -- it does meet the comp plan and the zoning currently, which is another piece I have to wrestle with. So, Commissioner Holland, you came off of mute. Go right ahead, ma'am.

Holland: I did. I still struggle. I -- I like the idea of being able to have a shared access road that would divide these two, because I think that would fix some of the problems for me, too, but that would be redesigning their site plan and I know that they weren't in favor of that option. Because I think it does work really well. I have seen it in a couple places. There is a spot on Linder and McMillan I want to say that they have something like that, too, where residential is on one side and commercial is on the other side of a road and it works really nicely there. I wish that that was something that we could have them look at. I understand their concern, too, about having another access point that comes through their neighborhood, because people would probably float through there. I just hate seeing it blocked off there. So, I'm still struggling with it. I don't know what else we can do there,

but my -- my preference would be to -- my number one preference, if we had the ability to have them do it, would be to have that shared access road that would divide this property line, because I think that would make a big difference. But I don't know if that's something that this commission would like to look into, because that would mean that they would have to redesign their plan again. I don't know if that's helpful. I -- I do appreciate what they -- what they have put forward. I think it's -- if you are just looking at the site by itself it's not a bad development. I know the product type looks good. It will match with what Eddington Commons does and it's such a good transition from Woodburn. It's just a tough -- I hate that it's -- it's tough in the regional perspective of what it's going to do for what's around it. I wish the other piece was done first.

Fitzgerald: Or master planned into it and I -- I know it's really hard to do that. And we have asked everybody to try that and it hasn't seemed to work.

Holland: Yeah. I wish that they could come in together jointly with these projects.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Cassinelli, I know you popped off mute, sir. What do you have to say?

Cassinelli: I kind of have a question and, first, let me say that I do like the project. For an in-fill I'm happy with the R-8, that's it's not R-15, that we are not -- you know, I like the layout. Their product is -- their product regionally is -- is good. I'm happy with all that and -- and I -- you know, I -- I sympathize with them with -- with five access points there that's a -- that's a ton for -- for seven acres. But I have got a question for staff. I just want to pose this. Either for Bill or Alan. If that commercial would have developed first -- and I know it's not, but had that developed first with a cross-access point to the -- going -- going towards this -- this parcel, would there be a requirement for this developer to line up with that and to -- to make that happen?

Tiefenbach: This is Alan Tiefenbach. If there was already an access that was required we would make them line up for it. The thing is it's not going to meet -- first of all, it's not going to meet ACHD spacing requirements. They are going to have an issue with that and it just depends on what kind of commercial development it is, because depending on what it is they wouldn't want that cross-through traffic. So, yes, if there was one already approved they would have to line up with it, but I'm not sure ACHD would support additional accesses coming through there. Bill, do you want to add anything?

Parsons: I think you have it covered, Alan. I think -- when I'm looking at the -- so I'm looking at the approved concept plan and the development agreement for that piece that came in. It was called Sugarman and there was never a shared access on the property like we are talking about tonight. It goes back to almost what Tim's comment was where there is an existing curb cut already constructed out there and that's where they showed their access coming in from. And, then, they were tied into the property to the north. So, even on the approved concept plan it never contemplated anything to the west -- or the east of this -- this east boundary here. I'm going to look at some of the DA provisions and see if that was the case. But I -- I don't recall it being the case.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Cassinelli, did you have follow up there?

Cassinelli: I did. For Bill or Alan. In previous talks with -- well, with a potential project there on that corner, is ACHD -- are they in agreement to keep that curb cut access there if there is not the cross-access, so at least that parcel would get a right-in, right-out off of Ustick?

Parsons: Well, I'm looking -- well, that's -- that's a good question. It goes back to almost -- you know, like anything -- here is my experience with ACHD and these -- these access points. Sometimes as part of a road widening or intersection they will widen it and they will put the access points in. Sometimes they work with the property owner and they, basically, vest that property owner with those access points. Other times I have seen it where they have said, no, we reserve the right to remove it at any time when there is a conflict or depending on the use. So, I'm not sure if any of those agreements exist for this particular development. All I can do is go off the concept plan that we have approved as part of that development agreement. It shows a curb cut. It does say that direct -- so, I'm -- I'm quoting verbatim from the recorded development agreement for that commercial property. It says direct lot access to West Ustick Road and North Linder Road is prohibited, except for the access points approved with the plat. I can tell you the plat has expired. There is no longer a valid plat. Only the development agreement runs with the land currently. So, it says access to North Linder Road shall be restricted to right-in, right-out and -- only and access to Ustick Road shall be determined by ACHD. So, again, as determined by ACHD. So, they have the ability --

Fitzgerald: Hey, Bill?

Parsons: -- to say no, they have the ability to say yes, just -- again, it's going back to -- it's contingent upon what -- when the actual development is proposed and right now all we have is a concept plan and zoning.

Fitzgerald: So, looking at the -- at Google Maps, there is curb cuts on both sides. There is one on the north boundary on Linder and there is a Ustick curb cut and that's after they have widened both roads.

Parsons: Yes. And that's consistent with the concept plan that's in the DA.

Fitzgerald: So, I'm just -- just for informational purposes for the commission -- I don't know if we can bring up Google Maps. I have it open.

Cassinelli: Yeah. I'm looking at it, too.

Fitzgerald: So, there is curb cuts that are there and that's post widening. I would guess that that's where they go. But I understand the concerns.

Parsons: And, then, I'm looking at the plat that's tied -- that was at one point valid and it showed those curb cuts were -- that's where the cross-access drives would come into the

development and serve of all those commercial lots. So, again, it's consistent to what the contract is currently on the property.

Holland: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Yeah. Go ahead. Commissioner Holland, go right ahead.

Holland: While I don't want to pass the buck onto Council, we could always just make a note instead of requiring that they change it, that Council take serious consideration on whether or not they think there should be cross-access there and just make a note that it was a big concern of ours, but not condition it. I might be willing to do that as a compromise, because I don't know that I have got a good solution for them of how to fix that, but I would at least want Council to consider with the applicant whether or not they could do a shared access or have that common drive become a public drive through to give cross-connectivity. But I don't really want to condition it. I would just at least like Council to have that conversation with them and see what they think. I don't know if that makes a compromise, but --

Grove: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Grove, go right ahead.

Grove: So, a few things. You know, reiterate a couple of things that were said earlier. You know, this is a lot of interconnectivity already for such a small piece, but, you know, in-fill is hard and I appreciate the work that they have done, especially in regards to working with the neighbors to address their concerns and really being thoughtful of making sure that their designs took those considerations and integrated them accordingly. I am lucky enough to not have been through some of the trauma that you guys have with this -- this particular area, so coming at it with, you know, a little bit naivete -- a little bit of -- whatever that --

Fitzgerald: We call it fresh eyes, Commissioner Grove. Fresh eyes.

Grove: One thing that I'm looking at, though, is -- I like how -- I like this project and I like what they have done with it, you know, with the constraints that they have. With the commercial lot, that piece to the west that we are discussing, I understand what we are saying with creating that connectivity, but I'm somewhat of the mindset that I don't necessarily think that having that direct connectivity is the absolute best piece -- or best idea just in terms of -- there would still be connectivity to the north and -- which allows the access back out to Linder to the north and, then, out to Ustick, you know, by going east and south, which creates a longer path, but I think that allows for that connectivity, but it's inconvenient enough for people that people wouldn't use it as much because people take the path of least resistance and so almost saying, yes, there is access there, but it's not direct access, so we are somewhat limiting it, because we are -- it's almost a traffic calming feature by not having direct access. So, that's my counter point. I don't know that it's valid necessarily, but that's just kind of how I'm looking at it, with not having been

through what you guys have on -- on these other projects, so --

Fitzgerald: I appreciate that. I think that's -- fresh eyes are always helpful. Additional comments? Commissioner Yearsley, you came off mute.

Yearsley: Oh, I -- I agree with Commissioner Grove not having dealt with it. On the -- on its own merits I think the subdivision looks good. I think they have done a decent job. You know, there is already two access points on that property already. So, I would be in favor of just moving it forward.

McCarvel: Yeah. Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: Yeah. I think there is a lot of reasons to not have that cross -- cross-access into the commercial right in front of the residential there. I mean they -- they don't have to redesign the whole thing and I think -- yeah. On its own it's -- it looks good.

Seal: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Seal, go right ahead.

Seal: Yeah. Echoing a lot of what I have heard already, I like the piece as it -- as it stands. I mean they have worked really well with the neighbors. They interconnect really well. They provide an abundance of interconnectivity. I -- I do agree that it's very concerning that that commercial property doesn't have the cross-access happening to it out of this, but to land that burden on this project is -- is a little troublesome, too. So, I agree that we should maybe -- that we should put something in there for City Council, let them know it was a large issue for us, you know, in case they don't read through everything that has happened here tonight. I do imagine when we get to that -- the next application for that commercial piece of property we are all going to roll our eyes as it comes through, because it's -- it's a tough piece. I mean it really is. You know, I -- I have been here for one of the hearings on it. I was here for the storage that was approved across the street and that was very contentious as well. So, it's going to be a tough one. But as far as this project I'm very much in support of seeing it move forward. And with that I can take a crack at a motion, unless somebody wants to jump in.

Fitzgerald: Go right ahead. Motions are always in order. Go right ahead.

Seal: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to approve file number H-2020-0112, as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of January 7th, 2021, with the following modifications: That they strike recommendation 1-C. That they add agreements with the northern -- northern neighbors to the formal DA. That we ask City Council to consider cross-access to the commercial property to the west as it was a large concern for the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Seal, is there a discussion about making sure that fence continues across the road for Mr. Wagner's -- or I mean Mr. Wagner's property? Would that be amenable to your motion?

Seal: I think he addressed that, but if -- do we want to make that a formal recommendation? I mean I'm --

Fitzgerald: It's up to you. I think I would like to make sure that that gets somewhere in there, so we can ensure that that's blocked off.

Seal: Okay. I will amend my -- my motion to include that a six foot fence is down across the eastern border of the property from the common area to the north all the way to Ustick Road.

Grove: Second.

Fitzgerald: I have a motion and a second to recommend approval of file number H-2020-0112. Any other further comments before we take a vote?

Cassinelli: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Cassinelli.

Cassinelli: Can -- can I just get a repeat of the language on the recommendation to Council regarding the cross-access?

Seal: What I said was that we ask that City Council consider cross-access to the commercial property to the west, as it was a large concern for the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Cassinelli: Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Any further comments?

Seal: I'm just surprised I can read my own handwriting there. So, that's my only comment.

Fitzgerald: I have a motion and a second to recommend approval of file number H-2020-0112, Tetherow Crossing Subdivision. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

3. Election of 2021 Commission Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson

Fitzgerald: Tim and -- we appreciate you being here tonight, sir. Ross, thanks for being here. We look forward to -- good luck on City Council and hope things go well. Okay.