

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:06 p.m., Tuesday, October 13, 2020, by Mayor Robert Simison.

Members Present: Robert Simison, Joe Borton, Luke Cavener, Treg Bernt, Jessica Perreault and Brad Hoaglund.

Members Absent: Liz Strader.

Also present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Joe Dodson, Brad Purser, Berle Stokes, Joe Bongiorno and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

☐ Liz Strader	☒ Joe Borton
☒ Brad Hoaglund	☒ Treg Bernt
☒ Jessica Perreault	☒ Luke Cavener
☒ Mayor Robert E. Simison	

Simison: Council, I will call this meeting to order. For the record it is Tuesday, October 13th, 2020, at 6:06 p.m. We will begin tonight's City Council regular meeting with roll call attendance.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Simison: Item No. 2 is the Pledge of Allegiance. If you all rise and, please, join us in the pledge.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

COMMUNITY INVOCATION

Simison: Next item on our agenda -- and, please, note for the record that Councilman Cavener, who was in Executive Session, took a second to get to his device, has joined us. Our next item is the community invocation, which will be led by Pastor Rod Enos with the Southside Christian Center. Pastor Enos, if you would like to come forward and for all those in the audience if you would like to take this -- join us in the community invocation or take this as a moment of silence.

Enos: Thank you, Mayor Simison. Father, we just thank you for the privilege of coming to you in your name and for the help that you desire to give us. Lord, we declare our need of you. Lord, we are living in extremely tumultuous times and we need your wisdom. We cannot rely upon our own understanding. So, Lord, come and let your spirit be here and anoint each one of these men and women as they would lead our city. We pray, Lord, that you would grant them wisdom and understanding and guidance. Lord, with each

ordinance and decision that they will make tonight we pray that you would guide them that they would make their decisions fairly and justly for all parties involved and, Lord, we pray, Lord, over our city. You know, we just pray a protection against this virus in Jesus' name and pray, Lord, for those who are suffering with it, that, Lord, your healing would be there and we just pray that you would give them strength and grace. Lord, we pray for our families, Lord, that are struggling with school and all of the disruptions and jobs and the like and we just pray that you would just be there with each one and provide for their needs. Lord, we thank you so much for this great city that you have allowed us to be a part of and just the blessing that we have experienced from you and we give you the honor for that. Now, Lord, just have your way tonight we pray in Jesus' name, amen.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Simison: Next item up is the adoption agenda. Mr. Bernt.

Bernt: I move that we -- sorry, Dean. Love you, buddy. Thanks for the reminder. I move -- Mr. Mayor, I move that we adopt the agenda as published.

Simison: Councilman Bernt, would you like to remove anything off the agenda?

Bernt: Oh, yes. Sorry. My fault. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Third time is a charm. Item No. 11, Executive Session, we took care of all of our business in our prior Executive Session, so we will take off Item 11 with Executive Session. With that I move that we approve the agenda as amended motion.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to adopt the agenda with that amendment. Is there any discussion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

PUBLIC FORUM – Future Meeting Topics

Simison: Mr. Clerk, did we have anyone sign on under public forum?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we do not.

PROCLAMATIONS [Action Item]

1. Cyber Security Awareness Month

Simison: Okay. Well, with that we will do something we haven't done in a while, we will head down to the podium for a proclamation. Council, we just heard from Pastor Enos speak about a virus that we are all familiar with, but we are also familiar with other viruses that are out there. As this is Cybersecurity Awareness Month, I would like to take a few minutes and just recognize the hard work that our team does, but it's more important to make the community aware to -- to be vigilant. We are all here wearing masks and, quite frankly, our computers need to wear masks in everything that they do, so that we can help keep our economy and everything else moving forward. So, I'm going to go ahead and read this proclamation and, then, turn it over to our CIO Dave Tiede here in a second. Whereas, the City of Meridian recognize it has a vital role in identifying, protecting its citizens from, and responding to cybersecurity threats that may have significant impact to our community and whereas cybersecurity education and awareness is crucial for everyone, including large corporations, small businesses, financial institutions, schools, government agencies, a home user and anyone who connects to the internet, but whereas you can protect yourself by monitoring your accounts, being conscientious of what you share online, keeping computer software up to date, creating unique passwords and changing them regularly. Installing antivirus programs and firewalls and using mobile device safe -- mobile devices safely and whereas the stop, think, connect campaign serves as the National Cybersecurity public awareness campaign implemented through a coalition working together to increase the public's understanding of cyber threats and empowering Americans to be safe and secure online and whereas maintaining the security of cyberspace is a shared responsibility in which each of us has a critical role to play in awareness that computer security essentials will improve the security of the City of Meridian's information infrastructure and economy. Therefore, I, Mayor Robert E. Simison, hereby proclaim this month of October 2020 as Cybersecurity Awareness Month in the City of Meridian and call upon the community to join me in recognizing how serious cybersecurity is and the steps each of us can take to protect ourselves and our community, dated the 6th of October 2020. So, with that, Mr. Tiede, I will present this to you. I encourage you to say some few words to the community that is much more important than what I said.

Tiede: Thank you, Mayor. So, I appreciate this opportunity we have to partner with the National Cybersecurity Alliance in recognizing National Cybersecurity Awareness Month. It's important to recognize that we all use technology, online resources, and mobile devices in our daily lives and this is an opportunity to reflect and look at what we are doing with those different types of technology to see how we can better protect ourselves, our families, our friends and our community. So, with that I will mention that staysafeonline.org has an abundance of resources available to the community and that is put together in conjunction with the various communities around the nation and the Department of Homeland. Thank you.

RESOLUTIONS [Action Item]

- 2. Resolution 20-2233: A Resolution of the Mayor and the City Council of the City of Meridian Appointing Camden Hyde as Youth Commissioner to the Meridian Parks and Recreation Commission and Raeya Wardle**

as Youth Commissioner to the Meridian Arts Commission

Simison: Thank you again for that -- bringing that forward, Dave. Appreciate it. Next item on the agenda is Resolution 20-2233, a resolution appointing Camden Hyde as the youth commissioner to the Meridian Parks and Recreation Commission and Raeya Wardle as youth commissioner to the Meridian Arts Commission. So, Council, these are the two last remaining commissions that don't have our youth members to them. We did put out a call to the community and there were interviews conducted with several well-qualified candidates. I do have to say that these two stood out amongst the applicants and I would be happy to answer any questions you have, but, otherwise, I would love a motion to appoint these two individuals to the commissions.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, I move adoption of Resolution 20-2233 appointing Camden Hyde as youth commissioner to the Meridian Parks and Recreation Commission and Raeya Wardle as youth commissioner to the Meridian Arts Commission.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Second.

Simison: Second. Perfect. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

Roll call: Bernt, yea; Borton, yea; Cavener, yea; Hoaglund, yea; Strader, absent; Perreault, yea.

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Simison: I do not see either of the two easily identified in -- in on the call. If either one of them are and if you would like to raise your hand and make a comment at this point in time, just do that on the zoom call with the -- with the icon at the bottom. And I did not see anything, so we will just go ahead and move on to the rest of the agenda.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor, one second.

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I just would like to say thank you to our youth of our city who get involved and care at such a young age and start learning the value of service over self and the foundation that creates for them and for those that they serve. So, thank you so much for the youth that have decided to be part of MYAC and for the youth that just -- that have the opportunity to serve on these commissions.

ACTION ITEMS

3. Public Hearing for Updates to the Citywide Fee Schedule

Simison: Very eloquent. Next item under Action Items is a public hearing for updates to the citywide fee schedule. Turn this over to Mr. Purser from our Finance Department. Well, actually, I will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Purser: Better? Okay. That's much better. Thank you, Mayor and Council. On October 2nd and 9th we published that we would be having a public hearing tonight for four fees, three of which are for -- from our Community Development Department regarding after hours inspections. The fourth is from -- a Republic Services fee that needed to be noticed and, you know, follow the process. That's why we are here today. I don't have anything further, other than we have noticed it and I will stand for any questions that anybody may have. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you, Brad. Council, any questions for staff at this time? This is a public hearing. Do we have anyone who has signed up online to testify on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we had no signups online or in the room.

Simison: Okay. If there -- if there is anybody who would like to come forward and testify on this item, I ask you to do so. Or if you are online use the raise the hand function and we will bring you in and allow you to provide testimony on this item. Seeing no one coming forward and no one raising their hand -- Council, do I have a motion?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I move that we approve Resolution 20-2234.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second -- do I need to close the public hearing first? So --

Perreault: My apologies. Mr. Mayor, shall I try it again?

Simison: That would be great.

Perreault: I move that we close the public hearing for the updates to the citywide fee schedule, Item No. 3 on tonight's agenda.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: Motion and second to close the public hearing. Is there discussion on the motion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

4. Resolution 20-2234: A Resolution of the Mayor and City Council of the City of Meridian Adopting New and Increasing Fees; Authorizing City Departments to Collect Such Fees; and Providing an Effective Date

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor, I move that we approve Resolution 20-2234, a resolution of the Mayor and City Council of the City of Meridian adopting new and increasing fees, authorizing city departments to collect such fees and providing an effective date.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve Resolution 20-2234. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it and the resolution is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

5. Public Hearing for Pearson Subdivision (H-2020-0075) by Melanie Pearson, Located at 175 W. Paint Horse Ln.

- A. Request: A Combined Preliminary and Final Plat consisting of 2 building lots on 3.98 acres of land in the R-4 zoning district.**
- B. Request: A Development Agreement Modification to allow the development of the property with one additional residential lot and specify the requirements for the connection of city services**

**to existing and future residential structures and the extension
of the future collector street consistent with the MSM.**

Simison: Next item up is a public hearing for Pearson Subdivision, H-2020-0075. I will turn this over to Joe. I will open this public hearing with staff comments and turn this over to Joe.

Dodson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. Good evening. First item before you tonight is for the Pearson combined preliminary and final plat application. The site consists of 3.9 acres of land, zoned R-4, located at 175 West Paint Horse Lane, which is at the very edge of our area of impact along Meridian Road. The subject application is proposing to subdivide one four acre lot into two lots for the purposes of allowing the current owner of the parcel to deed the new lot over to her daughter, so that her and her family are close by and this includes with helping her daughter with their newborn child. The subject property was annexed in 2015 as part of a larger annexation known as South Meridian Annexation. There is an existing development agreement associated with the original annexation in 2015 and this property and application constitutes development under city code. In reviewing the existing DA, the applicant was required to apply for a development agreement modification after the Planning and Zoning Commission hearing and the applicant has done so per the conditions of approval in the staff report. The subject application has also received city engineer and Public Works director approval for a utilities waiver to not connect to city services at this time due to services being more than a half mile away. Staff finds that making a singular property owner pay for extending city services for a two lot subdivision is neither fair nor necessary. Central District Health has also approved of an additional temporary well site and septic system on this property -- on the new property. This fact further diminishes any concerns staff has with the applicant's application regarding water and sewer services. As noted there is an existing single family home on the subject property that is not connected to city services. This property, along with nearby properties, were annexed in 2015 and were not required to connect to city services at that time due to services not being available. The situation has not changed for this area of south Meridian since 2015. However, when services do become available in Meridian Road, the applicant will be required to connect to them as conditioned in this application and in the existing development agreement. Staff and ACHD find that the existing private access is sufficient for one additional single family home. Because other abutting properties are not redeveloping at this time, there is no feasible way for the applicant and owner to comply with those requirements in the UDC and take access from anywhere else other than the existing access. In addition, adding one home does not create sufficient traffic to warrant construction of a collector roadway as shown on the master street map. However, staff understands that should anymore intensive redevelopment occur on site or on the surrounding properties, the access will be evaluated for compliance with these requirements. Staff is recommending a DA provision to be added with the DA modification that requires a future collector street consistent with the master street map if or when this or adjacent properties redevelop with more intense uses consistent with the mixed use regional land use designation. So, a quick summary. The subject application is proposing to subdivide one four acre parcel into two lots for the purposes of allowing the current owner of the parcel to deed the new

lot over to her daughter. Staff does not find that the city loses anything by approving this application and understands that this area may not redevelop for quite some time. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval for the subject application and did not offer much discussion on the item, except for any kind of timeline for services that could be available, which is wholly dependent on development in the area and, then, ensuring that the applicant is aware of the potential future costs associated with connecting to city services. And there has been no written testimony since the commission hearing. So, after that I will stand for questions. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you, Joe. Council, any questions for staff at this time? Okay. I do see that we have the applicant in the room. Ms. Pearson, would you like to be recognized for 15 minutes?

Pearson: I don't have anything additional to add.

Simison: Okay. Council, any questions for the applicant? This is a public hearing. Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone signed up to testify on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we did not online or in the room at this time.

Simison: Okay. If there anyone that would like to testify on this item I'm going to encourage you to come forward at this time or use the raise hand feature at the bottom of the Zoom call. And I do not see anybody wishing to do so. So, with that, Council, do I have any motions?

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I move that we close the public hearing for Item No. 5.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to close the public hearing. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. Ayes have it.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I move that we approve Item No. 5, H-2020-0075.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Second that motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve H-2020-0075. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

Roll call: Bernt, yea; Borton, yea; Cavener, yea; Hoaglund, yea; Strader, absent; Perreault, yea.

Simison: All ayes. Motion passes. Thank you and good luck.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

- 6. Public Hearing for Modern Craftsman at Black Cat (H-2020-0022) by Baron Black Cat, LLC, Located in the Northeast Corner of N. Black Cat Rd. and W. Chinden Blvd. (SH 20/26)**
 - A. Rezone a total of 23.63 acres of land for the purpose of reducing the C-C zone from approximately 8 acres to 4.42 acres and increase the R-15 zone from approximately 15.1 acres to approximately 19.2 acres.**
 - B. Short Plat consisting of 2 building lots and 2 common lots on 21.59 acres of land in the C-C and R-15 zoning districts.**
 - C. Conditional Use Permit for a multi-family development consisting of 196 residential units on 20.13 acres in the R-15 zone.**
 - D. Modification to the existing development agreements (Inst. #'s: 106151218; 107025555; 110059432; and 114054272) for the purpose of removing the subject property from the boundaries and terms of previous agreements and enter into a new one, consistent with the proposed development plan.**

Simison: Next item up is a public hearing for H-2020-0022 and we will open this public hearing with staff comments and turn this over to Joe.

Dodson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Again as noted this is the application for Modern Craftsman at Black Cat. The applications being heard tonight are a rezone, short plat, development agreement modification, conditional use permit and, then, on the staff side

private streets and administrative design review. The site consists of approximately 23.6 acres of land that's currently zoned C-C and R-15, located at the northeast corner of Black Cat Road and Chinden Boulevard. The adjacent land uses as noted in the -- the zoning map in the center is R-8 and R-4 zoning to the north, C-N zoning and the future church site to the east. Chinden Boulevard abuts the site to the south with a residential and small limited office zoning on the south side of Chinden across the street and North Black Cat abuts the site to its west with C-C zoning and future commercial planned on the west side of Black Cat north of Chinden. The Comprehensive Plan designation on this property is mixed use community. The application before you, as I noted, is for a rezone, short plat, DA mod, CUP and private streets. The subject site consists of approximately 23 acres of land zoned C-C and R-15. The requested rezone is to simply move the boundaries of the existing zoning, but not to change to any of the zoning designations. The future land use designation lists properties as mixed use commercial -- sorry -- mixed use community, which generally requires three distinct land uses and any residential use to be constructed at a six to 15 dwelling unit per acre density. Modern Craftsman is proposed with a gross density of 6 point -- or 8.7 dwelling units per acre. When analyzing projects within the MUC future land use, the approved and/or developed land uses nearby must also be taken into account. The proposed project offers an area of commercial zoning that should accommodate multiple future uses. The commercial area is proposing two building sites that have multiple suites, so there is potential that multiple distinct land uses will be available on site. Access for this development is proposed via private streets off of North Black Cat Road and West Tree Crest Way along the north -- the street abutting the site to the north. The two proposed access points of Black Cat have been approved by ACHD, but typically access to Black Cat is limited by the city. Staff has written a DA provision in the staff report regarding this. After further discussion internally and with the applicant I'm okay with striking that condition, which would be DA provision 8.1F and I'm sure the applicant will have more words to say on that as well. ACHD has approved the southern access to Black Cat as a limited right-in, right-out only. The applicant is also proposing an access in the northeast corner of the property that connects to a shared driveway with the Rock Harbor church site. Access via Chinden Boulevard is prohibited and not proposed. Private streets are proposed throughout the development and due to the nature of the proposed use staff believes private streets are appropriate in this development. Other than future commercial, the proposed use on this site is multi-family residential. However, it is not a traditional garden style apartment type of multi-family. It is a hybrid of single family style homes within a multi-family development, which, by definition, is just more than two buildings on one single lot -- two dwellings -- more than two dwellings on one lot. The proposed units are a majority of single story, one, two and three bedroom detached units with garages -- or without garages. The applicant is proposing traditional apartment style parking, but some units do have attached one car garages. Townhomes are also proposed and all these units have attached garages on their first floor. Largely the proposed residential units in this development look like detached single family homes, but have on-street parking and less private open space and a standard 4,000 or 8,000 square foot single family lot. Off-street parking is required to be provided in accordance with standards listed for multi-family and for commercial uses. The minimum amount of parking required for the multi-family portion of this development is 360 spaces, with 196 of those required to be covered. The total minimum

parking required for the development is 415, including the commercial space. The submitted and revised plan and conditional use plan shows 508 spaces for the entire development. The revised commercial area with a two story concept on the corner provides approximately 27,000 square feet of leasable commercial space. The minimum required parking for the proposed commercial is 55 spaces. Therefore, the proposed parking counts exceed the minimum UDC requirements. Open space requirements for this project are two tiered. The project must meet the general ten percent open space requirement and the common and private open space requirements in the specific use standards for multi-family development. In total the minimum amount of common open space to be provided should be 3.42 acres. The applicant has provided and proposed a total of 3.74 acres of qualified open space, of which 2.2 acres qualifies for the minimum ten percent and amounts to approximately 10.3 percent. The remaining 1.52 acres of open space meets the requirements for this specific use standards for common open space. In addition to this common open space, the applicant is required to provide at least 80 square feet of private usable open space per unit. On average the applicant is proposing 419 square feet of private open space for each unit, which is what separates this from traditional walk up garden style apartments. The applicant and staff have worked closely and diligently to design the open space in such a way to integrate the commercial with the residential as required in the mixed use community policies and goals. This integration and the proposed use allows for increased pedestrian connectivity as seen throughout the site. The open space meeting the requirements consists of a ten foot multi-use pathway within the Chinden landscape buffer, common lots with open space, and the required street buffers along adjacent roadways. There are also a number of proposed amenities within this development. The multi-use pathway is a qualifying site amenity that meets the requirements in standard 11-3G3 requirements. Other requirements -- other amenities are required to meet the specific use standards and what are proposed to meet those is a clubhouse with offices for rent by the residents, a tot lot, a swimming pool, picnic shelters with barbecue areas, a community garden and a plaza that is shared between the commercial and the residential. The proposed dog park area seen on the open space exhibit is not a qualifying site amenity due to it not meeting UDC requirements. In addition, the applicant is proposing 102 self storage lockers, each about 12 square feet spread throughout each of the garage parking buildings. This is also not a qualifying site amenity, but will likely be used regularly. The Planning and Zoning Commission heard this twice and recommended approval. At the first hearing they moved to continue it and had a request for the applicant to add additional commercial square footage and commercial zoning to the property and the applicant responded by doing so and changed one of the buildings along Black Cat from a traditional townhome style unit to a live-work vertically integrated structure as seen on the left-hand side here and also changed some of the parking and dynamics of this commercial area. There were 49 written testimonies outlining the same issues brought up during the hearing, with an additional comment of a desire by a number of the neighbors to have this area developed similarly to Spurwing and not be a mixed use development. The main issues of the public testimony was regarding the amount of parking, the location of any public transportation or lack thereof, the affordability of the proposed apartment units and the amount of commercial on the property. The Commission discussed -- also discussed the amount of commercial acreage on the property as noted. They discussed the viability of

incorporating vertically integrated, which the applicant took to heart and added that to the property. They discussed whether parking is allowed along Tree Crest Way, which as an answer it is not, because it is a collector roadway. They discussed the design of the proposed commercial on the hard corner, specifically whether it should be one or two stories, and the potential issues and resolutions of the required 25 foot buffer between the commercial zoning and the residential buildings. The one change that Commission had to the recommendation was to update my staff report to include the provisions from the memo from the second meeting and add that to the -- to the application. The only outstanding issue for City Council is that they will need to request a waiver from the City Council to reduce the land use buffer between the C-C zoning and the multi-family units proposed on the R-15 portion of the project, specifically that area between the clubhouse and the smaller commercial -- yeah. These areas right here and the residential. Since the commission hearing there has only been one additional public testimony and it outlined the same issues as previously presented. I added some elevations here for the benefit of the Council. This is some of the vertically integrated buildings that they had shown and the corner commercial of the two story concept, which Planning and Zoning had discussed and would prefer the two story as would staff. These are the revised townhome elevations that added some additional materials and color palettes. And with that I will stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you, Joe. Council, any questions for staff?

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Quick comment, Joe. If you could comment on any discussion or change with regards to the location of the pool, it being adjacent to the commercial and that eastern end there, was there discussion of why it's somewhat on the outside of this -- this proposal, as opposed to being more internal and away from that commercial parking lot?

Dodson: Councilman Borton, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, there were not discussions at the commission meeting, but there have been discussions between staff and the applicant regarding that. They have moved this further east from the original site plan and what we tried to do as a compromise was integrate the central open space area as a true vista that will connect all the way from the east to the west. I presume that the applicant can speak a little bit more as to why they would like it westerly, rather than centrally located, but I do know that that is one -- one reason why we really pushed to get the open space connected between the two areas.

Borton: Thank you.

Simison: Councilman Cavener, did you have a question as well?

Cavener: I did. Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Joe, you know, I followed kind of the -- the history of the -- the change in C-C from the Planning and Zoning Commission, but can you just kind of give me a brief rundown as to what precipitated the first request to reduce the C-C zone down -- I think it was from like seven to like three and change.

Dodson: Councilman Cavener, Members of the Council, yes, the existing zoning on the site, as seen in this, has a larger area on the western half that's approximately seven and a half acres of C-C zoning. The applicant is requesting to reduce that to now approximately four and a half. Originally it was only about one and a half and, then, we increased it a little bit more with some internal discussions with the applicant and, then, at the Planning and Zoning Commission it was approximately two and a half acres --

Cavener: Okay.

Dodson: -- that the Commission asked them to increase it more and now we are to the four and a half acres. But the -- the acreage is not necessarily the important part, it's really the leasable square footage, which is now approximately 27,000 square feet with the two story concept on the -- on the hard corner.

Cavener: Okay.

Simison: Council, any further questions at this time?

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: So, Joe, to confirm, how many acres of C-C zoning -- or how many acres of proposed commercial spaces?

Dodson: Now the acreage is about four and a half acres.

Bernt: So, you say about -- so, that is -- it is above four?

Dodson: Yes. It's definitely above four.

Bernt: Of the total. So, roughly a little bit more than half of the -- the currently zoned C-C area is proposed to be commercial?

Dodson: Yes. Yeah. More than half of the remaining -- of the existing. I apologize.

Simison: Okay. Would the applicant like to come forward? Please state your name and address for the record and you will be recognized for 15 minutes.

Nelson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. Deborah Nelson. My address is 601 West Bannock in Boise and I'm here on behalf of the applicant. Here with me

tonight are members of Baron Properties, Jeff Riggs and Greg Hector, as well as some other members of our local development team and they are all available to answer your questions. Just briefly to introduce Baron Properties to you, it's a company that was founded in 1983 and they have developed and operated over 125 residential communities across the west. Their core business, among other businesses, is multi-family housing for rent and what's -- what I really want you to understand about their products that's so special is that these are high end developments, highly amenitized that they own, operate, and maintain, so that the residents that live there can have the quality of life that they are looking for, but without any maintenance or upkeep. I'm going to start with a fly through video just to give you an overview and introduce you to the Black Cat project -- Modern Craftsman at Black Cat. This is just a little under four minutes and, then, we will discuss some of the details. It's playing the sound, but not the video.

Johnson: We are changing the Zoom share.

Nelson: While we are waiting on that I will continue with a few points. As Joe mentioned, this site is already annexed into your city and it's already zoned C-C and R-15, the same zones that we are seeking now, and so we are not asking for any uses that weren't already contemplated when the city zoned this property and, in fact, the multi-use -- the -- the multi-family use is conditionally allowed in both of those zones and so we are not proposing anything that couldn't have happened without changing the zone sizes. That was already contemplated and so was this level of intensity of development here. Thank you so much.

(Video played.)

Nelson: Thank you. I hope that gives you a good overview of what it feels like to be in the development, to live and feel and see the architectural variety. I'm going to start by looking at some of the nonresidential uses with you. I think Joe has covered the -- the site plan well, but we are primarily going to start down here in the southwest corner. Talk about some of the mixed uses. Over 20,000 square feet of space is available for commercial uses and this will complement the Fairborne commercial that's directly across Black Cat and also some of the larger regional commercial developments, Costco, is just .7 miles to the east. The Central Valley plaza is just a half mile to the west. Focusing on the clubhouse first and the nonresidential aspects of it, we have over a thousand square feet of office space here, including three offices and conference rooms that can be reserved and used for meeting space by the residents. Also we will have our office space for our on-site leasing and maintenance staff, which are full time. We have added this commercial pop up space in discussions with staff and we are very excited about it. This is across the landscape plaza from the clubhouse and it creates an opportunity for some shorter term leasing in a variety of smaller commercial uses. We call it a pop up, because it allows that variety for shorter term leasing, but it is still a very permanent and beautiful building. We also added in discussion with staff and the commission this vertically integrated product that Joe described, with commercial on the ground floor, over 5,000 square feet, and residential upstairs with six units that will provide a nice opportunity, again, for a variety of different sizes, little longer term here looking at more like a year

lease. So, you get a different type of commercial users in here. Attractive on both sides, so that it fronts well on Black Cat and, then, opens up nicely to the site. This is the other side of that building. Very attractive on both sides. On our commercial corner we did provide two concepts, a single story and the two story. Both options will create a very striking presence on the corner, while opening up and integrating internally to the site. The amount of usable commercial does not vary significantly between these two because of the extra parking that's required when you add the two story. We do request some flexibility in the building height to be able to respond to actual market conditions. We want to make sure that we are able to attract compatible retail and office uses to this location and we want to make sure this corner is viable and activated. Turning to some of the residential homes here. The R-15 portion of Modern Craftsman is going to have a wide variety of housing types and sizes. We are primarily targeting millennials and baby boomers, who want an amenitized home without the maintenance responsibilities. We will have one and two and three bedroom offerings and detached homes and attach product, duplexes and six-plexes, some with attached or tuck under garages. All of these residential units will provide private outdoor space, most with private backyards. All of the buildings will use quality materials, including stone and stucco and wood tone sidings. The roof lines provide variety with some single slope and hip roofs. Three color palettes provide variety, but also create cohesiveness and complimentary color schemes. This slide shows a duplex on top, a detached two bedroom on the lower right, and a detached three bedroom on the lower left with different roof lines and colors. This slide shows a two bedroom with an attached garage on top, two bedroom on the lower left, and a three bedroom on the lower right, all detached units with different roof lines and colors. This is one of our six-plex buildings. Each unit is two stories, with a tuck under garage, in a townhome style with two and three bedrooms. The other side of the building. The site plan here shows you how these -- this great variety is distributed throughout the site to make it feel like a neighborhood where you have got intermixed unit types and so this -- these colors are just for illustration of the different types. Throughout the central part of the development the homes are detached and single story, which integrates well to our neighboring communities. On the western and eastern end we have more of the two story product with our live-work building and the townhome style six-plexes, which are adjacent to both Black Cat on the west and, then, the Rock Harbor church on the east. This slide similarly shows the architectural variety that's distributed throughout the community with all the different roof lines and color palettes. We have ample parking on the site, as Joe described, with 84 attached garages, 36 detached garages shown in the green buildings here, 134 covered parking spaces and that's the orange that's highlighted here. We also have 102 storage units that are located inside the garage buildings, which is a great amenity for our residents. Turning to amenities, these are distributed throughout the site. We do have a focus on having some of our activities concentrated together to integrate between the residential and the commercial. They create both buffering, but also create integration for people to join in the public aspects of this. We have got a dog park in the northwest for our community. The clubhouse with the fitness center and pool inside the clubhouse. We have got the workspace as I mentioned. The coffee bar and/or gathering spaces. A kitchen. And, Council Member Borton, you asked about the location of the pool and the -- and the clubhouse, so I want to touch on that. It's purposeful to -- it is -- it is centrally located in this location, but it's very purposeful to allow residents to

choose whether they want to be next to active amenities, as many of the residents will choose that very purposefully, but, then, also create some more private quieter spaces within the development. They are all connected with pathways. At staff's request we did add the western park and picnic shelter and barbecue so that there is a closer amenity but it also still is a quieter scale so that people who don't want to be next to a pool can choose not to be. We also have a tot lot. Publicly accessible plaza that integrates our residential amenities with the public facing commercial amenities. A community garden and that eastern park that I mentioned. The pathways are extensive and this really creates a very pedestrian friendly development here and Joe walked through the multi-use pathway. In the interest of time I'm going to move on -- quickly on the inside amenities. These are great living spaces with modern finishes, stainless steel appliances, in-unit washers and dryers, nine to 12 foot ceilings. These are very quality places. Looking at services, this is an in-fill development and so all of the services are available to serve the site. Police and Fire didn't have any concerns. ACHD has approved and we -- all conditions of approval are acceptable. All of the schools that serve this site currently have capacity. We asked for two changes in the conditions of approval. One is to delete a condition that is no longer necessary in our discussions with staff related to our access points that have been approved by ACHD and are consistent with your code. Secondly, as mentioned already, we asked to amend this condition to allow us the flexibility for a one story or a two story building, to allow us to respond to market conditions and still make sure that we can have an active and viable commercial corner here. We do also need a waiver, as Joe mentioned, from your code that requires a 25 foot landscape buffer between the C-C zones and a residential zone. The intent of this code requirement is to create separation between different and potentially incompatible zones. That's not the case here. We have a single owner and operator, a single unified community that is actually purposefully integrated and purposefully designed to be connected to have those uses adjacent to each other. The pool area, the tot lot, the community plaza and our community garden already do create the buffering that's appropriate, but it also allows us to have residents that can choose to be right next to that if they want to. So, with that I would ask for your support of this development, support of the waiver, and I would stand for any questions you may have. Thank you very much.

Simison: Thank you, Deb. Council, any questions for the applicant?

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Go over real quickly one more time what -- what Deb is asking for to be waived.

Nelson: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Bernt, I would be happy to address that further. So, you have a code requirement that requires a landscape buffer in between a commercial zone and a residential zone, really contemplating that you have two different developers on those sites and we are asking for that item to be waived. Your code expressly allows it to be waived and -- and so we are asking for you to enact that waiver for the

circumstances presented here and to approve the setbacks that are shown in the site plan.

Bernt: And to -- Mayor, follow up. And to also have the option of going from one to two stories in the commercial building on the corner; right?

Nelson: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Bernt, that's correct. We asked you to amend condition 1-A sub I to allow either a one story or a two story commercial. Both concepts are shown there and you can see that they are similar and provide the same opportunities on the corner and internal.

Bernt: Finally, Mr. Mayor, just the access --

Nelson: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Bernt, appreciate your question on that, since I did kind of race through that. I want to make sure it's clear. So, there is a condition that currently requires us to obtain Council approval for the access points along Black Cat. You can see we have two access points on Black Cat. In further discussions with staff we were able to demonstrate that we do comply with your code and so a waiver is not required there and, further, that the access points that are on Black Cat are directly across from the access points approved on Fairborne. I think there was some misunderstanding about that before and so as a result planning staff -- and they can speak for -- Joe can speak for himself, but we -- we understand that they support removing this condition of approval to restrict the access points on Black Cat. ACHD has approved both and there -- they help us internally with our site, both to support -- support the viability of this commercial corner and also to help us have a more pedestrian friendly internal circulation.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you so much for this detailed presentation. I want to touch on the -- I think it was commissioners requested some additional green space there on -- on the eastern side. Just curious, it seems to me like the -- the two story townhomes that are on the eastern side, that they would want to have more access to green space as they don't have any -- really any green space around them, like -- like the detached units do and so I -- it's -- it seems to me that's a pretty significant distance to get to most of the amenities on the western side. Can you tell us more about your -- you know, the thought process on that and why the -- the amenities wouldn't be more evenly spread out through the -- throughout the development?

Nelson: Mr. Mayor and Council Member Perreault, I have pulled up a slide to try to illustrate I think what you are asking about here and -- and, yes, it is actually a very purposeful design to create different areas within the development, so that, you know, what -- what -- with all the experience that Baron has in developing these types of facilities, they have found that people will make choices based on their preferences and some people like to be right next to a pool and an activated open space area and others

would like to have a distance from that to have a quieter home and residents and they also enjoy the walking community. You know, keep in mind this is actually a relatively small site. We are talking about a 20 acre site. You look at these connections between the east and west and the pathway that runs east-west right through the middle connects directly to that pool area and so the other thing that went into our discussions with staff -- we did previously have the clubhouse up in the northwest corner and so we moved it down in discussions with staff. It also helps us create that integration that's called for in your Comprehensive Plan between residential and commercial uses and so in redesigning this we were able to add the new community plaza that is directly to the south of the clubhouse and directly north of the pop up area and that was made possible by having this in this location adjacent to the commercial. So, we felt like it kind of hit the best of both worlds where our residents get the access that they want, but it also allows us to integrate with the commercial better and kind of blend those uses.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Deb, a couple questions. I just wanted to touch on access again. The first access point is a right-in, right-out only. Is the second one, the main entrance, is that -- do they have access to a left turn or is that right-in, right-out only as well?

Nelson: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Hoaglund, the second access -- the further to the north is a full access point.

Hoaglund: Okay. And follow up, Mr. Mayor.

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Do -- Tree Farm Way, they do have access to that. Is there going to be a light there someday or is that just right -- right-in, left turn only? That's to the north of the development.

Nelson: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Hoaglund, that's Tree Crest and there is no light or expected to be a warrant there. That's a pretty small intersection there. It does connect further over to the east to Tree Farm I think you are thinking of. Yes.

Hoaglund: And, Mr. Mayor, one more question related to the commercial.

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Deb, I think I read during -- in the Planning and Zoning there was -- the two story building was going to have parking underneath at one point in time. What -- is that still how a two story would be designed?

Nelson: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Hoaglund, that's correct. A two story building in order to, you know, accommodate the parking would be designed with some parking underneath and so if you look at the lower picture on this slide over on the left side, that lower level would be parking that's accessible. So, it's very tastefully integrated. That's also why there is not a significant difference between the one and two story on commercial space available.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: If we can dialogue about that, Deborah, a little bit. Yeah. I was trying to think, okay, if there is parking on that left side and it's a two story building, your actual footprint for -- for commercial is one story with additional parking. If you just go to one story we don't add parking. Is there sufficient parking for that commercial building if it is one story with just that surface parking? Just trying to see how that -- how that balances out.

Nelson: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, Council Member Hoaglund, they are great questions and we wrestled with that in a lot of detail with the commission, so I kind of had to quickly cover it here. They are good questions. And -- and to be clear, the parking that's on the -- the first floor of the two story doesn't cover the entire footprint and so there is two story, if you look to the -- to the right side, the western side of the building, it is two story integrated commercial use and so it's a -- it's a partial podium parking, you know, which is, you know, an expensive building, obviously, but that makes it look pretty nice. But the -- the commercial square footage on either -- whether you are looking at a single story or a multi-story building, does accommodate a variety of uses and spaces and so the range is from approximately 13,000 square feet to approximately 19,500 square feet and either way there is sufficient parking under your code and ample parking. As Joe mentioned, we exceed all of your parking requirements and so the parking here -- here actually was redesigned in discussion with the commission. That's part of what happened with the redesign of adding more commercial areas, they wanted a parking lot that you could pull in and out of that didn't have parking spaces that backed into the road and so it's actually a pretty good sized surface parking lot with internal spaces as well if needed for a two story.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, Deborah, thank you.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Deborah, question either for you or for your team and you used a term that -- that I have to say I really agree with that this project is very deliberative, but I do have a little bit of a question as we see kind of the -- the elevations of these buildings I do have a little bit of a concern that they -- they all seem to look very similar. I like diversity of housing and both diversity in size and aesthetics and I just -- I'm

trying to visualize this as I'm driving down the road and we have got a couple of spots in Meridian where we have seen this where kind of all the housing looks alike and I'm just curious if you can help me understand why -- the thought process was around this particular type of design and why it all, for the most part, looks the same.

Nelson: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Cavener, I would be happy to. I actually think there is a lot of variety here in the housing. Just on this slide alone you can see the different styles of roof lines and within each of the unit types -- for example, in the two bedrooms there are multiple layouts that create different frontage and -- and shapes and sizes of these products with the mix of attached and detached product. The three different color schemes are intentional to both provide some variety, but also I think -- and more specifically in response to your comment, Council Member Cavener, is about trying to create some kind of cohesiveness and you do see that and, you know, for owner single family residential as well and so you are trying to create something that doesn't look incongruous with -- with each other, but, then, also has enough variety that when you walk down the street you can see a variety of roof lines and a different -- and a variety of homes. I guess, again, I would ask you just to keep in mind we are -- we are talking about a 20 acre site and, you know, what's so special and unique about this development is rather than having your kind of standard, you know, garden three to four story walk up apartments that could have -- were certainly contemplated by the zoning on this site, they are able to create more of a community neighborhood feel and -- and part of that is having that cohesive look together. The -- the Planning Commission did comment on this and really liked the architecture style. We got a large amount of praise from them. They liked the modern look and the clean lines. They thought it was a very attractive development, you know, for what it's worth, sharing their -- their comments with you.

Cavener: Appreciate that, Deb. Mr. Mayor, a follow up if I can.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thanks. And, again, I -- I read through the minutes and I don't disagree, I just -- with what the Planning and Zoning Commission said, it just -- it does just all appear to be kind of one very similar style. But I guess my follow-up question was -- if you can pull up your slide on the impact of the schools, because --

Nelson: Yes.

Cavener: -- I'm curious about where that piece of information that you shared about impact on the schools came from, because I think that is a different number than we have seen I think in our letter from the school district. So, I'm just trying to track where that data came from. Maybe the letter from Joe Yochum that we received was -- year 2019-2020 and if you have got 2020-2021 enrollment that would be helpful to understand.

Nelson: Yes. Mr. Mayor, Council Member Cavener, thank you for the question. I did have to race through there, but I would love to provide that explanation.

Cavener: That's okay.

Nelson: And so since we received the letter from the school district we were able to update these numbers. As you know, the school district has a new facilities plan that's been issued and also we were in discussions with the school district to update this, because Star Elementary has been expanded and also they have the updated numbers for enrollment for Star Elementary in the new facilities plan. I would note, too, that 625 was the number we heard from the school district directly. Their plan actually believes that they have got a capacity of 650 there, but we went with the lower number and so that -- that is an update since the school district's letter provided many months ago on this project. There -- it's not different on the middle school or the high school, the only numbers that have changed is Star Elementary, which I think you guys are aware of went through a recent expansion.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, follow up if I may.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: So, Deb, the number for Star Elementary is for the 2020-2021 academic year. Correct?

Nelson: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Cavener, that is my understanding from our discussion with the school district.

Cavener: Okay. Thank you.

Simison: Council, any further questions for the applicant? Okay. Thank you very much.

Nelson: Thank you very much.

Simison: Mr. Clerk, I assume we had some people signed up to testify on this?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we do. None online, but we had six people sign in in the room, one wishing to testify and one as maybe testify. First we have Jessica Rieke.

Simison: If there is anybody who is on the Zoom call that would like to testify, please, indicate by raising your hand at the bottom of the call and, then, we will bring you in. Thank you, Jessica. If you can state your name and address for the record and be recognized for three minutes.

Rieke: Yes. My name is Jessica Rieke. My address is 6911 North Callery Pear Avenue. Good evening, Mayor, Members of the Council. Thank you for having me tonight and allowing me to speak. My name is Jessica Rieke and along with my husband Kenneth we are proud homeowners in the Spurwing Heights community. I also have the honor of serving as the vice-president on our HOA board. I feel it's important to note we chose our home based on the quality of amenities of our community that it offers, specifically the

clubhouse membership, the park in the center of our small community, the quality of our home and, finally, the understanding of a sound investment given the area and many more. I deeply hope you will -- you will seriously consider the testimony from myself and so many of my neighbors who have submitted their writing online previously, offering their strong dissent for this project as it is currently proposed, specifically with regard to the issue of the high density housing. I understand Ms. Nelson comment -- commented that this zoning -- and forgive me, I'm not completely clear, but she -- she commented that the zoning was already established for communities such as this. It may be permissible, I don't agree that it would be beneficial. As you are fully aware, a lot of the concern focuses around the encroach -- on the encroachment on my quality of life, as well as the neighbors. Ultimately, though, this developer may not agree, I will argue this is not the highest and best use of the land. It's easy to see that the Spurwing community in Meridian has a reputation of excellence and being slightly set apart from other neighboring residential developments. A high density, regardless of how nice -- and they do look nice. I don't disagree that they are beautiful. I just think that it would be better suited in a different plot of land. It will perpetuate -- perpetuate diminishing property values in our community. I don't know if any of you have had the opportunity to drive the area, but though ACHD may give their sign off, the area is quite small. The question by one of the members of the Council was about a light. A light will not fit there. The traffic will not fit on Black Cat on Tree Crest. And the question of the schools I believe is a good one. I believe that this will greatly contribute to the overcrowding of schools. And, then, the totality of the overall development and projects in our area makes this particular project as it is currently proposed essentially a square peg in a round hole. It's -- it's meeting development requirements, but I don't believe it will be sufficient for a positive quality of life for the adjacent Spurwing communities. And, ultimately, I don't agree that it would be for this proposed development. If this was a proposed development of say something like residences for those are -- those 55 and older, I'm certain this discussion would look much different, if at all, given it would substantially mitigate and to do several of the concerns around the parking, traffic, and -- and school enrollment.

Simison: If you can summarize, please.

Rieke: Yep. I, obviously, can't provide my support for this project at the current point and I propose this project be placed on hold until the developer -- developer can present a plan that serves the interest of the community, one with a significantly lower density and appropriately reflects the values that residents of this community hold dear. I understand these are very micro level concerns I have. However, I do believe there needs to be a higher, more macro level discussion about the way that we are building and handling -- dealing with this burgeoning growth within the Meridian city. Thank you for your time.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Jessica, I think there might be some questions for you.

Rieke: Oh, I'm sorry.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Jessica, first thanks for serving on an HOA board. I don't think there is any more thankless job in government than serving on the homeowners association board. So, thanks for doing that.

Rieke: Yes.

Cavener: But my question is about one of your comments towards the end about asking this project be on hold to lower the density --

Rieke: Uh-huh.

Cavener: -- and I'm just curious kind of from your perspective how much lower do you think is -- is sufficient in your opinion as somebody who lives over in that area and you have, obviously, an opinion on that, I just -- I don't like open ended requests, I like to know specifics, so I'm just curious where you stand on that.

Rieke: Sure. Thank you. I appreciate that clarification. You know, we have just east of this development along Tree Crest we actually have townhome type dwellings and they are -- they are dual -- I believe that if you were to significantly reduce these -- what would it be six -- six dwellings within one building, if you were to significantly reduce those or even potentially eliminate that it would be significantly helpful, but I do -- I would ideally like to see these be single dwelling residences or townhome type -- townhome type residences. Does that answer your question?

Cavener: I get to the point that you are trying to make. I don't think it necessarily specifically answers my question, but it just gives me additional insight into your thought process. So thank you.

Rieke: I will say this, Mr. Cavener. I think that 196 dwellings here significantly increases the population and I would -- I would -- I would guesstimate that cutting that in half would be appropriate.

Cavener: Okay. Thank you.

Rieke: Thanks.

Simison: I think Council Woman Perreault had a question next.

Rieke: Okay.

Perreault: I do. Thank you, Mayor. And it is similar to Councilman Cavener's, but maybe in a bigger picture. I guess I'm curious if there was a bigger expectation that this -- there would be more commercial use and less residential use is -- just more as Councilman Cavener was saying, more clarification on -- on -- we always want to know specifics and what it is that the -- that you and the neighbors had anticipated would go in here. I know there has been changes made to the plans, the design, the amount of commercial versus residential since the Planning and Zoning Commission hearings have happened, so it -- was there an expectation of something different than what was presented and also, you know, it sounds like there is some idea of what should go here instead of what is presented and -- and more -- more detail on that. Sorry, if that's a bit of a duplication of Councilman Cavener, but I -- I'm still not a hundred percent, you know, understanding what the trade-off should be.

Rieke: I appreciate the question. Though I can't speak for everybody in our community, I do think that, you know, additional commercial space would help mitigate some of the concerns that we have here. You know, to be completely honest with you, I think that -- I think that everybody is understanding that this is a beautiful piece of land, it's -- it's an amazing location, it's just simply the -- the high density, the amount of people they are planning on cramming on this -- this plot of land is very concerning. So, if it were to be something more like a single use -- single family household type development with more commercial say space -- you know, the fact that they are trying to bring the commercial space down is even more concerning. So, to answer your question, yes, it would be that there would be a greater addition or emphasis on commercial land and, then, obviously, mitigating the amount of multi-family dwellings in this -- in this place. Does that help answer your question?

Perreault: Yes. Thank you.

Rieke: Okay.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Yeah, Jessica, if you wouldn't mind. I -- it sounded like to me your testimony -- the commercial you weren't concerned about, it was the R-15 zoning, which it has, and which allows that more -- that density; is that correct?

Rieke: Yes. That is correct.

Hoaglund: Okay. And, Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Yeah. And I think on the other side it -- if I recall seeing the maps correctly was R-8. So, that's -- that's the issue we have is if that was R-8 we could certainly, you know,

go lower and -- or if the developer came in, but if they are within that R-15 allowance it's -- it makes it a little more -- more difficult. We got a mix of R-4 there to the north of this property and, then, the -- the -- in the light yellow, darker yellow, is R-8. So, that's trying to -- trying to work our way around that to figure out how does that -- how does that flow and match. So, that's -- that's the -- if you would care to comment on that I will certainly allow that.

Rieke: Sure. I think -- I think that is understood. I just think that it is prudent for all of us as homeowners in this beautiful community that we express our -- our concern despite zoning as it currently stands. Again, to my point about looking at this at a macro level and understanding -- thinking how this is going to impact the city and our community ten, 20 years from now, I think it's an important discussion. Again, I understand that the zoning is -- it exists as it is and that presents a very difficult topic of discussion for you. I don't -- I don't envy your jobs here in trying to work through that. However, as I said, I just feel it's prudent that we are clear and honest about our concerns.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: And, Jessica, I appreciate that. It's good testimony and we want that input. So, it's greatly appreciated and well done.

Rieke: Yeah. Thank you. Thank you for your time. Any other questions? Okay. Thank you so much.

Dodson: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Yes, Joe.

Dodson: If I may clarify for the record. The issue of density is not tied to zoning, it is tied to the future land use designation, which is mixed use community. So, the -- the use of multi-family is tied to the R-15, which is a conditional use in that zone, but the density for mixed use community is six to 15. So, in order to go -- my point being that a lot of the testimony, both written and public, were wanting to basically duplicate much of Spurwing here. That kind of density would have to go through a comp plan amendment and is not what Council has approved in the vision for this property. So, that's why this application is more to do -- at least the density side of it is more to do with the future land use than the zoning. So, I just wanted to make that clear for everybody.

Simison: Thank you. Just -- if you want to come up and testify you are welcome to come up and we can have the staff answer any questions, but you have to do it on the record. Do we have -- we don't have anyone else who has signed up; correct?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, there was no one else signed up. There was a Mr. Bennion was testifying if needed, so --

Simison: Okay. Come -- come on up and state your name and address for the record and be recognized for three minutes.

Bennion: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. Thank you very much for hearing me tonight. My name is Karl Bennion. I live at 4566 West Sugar Tree Drive in the Spurwing Heights community just north of this planned development. I, first of all, want to echo Jessica's comments. We in the Spurwing Heights community and the Spurwing Greens communities feel very similar in that way in that we are just very highly concerned about this planned development here. I'm really concerned about dropping down in the commercial size going down from eight down to about four and a half. That includes probably approximately 36 more units get brought in. That's 36 more units that have two to three people per unit. That puts another hundred people and a hundred cars and everything in that area. So, the more commercial we lose the more residents we are going to have and more congestion we are going to have in that area. So, I'm greatly, you know, really concerned about dropping from eight acres down to 4.4 acres. I think that's going to be a real detriment to that. I worry, too, if they are only building single story on that -- on that commercial piece, there is going to be more traffic, more congestion in the whole property. I believe that will spill over -- over onto Tree Crest Drive. I, too, echo the sentiment that I would love to see more single family homes, more in the hundred unit for that size, because Spurwing Heights has both R-4 and R-8 and, you know, if we add something in those ranges or -- or in there we would feel much more comfortable with what's going on. I agree it looks like a -- there is a lot of good planning going around this. I just believe the density is too high around that. I -- I'm really concerned about parking spilling over into Tree Crest. I know they have talked about it, said it won't, but we all know with residential that are rentals sometimes people don't monitor that closely and it can spill over out onto Tree Crest and, then, we are going to have lots of congestion on our Tree Crest. Thank you very much.

Simison: Council, any questions?

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: Clarification for me, if you would, Karl, and that was on commercial you would like to see commercial expanded -- you know, kept at the eight, it would reduce, but, then, I thought you said something about commercial increases traffic. So, I didn't know where you stood on that, so if you would clarify, please. Thanks.

Bennion: Yes. I'm sorry if I misstated that. I want to keep the commercial up as high as possible like it's -- like it's already zoned for with eight. I think that having more residences there -- is if we take those -- if you plan to have more commercial acreage there that's needed for that it will reduce the number of home units by about 36 units, which are 70 people, which, again, with 70 extra units out there that was where the increase would come. So, I probably didn't state that correctly. Thank you, Mr. Hoaglun.

Simison: And, Joe, I guess this question is kind of for you, but just so we all understand, increasing the commercial doesn't necessarily mean you would get less residents, because they have the ability to go up by a fair amount over what they are currently proposing.

Dodson: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, that is correct. So, again, the density range is six to 15 dwelling units per acre. They are at 8.7. So, they are at the lower end of that. They could -- as was stated at the Planning and Zoning Commission, they could have proposed three or four story tall, you know, apartment complexes and get upwards of 400 units on this plot. That is, obviously, not what is desired and the applicant understood that and, therefore, proposed a majority of single story single family units, but on a multi-family plot, which just means more than three -- more than two dwellings on one lot. So, yes, that is correct.

Simison: Thank you. I just wanted to make sure it was clear it wasn't an inverse proportional relationship necessarily. Council, any further questions? All right. Thank you.

Bennion: Thank you very much, Mr. Mayor and Council -- Members of the Council.

Simison: Sir, did you want to come forward and -- did you want to come forward and at least state your name and address and ask the question and we can get it on the record.

Hammer: Joseph Hammer. I live in Spurwing Heights. 6922 North Agrarian Avenue. My purpose here is -- I didn't quite understand staff's discussion of zoning versus density. It made no sense to me. But I'm not an expert in it. So, I just wanted to see if that was clarified, because my understanding is that the Council seems bound by the current zoning without amending the Comprehensive Plan. So, what's -- what -- what's the difference? I didn't quite understand what you were saying about future use versus density.

Dodson: Yes, sir. Great question. It's a big question when we deal with these applications every time from the public. So, there is existing C-C and R-15 zoning. That dictates the dimensional standards, which is height, setbacks, all of those things. Parking ratios even. And the -- the uses. That's what the zoning is for. And with the recent update to the Comprehensive Plan, zoning is now tied to the future land use designation, which is separate of the zoning. It has a future -- every property, whether it's zoned or annexed into the city at this point, if it's in our area of impact it has a future land use on it. It's our way of planning for the future with everything in its full build out intentions at least now. So, that's where -- if you look at your screen on those maps in front of you, the brown area, this is the future land use map. This brown area is the mixed use community, which encompasses this property. This centerpiece has the zoning. So, again, density is tied to the future land use and not to the zoning. The zoning determines the uses and the dimensional standards.

Hammer: An amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, which is a future --

Dodson: If they -- if anybody wanted to turn this property into a medium density residential, which is what Spurwing is under, then, yes, that would require a comp plan map amendment.

Hammer: All right. Just one other kind of anecdotal comment. I bike a lot and -- and I agree with the applicant, it is a very small space. You know, it's all weeds right now or less, but you can bike around it in a matter of five minutes and so it is small and I know that the applicant has indicated it's a 20 acre site, but it raises some of those concerns of being crammed and a little bit too dense. But thank you.

Simison: Council, any questions? Thank you.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I wanted to thank Mr. Hammer for his question. It's not uncommon for that question to arise sometimes. Most people have a question regard to the difference between future land use maps and zoning. So, thank you, Mr. Hammer, for clarifying that for your -- your other residents.

Simison: Mr. Clerk, I see we have Denise LaFever wishing to testify.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, that's correct. She is joining the meeting now.

Simison: Okay. Denise, if you could state your name and address for the record and be recognized for three minutes.

LaFever: Hi. My name is Denise LaFever and I'm at 6706 North Salvia Way in Spurwing and everybody's asking what you want there. I want Bown Crossing over in south Boise. That's a beautifully integrated mixed use community. When you go back and you look at our future land use map, there is just -- there wasn't the commercial designation on the future land use, it's mixed use, and I'm seeing more and more people and developers wanting to turn them into apartments and residential. I would really like to see the commercial there. There is also some confusion -- the staff report says that it's going to be 2.26 acres of commercial is what they are asking for, but Kent Brown's memo says 4.23. So, I'm not really sure exactly how much of that commercial is actually being developed. I'm in more support of the commercial. This is like the trifecta of commercial. You have got access points -- a left controlled light at Black Cat and Tree Farm. You have trip counts and you have roof tops. This spells I love commercial all over it. Plus mixed use community is supposed to serve the community. A lot of what the amenities that they talked about in the first application and towards the second application is more about supporting the current residents that are in the development. The memo on Kent Brown makes it clear that it is one story, underlined, or two stories. The intent is really to be one story. If you look at the video it also shows a one story commercial on the corner. So, their intent is to be more residential and not that two story. It's underlined and it's in the

video. This is an all residential rental area, which isn't compatible with all the surrounding areas, which is a high end -- high end home ownership, a lot of pride, and the neighborhood off to the west has done a really good job on melding with the Spurwing philosophy of life. One of my biggest issues is the usable space. Although they need the usable space, when you actually look at usable space it calculates in buffers and other nonusable amenities that are actually usable. This puts a large constraint on the neighborhoods around them for these neighbors to be using the usable spaces throughout this Spurwing community. The nearest park is .8 miles, which is Keith Bird Park. That is not practical to go across four heavy lanes of traffic, soon to be six in the future, and coupled with a high density regional compact use of Costco. So, it really is a lack of usable park space when they put it into the calculations. Not only that, but over at Costco right to the back they already have proposed 196 bedrooms, 102 units of apartments in that area. This whole development is -- is basically done on private roads, with the whole concept of getting higher and higher density in there that's not commiserative to the surrounding areas --

Simison: Denise, your time has expired. If you can wrap up, please.

LaFever: Okay. I would like to see it closer to a six density, but more open space, more commercial, and I would like to see the impact be respected to the quality of life of the people that live around it. Once again, I would like to see it being more of the spirit of a mixed use more like Bown -- Bown Crossing in southeast. Thank you for your time.

Simison: Council, any questions?

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I have a question -- not for Denise. I have a question for staff whenever that would be appropriate to ask.

Simison: I don't see anybody else wanting to ask Denise a question that I can identify, so this would be a perfect time.

Bernt: Thank you. Joe, got a question for you, brother. Is -- are we counting the community center as commercial space? If so, is it made available to the general public? If not -- I guess I will stop there until -- I have a bunch more questions.

Dodson: No problem. Councilman Bernt, Members of the Council, so one of the revisions from the Planning and Zoning was to increase the area of C-C zoning from the two acres to what is now 4.2. Yes, the clubhouse area is part of that, including the plaza. I understand that that -- well, first, let me say that the clubhouse has about a thousand square feet of office that is available -- from my understanding it is available or not restricted to the public, but it is the intent to use it more for the residents of the community. And my next comment to that is I understand the public's concern and any concern that

it might be just a token area of additional commercial acreage, which is why I was trying to harp on the fact of having this two story concept on the corner adds the actual leasable square footage of additional commercial space, which I find more important than the acreage of zoning, at least in this case. So, that's -- yes, to answer your question.

Bernt: All right. Mr. Mayor, follow up?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: So, just -- so, to clarify. So, what you are saying is that you are -- they are considering -- or they are counting the community center as -- as -- as commercial space, mostly geared toward their own residents, not toward the public. That's true?

Dodson: That is my understanding.

Bernt: Okay. So, how many -- how many acres is the community center sitting on?

Dodson: I honestly do not know, sir. I would say it's roughly --

Bernt: That's roughly. I don't need --

Dodson: -- an acre. It's got to be -- no more than an acre. With the plaza it's probably a little over an acre.

Bernt: Okay. That's perfect. Thanks, man.

Simison: Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone else who is signed up to testify? If not --

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we did not. No one online or in the room.

Simison: All right. Anybody else who would like to provide testimony, please, come forward to the mic and state your name and address for the record.

Brown: For the record Kent Brown. 3161 East Springwood. I have been before you many times. I have been real excited about bringing this to the City of Meridian as one of the first places and the part that I think is -- that's kind of getting overlooked is the -- these buildings -- these residential buildings. If we were trying to put the density that the neighbors are concerned about, my clients would have put a lot more townhouses. Numerous times in talking with staff they suggested maybe along Chinden putting some more townhouses. The desire has been to -- to bring this one story detached units -- detached -- some being duplexes, some being completely independent. Some have garages. So, the -- that they can -- or that are attached to the unit themselves and in doing the many multi-family projects that I brought before you before, we count specifically everything that's on the outside of the building that makes the open space higher. We keep the buildings 20 feet apart, so, then, that means that all of that area is counted. We have those spaces in here, but they are private. We have -- we have homes

that are basically single story that is planned to an extent that they can be clustered in, but they -- the people have privacy and they have these -- these yards for their -- their -- their product and what I really liked about Jeff Riggs -- one of the -- the main people with Baron, he made a comment that if we were looking for property that we were trying to put density on we wouldn't do townhouses. We -- we do that product places, but we chose not to do that here and the single story really provides something that's needed in the market. They have done the research, they have found that people want that experience and many of us have parents that are elderly -- yes, the -- the neighborhood has said that they would like 55 or older. Well, I see a lot of 55 or older living here, because they have no maintenance. They have parcel stuff, they -- they -- they have a service to take your trash to the dumpster for you. They -- they provide care with regards to parking that the neighbors were concerned about where they pay someone to go around and remove vehicles that aren't parked where they are not supposed to be and so that it makes this something that has not been seen in this valley. Yes, you are -- you are used to the two story and up, but this different -- this is a different product that you haven't seen and I'm real excited about it and there are with each building different roof styles, so that even though that they are the same building next to each other, they don't look like the same building. You can't even do that in a single family neighborhood when you have builder teams.

Simison: Thank you.

Brown: I will stand for any questions.

Simison: Council, any questions?

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Question for Mr. Brown. I did note that you are required to provide 80 square feet of private usable open space per unit and you are at 419, which is, what, five times the required, which we always appreciate when people do more than the minimum, but is that surrounding the unit? Is that how -- how that's counted?

Brown: Yes.

Hoaglund: Is it more in a back area, as opposed to front and the other is just --

Brown: One of the pictures has areas that are highlighted in blue --

Hoaglund: Okay.

Brown: -- the one that's on the screen right now. Those are all private open spaces. So, they are fenced, they have yards, there is -- there was one of the slides that show people sitting there and so that's one of the reasons why having the clubhouse at the one end

-- you have the people having the ability to do stuff in their own yard, which is what we do in our single family neighborhoods and -- but what it all comes down to is having that privacy and something that is highly maintained and taken care of and -- and Baron's won awards for their maintenance. We are a part of the DA for Spurwing, which called out that we do something similar to this, and staff told us in one of our pre-app meetings that we didn't have to ask for a rezone. They suggested that we do, because everything that we are doing we could do in the C-C zone if we didn't change it, so -- anything else?

Simison: Council, any further questions?

Brown: Thanks.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Kent, following up --

Brown: Yes, sir.

Borton: Quick follow up on Councilman Bernt's question. If, you know, you had approximately eight acres planned for the current commercial C-C zone and at P&Z I think the rezone application had it -- had it much lower, perhaps that's where the two or 2.2 comes from, but at the P&Z continuance there was a request to put a little more commercial back into it and that was done to some extent up to the approximate four acres in the current application. What was -- back in P&Z hearing that allowed for the requested increase in commercial to the acres that we see now?

Brown: One of the items is the live-work building. It -- it mixes both and as Deborah talked about early on, to have that mixed use -- one of the -- one of the difficulties about doing a mixed use product with the way that the city has the guidelines for it is that you have outdoor and you have plazas and so forth that the commercial takes advantage of, but that the residents also do. So, if they -- for example, in the pop ups, if -- if someone's got a fruit stand or they have got an ice cream thing there, they can, then, go to someplace that's close by and they can eat that outdoors type of scenario. And so that's what's making this all work in the same area and clustered close together is a part of the reason why we have to do that and moving those things further down diminishes from that, because we have to have those same elements for the commercial.

Borton: Mr. Mayor, quick follow up.

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: So, Kent, was -- going into that second P&Z to -- to increase the commercial was removed such as a residence and converted to additional commercial space or was

something that was already on the proposal recharacterized to count as commercial, serving a dual purpose? It sounded like maybe the --

Brown: Like the clubhouse? Is that what you are getting at?

Borton: Or anything else. I'm just trying to get a sense of -- did something come out and commercial went back in or was something merely recharacterized to count as commercial?

Brown: No. We -- we put stuff in and the stuff that we put in was the live-work and they wanted a vertical integrated -- they wanted to have buffering against Black Cat and so they wanted a two story building there. We have always tried to be mindful of our neighbors that have been testifying to the north of us, because where we put our fence in against those neighbors they are not going to see any units and there isn't anybody that's looking over across Tree Crest at them. So, we have tried to keep everything that's taller against those roads and against buffering us from the large Rock Church -- Rock Harbor church building. We have always planned on having offices in the clubhouse, but we have changed that, so that there -- there is leasable spaces in that clubhouse and Deb has the numbers with that, so she can speak to that number wise. But one of the things early on with staff is Baron says that they like to have events and they like to support community type things and staff said that we couldn't do that in an R-15 zone. So, when we started talking about relooking at some of those, now we can do those kinds of things -- neighborhood events from that clubhouse, whether that's, you know, Blue Cross -- or not Blue Cross -- but Red Cross and other types of functions. Breast cancer and so forth.

Borton: Mr. Mayor --

Brown: One of the things that didn't get discussed is our northern entrance ties in directly with the roadway that goes over to central village -- or Central Valley with plaza with the hospital and so forth. So, that's a straight shot out of our development over to the west for the hospital that's over there.

Simison: Councilman Borton, did you have another question?

Borton: Just -- just one final question and, Kent, either you or -- or Ms. Nelson can -- for that clubhouse community center, is that available to the -- for reservation and use and, if so, is it --

Brown: I will let her speak to that.

Borton: Okay. And the second question on that is it paid for and maintained and insured by -- or some other entity?

Brown: I will let her --

Nelson: Mr. Mayor, Council Members, I would like to offer some rebuttal points, but I would be happy to start with that last question, if that makes the most sense for you.

Simison: Deb, I don't -- we haven't closed it to other people's testimony, so if you just want to answer that question, then, we can see if anybody else wants to testify --

Nelson: Okay.

Simison: -- before we move into --

Nelson: I will handle it that way then. Thank you. Council Member Borton, your questions overlapped with what Council Member Hoaglund was asking as well and the answer is that the clubhouse is a residential amenity available for residences to reserve those office spaces and there is approximately 1,050 square feet of office space that is reservable by the residents. In addition there is office space for our full-time staff and that -- that building could appropriately be located either in the C-C zone or in the R-15 zone. It would be allowed in either location under your code. It is appropriately in the C-C for the reasons -- for many reasons, one of which Kent just touched on was having that adjacent plaza that's open to the public that creates that integration there. The -- the building is only 4,500 square feet. You had asked, Council Member Hoaglund, about the size in particular of how much land. It's only a 10th of an acre. If you count the public, you know, open space, the -- the plaza that's really appropriately in the C-C zone, you might get up to a third of an acre. This is a small footprint. And when we display our square footage that we are describing without that office space, it's 27,000 feet overall and so it's -- and I -- when I presented I said over 20,000, because we would like the flexibility to go down to a one story building on the corner. So, I think that hits on all of the questions you guys asked about the clubhouse, but let me know if there is -- there is more that I missed.

Simison: Okay.

Borton: Sounds good. Thank you.

Nelson: Thank you.

Simison: We are still in a public hearing. Is there anybody else that would like to provide testimony on this application? If you would like to come forward and state your name and address for the record, please.

Parkinson: My name is Ray Parkinson. I live at 6925 North Agrarian Drive, just at that intersection that they claim on the north, that's how I leave my subdivision. So, it's directly adjacent. I understand that they have done a pretty good job and we understand that something's going to happen -- something's going to have to go there and it sounds like they have taken some consideration to make it a cohesive development. However, I just moved here in June of this year, I wasn't even aware of what was going on here and I don't know that it would have made an impact on whether I would have decided to live in the Spurwing Subdivision or not, but it definitely is concerning to me now not knowing

exactly how that's going to impact my property values and my quality of life here. I personally would like to see, as mentioned by the -- some of the other Spurwing residents, a little less dense housing and a little more commercial there that would be maybe a little more compatible to what we currently have in that area. However, I think at this point I would really like to encourage the consideration of some of the requests that they have made and the green space on the west side on Black -- Black Cat. I think that we just need to make sure that -- that the residents there are being fairly represented by our -- our Council Members and I know some of the developers -- they are coming in to make their money and that's all fine. I appreciate that. And my day job's a banker and I have been involved in several developments such as this and I'm very impressed with their presentation, but I would just encourage you to make sure that us as residents are being considered in these decisions and I would prefer -- you know, like has been mentioned before, maybe even half the density, but I understand that the current -- they are allowed to do even more dense housing. So, I guess my whole point is I wanted to make sure that as you guys make the decisions here that you are considering us as residents of those neighborhoods in your decisions. So, thank you for hearing me.

Bernt: Welcome to Meridian.

Parkinson: Yeah. Thank you. It's a pleasure to be here. I love it.

Simison: And for Council, Ray has taken over the spot for Toni Smith, who has now retired, just for people's knowledge.

Parkinson: Some very big high heels to fill, actually.

Simison: Council, any questions? Is there anybody else would like to provide testimony at this time? Okay. Then the applicant will come forward to close.

Nelson: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, thank you and I appreciate the comments from all the neighbors and also from the -- the question and answer back and forth. I think it helps us get to a presentation that you can understand all the detailed aspects of this. A couple of specific points that were brought up. There was a comment about schools and we already just touched on that. I just want to point out that based on, you know, West Ada has changed their calculation and that's another thing that's changed since their original letter as well. They now calculate a .7 for every home, instead of .8. A .7 would bring us to 137 students. But this development is targeting millennials and baby boomers and so we actually expect that number to be significantly less and as we discussed we are within the capacities. Open space was brought up, that we should have more open space. We actually have 17 and a half percent of open space in this development, which is significant for its size, and we provide six qualified amenities, where only four are required. On the comment about traffic, all of the roads currently meet -- as they have been improved. I think everybody here is aware of all the improvements that have gone on in this area with the Costco development and widening Chinden and adding a signal at Black Cat and those roads meet the level of service with the trips from this development. The development will also be providing almost a hundred

thousand dollars in proportionate share mitigation to ITD. So, that's a significant contribution. Plus all of their impact fees to ACHD. The homeowner representative discussed it would be great if we could have more townhomes. Well, we do have a townhome. I mean that's what's great is we have that housing product. In addition to that, we have the detached product that I think truly is more favorable to what we are hearing from the Spurwing neighbors and so adding more townhomes would add more density here and we have really tried to limit that and find that right balance. There was discussion about the commercial size and questions from the Council Member about the commercial size and the evolution at the Planning and Zoning Commission. The -- the comments from the Planning and Zoning Commission were that it would be nice to have around a four acre site, because they thought that added enough opportunity for a mix of uses. But as Joe has pointed out, there is nothing magical about the acres, it's really about increasing the intensity of the available space and our original development came in with 12,500 square feet and so we have doubled that. So, that's really what the Planning and Zoning Commission was looking at where you could have that synergy of uses in one location with our six units and the live-work and our four units and the pop up, plus the corner commercial, we have a lot of opportunity for a mix of uses that people can walk to with pathways that connect, so that it doesn't just serve our development, it serves the neighbors, too. The testimony from the neighbors at the P&Z was that they wanted neighborhood commercial. They don't want an auto based commercial. They don't want more traffic. And I think that was, you know, flushed out again today, that, you know, retail trips generate much more traffic than residential and so I think we have tried to strike that right balance of getting enough commercial here that doesn't create an unreasonable amount of traffic. We also have the limitations of the site that have to be taken into account that were part of that balancing act. Chinden has no access and so with access limitations you can't really develop a larger regional based commercial. Instead that has happened on other sites around us with Fairborne, Costco, and the Central Valley Plaza. And this -- this discussion about it would be great if it were just half the units. I mean Joe answered that correctly that when we are looking at a rezone, the range of density that your plan has called for here -- your updated plan calls for six to 15 and so it's always been contemplated to be in that range. Even more importantly, we are currently zoned and so we are allowed to build something up to 15. We are only seeking the rezone to realign the zones as requested by staff and so somebody could come in and put 15 units per acre here and that is allowed under the current zone and so -- but I think even more important than that I think it's just important to keep in mind the context of what was planned when Tree Farm was approved, that this was supposed to be a little more of an intense site. They didn't want to have all of the same housing type in this area. This area was called for multi-family and for commercial and so we are fulfilling that vision that has been long held and we are creating an opportunity that's attractive and useful and functional on this in-fill site that's been waiting to be developed. Baron's really excited to be here. We think it's a great site. We think it's a great product for Meridian and they are excited to be a part of your city to bring that forward. So, I would stand for any additional questions you may have.

Simison: Thank you, Deb. Council, questions?

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Deb, I need some help on this -- this struggle I have and it's not about the overall development, this is mixed use community and there are some amenities and qualities here that -- Mr. Brown was right, we don't see in Meridian. So, thank you for doing that, because this is unique and I know the residents who live in Spurwing may go, oh, no, this is high density, this is terrible, but yet from our perspective when we see these developments coming in from all parts of the city, it's like here we go again, townhouse after townhouse after townhouse and apartment complex after apartment complex. To see something like this is refreshing and rather exciting. But I -- but I certainly understand the perspective of your neighbors. It's -- it's change and it's different than -- you know, it's just -- it's -- it's our human nature to -- you know, that unknown. But where my -- where my angst is right now is on that commercial portion, because in going through the minutes with the Planning and Zoning Commission, they talked about having something on the corner that stood out and I guess it really gets down to that is that single story, is that two story and what does that look like when you go by that, oh, there is -- there is something there and -- and you made a good point about its neighborhood commercial, as opposed to retail commercial, which -- I think it was -- I asked Karl Bennion about that -- what would -- you know, his concern or was it retail driving that -- but it was the density of the housing. So, that -- that does give me pause going, okay, if it's a neighborhood, but is there still a commercial component to it that some want that visibility from that area to be seen -- if it's a real estate office, for example. They want to have their sign out front and know that's where -- where are they located. So, help me understand why you think that one story would be -- would work still, as opposed to -- and I understand what you have the -- more than half of the building -- well, about half the building would be underground -- parking on that first floor, so it's not a complete two story structure, but help me understand why you think that one story is plenty.

Nelson: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Hoaglund, I would be happy to. The -- the one story building -- and I -- and I understand the comments that you read from the P&Z. I recall specifically that they talked about, actually, that they felt like we had satisfied their desire to add sufficient commercial. They liked the architecture of the two story. You probably remember that comment. And -- and we appreciate that. It's a beautiful building. We have great architects. But they also designed a similar look in a one story to create that same striking presence and so because of the signal that's now gone in at Black Cat and Chinden you can get that visibility that you are talking about and so the commercial users can have visibility on that corner that's created by the signal. It's still got that same design. We love the design they put together with the corner and the L shape, so it creates a striking presence on the corner, whether it's one story or two. It's got the elevated kind of sloped modern roofline that creates that higher elevation look and so the P&Z became satisfied with the amount of commercial. Council Member Borton, you asked earlier about, well, what was taken out. Well, that live-work building was townhouses and so we added commercial through vertical integration there and, then, we expanded the footprint of that corner commercial area to allow a larger footprint of square footage and we would

love it if we could find the retail uses -- if we have the demand for two story -- we like the look of that, too. We would be delighted to have that. But a vacant corner that isn't viable doesn't activate the commercial area at all and so we have to be cognizant of that and make sure we get the right user that is compatible, that is neighborhood commercial, and that's all we are asking for is flexibility. We are not asking to have a one story building only, we are asking for the option.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor. Deborah, thank you.

Simison: Council, any other questions? Okay.

Nelson: Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Council, I will -- happy to let you all talk amongst yourselves or take a motion to close the public hearing, whichever direction you would like to go.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I would encourage Council to use as much dialogue right now before we go into -- or before we close the public hearing, if it's all necessary.

Simison: Just real quick, since we have been going at this since 4:30, would Council like to take a break or just keep going? Okay. We are going to go ahead and take a ten minute recess. We will reconvene at 8:15.

(Recess: 8:05 p.m. to 8:17 p.m.)

Simison: Okay. I'm going to go ahead and bring this back from recess. Council, under your president's direction would anybody like to be recognized for comments at this time?

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: I will make some -- some brief opening comment to all the material that we reviewed up through today. The -- the considerations, depending on the type of application, annexations versus applications such as this where there is existing entitlements is an important distinction. The application starts with a vested right to do certain things on this property with the C-C and R-15 zoning. The rezone application, as I see it, is a moving of a line expanding one existing use to a certain degree and reducing another, all within the mixed use community. But the two zones that are within this application are consistent with mixed use community and consistent with the Comprehensive Plan future land use map, so all things considered it seems to me to be improvement in the existing entitlements. I think the -- the density vested existing

residential use could be much higher. I appreciate the fact that it's not. I think that the concerns about excessive residential traffic are well taken and the applicant stayed on the low end of that existing invested right, which I think is appreciated, perhaps in consideration of concern. I think the product is -- it's unique in that region. It is diverse. So, I appreciate that as well. Again, providing some diversity in an existing right to provide that type of mixed use residential. So, I think the -- the project is one -- excuse me -- the application is one worth approving. I think the rezone, having been really vetted well by Planning and Zoning and thanks to the Commission for doing that, I think that process with the citizens' input made this a net improvement on what was already an otherwise existing right and entitlement on this property. So, for those reasons that I'm supportive of it.

Simison: Thank you, Councilman Borton.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Yeah. As I -- as I go through this and I kind of probably got ahead of myself a little bit when I talked about earlier that this is -- this is new, it's different, it's kind of exciting to see something -- refreshing to see something that is different, that is not just maxing out the densities that -- that they could and, you know, like any project you look at it and you see things that, you know, why did they put the dog park there, I think I would move it over here and change things around. But, really, as I went through the two sets of Planning and Zoning minutes -- and Councilman Borton has pointed out -- they did an excellent job. They -- they put a lot of time and effort into this and the result of that is -- is a better project and that's -- that's what we want to see and we certainly appreciate that work by them and the applicant and the neighbors who helped make that with their testimony to a better project and, you know, as we get into the waivers, you know, one of the -- one of the requests is allowing a one or two story building and -- and as I have gone back and forth on that -- and I think I understand that, it's not a retail destination. I know Ms. LaFever had talked about that -- like a Bown Crossing, which is unique and exciting, but that is not this and -- and not planned to be that and I can buy into the -- it's a neighborhood retail location and so going to allowing a one story or two story is something I can live with. I didn't have any problems with the 25 foot landscape buffer waiver. It flows well the way the concept is designed, that -- that is workable to me and -- and, of course, the access issue has been worked out, we just need to delete that condition. So, those things have been answered for me as -- as we went through the course of the discussion this evening. So, I think I can -- I can support those.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I think Council Member Hoaglund touched on something that is a good reminder for all of us on the Council. I think it's a -- it's an easy trap for us to fall into to, you know,

play SimCity and say, oh, I want this to be here and that to be there and I was pretty clear about my comments, I don't love the design and look of this. I just think it's very -- it just all looks the same. But I think we also know that I am not in the homebuilding business and I think it would be a challenge for all of Meridian if I was. So, I'm not so beholden to that particular piece that I'm -- I'm opposing the project. The one piece I do have a little bit of a hang up on -- and Council Member Hoaglund touched on it -- is the waiver for the two story. To me, again, going back to the comments in P&Z -- and Deborah, obviously, spoke about it in her comments -- is that was trying to capture some of the desire of the Planning and Zoning Commission to have that greater element -- I think Council Member Holland said time and time again the desire to go vertical on -- on that commercial piece. So, I'm not supportive of that particular waiver, but I think overall with everything else related to the project I can be supportive.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Oh, I'm -- I'm struggling with this one a little bit. So, I -- I agree with my fellow Council Members' comments about the uniqueness of this. I really think the applicant has put in an incredible amount of -- of well thought out effort and design, the uniqueness. I love the concept of the -- the -- the multiplicity of types of properties together and how they are intended to work as one development, but also be unique. I like the livability aspect of it. There is so many things about it I really like. The -- the challenge I'm experiencing is I don't love this location for this and this isn't -- we talked a lot in the past in general about we only have so many corners in Meridian to -- and -- and so many opportunities to get these developments right and this is a really important location because of its -- because of it being on Chinden and for the most part in my opinion all in all Chinden really lacks commercial, even with everything that's coming in -- considering the number of units that are along Chinden I don't feel like we have enough and so I would actually prefer to see a little greater use of commercial space in here than residential space in here. I wouldn't call this a hard corner per se, because Black Cat going north stops. There isn't traffic coming in from the north. So, there is that element there of -- of it not necessarily being a corner with two -- you know, two arterials or a highway and an arterial. But I just -- I really don't -- I don't love this location for this, as much as I really like the concepts and the residential designs and whatnot. I also agree with Councilman Cavener that I feel like there could be more variety in -- not necessarily the elevations, but the colors specifically. And I know -- and, sure enough, those renderings probably are not accurate as to what you are going to do, but I definitely think that with the proximity of the homes one to the other that there needs to be a significant variety among them. But I -- I -- what I don't have for you at this very moment is exactly what I would do differently and that's what I'm kind of wrestling with is we have asked the applicant and we have asked some of the -- the individuals giving testimony for specifics on what they would like to see differently and I would like to do the same. To say what -- you know, I can't plan this for the applicant by any means or for the city, but just in general I would really like to see a little more intense use here myself.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor, my turn.

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: To begin I really like the concept of this -- this project. This application. I don't think this type of development will attract big families. I really don't believe that. I think most -- most of those who will be interested in this type of a project will be younger professionals, those who don't want to -- those who don't want to spend their time mowing lawns and -- and doing yard work and trimming trees and so on and so forth. I -- I -- if there are -- if there are going to be families I think they are going to be pretty small and younger families. Mostly retirees. And so I don't think that you are going to get a lot of density of people that -- what's been expressed by -- by those who have given testimonial, albeit I appreciate the testimony given and respectfully understand where you -- where you come from with that concern. I -- I believe the amenities are great. Maybe add a pickleball court or something, but -- but for the most part I think that the amenities are great. One thing that I believe to be true and very important in any city, whether it's small, big, old or new, is a diversity of housing. I think what makes a strong city is a diversity in housing and sometimes when you get west and you get away from our -- our dear friends of the east I think that sometimes folks sometimes just sort of expect the same thing in every -- in every subdivision, you know, single family dwellings that -- that -- that aren't quite as dense, but at the end of the day I think in some places I think that that's important and we may agree to disagree and know that I love you for it if we do, but, you know, if there is one place where -- where density makes sense it's probably right here. I'm not -- I'm not a -- I'm not a guy with -- and I want to be clear, I'm not a guy that likes to plop, you know, multi-family projects in the middle of town. I get why that wouldn't be advantageous. But you have Highway 20-26 right there on Chinden. It's been expanded and it's going to create a nice thoroughfare for people to travel from -- from point A to point Z. To the west you are going to have Highway 16. And so you are going to have an area where traffic isn't going to be as big of a deal as if it were, you know, somewhere on Ustick, you know, off of Locust Grove for example. And that's just -- that's just my thought that I have. With that said, I would -- this is where I struggle and it's with the commercial aspect. I don't like how it was sold as -- the community center as a portion of the commercial area of it and maybe I misunderstood that calculation. If I do I apologize. I just think that's a little bit fuzzy. We have been doing this for a long time and -- and I -- I wish you would have portrayed that differently, because I don't think that that was necessarily -- I don't know -- that's not commercial period. I mean that's residential. Hundred percent. I -- I would like to see more creativity in -- in the commercial aspect of this. I think it's just sort of blah and I -- and I -- we -- there is a lot of people that bring up Bown Crossing as an example. This for sure isn't Bown Crossing. Bown Crossing is a phenomenal area of Boise. But this -- this just isn't that. But with that said, I do believe it could have been more creative with the commercial aspect of it and with City Council we are not designers, we are not planners, I'm never going to get into specifics of what I like and what I don't like and what should be there and what should be taken out, that's not our purview, but I can tell you that we -- the commercial aspect of this could have been done better. I certainly am in favor of a two story building, as opposed to a one story building. I think going vertical is extremely important, especially on that hard corner.

Usually -- and I say this -- usually I believe it's in the city's best interest to not take away from the commercial aspect of -- of our -- of our zoning and give more to residential. I just don't like that. When it's commercial it should stay commercial and if right now it doesn't make sense for that development, because you feel like it needs to be more residential than commercial, then, maybe right now is not the right time. I don't know. I just -- I struggle with that and I -- and with that said I do believe that the applicant did a good job of changing and making it better. At the end of the day I don't like taking away commercial and giving it to residential, especially in the -- in the climate that we are in right now in our -- in our valley, so --

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I -- I agree with Councilman Bernt and he said it much more eloquently than I -- than I did. I didn't specifically say that I am not in support of the waiver or in support of allowing a one or two story. I think a two story at minimum needs to be there and I just wanted to put on record that -- that I -- that I specifically believe that to be the case, along with Councilman Cavener's statement. So, I wanted to make it clear that -- that that's my opinion on that and I agree with Councilman Bernt, I think that this is a really important corner and that I would like to see the commercial expanded here and, then, I do believe that the clubhouse and the plaza, those are intended for the residents in that community and that they should not be considered commercial for public use.

Simison: I was going to leave my suitcase packed tonight, but I -- so, I'm going to unpack a little bit of it, you know, because I love this project and I hate this project. You know, top to bottom, you know, I think it brings some great innovations and there is other things that I really don't care for. Again, not trying to redesign, but speaking to the commercial, because what I have heard -- and maybe Joe can confirm -- this two story is only talking about, in reality, a visual element. We are talking about -- not talking about adding more commercial, because what I have heard is the parking is really taking up what would be commercial on this element. Is that correct, Joe? Is there really a -- is there significant amount of more commercial from two to one?

Dodson: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, the one story is about 13,000 square feet of leasable space. The two story is 19,500. So, that's 6,500 more square feet, which -- yeah. I'm not a commercial expert, honestly, but I -- 6,500 is more.

Simison: It's more. Yes. Correct.

Bernt: Thanks, Joe.

Dodson: Anytime.

Simison: But -- but to go to my other Council Members' points, I -- I think the other two things you have for commercial are innovative in what they are. I would be really really

curious to know if they are successful at all and I'm like -- the only thing I can think of is the Hickory Farms coming in. I don't know about the rest of the pop up concepts or anything else, if that's really going to add, you know, long-term value and what -- and what that looks like. I'm sure some of it will, but, you know, a greater commercial in this corner is what I would really advocate for and even go as far as to say -- and I know that they are even saying don't do, you know, the flexibility, but you have plenty of parking. I assume this is all cross-parked. There is nothing specific to any of the zones not to have any parking under the first -- or under the second story on that property to make that all potential be commercial. That's just my two cents as it relates to the commercial aspect, because I think that there is -- more commercial is better in this location, rather than less. And that's really all I'm going to unpack. I will leave everything else in the suitcase. It doesn't really have much bearing on where Council has made comments.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I might ask Joe a question. Deborah had talked about the clubhouse and said whether it's commercial or residential it fits either designation. Is -- is that -- that clubhouse, is that something that is a flexible type of space that can be in either designation?

Dodson: Councilman Hoaglund, Members of the Council, from my understanding, yes, because the multi-family project, which is a conditional use in either C-C or R-15 where that is zoning wise is really unrelated. I think the reason that Kent and the team push it into the C-C was because of my comments regarding if it was going to be used as an event center for people beyond this project, then, we get into needing -- maybe needing a conditional use permit for an indoor rec center or an event center and things like that, which is not part of this application. Unless it's in the C-C zone, which is -- then those indoor facilities are permitted by right. So, I think that that's where they kind of went with that. But it -- as a functioning clubhouse it could be either/or, because it's tied to the residential multi-family.

Hoaglund: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Joe. Appreciate that. Because I think the comments I did were that having Red Cross, if you do a blood drive or you have a group come in or something like that and -- and one of the things that concerns me is seeing some -- some of our small strip malls where a bar or a restaurant goes in and it's wildly popular, there is not enough parking. You just -- and something like that would -- would not fit and that would create the problems that residents talked about -- existing resident -- neighbors and it would cause problems for the neighborhood itself there, so having it a neighborhood retail, pop up space, it -- it's unique and I'm not sure what it looked like or how successful it will be, but it's a concept with live-work units that why not, I think there can be some good use out of that. So, we may see what happens. Having the -- not having the flexibility for one or two story is not a sword I'm going to -- willing to die on for this whole project. I can -- I understand the reason for two story and, then, having that commercial, it's -- it's -- it's something that -- while they wanted the flexibility, if -- if fellow

Council Members and the Planning and Zoning Commission want to see, hey, it really needs to be two story, I can certainly live with that, so --

Simison: Council, anything else before anyone wants to make a motion?

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: It sounds very quiet, so I'm going to make a motion. I move that we close the public hearing on Item 6, H-2020-0022.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to close the public hearing. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Appreciate the good discussion. I, too, think hearing Council's comments on the desire for more mass and the two story -- the additional commercial space makes sense. So, having that requirement that it be two stories seems appropriate. So, that portion of the waiver would not be part of it. So, I'm going to make a motion that we approve H-2020-0022, without granting the waiver on the height -- the height requirement on that commercial corner portion. So, it will be the two stories or -- or that height equivalent. And I think the other waiver was with regards to the land use buffer. We didn't hear any concern with that, so that would be granted as part of the application as presented.

Dodson: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Yes, Joe.

Dodson: Before -- just wanted to note the deletion of the DA provision A-1S as well regarding the access.

Borton: Thank you, Joe. That's included in the motion.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I would second that motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

Roll call: Bernt, yea; Borton, yea; Cavener, yea; Hoaglund, yea; Strader, absent; Perreault, yea.

Simison: All ayes. Motion is agreed to and approved. Thank you very much for being here this evening.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

ORDINANCES [Action Item]

7. Ordinance No. 20-1898: An Ordinance Amending Meridian City Code Section 3-4-2(A)(5)(d), Regarding Criminal History Disqualifying Applicants for Mobile Sales Unit License; Amending Meridian City Code Section 3-3-2(C), Regarding Criminal History Disqualifying Applicants for Vehicle Immobilization License; Adopting a Savings Clause; and Providing an Effective Date

Simison: Council, next item on the agenda is Item No. 7, Ordinance No. 1898. I will ask our clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. This is Ordinance No. 20-1898, an ordinance amending Meridian City Code Section 3-4-2(A)(5)(d), regarding criminal history disqualifying applicants for mobile sales unit license; amending Meridian City Code Section 3-3-2(c), regarding criminal history disqualifying applicants for vehicle and mobilization license; adopting a savings clause; and providing an effective date.

Simison: Council, you have heard this ordinance read by title. Is there anyone -- would you or anyone else in attendance like it read in its entirety? If not, do I have a motion?

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 20-1898 with the suspension of rules.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve Ordinance No. 20-1898 under suspension of rules. Is there any discussion on the motion?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I just wanted to thank police and clerk's office for their work on this particular piece. Sorry, my lights keep going off up here. I will get that fixed. I'm not quite sure that I'm supportive of these changes. I get what we are trying to accomplish. I think that the way this process has played out before I think is sufficient. I appreciate what Council is trying to achieve. I just -- I didn't want to catch anybody off guard if I'm -- if I vote in opposition to this.

Simison: Thank you, Councilman Cavener. Any other comments on this item? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay.

Cavener: Nay.

Simison: The ayes have it.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. ONE NAY. ONE ABSENT.

- 8. Ordinance No. 20-1899: An Ordinance (H-2020-0035 – Poiema Subdivision) for Annexation of a Parcel of Land as Shown on Record of Survey Number 2880, Recorded as Instrument Number 94050954, Records of Ada County, Situate in a Portion of Government Lot 3, Section 4, Township 4 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, as Described in Attachment “A” and Annexing Certain Lands and Territory, Situated in Ada County, Idaho, and Adjacent and Contiguous to the Corporate Limits of the City of Meridian as Requested by the City of Meridian; Establishing and Determining the Land Use Zoning Classification of 14.87 Acres of Land From RUT to R-15 (Medium High Density Residential) Zoning District in the Meridian City Code; Providing that Copies of this Ordinance Shall be Filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as Required by Law; and Providing for a Summary of the Ordinance; and Providing for a Waiver of the Reading Rules; and Providing an Effective Date**

Simison: Next item is Ordinance No. 20-1899. Ask the clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. This ordinance is related H-2020-0035, Poiema Subdivision, for annexation of a parcel of land as shown on Record of Survey Number 2880, recorded as Instrument Number 94050954, Records of Ada County, situated in a portion of Government Lot 3, Section 4, Township 4 North, Range 1 East, Boise meridian, Ada county, Idaho, as described in Attachment “A” and annexing certain lands and territory, situated in Ada county, Idaho, and adjacent and contiguous to the corporate limits of the City of Meridian as requested by the City of Meridian; establishing and determining the land use zoning classification of 14.87 acres of land from RUT to R-15 (Medium High

Density Residential) zoning district in the Meridian City Code; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; and providing for a summary of the ordinance; and providing for a waiver of the reading rules; and providing an effective date.

Simison: Thank you, Chris. Council, you have heard this ordinance read by title. Is there anyone that would like it read in its entirety? If not, do I have a motion?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 20-1899 with the suspension of rules.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve Ordinance No. 20-1899 under suspension of the rules. Any discussion on the motion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

- 9. Ordinance No. 20-1900: An Ordinance (H-2020-0032 – Brody Square) for Annexation of a Parcel of Land Situated Within the Southwest ¼ of the Southwest ¼ of Section 27, Township 4 North, Range 1 West, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, as Described in Attachment “A” and Annexing Certain Lands and Territory, Situated in Ada County, Idaho, and Adjacent and Contiguous to the Corporate Limits of the City of Meridian as Requested by the City of Meridian; Establishing and Determining the Land Use Zoning Classification of 15.00 Acres of Land From RUT to R-8 (Medium Density Residential) Zoning District in the Meridian City Code; Providing that Copies of this Ordinance Shall be Filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as Required by Law; and Providing for a Summary of the Ordinance; and Providing for a Waiver of the Reading Rules; and Providing an Effective Date**

Simison: Next item is ordinance -- Item No. 9, Ordinance 20-1900. Ask the clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. This is an Ordinance related to H-2020-0032, Brody Square, for annexation of a parcel of land situated within the Southwest ¼ of the

Southwest ¼ of Section 27, Township 4 North, Range 1 West, Boise meridian, Ada county, Idaho, as described in Attachment “A” and annexing certain lands and territory, situated in Ada county, Idaho, and adjacent and contiguous to the corporate limits of the City of Meridian as requested by the City of Meridian; establishing and determining the land use zoning classification of 15.00 acres of land from RUT to R-8 (Medium Density Residential) zoning district in the Meridian City Code; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; and providing for a summary of the ordinance; and providing for a waiver of the reading rules; and providing an effective date.

Simison: You have heard this ordinance read by title. Is there anyone who would like it read in its entirety? Seeing none, Council, do I have a motion?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 20-1900 with the suspension of rules.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve Ordinance No. 20-1900 under suspension of the rules. Is there any discussion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it and the ordinance is adopted.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

- 10. Ordinance No. 20-1901: An Ordinance (H-2019-0106 – Shelburne South) for Annexation of a Parcel of Land Being Located in the SW ¼ of the SE ¼ of Section 28 Township 3 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, as Described in Attachment “A” and Annexing Certain Lands and Territory, Situated in Ada County, Idaho, and Adjacent and Contiguous to the Corporate Limits of the City of Meridian as Requested by the City of Meridian; Establishing and Determining the Land Use Zoning Classification of 29.01 Acres of Land From RUT to R-8 (Medium Density Residential) Zoning District in the Meridian City Code; Providing that Copies of this Ordinance Shall be Filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as Required by Law; and Providing for a Summary of the Ordinance; and Providing for a Waiver of the Reading Rules; and Providing an Effective Date**

Simison: Next item is No. 10, Ordinance No. 20-1901. I will ask the clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. This is an ordinance related to H-2019-0106, Shelburne South, for annexation of a parcel of land being located in the SW ¼ of the SE ¼ of Section 28, Township 3 North, Range 1 East, Boise meridian, Ada county, Idaho, as described in Attachment "A" and annexing certain lands and territory, situated in Ada county, Idaho, and adjacent and contiguous to the corporate limits of the City of Meridian as requested by the City of Meridian; establishing and determining the land use zoning classification of 29.01 acres of land from RUT to R-8 (Medium Density Residential) zoning district in the Meridian City Code; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; and providing for a summary of the ordinance; and providing for a waiver of the reading rules; and providing an effective date.

Simison: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Is there anyone that would like this ordinance read in its entirety? If not, do I have a motion?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 20-1901 with the suspension of rules.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: Been motioned and seconded to adopt ordinance -- or approve Ordinance No. 20-1901 under suspension of the rules. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it and the ordinance is adopted.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

FUTURE MEETING TOPICS

Simison: Council, any items under future meeting topics?

EXECUTIVE SESSION

- 11. Per Idaho Code 74-206A(1)(a) To deliberate on a labor contract offer or to formulate a counteroffer; and 74-206(1)d To consider records that are exempt from disclosure as provided in chapter 1, title 74, Idaho**

Code

Simison: Okay. Item No. 11 was vacated. So, we will move to the last item.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I move that we adjourn the meeting.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: Second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to adjourn the meeting. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. And we are adjourned.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:48 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON

_____/_____/_____
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK