

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:00 p.m. Tuesday, May 12, 2026, by Mayor Robert Simison.

Members Present: Robert Simison, Luke Cavener, Liz Strader, John Overton, Doug Taylor, Anne Little Roberts and Brian Whitlock.

Other Present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Bill Parsons, Linda Ritter.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Liz Strader	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brian Whitlock
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anne Little Roberts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John Overton
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doug Taylor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Luke Cavener
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mayor Robert E. Simison	

Simison: Council, we will call the meeting to order. For the record it is May 12th, 2026, at 6:00 p.m. We will begin tonight's regular City Council meeting with roll call attendance.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Simison: Next is the Pledge of Allegiance. If you would all, please, rise and join us in the pledge.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

COMMUNITY INVOCATION

Simison: Our next item will be our community invocation, which tonight will be delivered by Mick Armstrong. If you would all, please, join us in the community invocation or take this as a moment of silence and reflection. There -- there is a button down below that you may have to -- down at the very base. Mick, down at the -- there is a -- Bill's coming to get it on.

Armstrong: There we go. So, I apologize for my casual attire. Our youngest grandson has a baseball -- Meridian Baseball League game as soon as -- after this, but -- Father, I just want to thank you for the way you have blessed this community. You blessed us with good leaders and there is just in reading in Isaiah it talks about how we are like grass and yet your word endures forever and -- and, Father, that -- just the decisions we make we intend to do good for our community and do things that are lasting and help make the community better and I just pray for the Council and Mayor as we make decisions tonight and discernment and that they would make choices that would improve this community. It's feeling the strain of growth and there is a tug and pull on

what we would like to do about that growth and just pray that you would give them wisdom as we navigate that. I pray this in Jesus' name. Amen.

Simison: Thank you, Mick.

Cavener: Hope the game goes well.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Simison: With that move on to Adoption of the Agenda.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: There is one small change to tonight's agenda. On the Executive Session we will be vacating the last section, Idaho Code 74-206(1)(j) to consider labor contract matters authorized under Section 74-206-(a)(1)(a) and (1)(b) of Idaho Code. Other than that the agenda will stand as published.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve the agenda as amended. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor say aye by saying aye. Those opposed nay? The ayes have it and the agenda is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

PROCLAMATIONS

1. World NF Awareness Day Proclamation

Simison: Next up will be a proclamation for World NFF -- NF Awareness Day. Shannon, if you and anybody else would like to join us at the podium. So, as was mentioned we are here to do a proclamation for NF Day. We will go ahead and read the proclamation and, then, Shannon, I will turn it over to you for any comments, so -- whereas neurofibromatosis, NF, causes tumors to grow on nerves throughout the body, which can affect the development of the brain, cardiovascular system, bones and skin and affects all populations equally regardless of race, ethnicity or gender and whereas the Children's Tumor Foundation unites patients, families, researchers and industry leaders to break down barriers, strengthen the NF community, accelerate the development of new treatments and whereas patient and family support is provided by the Children's Tumor Foundation through its informed resources, youth programs and local chapter activities and whereas much remains to be done in raising public awareness of NF to help promote early diagnosis, proper management and treatment, prevention of complications and support of research and whereas the Children's Tumor

Foundation is declaring May 17th, 2026, as World Neurofibromatosis, NF, Awareness Day to educate the public about this rare genetic disorder. Therefore, I'm, Mayor, Robert E. Simison, hereby proclaim May 17th, 2026, as World NF Awareness Day in the City of Meridian encourage all citizens and committee members to become informed and involved in the fight, so we can imagine a world without NF. Dated this 12th day of May 2026. So, on behalf of the City of Meridian I want to present this proclamation to you and, Shannon, be happy to turn over the microphone.

McNall: Thank you so much. Hi, everyone. Carson, come up. So, this is our fourth time coming here. The first time that we came here Carson was six years old and his sister was four and back then -- NF is a genetic disorder that causes tumors to grow anywhere on the nervous system and it affects now -- it used to be one in 3,000. Now they know it's one in 2,000 births in America and we have been fighting it as a family. That's the other two right there. Literally ever -- our entire lives and a lot has changed. When we first came here there was no cure and, then, I think the second time we came here they had had their first effective treatment and now they have three effective treatments. They are all for different types of tumors, but the foundation itself is growing. But what I really want to say is that these proclamations mean the world. When you have a disorder that -- I mean I don't think anybody could spell neurofibromatosis, let alone say it. It -- bringing out awareness to it is so important and for Carson being able to have that awareness and get the therapies and the treatments that he has needed -- he has gone through a lot, but I will say he is in -- for those who have seen him on the Council he is now in his first year at Boise State. He just pulled a 4.0 and he is thriving because of the awareness that's brought. So, we just want to say thank you to the City of Meridian.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND RECOGNITION

Simison: Okay. Council, with that anything for announcements and recognition?

PUBLIC HEARINGS [Action Item]

2. Public Hearing for Establishment of a Commercial Property Assessed Capital Expenditure (C-PACE) Program

Simison: Okay. Then with that we will move -- we will move on to our first public hearing of this evening, Item 2, which is a public hearing for establishment of a Commercial Property Assess Capital Expenditures, C-PACE program. We will open this public hearing with any comments from Curtis.

Calder: Good evening, Mayor and Council. I have no further comments, but I'm here to answer any questions that might arise during the public hearing.

Simison: Council, any questions from the presentation as you have already received? Or any information you would like for the public to hear as part of this public hearing? Okay. Thank you, Curtis.

Calder: Thank you.

Simison: Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone signed up?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we did not.

Simison: Okay. Is there anybody present who would like to provide comments on this item, either online or -- if you are online you can use the raise your hand function. If you are present you are welcome to come forward at this time. Seeing no one raising their hand online or coming forward, do I have a motion to close the public hearing?

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I move that we close the public hearing for the establishment of a Commercial Property Assessment Capital Expenditures, C-PACE program.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to close the public hearing. All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have and the public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

3. Resolution 26-2587: A Resolution Establishing a Commercial Property Assessed Capital Expenditure Program ("C-PACE Program"); Authorizing Certain Administrative Actions Concerning the C-PACE Program, Adopting New C-PACE Program Fees; and Providing an Effective Date

Simison: Next item up is Item 3, Resolution 26-2587.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Move that we approve Resolution 26-2587.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Resolution No. 26-2587. Is there discussion on the motion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it. The item is agreed to. Congratulations, Curtis. And good luck and hope you go find some people that can take advantage of this to do better projects in our community.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

4. Public Hearing (Continued from March 10, 2026) for Shafer View Ridge Subdivision (H-2025-0047) by Gregg Davis, Breckon Land Design, located at Lot 18 of the Shafer View Estates Subdivision at the intersection of S. Meridian Rd. and E. Shafer View Dr.

- A. Request: Annexation of 15.2 acres of land from RUT in Ada County to the R-4 zoning district.
- B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 38 lots (29 building lots and 9 common lots) on 13.437 acres of land.

Simison: Okay. With that we will move on to Item 4, which is a public hearing continued from March 10th, 2026, for Shafer View Ridge Subdivision, H-2025-0047. We will continue this public hearing with comments from staff.

Ritter: Good evening, Mayor and Council. So, at the -- our last hearing staff was -- and the applicant was asked to meet with the regulatory agencies. So, staff and the applicant met with ITD and ACHD and also talked with the school district. During that meeting we talked about the potential closure for Shafer View Drive. At that time all parties agreed that we would have no issue with that -- with Shafer View Drive being closed, with the understanding that ITD is the regulatory agency for State Highway Meridian Road, which is a state highway, so they had no objection. ACHD had no objection even though -- they are not in charge of that, but they had no objection to the proposal. They did require that the applicant put a cul-de-sac at the end of Meridian Road and it could be used for emergency access only and, then, the school district -- oops. Apologies. So, this is kind of their proposal, which the applicant will be addressing and the school district had no issue, because this is the location off Quartz Drive of the school bus stop. We were kind of wondering where that -- where that actual stop was. That is the location. So, the applicant -- after our meeting the applicant did meet with the neighbors and based on the applicant's response to the city is that the neighbors were in approval of closing this road, too, so -- but the applicant will give you more information on that. So, I don't want to steal his thunder. So, just wanted to kind of make you aware of where we were when we last met and what you requested and, then, what the city and the applicant did to meet your request. So, unless you have other questions for me I will let the applicant kind of give you the information on his meeting with the neighbors and his design.

Simison: Thank you, Linda. Council, any questions for staff? Okay. Would the applicant like to come forward.

Breckon; Jon Breckon. 6661 North Glenwood Street, Garden City. I -- I brought some of the drawings that we had at the neighborhood meeting and -- and, then, I have some overview for -- for reference. Let's see here. But at the neighborhood meeting we -- we discussed, you know, the option to -- to close off and provide the cul-de-sac with the

neighbors -- neighbors. We also showed them an overview plan. This was something I brought to the neighborhood meeting as well, just talked about overall circulation and how that would function into the future with that closure and open -- ultimately, after answering all their questions, they were in favor of this option to close and provide the cul-de-sac, which was acceptable to ACHD and -- and ITD. But I -- I -- I have -- I don't really have a whole lot more to present on this. It was -- we had a lot of discussion, answered all their questions, it was -- it was a very productive meeting I felt like with the neighbors. But I -- I brought some drawings and additional information here to answer any questions that Council might have.

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

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Either for the applicant or for staff. So, I heard the early description that this will be a turnaround. It will not be -- but it will have emergency access. Do we have any type of rendering on what that's supposed to look like? Is that going to be bollard style? Gate style? What are we -- what are we talking about?

Breckon: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Overton, so my understanding would this be like a steel gate -- a steel vehicle -- vehicle gate with -- I don't know, I haven't talked to fire as to what kind of locking mechanism they would like, but probably like a Knox Box or something like that and, then, it would go just -- well, off of that -- off of that approach, so that the gate would be away from the highway, so that a fire truck could pull off, they could get out, unlock the gate, and access in -- in that event.

Overton: Thank you.

Simison: Council, any additional questions? All right. Thank you very much. Mr. Clerk, anyone signed up to provide testimony on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, yes. Dave Morgan. Mr. Morgan's representing an HOA.

Simison: Good evening. State your name and address for the record.

Morgan: Good evening. Dave Morgan. 498 East Shafer View Drive, Meridian, Idaho. I'm also the HOA president for Shafer View Estates. So, just kind of basically want to step up here and just see what they had. I wasn't able to attend that last meeting, but I did get an update on everything from that and it looks like all the changes -- kind of things that we had asked for, things that we are going to do and weren't -- we are taking care of. So, from what I can see that looks like a fairly acceptable proposal as far as that goes for the subdivision. So, I didn't know if there were any -- we had quite a few questions for me last time, so I don't know if there were any more additional this time. No? Okay.

Simison: Council, any questions? No. Thank you very much.

Morgan: Thank you.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, that was everyone.

Simison: Okay. Is there anybody else who would like to provide testimony on this item, either in the room or online? If you are online use the raise your hand function. Seeing no one raising their hand or coming forward, would the applicant like to make any final comments or the applicant waive? Applicant waives. Okay.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I -- I did have a -- a question, though, then, for the applicant.

Simison: Okay.

Cavener: I know he waived, but I did have a -- Mr. Breckon, appreciate you being here and getting -- working with our staff and ITD and ACHD. Government times government times government is never easy, so I appreciate that. When you were here last month we talked a little bit about kind of just my concern around sidewalk, curb, gutter on that other side. I -- I didn't know if you had any updates for me on kind of any progress on that. Is it still intended that we are not going to -- we are only going to do it on one side?

Breckon: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Cavener, topic did come up at the neighborhood meeting and the neighbors would much prefer to not have that sidewalk in there. So, I -- you know, I guess --

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Mr. Breckon, I'm going to let you off. I -- I understand you -- you find yourself between a rock and a hard place and that the neighbors that you are trying to work are saying we don't want it and a decision maker saying, boy, we really think that we need to have it. We have got another application later on tonight that deals with something similar. It's on private roads, so it's a little bit different and I'm -- I'm trying to be really -- really consistent in kind of my decision making. I think when I was -- last month I said, boy, I don't -- I don't think I can be supportive of this if it doesn't have it. I'm -- I'm certainly going to be contemplative. I appreciate you engaging with the neighborhood one more time on that. It's -- it's hard to force what I think is an important amenity onto somebody who -- who doesn't see the value in it, so -- Mr. Mayor, thanks. I appreciate it.

Simison: Okay. Thank you.

Breckon: Thank you.

Simison: Would you like to come back -- yeah, since there was a question and directed -- yeah.

Morgan: We don't have a problem with it, so -- to kind of answer your question, since I do represent the entire sub, no, we don't want that. You are tearing up a lot of people's yards, landscaping going into that. You are just having on one side of the street. It's not meant to walk through our subdivision. It's meant to walk through their subdivision. So, I would suggest that. And also we are county at that point, too. We are not -- that's not city property at that point, so up to that I think where I described before, if you saw on the map, just past that cul-de-sac -- actually right where that road -- first road comes out, sidewalk ends, you have a little sidewalk -- or, excuse me, a crosswalk right there, then, that goes -- so you can walk clear around Shafer View Terrace, back in through Pinnacle, all in through that direction. So, just to let you know as far as the sidewalk goes that's 15 in -- not in favor of, so -- all right. Appreciate it. Thanks.

Simison: Thank you. Well, with that does the applicant have any final comments or would they like to waive again? Applicant waives again.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Nobody else looking to make comment, I move that we are going to close the public hearing on Item No. 4, application H-2025-0047.

Overton: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Quick appreciation to staff being -- doing that proactive engagement with the highway district and the state. Be easy to say applicant go figure it out. But I think you really served as a liaison, represented the Meridian Way and I just want to commend you on that. Also appreciate the applicant working proactive in it. So, broken clock is always right twice a day, so I'm going to move that we approve Item No. 4, application

H-2025-0047, as presented in the staff report of May 12th, 2026, and include all staff, applicant and public testimony.

Overton: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Item 4, H-2025-0047. Is there discussion on the motion?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I just wanted to make sure that that's inclusive of the closure of Shafer within the -- if the staff comments had already been updated to include that or if that needs to be part of the motion.

Ritter: That will need to be part of your motion.

Cavener: Okay. Mr. Mayor, I --

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I -- I -- I took it because it was presented this afternoon with the memo that it would be inclusive of that, but thank you, Council Member Strader, for the clarification and, staff, for providing that clarification to be inclusive of the -- the road closure.

Simison: Second concur?

Overton: Second agrees.

Simison: Okay. Is there any further discussion on the motion?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Just a comment. I normally am not a fan of any kind of roadway in Meridian, even if it's in the county, not having sidewalks and all of the things that we normally expect. In this one instance I think an exception is warranted, because of the road closure. That gave me some comfort that we are not going to see the same kind of traffic level that we would normally see, but I just wanted to provide that rationale for people listening, so they understand that I would not look favorably upon a similar situation in the future most likely.

Simison: Okay. Any further comments on this item? If not clerk call the roll.

Roll Call: Cavener, yea; Strader, yea; Overton, yea; Little Roberts, yea; Taylor, yea; Whitlock, yea.

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries and the item is agreed to. Good luck.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

5. Public Hearing for Skybreak Rim (H-2026-0001) by Conger Group, located near the southeast corner of S. Eagle Rd., and E. Lake Hazel Rd.

- A. Request: Modified Development Agreement to the existing development agreement (Inst. #2021-042520).
- B. Request: Planned Unit Development to remove the subject property from the boundary of the approved Pura Vida Ridge Ranch Subdivision and enter into a new development agreement.
- C. Request: Rezone of approximately 6.64 acres of land from the R-8 zone to the R-15 zone.
- D. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 38 single-family residential building lots, 5 common lots, 2 common drive lots and one private street lot on 9.74 acres of land in the proposed R-15 zone.
- E. Request: Private Street to provide access to the proposed development.

Simison: Next item up is Item 5, public hearing for Skybreak Rim, H-2026-0001. We will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Ritter: Okay. So, this application is for the request to modify the existing development agreement to create a new development agreement, planned unit development modification to remove the subject property from the boundary of the approved Pura Vida Ridge Ranch Subdivision, rezone of approximately 6.64 acres of land from R-8 to R-15. A preliminary plat consisting of 38 single family residential lots -- building lots, five common lots, two common drive lots and one private street, for the property located at 3727 East Lake Hazel Drive -- Road. So, this particular property in 2001, it was included in the planned unit development consisting of mixed -- a mix of residential housing types, including single family detached, attached and townhome units. So, the applicant is now proposing to remove this portion of the property from the PUD, rezone the parcel to R-15 from R-8, add eight additional lots and develop it as a standalone subdivision. To proceed with these changes the applicant must amend the existing PUD to demonstrate that removing the parcel will not negatively impact the integrity of the remaining development and the existing development agreement must be modified to exclude the subject parcel and the new development agreement must be established

for proposed standalone subdivision. So, again, the applicant is proposing to remove this portion from the PUD and so the -- the PUD itself it approved -- the approval also included deviations from the dimensional standards of the R-15 zoning district to accommodate a variety of housing types and the overall developments. So, all of the R-4 -- R-8 lots were required to comply with the required dimensional standards. This portion of the property that the applicant is proposing to rezone to R-15 and the development of the single family detached homes, similar to the previous approval. So, the rezone allows the applicant to increase the number of lots from 30 to 38. Like the previous approval, no deviations to the dimensional standards are requested or being asked to be approved at this time. Staff has concluded that the portion of the PUD will still provide a mix of housing types as required. Therefore, staff is supportive of the applicant increasing the density and providing all single family detached homes within the proposed development. The original PUD also established specific requirements for amenities and open space to serve the overall development. Based on staff's review the majority of the proven amenities and open space are located and the remaining property that will continue to be governed by the PUD. By removing the subject property from the PUD boundary the applicant is required to independently meet the current open space and amenity requirements. So, based on that -- that analysis staff is supportive of being -- of the property being excluded from the boundary of the PUD. So, although it's not required, the applicant tends to have both developments, Skybreak and Skybreak Rim, share the amenities and open space. This is the preliminary plat and their landscape plan. This is their open space requirement. So, based on the -- the UDC a minimum of 15 percent for the R-15 zoning district a qualified open space is required to be provided within development. An open space -- this -- this open space exhibit shows that 49.1 percent or 4.7 acres of open space and they meet the -- they actually exceed the requirements for qualified open space standards and they only need one amenity point, which they are providing a picnic seating area and a shade structure and they are doing enhanced landscaping. So, the -- their open space area for the picnic area is 5,000 square feet inside, so it qualifies for a maximum of too many amenity appoints, so they exceed that also. And this is like their proposed amenity.

Simison: Linda, can you get closer to the mic?

Ritter: Oh. Sorry. So, this shows their pedestrian connectivity. So, this -- on the right-hand side this is what was proposed with the previous approval for -- for Pura Vida. So, this is what is actually being proposed for the new subdivision. They will continue this pathway. It's like a natural pathway. So, it won't be paved. It's a steeped area and, then, the private road will connect to an existing private road that connects to the private road and, then, goes out to this pathway that will continue on to connect to existing pathways in this area. So, this is the emergency access. This is a common drive, which will connect to another common drive that gets out to the private road. So, that has been approved by the fire marshal. These are the amenities that exist within Skybreak that will be shared with Skybreak Rim. These are the building elevations that were submitted for Skybreak Rim. So, we are going to talk about some issues and waivers that came about as we were reviewing this. So, common drives. So, based on our code common drives are not allowed off of a private street, unless at least one side

of the street or the development has designed -- has designated adequate guest parking dispersed throughout as determined by the director. The applicant is providing parking on one side of the street as required. However, Council needs to determine if adequate parking has been provided. The applicant is required to comply with the private street requirements outlined in the UDC. To serve 30 -- the 38 lot development the applicant is proposing the private street. In doing so they are proposing to utilize the existing private street network within Skybreak development. While the proposed subdivision does not include additional gates, the development will connect and rely on the existing private streets and gated entrance that currently serves Skybreak Community. UDC 11-3F-4B.4 states proposed gate developments shall serve no more than one hundred dwelling units. The applicant is proposing to construct private streets that tie into the existing private street network approved with the Skybreak project. A gate is -- again a gate is not being proposed with this development, which means 38 additional homes will be used and the two existing gates approved with the Skybreak Subdivision. So with this, again, we are asking you to consider if the additional homes being served by the private streets is adequate, because with this -- the previously approved Skybreak development was approved with 106 homes served by that private street with the two gated accesses. So, this will add an additional 38 homes to that. So, the code and the fact at the time when the gated entry was approved it was for every 50 dwelling units. So, given that the previously approved development already exceeds the one hundred unit threshold and the applicant's proposing to add an additional 38 homes to the existing private street network, so we are -- we are just asking you to look at this and consider whether expanding the number of homes served by this private street system remains appropriate and consistent with the intent of the Meridian City Code. This is the parking space that they are providing along the street and this is their design for the private street, so they will have the sidewalk on the -- the right-hand side of the private street and not on -- nothing on the left-hand side. Again, our code states that private streets serving dwellings -- a five foot wide attached sidewalk or four foot wide detached sidewalk shall be provided on both sides of the private street. This requirement may be waived or modified by decision making body if the applicant can demonstrate that an alternative similar pedestrian path exists that, again, the applicant is requesting a Council waiver to construct a five foot sidewalk on one side of the street as previously approved with the Skybreak project. With this subdivision the applicant will be required to modify some -- Skybreak No. 1 Subdivision. They will be removing a lot to add this private road. So, that modification will need to take place before they submit for their final plan if approved. So, the Commission recommended approval with conditions. They had no changes to staff's recommendation -- like they had no issues with what the applicant is proposing. We -- some of the key issues that were talked about at the hearing were the shared amenities, the additional lots utilizing the existing private streets and gates, smaller lots and smaller side yard setbacks, on-street parking and consistency with the Pura Vida Ranch development. We did have several people commenting at the public hearing. We had two people -- two written comments. We have not received any comments since the Commission public hearing. The outstanding things for Council is the Commission supported the applicant's waiver signed that there was adequate on-street parking, sidewalk connectivity and allowing additional homes to use the existing gated private

streets that were approved and constructed with the Skybreak Subdivision. So, those are the waivers that we are asking Council to carefully consider and at this time with that we -- I will stand for any questions that you may have.

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

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Just a couple of quick ones. So, this section -- this -- what we are talking about tonight was part of the PUD.

Ritter: Correct.

Overton: So, that was all one development, but it was 30 lots.

Ritter: Correct.

Overton: And at that time it was sharing all the amenities, because it was one PUD.

Ritter: Correct. It was sharing the amenities with this -- if you can see my mouse here. So, this is part of this development over here. So, it was sharing the amenities with this and, then, there is a portion that goes down, crosses the canal there.

Overton: All right. Thank you.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Ritter: Bill will elaborate on that.

Parsons: Mayor and Council, I'm -- I'm happy to. I think -- I don't -- Linda wasn't around when this came through. So, I'm -- I'm tag teaming this one with her. But, essentially, you are correct, it was -- it came through as one development. But if you have ever been out to this site you can definitely see that this project is quite a bit higher than the -- the -- the remainder project. So, when it was approved a lot of the deviations through the PUD process happened on the lower half of the property where they are building the townhomes and the attached product down below the ridge and so when the applicant came through with the PUD for the 30 lots, it was -- there was no vehicular connection. It was only a pedestrian connection. So, although it came in as one part, it is somewhat disjointed from Pura Vida, just because of the nature of the slope and the topography in the area and that's why you -- you saw it connect into Skybreak originally back when Sky -- they happened about the same time. Skybreak was annexed in about the same time as Pura Vida and so they worked with this applicant to make sure that they were tying in with their utilities and their street network and just to be clear on the record that this 30 lot sub portion did not request any deviations from the dimensional standards,

because, again, it was intended that it would be single family and potentially blend in more with this portion of the development than down below, so -- and that's really what we are here to talk about tonight is how -- how does this piece fit into the puzzle now when you don't really have good vehicular connectivity to the area down below and so I think the count -- the -- the applicant will provide a lot of that information, but it's -- just kind of give you that back story. This was always kind of -- we will do R-8, because it's medium density. We really think access is an issue for the fire department. We can't do more than 30 homes on this without having a secondary access. So, that's where the -- the 30 came in and R-8 along the perimeter seemed to blend in with what was the existing development to the south of this one.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Bill or Linda, kind of along Council President Overton's comment, I'm living in the subject area. How do I get to the amenities? Can you just -- can you walk me through my -- my paths to get there?

Parsons: Mayor, Members of the Council, third time is a charm. So, as Linda mentioned there will be some common driveways that connect on the -- the west boundary and, then, that private street will have to be extended. So, they do have another portion of that subdivision that hasn't been platted yet, so you will be able to walk down the public streets to get to some of those amenities. If you recall when Skybreak was approved originally staff was focused on having a central location -- a central amenity for the development and at that time Council -- when you guys acted on the application you guys were fine with these nodes of open space being broken up -- dispersed throughout the development, because you thought that provided a good additional -- this is a large development, so it made sense to have it dispersed throughout the development. So, that's why I was just as critical that when we reviewed this one that this site was a standalone, had their own amenities, own open space, so that if residents didn't -- or wanted to at least stay here in their gated portion they could still have a way to enjoy that amenity and recreation. But there is plenty of connectivity that will come through this, it's just hard to see it at this scale, but I'm sure the applicant can probably elaborate more on that for you. But they will have access to the pool and the clubhouse. It's, I don't know, a couple hundred feet away.

Cavener: Okay. Okay. Mr. Mayor, maybe a couple just quick for staff.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Bill -- Bill or Linda, I want to talk about the -- the hundred units for a -- for a gate. Like what -- talk to me the -- the basis why -- why a hundred? Why not two hundred? Why not fifty? What happens at a hundred that would cause staff or Council that we should be concerned? Like we -- we granted an exception, passed a hundred

to I think 106 or 108, but what -- what has accelerated to make things dramatically worse at the amount that the applicant is proposing?

Parsons: Yeah. Mayor, Council, I think -- I think you are aware we recently changed code. Based the direction of the UDC focus group you guys recently passed that, but the reason why we capped it at a hundred originally was we wanted -- we want to promote public streets, not private streets because of the cost and expense. We want neighborhood connectivity. So, the more you add homes behind that the more impact you could have over time to that road network. So, that was the rationale that the code always said a limited gated community. So, what does limited mean? So, a hundred seemed to be the right number. There -- there is no magical --

Cavener: Okay.

Parsons: -- but originally when we had it it was 50 -- the -- the fire code was no more than 50 homes behind the -- on a single access. So, that's why we landed one per 50 and we ended up -- you -- you would have to provide a gate for every 50 homes. Now with the change what we say is you can have up to a hundred homes unless you go through a PUD process. So, that's what we did with Apex Cadence. They went through that PUD process, they did 200 plus homes behind two gates and so that's how we arrived at that. We have -- we have given the applicant the out. The -- the only oddity with this is when you are trying to take an existing private street and roll more into it, because it doesn't make sense to do a PUD on this little piece of -- of a pie. So, that's why we try to make the case to you that they are not adding a gate, they are just using existing gates and so that gives you the ability to say you are still meeting the intent or not, was how we try to at least portray that in the staff report, that you could still get there under -- because they are not actually providing a gate. So, that's the rationale we wanted to provide. And, then, of course, as Linda mentioned this came up before you in 2021 when you took action on this application and you guys were comfortable with more than a hundred homes behind the two gates.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, just my final question.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: The -- the private drive that runs along -- was it Lot 17, 18 and 19? What's the -- what's the length on that? Do we know?

Parsons: Mayor, Members of the Council, if I had to guess probably about -- the lots are about 40 feet wide. So, about 120. But you add the other one into it, so the total length of the two common driveways will be definitely be over a couple -- couple hundred feet. But there will be a -- a gate between the -- separating the two common driveways from -- from each phase.

Cavener: Thank you.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Just a quick question, Bill. Going back to the gates and PUDs. Tonight we would -- we would be considering waiving that requirement, as opposed to allowing more than a hundred with the PUD, because as I was kind of looking at it we -- we -- the PUD granted them some excess homes. More than a hundred. We did it in -- was it Apex Cadence or one of the other -- it was a couple hundred homes through a PUD. This is not a PUD tonight. So, we -- if we are going to allow it we are allowing it via a waiver? Am I understanding that correctly? The city would be waiving that requirement?

Parsons: Mayor, Members of the Council, it's not necessarily a waiver. It's just -- you are making the finding they are still meeting in the intent of the private streets, because the fact that they are not really providing another gate.

Taylor: Yeah. Mr. Mayor? And I -- just real quick. I was -- wasn't sure if what we were doing tonight was anything unusual or if it was --

Parsons: Yeah. It shouldn't be anything out of the ordinary or unusual. Again, it's -- it's consistent with -- what you will hear from the applicant is -- again, it's -- it's kind of always been this way coming -- it's always been branded or part of this development. They are just trying to make it official now.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for staff? Okay. Would the applicant like to come forward?

Clark: Good evening, everybody. Good to see everyone. Hethe Clark. 251 East Front Street, representing the applicant. So, this is I think a pretty straightforward application. Essentially we are trying to take an -- an orphan part of another subdivision and bring it in with the rest of the family in a way that I think makes a lot of practical sense. So, this is the location of the project and you can see how it sits between the -- the two existing projects, Pura Vida and Skybreak. The area itself everybody is familiar with. There has been a lot of work done in that area, lots of infrastructure that's gone in, but one thing I -- we added here was this kind of red hashed area and -- because I'm going to talk about that a lot during this evening's presentation and that is the hillside there and it's pretty steep and it really drives a lot of the conversation about why we are doing what we are doing here tonight. Another element that I do want to emphasize is -- is the Comprehensive Plan. So, you can see that there is a dividing line between existing Skybreak and Pura Vida where you have medium -- medium density residential on the south for -- for Skybreak and, then, this project is actually in the medium high density residential, which is the eight to 12 units. So, that, in part, was part of why we are -- we are looking at this trying to make it match up with the city's Comprehensive Plan, but we are very much well below the Comprehensive Plan band of eight to 12 units. We are -- we are below six. So, this may help Council Member Overton's questions. You can

kind of get a -- get a feel for the -- the difference here. So, if you -- if you stand on the side of the hillside there you are looking down at slopes of two to one. That's in part why we don't have as many pathways as we are shown originally on the Pura Vida plan, because they are just not possible. You are looking down about 60 feet and it's about the equivalent of a five to six story building. It's kind of surprising you wouldn't realize that there is that much, but you can see the Skybreak lots looking down over Boise Ranch Golf Course there. So, that gives you a feel for, you know, how they -- these two projects really didn't connect physically. Now, as a -- as an entitlement you can see the difference here as well. So, the -- the PUD area for Pura Vida is really the stuff that's down in the bottom of the valley. That's where the attached stuff was, where the dimensional standards were tweaked and it sits separated from the R-8 area that's up on top of the hill 60 feet away -- or 60 feet above and that was driven by a lot of things, but you can see that it has just the single access, right, so they were really capped at doing the 30 lots there despite the medium high density residential. So, they did the -- the 30 lots at an R-8. Made sense. And, then, they moved forward, so -- but the -- you know, I think the -- the point in looking at this is that you can see that this is very much separated. So, if you were a homeowner within -- if this were to stay in Pura Vida and it was developed that way, if you wanted to take the kids down to go use the park or the -- the neighborhood HOA amenities, you would not -- you would be either jumping in the car and driving around and down Eagle Road and, then, back up to Lake Hazel and down to get into the project or you would have been getting on one of those -- a switch back pathway to get down and travel down the -- the 50, 60 feet. So, you are really not connected. What you were probably going to have happen is just the unsecured amenities at Skybreak are probably going to be the ones that these folks were going to use anyway. So, from there it made sense to try to bring them in together, make them part of the same neighborhood. So, no longer would those residents be on an island, they would be part of the HOA whose amenities they are most likely to use. They would be able to walk to those amenities and -- and have much better access to them. One other item I wanted to mention, too. You know, the amenities came up a couple of minutes ago. After the Skybreak approval was completed, this developer ended up adding more amenities than what were part of the original entitlement. So, in addition to what was part of the original entitlement we also added a pool and two more pickleball courts and so you can see these are actual pictures from the -- from the project. We feel very confident and very comfortable that the additional 38 lots can easily be accommodated with the amenities that we have in the project. So, with that the -- there were the three items that staff had mentioned and I will -- I will jump through those real quick and, then, answer questions. The first one is parking. You guys are pretty familiar with this drawing. This is the one we use on all of them. But you can see that we do have parking on one side of the street. So, we have the additional, you know, conservatively 18 on-street parking spot. So, we think parking is -- is adequately handled. With regard to the gates -- and this is probably the one I would spend the most time with. So, as -- as mentioned with Skybreak, the original application, there was the 106 lots that were approved behind the gate. So, you can see those on this drawing. They are all shaded blue. So, they are all on the east side. That gated area is accessed by two gates, not one. So, those gates are the green arrows that you can see on there and, then, in addition there will be the two emergency accesses. So, very

porous. Oops. Excuse me. Very -- you know, a lot of ability to get in and out. Should not be a congestion issue. I -- I want to also mention one thing about kind of the thought process here. So, the gated area includes the rim lots. It also is R-15 product. So, the stuff that's on the west is primarily R-8 product. Stuff that's on the east is R-15. So, part of our thought process in including the Skybreak Rim area within the gated areas is that it's like for like. So, those are -- those are also rim lots. They are R-15, because we are trying to get it to the medium high density residential designation, so -- and -- and to be frank, if we had owned Skybreak Rim at the time of the application those -- those lots would have been behind the gate at that time as well, so -- so -- and as Bill mentioned, no new gates are proposed. We are asking to add the rim lots to the existing gated area and, you know, we -- we feel very confident that the -- those roadway networks are porous enough and they can certainly handle it. Then last sidewalks. The sidewalks are -- that we are requesting are -- would be -- the layout with the sidewalk on one side of the private streets, that's consistent with what was approved with Skybreak and so we would like to continue that. That's been something that the residents have liked quite a bit. It kind of provides for a more kind of intimate street setting over there and if we have it -- continue that, then, we don't have a sidewalk that connects to nothing; right? Because you already have the one -- the one sidewalk set up on -- in the existing areas of Skybreak. You can also see the pathways here. So, you can see that we would maintain that foothills trail in the location on the north. That's the one that we do think is feasible. So, that would provide some pedestrian connection that way and, then, we would also have the future one going off to the east, so you can see in blue. So, I will wrap up. Again, no new entitlements that we are really talking about here tonight. Instead we are trying to alter two project boundaries to bring Skybreak Rim into Skybreak itself and to do so consistent with Skybreak's existing entitlements. We were appreciative of P&Z's comments and their recommendation of approval. We are in agreement with the staff conditions and happy to answer any other questions.

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

Clark: Okay. Thank you.

Simison: Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone signed up to provide testimony?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we do not. Okay. Is there anybody present who would like to provide testimony on this item, either in the room or online? If you are online use the raise your hand feature. Seeing no one wishing to testify, do you want the applicant to come back up for final comments? Any other questions that Council has? Okay. Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Thank you. Thank you, Hethe. Sorry about that.

Clark: No. No problem.

Little Roberts: I was drawing lines thinking all my questions were answered, but just out of curiosity -- I think it was mentioned that there was 49 percent open space. What if you include everything? What's the percentage of them then? I'm assuming it's not going to be 49 percent.

Clark: Sure. The -- and, Council Member Little Roberts, I think you are meaning if we include that within all of Skybreak --

Little Roberts: Right.

Clark: -- as well. Do we have a number on that? I don't know that we have a number. But it's -- it is well in excess of the overall open space requirements. I just don't know exactly where it would be.

Little Roberts: Okay. And my second question is -- I'm curious about the area that's too steep to include in anything. Is that going to be maintained in any way? Of course this year with what we are looking at I think fire season, how is it going to be maintained or left natural?

Clark: Yeah. Council Member Little Roberts, so the -- the -- the hillside area itself -- I think that's what you are focusing on?

Little Roberts: Yes.

Clark: It will be a common lot. So, the ultimate long-term maintenance of it would be the association with the -- with those areas we do try to focus on that issue of trying to make sure that we are not having combustible materials build up and, then, when we -- if we are touching the hillside at all that we are doing a revegetation plan that makes sure that we are not using the -- you know, not allowing like a bunch of cheat grass and that sort of thing to get in there. So, it would be those kind of, you know, responsible hillside development pieces. But long-term maintenance would be the association.

Little Roberts: Great. Thank you.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Hi, Hethe. It's great to see you. I'm not loving the sidewalk on one side. I'm sure that's not a surprise to you, because I have been pretty consistent about it, but refresh my memory as to what other adjacent approvals you have in terms of your sidewalk set up, because I recall that there were not sidewalks on both side on one of the neighboring developments. If you just want to walk us through how this kind of compares to the surrounding developments.

Clark: Council Member Strader, the primary -- so, I mean if we look at Skybreak itself and -- and -- and I don't know if you are referring to Skybreak itself or if you are asking about other projects, which I don't know that we -- Jim, do we have any other projects with sidewalk on one side? Movado? Okay. So, in the -- the -- excuse me. What's that? Okay. So, I will talk about Skybreak first, but -- so, when I said, for example, that the -- if the sidewalk would connect to the sidewalk in -- if you had it on the one side and if you had it on the other it would go into a dead end, if you can see my -- or an area that doesn't have a sidewalk if you can see my cursor, this is where the sidewalk's being proposed and it would connect through and, then, match up against sidewalk that's on that inner block there. The only other places that we have used that type of layout is also behind gates and on private streets and one example would be Movado.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Strader.

Strader: So -- but just to confirm, so this entire gated area that would be consistent with having the sidewalk on one side?

Clark: That's correct.

Strader: Okay. Thank you. That's what I thought. I just wanted to make sure I wasn't remembering incorrectly.

Clark: No. You are correct. So, everything in the blue is the area that has the -- the sidewalk on the one side.

Strader: Uh-huh. And, then, I had one more question, just -- I had had concerns previously about the topography of this area and just the drainage and how things are going. Is there any update on what is the status of the surrounding projects that you guys control? How are things going? Are you selling? Like where -- where is everything at?

Clark: Yeah. So, I think -- if I can pull up a neighborhood map. So, the -- I think you might be referring to these areas over here and up on the front up against Lake Hazel. Mr. Cafferty owns all of this, so it's not stuff that we are in control of. We have pre-app'd on a portion of it, so, you know, it is moving forward and we anticipate that coming before this Council at some point, but we don't have a specific time frame for those yet.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: You know, that's helpful. I -- I think maybe to be more specific, how is it going with Pura Vida? If -- if you guys control that still how is that going? And, then, how is it going with Skybreak? Like have you -- I don't live in south Meridian, so I don't drive by it

all the time. So, just like where is it at? Did we build -- did we build a bunch of houses? Are we selling the houses?

Clark: Okay. Yeah. That's a good point. Jim just reminded me that I live across the street.

Strader: And Jim -- and Jim knows how -- knows my weird obsession with the topography here, so there is none of this surprised him, so --

Clark: No. That's great. So, we -- Skybreak itself is probably about 60 percent through. A lot of the customs are going. Pura Vida is -- is moving somewhat. The rumor is that Brighton might be taking that over. So, if that's the case, then, I would expect that it would be going gangbusters at that point and, then, like I mentioned, the stuff that's up at the hard corner is also -- is still on -- on the plan and would move forward in the relatively near future. So, hopefully, that answers all of that, but --

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I think you answered some of it. So, at least -- I don't need to worry too much about neighbors concerned about a bait and switch on the PUD, because they really have not bought most of the homes at this point. My -- my other question was just about the drainage situation. So, how is that going? Because from -- and this is like a while ago, so I'm trying to remember back, but I recall that the Pura Vida Subdivision was like at the bottom of a very big slope, which I think is that same five to six story differential. So, I was just curious how is that going? When you get a lot of precipitation there is it fine? I -- I -- and I realize it's not relevant to this direct application, but more of a curiosity honestly on my part.

Clark: And I'm going to bring the construction manager guy in to talk about that.

Conger: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, Council Member Strader, Jim Conger. 810 East Central Lane, Meridian. Yep. No, Council Member Strader, the good part about our area of Skybreak is we are up -- which is really a pit run shelf. So, that drainage is all in the ground and subsurface.

Strader: Okay.

Conger: None of it is ponds or anything of that nature and none of it have we taken any advantage of pre-development flows to push water over the edges and we actually have at our lower area by our -- below our phase one we actually have another future phase, once Pura Vida does their phase two, that has 18 or 25 lots still at the bottom of it that will be unaffected by anything up on top.

Strader: Okay.

Conger: But -- but, no, the Pura Vida, which we don't control the bottom area, all of that is along the Ten Mile and -- and does have a little higher groundwater, but -- but up on our top area it's all subsurface straight -- straight into the ground through ACHD sand filters and even on our private streets the City of Meridian standards have to match ACHD standards, which all of that is filtered drain water through that C33 sand and things of that nature.

Strader: Okay.

Conger: So, absolutely no drainage issues amongst neighbors or to any -- any of our own -- I mean drainage thank goodness on this one is just fine.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you. That's helpful. I just wanted to close the loop on that, because it was an issue that stood out to me from before. That was a little while ago, but -- thanks. Okay.

Clark: Council Member Strader, I made my boys dig multiple large holes to plant plants for Mother's Day last weekend and we basically had to have pick axes to get into. There is just a lot of rock, so --

Strader: Not a bad thing.

Clark: Yeah. No. It was good to -- they need to do more manual labor, so --

Strader: Okay. Thank you.

Simison: Council, any additional questions at this time? Well, would the applicant like to close then?

Clark: I think we are good. If there is any questions we are happy to answer them, but we appreciate your consideration.

Simison: Applicant waives a closing. Okay. Thank you.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I think we have had a good discussion. I would move that we close the public hearing on this item.

Taylor: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to close the public hearing on Item H-2026-0001. Is there discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The eyes have it. The public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Happy to kick off a discussion. I think a little bit of an unusual situation, but I think there are some decent mitigating factors here. It -- it doesn't bother me so much the sharing of the gated community, if that makes sense. I just think in the context of the topography and this property it does make a lot more sense for it to sort of be joined together with Skybreak more, share those amenities. They know -- and I have said before I hate having sidewalks on one side. I don't agree with that. But we approved it for you on -- on literally the adjacent development. So, I think we should be consistent with City Council's past decisions on that. So, with that I'm happy to make a motion. After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to approve file number H-2026-0001 as presented in the staff report for today's hearing date.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Item 5. Is there discussion on the motion? If not, clerk call the roll.

Roll Call: Cavener, yea; Strader, yea; Overton, yea; Little Roberts, yea; Taylor, yea; Whitlock, yea.

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries and the item is agreed to. Thank you. Keep building those sidewalks. Only half.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

ORDINANCES [Action Item]

- 6. Ordinance No. 26-2124: An Ordinance (Pine 43 Mixed-Use Subdivision H-2024-0071) for rezone of a parcel of land located in the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of Section 8, Township 3 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, City of Meridian, County of Ada, State of Idaho, as depicted in the map exhibit, rezoning 3.08 acres of land from C-G (General Retail and Service Commercial) zoning district to the R-15 (Medium High-Density Residential) zoning district in the Meridian City Code; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all applicable official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning**

districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; and providing an effective date.

Simison: Okay. With that we will move on to Item 6, which is Ordinance No. 26-2124. Ask the clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. It's an ordinance for rezone of a parcel of land located in the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter of Section 8, Township 3 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, City of Meridian, County of Ada, State of Idaho, as depicted in the map exhibit, rezoning 3.08 acres of land from C-G zoning district to the R-15 zoning district in the Meridian City Code; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all applicable official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; and providing an effective date.

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

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 26-2124.

Overton: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Ordinance No. 26-2124. Is there any discussion? If not, clerk call the roll.

Roll Call: Cavener, yea; Strader, yea; Overton, yea; Little Roberts, yea; Taylor, yea; Whitlock, yea.

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries and the item is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

- 7. Ordinance No. 26-2125: An Ordinance (North Meridian Fields – H-2026-0003) annexing land located in a portion of the west half of the northeast quarter of Section 29, Township 4 North, Range 1 West, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, as depicted in the map exhibit; rezoning 71.445 acres of such real property from RUT (Rural Urban**

Transition) to R-8 (Medium-Density Residential) (47.79 acres) and C-N (Neighborhood Business District) (23.655 acres) zoning districts; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; repealing conflicting ordinances; and providing an effective date.

Simison: Next up is Item No. 7, which is Ordinance No. 26-2125. Ask the clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. It's an ordinance annexing land located in a portion of the west half of the northeast quarter of Section 29, Township 4 North, Range 1 West, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, as depicted in the map exhibit; rezoning 71.445 acres of such real property from RUT to R-8 and C-N zoning districts; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; repealing conflicting ordinances; and providing an effective date.

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

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 26-2125.

Cavener: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve Ordinance No. 26-2125. Is there any discussion? If not, clerk call the roll.

Roll Call: Cavener, yea; Strader, yea; Overton, yea; Little Roberts, yea; Taylor, yea; Whitlock, yea.

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries and the item is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

EXECUTIVE SESSION [Action Item] Per Idaho Code 74-206(1)(c):To acquire an interest in real property not owned by a public agency; 74-206(1)(f): To communicate with legal counsel for the public agency to discuss the legal ramifications of and legal options for pending litigation, or controversies not yet being litigated but imminently likely to be litigated, and 74-206(1)(j): To consider labor contract matters authorized under section 74-206A (1)(a) and (b), Idaho Code.

Simison: Next item up is Executive Session.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I move that we move into Executive Session for Idaho Code 74-206 Subsection (1)(c) and (1)(f).

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to go into Executive Session. Is there a discussion? If not clerk call the roll.

Roll Call: Cavener, yea; Strader, yea; Overton, yea; Little Roberts, yea; Taylor, yea; Whitlock, yea.

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries and we will go into Executive Session.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

EXECUTIVE SESSION: (7:08 p.m. to 7:50 p.m.)

(Motion-Second out of Executive Session-Overton/Little Roberts)

(Motion-Second to adjourn-Overton/Little Roberts)

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:50 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON

DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK