

## **Meridian Planning and Zoning Meeting**

**July 10, 2025.**

Meeting of the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission of July 17, 2025, was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chairman Maria Lorcher.

Members Present: Commissioner Maria Lorcher, Commissioner Jared Smith, Commissioner Brian Garrett, Commissioner Jessica Perreault, Commissioner Sam Rust and Commissioner Matthew Stoll.

Members Absent: Commissioner Matthew Sandoval.

Others Present: Tina Lomeli, Kurt Starman, Sonya Allen, Garrett White, Jamie Leslie, Steve Taulbee and Dean Willis.

### **ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brian Garrett	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Matthew Stoll
<input type="checkbox"/> Matthew Sandoval	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jessica Perrault
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sam Rust	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jared Smith
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Maria Lorcher - Chairman	

Lorcher: Good evening. Welcome to Planning and Zoning Commission meeting for July 17th, 2025. At this time I would like to call the meeting to order. The Commissioners who are present for this evening are here at City Hall and currently we do not have any commissioners on Zoom. We also have staff from the city attorney and the city clerk's office, as well as the city's planning department. If you are joining us on Zoom this evening we can see that you are here. You may observe the meeting, however, the ability to be seen on screen and talk will be muted. During the public testimony portion of the meeting you will be unmuted and, then, be able to comment. Please note that we cannot take questions until the public testimony portion of the meeting. If you have a process question during the meeting please e-mail [cityclerk@meridiancity.org](mailto:cityclerk@meridiancity.org) and they will reply as quickly as possible. If you simply want to watch the meeting we encourage you to watch the streaming on the city's YouTube channel. You can access it at [meridiancity.org/live](https://www.meridiancity.org/live). With that let us begin with roll call. Madam Clerk.

### **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

Lorcher: The first item on the agenda is the adoption of the agenda. There are no changes tonight to tonight's agenda. May I get a motion to adopt tonight's agenda?

Smith: So moved.

Perreault: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to adopt tonight's agenda. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

### **CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]**

- 1. Approve Minutes of the June 26, 2025 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting**
- 2. Approve Minutes of the July 10, 2025 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting**
- 3. Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for Uplift Gym by Erik Hagen, located at at 3410 W. Nelis Dr.**

Lorcher: The next item on the agenda is the Consent Agenda, which include to approve the minutes of the June 26th Planning and Zoning meeting, approve the meeting minutes of the July 10th Planning and Zoning meeting and Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law for Uplift Gym. Could I get a motion to accept the Consent Agenda as presented?

Rust: So moved.

Smith: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to approve the Consent Agenda. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

### **ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]**

Lorcher: At this time I would briefly like to explain the public hearing process. We will open each item individually and begin with the staff report. Staff will report their findings on how the item adheres to our Comprehensive Plan and our Unified Development Code. After staff has made their presentation the applicant will come forward to present their case and respond to staff's comments and they will have 15 minutes to do so. After the applicant is finished we will open the floor to public testimony. Each person will be called only once during the public testimony portion. The clerk will call the names individually of those who have signed up in advance or if you are in Chambers you may come to the microphone or be unmuted on Zoom. Please state your name and address for the record. You will have three minutes to address the Commission. If you have previously sent pictures or a presentation for the meeting it will be displayed on the screen and our clerk will help you with the presentation. If you have established you are speaking on behalf of like a larger group, like an HOA, where others from the

group will allow you to speak on their behalf, you will have up to ten minutes. After all those who have signed up in advance have spoken we will invite any others who wish to testify. If you wish to speak on a topic you may come forward in Chambers or if on Zoom you may hit the raised hand button or if you are only listening on the telephone please press star nine and wait for your name to be called. If you are listening on multiple devices, such as a computer and a phone, please -- please be sure to mute those extra devices, so we don't experience feedback and we can hear you clearly. When you are finished if the Commission doesn't have questions for you you will return to your seat in chambers or be muted on Zoom and no longer have the ability to speak and, please, remember we will not call on you a second time. After all the testimony has been heard the applicant will be given another ten minutes to come back and respond. When the applicant has finished responding to the questions and concerns we will close the public hearing and the Commissioners will have an opportunity to discuss and hopefully make either final decisions or recommendations to City Council as needed.

## **ACTION ITEMS**

- 4. Public Hearing for Touchmark (H-2025-0012) by The Land Group, generally located on the south side of E. Franklin Rd. and the north side of I-84, midway between S. Eagle Rd. and S. Cloverdale Rd.**
  - A. Request: Modified Development Agreement to update the conceptual development plan for the overall site, which consists of approximately 121.50 acres of land to consolidate the existing agreements (AZ-99-021 Touchmark (recorded in 2001, Inst. #101048096); April 2001 Addendum (Inst. # 101048097); May 2003 Addendum (Inst. #103137119); AZ-02-018 (Bair Property AZ-02-018, Inst. #102143308); MI-07-006 (Meadowlake Village North 3rd Addendum, Inst. #108022885) into one new agreement that replaces all previous agreements.
  - B. Request: Rezone of 63.34 acres of land from the L-O to the C-C (55.17 acres) and C-G (8.17 acres) zoning districts.
  - C. Planned Unit Development Modification (Meadowlake Village CUP-03-005) to update the concept/use plan and include 4.6 acres of additional land, a deviation to the maximum building height allowed in the C-C district from 50ft. to 64ft. for the hotel and inclusion of 2 and 3 story townhome dwellings.

Lorcher: With that we will start with item -- Item No. 3 on the agenda for H-2025-0012 for a modified development agreement, rezone and a planned unit development modification for Touchmark and Meadow Lake Village and we will begin with the staff report.

Allen: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. The development agreement modification does not require action from the Commission tonight. That is only a City Council decision on that. Modification of the existing planned unit development and rezone. This site consists of 121.5 acres of land. It's zoned L-O, limited office. It's generally located on the south side of East Franklin Road on the -- and the north side of I-84, midway between South Eagle Road and South Cloverdale Road. I will go through a little history on this property and the approvals. The majority of this property was annexed back in 2000 with a development agreement and a conditional use permit for a conceptual planned unit development. A smaller 4.6 acre portion of property was later annexed and included in an amended development agreement and conceptual development plan. The original conceptual PUD was approved for a continuing care retirement community comprised of 250 to 300 units of independent and assisted living, 450 units of residential, including single family, duplex townhomes and multi-family. A community senior health and fitness center. Medical office parks. Commercial and retail businesses. Since that time approximately 428 residential units have been built in the retirement community, along with the senior health and fitness center and many amenities, including open green space and walking trails, a community garden, coffee shop and bistro, salon and barber shop, a library, theater, dining venues, pickleball courts and other on-site amenities. In 2003 the development agreement and planned unit development were amended to allow the development of 318 residential units and approximately 600,000 square feet of commercial and office space on a larger 138 acre area with reduced building setbacks in the L-O zoning district. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation is mixed use community. A modification to the development agreement is proposed to update the conceptual development plan for the overall site, which consists of approximately 121.5 acres of land and consolidate the existing development agreements into one new agreement that replaces all previous versions. A rezone of 55.17 acres of land to the C-C zoning district and 8.17 acres to the C-G district is proposed from the L-O zoning district to the undeveloped -- excuse me -- for the undeveloped portion of the site, included in the master plan to accommodate the proposed uses. So, everything that they are proposing is C-C and, then, just that parcel in their piece up in the upper northeast corner is C-G. The proposed project consists of -- let me back up for just a minute. I didn't have my slide on when I was talking about the original existing concept plan that's approved for this property and that is in your staff report as well if you want to look at it a little closer. This plan is proposed to be replaced with a new plan and that's this plan right here. The proposed project consists of 121.5 acres of land within a larger mixed use community designated area, totaling approximately 164 acres and includes a mix of uses consisting of commercial, office, light industry and a variety of residential housing types as shown on this bubble plan here before you and that is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan for mixed use community designation. A couple of areas on the concept plan. The ones -- the two with the star symbols are shown with two possible uses, the medical office and townhomes along the southwest boundary of the site and the community -- commercial and multi-family along the north side of the site along Franklin Road. If the demand for office space doesn't come to fruition the applicant proposes an alternate use of townhomes, 50 to 55 units in that area. Commercial uses similar to the commercial

proposed to the west along Franklin Road is proposed on the other area with the flexibility for multi-family residential. The number of units and density is not specified on the plan, but the applicant states the area could support 115 to 140 units, using the same density as the other multi-family area. The multi-family use would be at a larger scale than the townhomes and an increase in density. Staff does not recommend approval of the optional residential uses, because residential uses, as the comp plan allows for up to 65 percent of the development area to be comprised of residential uses with the provision of transit, which the applicant is providing, which does exist and the applicant is proposing approximately 68 percent, not including the optional multi-family and townhome style units. Additionally, the commercial uses are desired in the mixed use community diagram and the comp plan along arterial streets transitioning to lesser intense uses. Therefore, staff recommends the concept plan is revised to only reflect commercial uses on those portions of the property prior to the City Council hearing. A modification to the existing planned unit development for Meadow Lake Village, CUP-03-005, is proposed to update the concept plan and includes a request for deviation to the maximum building height allowed in the C-C district from 50 feet to 64 feet for the hotel measured to the highest point of the structure and inclusion of the townhome dwellings as a permitted use in the C-C district. Staff is amenable to the building height increase as proposed. However, is not in support of the request for townhomes to develop in the C-C district, because townhomes, where each unit is on its own property, are a prohibited use in the C-C district and, therefore, aren't allowed through the planned unit development. This would require rezone to a residential or a traditional neighborhood zoning district in which the use is allowed. Because the applicant isn't proposing to subdivide the property, the use is considered multi-family residential, as all of the units are on one property and is allowed in the C-C district. The new development plan includes approximately 114,000 square feet of medical office space, approximately 300 to 400 non-age restricted market rate multi-family units, both apartments and townhomes, with the possibility of 165 to 195 additional units through the alternate uses proposed. Twenty to 25 single family attached units, also known as villas, three single family detached units, also known as cottages on the plan; 75,546 square feet of self-storage, i.e., light industry; 45,000 square feet of general office space; 45,000 square feet of commercial retail space and an approximate 126 room hotel. Conceptual building elevations for the proposed structure as -- are as shown there on the sides of that plan. A pedestrian pathway plan was submitted as shown there. The green lines represent ten foot wide pathways. The blue five foot proposed sidewalks and the pink five foot wide existing sidewalks. A phasing plan is proposed as shown, which depicts four phases of development. It's anticipated to be completed between 2030 and 2040. Phase one is the villas and cottages, which is two to five years. Phase two is the apartments and townhomes, which is three to ten years. Phase three is the commercial, self-storage, additional multi-family and hotel along Franklin Road, which is three to 15 years. And phase four is the medical office and daycare, post-acute care and townhomes, four to 15 years. Staff recommends a subdivision application is submitted for each phase of development and recorded in order to have a legal parcel for development purposes. The existing community is proposed to remain unchanged, except for the small golf course and that is this pink area right here around their water feature here, which at some point in the future may

redevelop with villas and that's the single family attached units. The open space amenities are also evolving and as the golf course is redeveloped the required open space amenities will be reprogrammed in other areas of the project. Before changes can be approved to this area the applicant must demonstrate compliance with the terms of the previously approved PUD in regard to site amenities with removal of the golf course. Per the city code in effect at that time at least ten percent of the gross area of the PUD was required as open space, exclusive of required street buffers and buffers between incompatible land uses. The development area consists of 61.5 acres of land. Therefore, a minimum of 6.15 acres of qualified open space is required to be provided. An exhibit should be submitted showing the existing qualified open space without the golf course area prior to the City Council hearing. No written testimony has been received from the public. The applicant did submit a response to the staff report and they will go through that in their presentation. Staff is recommending approval per the recommendation in the staff report and I would just like to make a note that with development agreements and planned unit developments, the decision making body is able to place additional conditions on development applications that may not typically be required in the UDC in an effort to provide exemplary site development in accord with the purpose statement of the planned unit development. Staff will stand for any questions. The applicant is here to present.

Lorcher: Would the applicant like to come forward? Hi.

Thompson: Hi, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. My name is Tamara Thompson. I'm with The Land Group. Our offices are at 462 East Shore Drive in Eagle. With me tonight I have Kendra Lackey and Ryan Benson from Touchmark and Gary Sorensen from Pivot North. So, we have our full team here to answer any of your questions and I do have a presentation. I will try not to be redundant with -- with Sonya's presentation. She was -- she was very thorough. But just to give you a brief overview, the development site is located on the south side of Franklin and east of Touchmark. The -- the west side is the Ridenbaugh Canal and we are just north of Interstate 84. North of Franklin Road are industrial uses that are zoned I-L and west is medical office, which includes St. Luke's. Those are all zoned L-O. Currently the site is zoned L-O and in order to align better with what the uses are the staff has recommended that we do that rezone, although the -- the proposal that we have before you is not much different than -- than what is currently approved in our PUD. Again we are in the MUC future land use map designation. Here is that zone -- or zoomed in and the reason I wanted to show this is just to show how close we are to the city of Boise. City of Boise is just right on the other side of the Ridenbaugh Canal. That is that dashed line there. With industrial across on the north side of Franklin. Just to give -- I'm sure you have all driven this area, but just to give a little overview of what it looks like, the -- the top photo is looking west along Franklin that has the industrial properties there to the right and the bottom is looking east along Franklin Road. The properties were developed in 2003 and at that time Touchmark did all of the public roads to their facility to and through the facility, and did all of the beautiful fountains and water features, all the landscaping and I just have some pictures of -- of all of that and you can tell on this bottom left one all of the sidewalks, even back in 2003, were the detached

sidewalks, which weren't -- weren't common back then. And, then, I will point out also that all of the utilities were stubbed at that time as well. As Sonya mentioned, this was the -- the concept plan with the development agreement. So, Touchmark has owned this property since the late 1990s and it opened its first phase of the retirement community, which was Touchmark at Meadow Lake Village in 2003. Touchmark has been a member of the Meridian community for over 20 years, collaborating with local businesses, nonprofits, schools and government organizations to provide employment and volunteer opportunities, as well as provide much needed service for elderly residents of the Boise and Meridian areas who moved to the Touchmark at Meadow Lake Village. The properties were annexed and zoned L-O with a PUD and a development agreement in 2001 and, then, there were multiple development agreement modifications after that. The development agreement states the construction and development of a continuing care retirement community comprised of 250 to 300 units of independent and assisted living, 450 units of residential, including single family duplexes, multi-family, townhomes, medical office parks, commercial and retail businesses and community and senior health and fitness center. Our proposal today is not much different than that. We are just going to define it a little bit better, since what was defined back then it -- it lists all those, but it doesn't really define well the exact acreage or the exact square footage of those types of -- of -- of uses. Again, there is the development agreement and three subsequent addendums to that development agreement. The most recent development agreement was recorded in 2008. As you can see on this aerial, approximately 62.8 acres of the 121.5 total acres or 52 percent of the original master plan has been constructed and is operating as Meadow Lake Village, a Touchmark community. Since that time approximately 428 residential units have been built and much of the -- all of the public roads have been built and the utility infrastructure and landscaping along those public roads. Sonya mentioned all of the amenities that have been -- that go along with it as far as the green space and walking trails. You can see there is a pond and numerous water features for the residents. The pond and center community area is planned to be part of the entire community, not just for the senior housing. Currently there are over 12 acres of qualified open space and part of that then -- which is over 20 percent of the existing community that part of that will be for -- for everybody and, then, we will be adding even more for -- for -- for the new development. Here is some photos of just some of the existing. All right. Now, to the Touchmark mixed use development. This includes approximately 114,000 square feet of medical office, 500 non-age restricted market rate multi-family units. These will be both in the form of apartments and townhomes. As Sonya mentioned, they won't be fee simple townhomes, they will be townhome style, but they will be designated multi-family, because they will all be on one lot, but they will look like townhomes. There will be age restricted villas and cottages. So, there is 24 of those, which will be -- I don't know if I can point on this thing. Don't know how to do that. So, it's -- it's -- if I just point to it does it do it? Yeah. Right in that area around -- around the -- the pond area. Forty-five thousand square feet of general office and 45,000 square feet of commercial retail space. A hundred and twenty-six room hotel. And the development is planned to be phased over the next five to 15 years. We -- we have included concept plans and concept elevations and with those we have -- we have added that the city's design standards are what are to be met. So, those will be -- will go through the city's CZC and

design review process. Throughout the project additional pedestrian sidewalks and multi-use pathways will be utilized to create a better network to ensure safety and efficient mobility through the site and as intended with the original master plan a multi-generational project where residents of the existing Touchmark retirement community can maintain a sense of security, while benefiting from the adjacent diverse uses is intentional. Future occupants of the multi-family and townhomes, as well as users of the future commercial and retail, will benefit from generous new connectivity and green space throughout the interior of the master plan, as well as from the existing pedestrian infrastructure along Franklin Road and Touchmark Way. Extensive pathways will be accompanied by recreational areas for children and adults to enjoy daytime leisure activities, such as playgrounds, open spaces, dog park areas and functional spaces, that promote general health and wellness. The existing monument sign and fountain at the entrance, that fountain amenity will -- that exists will be maintained and remain and, then, at least one amenity per amenity category within the Meridian City Code is proposed. So, that will continue through the CZC process and that's something that we provided in our application with -- with the PUD. And, then, the -- with each of the areas -- or each of the zones we provided a sub area with dimensional standards for that -- for each of that sub area. Accesses to the project -- most of those are already existing. There is only one new access to Franklin here that aligns with Truckee Avenue to the north. An updated traffic study was required and it was conducted by Kittelson and Associates and both -- both ITD and ACHD have comment on -- commented on that and the -- there are no new conditions that are required. The Touchmark development can be development -- developed with minimal impacts to the surrounding roadway system. We do have a couple of requested revisions. We have reviewed the staff report and agree with staff's recommended conditions with the following revisions. There is a reference to wrought iron fence. We would like to replace that with metal picket fence to make that just a little -- instead of wrought iron, a lot of times those are metal picket or full privacy to match the existing. What we are showing here is what the existing fence is around the perimeter of the existing development. So, we are asking to stay consistent with that. And I'm sorry if you want that number I can give that to you. That is condition A.1.ii. And, then, condition -- conditional use permit and the planned unit development modification I, the drive private street from Truckee, there is a condition to have an internal drive that connects to the east to that existing drive and let me go back here. That would be to -- from that Truckee one here to this existing drive at that location and there -- that may not be possible and let me just give you a few items here. So, what I have here on the right-hand side is the topography of that area and there -- there is an existing ditch that runs at the top of the grade. So, on the bottom there is a 27 foot grade difference from that approach to the top of that hill and, then, there is a ditch that runs across there, which is a gravity irrigation ditch and -- and, then, the -- the top left is an aerial of that. So, all the engineering hasn't been done for this area yet, but in maintaining flows for that ditch and having to address 27 feet of fall from the top of that down to that existing access, it may not be possible to have a street access at that location, which is why we didn't put one initially and, then, I just wanted to show -- so, this is that access and you can see that for this one -- can I -- can I finish, please? Okay. Just coming in initially they had to put retaining walls immediately once -- at this one. So, this -- what we would like to do is be mindful of that request and work



with staff during the CZC process and that if it's possible we will -- we will make that connection, but -- but not have that as -- as a requirement. And, then, lastly, our plan as proposed is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and we respectfully request the ability for up to 65 percent of the land to be allowed as residential uses. When I did the math at that -- what -- what Sonya mentioned as the 68 percent, I incorrectly did that with the rezone, which those go to the center line of the roads, but if I just use the land area -- so, the way that that goes is right now with the -- with the layout the commercial uses are 41 percent of the -- of the master plan. The residential is 36 percent and the areas that we have laid out as the flex areas comprise 21 percent. So, if a hundred percent of that flex area were to go to the commercial side, then, that would be 62 percent to the -- to the commercial. If a hundred percent of that flex area were to go residential, it would be 58 percent. We are not asking for more units, we are -- we are sticking at that -- at the 524 units, we are just asking for more flexibility on that land area. It's been 20 plus years that they have had that frontage as -- as commercial and should they need it they -- they just want that flexibility to extend in those two areas.

Lorcher: Thank you very much. Commissioners, do we have questions for Tamara?

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Good to see you.

Thompson: Good to see you.

Perreault: Yes, I do have some questions for you. So, am I to understand correctly that the only age restricted residential units will be the cottages and, then, some of the townhomes?

Thompson: Madam Chair and Chair -- or Council -- Commissioner --

Perreault: Commissioner.

Thompson: Commissioner Perreault, the -- a hundred percent of the current community is age restricted, 55 and older, and 24 of the new units that's adjacent to that would be age restricted. The -- the new ones will not be. That is correct. Because it has always been the plan for it to be multi-generational.

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Is there a market need for the additional age restricted or are you not seeing that often?

Thompson: I would need my -- my client to answer that question, but I'm guessing if -- if they are not going that direction, then, there wouldn't be.

Perreault: Okay. And, then, I just want to get clarification. So, the way I read the staff report is that the limitation on the 65 percent residential for the development area I was under the impression that was for the entire original project, like the master plan, and you have calculated it as just this area that is being rezoned. So, did I misunderstand that? Would you like to answer that?

Thompson: That's true. I am calculating on the -- on the new area and I can give a little bit more history on that, too. Is that -- and -- and a few years ago we did this on other projects in the -- in the vicinity and in the mixed use community area most of those developments, especially south of I-84, do not get developed with 20 percent or even 50 percent residential uses and so if you blend the entire mixed use community area it doesn't -- it doesn't even get to ten percent in the audit that we did a couple years ago for -- for a different project south of the freeway. But on this one we were just looking at the new development area.

Perreault: So, if I'm understanding you correctly, you are saying that the 164 acres within the full MUC designated area has much smaller percentage of residential? If you looked at the entire picture that MUC designation, you are saying that it doesn't come close to the 65 percent?

Thompson: And -- and if we looked at the MUC area within just this quadrant even south of the freeway we wouldn't even come close to that.

Perreault: Okay. I think that's all the questions I have for you for now. Thank you.

Thompson: Thank you.

Lorcher: Commissioners, any other questions before we take public testimony? I did have a question in regard to some of the last slides where the city asked you to have some connectivity and you said that there were some topical restrictions based on the way the topography works. The drainage ditch that goes, you know, south to north that draining down, is that run by Nampa-Meridian -- or the irrigation district or is that just part of that parcel, because it used to be a farm?

Thompson: Madam Chair, it does -- it is run by the irrigation district. It -- its headgate is on the Ridenbaugh and it -- it goes through the property, but it does serve downstream as well. It's not just for this property. So, we do need to maintain it and so, you know, we can't drop it too much, maybe we can drop it a little bit. Like I said, the -- the -- the engineering and all that for this -- for it hasn't happened, but one -- when you are looking at 27 feet of grade change and needing to maintain flows, it -- it -- it's going to be difficult at best. So, I would like to have it as a please look at, but not a hard and fast requirement.

Lorcher: And did they say they wanted it tiled once it gets development or that -- or did they want it open?

Thompson: They haven't said, but typically we can tile that size.

Lorcher: So, if you tiled that size would it be a challenge to, then, put a road on top of it, at least the portion that it cuts across, because you are a diagonal and the cross-street would go in perpendicular?

Thompson: I don't think it would be as much of a problem with putting a road on top of it, it's just however those flows are going to be.

Lorcher: Right.

Thompson: Yeah.

Lorcher: And, then, finally, cross-access to the eastern property, which is the city of Boise. So, is the city of Boise requiring connectivity, like typically Meridian asks for connectivity between, you know, parcels and subdivisions, so that there is always an escape route?

Thompson: So, I looked at the plat for that property. That's an industrial plat that's in the city of Boise and I -- ACHD constructed those access points prior to that development when they did the improvements along Franklin years ago and -- but the -- the plat for that industrial property does look like it has a -- an easement around it that goes back at least a little bit. So, it doesn't go all the way back, but it goes back enough for just a little bit of -- for the shared access, so that we can at least get to the access point and it does split the property line, so half of that access is already on our property, but it does have a little bit of an easement around it on both sides, so they are using it on our property currently and we can get to it to get to theirs. But it doesn't go like all the way back to have like a big road coming in if -- if that's what you are asking. Yeah.

Lorcher: Okay. Any other questions before we open public testimony? Okay. Thank you very much.

Thompson: Thank you.

Lorcher: Oh. Wait. Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: I found a few more. So, if we are understanding the phasing plan correctly, you could -- you could have all four phases going at the same time. I mean the first three years you could potentially have all different types of construction going on. Have you -- do you have or have you thought through how that will work with -- just with that entrance -- or with the entrance that comes off of Franklin Road and the entrance to Touchmark, how will that flow if you have construction going on in all different areas?

Thompson: We will need to -- we will definitely need to work through that with -- with what becomes fruition first. I don't know that all four would happen at the same time. We just kept that flexibility that -- that any one of those could go first.

Perreault: Okay. And are the calculate -- the square footage calculations that you used for the office and retail, does that include those areas that you want to keep flexible or does it not?

Thompson: Let me find it. So, in my calculation I have the commercial, hotel, light industry and medical office the ones that are solid colors on the concept plan. Those come out to 41 percent and, then, if I take the villas, cottages, townhomes and multi-families, the ones that are solid colors, those come out to 36 percent and, then, if I take the medical office slash townhomes, the one that has the striped color and the commercial, multi-family striped color, that's 21 percent.

Perreault: Okay. So, where it says there is potentially 45,000 square foot of commercial retail space, this -- is that counting that area as commercial or is it counting that area as multi-family -- I mean is it included or not?

Thompson: I was -- I did my calculation off of the land area on the concept plan.

Perreault: To calculate square footage of the commercial.

Thompson: To calculate the -- the -- because that's what the 65 percent is is land area. So, I was doing land area.

Perreault: Okay. I'm just referring to what was in our presentation tonight, so --

Thompson: Yeah. I -- we may be talking apples and oranges, because I was looking at the land area, because -- because that's what the -- the comp plan talks about, land area of up to 65 percent if you are in proximity of a transit -- of transit.

Perreault: Thank you.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much.

Thompson: Thank you.

Lorcher: Madam Clerk, do we have anybody that signed up to testify?

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. No one has signed up. You can come forward.

Lorcher: Yeah, you can come forward. If you can state your name and address for the record that would be great.

Cruise: Okay. Thank you. I apologize, I did not know I needed to sign up.

Lorcher: No. That's fine. That's why we have big Chambers here, so there is plenty of room for people to come.

Cruise: My name is Sandra Cruise. C-r-u-i-s-e. My address is 210 South Winthrop Place, Boise. 83709. I live in Edgeview Estates, which is the subdivision on the east side of the Ridenbaugh Canal and my house is -- my property is adjacent to the development. We live right on the canal and so I have several questions or issues that I wanted to make sure were in your -- under your consideration and I don't even know if I have a voice in this, because I don't live in Meridian, but, first of all, there is a tree -- I live right where -- where the Ridenbaugh wraps around my subdivision. I would be most adjacent to commercial light industry there where you were just talking about how there is a 27 percent gradient. There is a very large very old black locust tree. I believe it's black locust tree that's home to many raptors and other birds and many animals. It's habitat for red tails, kestrels -- we have got Coopers now in the neighborhood -- Cooper hawks also. I would hate to see -- see us lose that tree. I would hate to see the birds lose that tree. They are losing their feeding grounds with this development, but they -- they have managed to hang on all of these years -- for 25 years as their -- their land, their opportunity for hunting has decreased they have managed to stay in the area and I would hate to lose them and see them go. At the very very least I would be -- if you -- if that tree is taken down that it be taken down not in a nesting season. Oh. And there is owls, too, there sometimes. So, just be -- be mindful that raptors live in that tree and other trees. Number two, the development to the east, the light industrial development to the south side of Franklin Road, when that went in the Ridenbaugh Canal was paved, because it's up above all of that, and I wonder if the Ridenbaugh will need to be paved for that -- I would call it the yellow commercial slash light industry piece that -- that eastern most piece will it need to be paved also. So, that is a question I do not have -- do not expect you all to have an answer for that, but that's a Nampa-Meridian Irrigation question that I would hope would be addressed.

Lorcher: Is it your preference to have it open or closed?

Cruise: It's my preference that the Nampa Irrigation District is mindful of it and that -- the reason they paved it is -- they paved the part that was getting developed below is because what if the -- what if the canal is breached --

Lorcher: Right.

Cruise: -- everything below it would be flooded.

Lorcher: Okay.

Cruise: So, that's -- you know, of course I would rather the Ridenbaugh Canal -- it's not paved over, it's just the sides are paved.

Lorcher: Got you.

Cruise: Yeah. It's -- so it's reinforced.

Lorcher: Got you.

Cruise: And, then, of course, we are -- we are used to our unrestricted view and I know progress happens and people lose their views, but we would hate to have three story housing just staring into our backyard, even though it is across the canal and I would hope that there would be some consideration for easements from one story to two story to three story, because there is a residential area around us. We are -- I know that there is not many houses that would be affected by this multi-family three story development, but there are some of us and we were expecting over the years that Touchmark would continue to develop one story housing, which is what we were told 20 some years ago, that it would be senior development one story. Well, the central part -- the central buildings are tall, but that we could expect one story building.

Lorcher: Okay.

Cruise: That's what we were told.

Lorcher: All right.

Cruise: Whether that's what they thought I can't speak to that.

Lorcher: All right. Well --

Cruise: Those are my issues.

Lorcher: Okay.

Cruise: Thank you very much.

Lorcher: Thank you for your time. Anybody else in Chambers that would like to speak as part of the public testimony? And is there anybody online?

Lomeli: Madam Chair, there is one person attending online. They have not raised their hand.

Lorcher: Okay. Tamara, would you like to come back and respond?

Thompson: Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, Tamara Thompson again. So, I wrote down three items. If you will let me know if there was something that I -- that I missed here. So, the questions are the black locust tree. I think I know which one that is. I believe it to be the one where the headgate is for that canal -- or that ditch that we were just talking about. So, I do not know on that one currently, but if we can retain it we always like to retain trees. We are -- first and foremost The Land Group is landscape architects, so we retrain -- retain trees where -- where we can. So -- so we

would like to do that. It is on the perimeter of the project. So, we are hoping that we can. As far as the Ridenbaugh and paving the sides and those types of things, we will not have anything to do with -- with the Ridenbaugh. The Ridenbaugh -- we will go up to right at their easement line and, then, we won't have anything to do with it past that. So, I don't have an answer for that. That will be the irrigation district. And, then, as far as the two story, three story housing, we can definitely take a look at that. We have -- we were doing that stair step with the -- with the townhouses and, then, to the multi-family and so there is just a small little area right in -- right in this -- right there that we can -- we can look at that, too. It's probably going to be frankly parking garages there first and then -- and, then, get to the -- get to the units. So, the -- the apartments will probably be back a little ways.

Lorcher: Okay.

Thompson: So, did I answer everything? I think I got it.

Lorcher: I believe so. I believe so. I mean, you know, it's impossible to guarantee any unrestricted view, but being conscious of the people who always live there is always a nice consideration.

Thompson: It is.

Lorcher: I do have a few questions for you in regard to the golf course. So, you are suggesting of eliminating the golf course and turning those into villas.

Thompson: So, the way that it's colored in it looks like all of it goes. It's just going to be reprogrammed. There will be some open space around that. There is -- there is -- there is a small number of villas that go in there. There is 20 villas that go in there. So, there will be a considerable amount of open space that -- that retains. What's -- what's left there is going to be around six acres with the current pond and what's over on the -- on the west side as well and, then, there -- they will -- typically their -- their programming and what they have has some sort of putting green or pitching green -- you know, pitching area, those types of things. So, it's -- it likely won't a hundred percent go away, but it's just going to be reprogrammed.

Lorcher: And does that satisfy -- because I don't know the exact wording, so, Sonya, you might have to help me with this, but does that satisfy the original PUD of open space that was required if the golf course is amended?

Allen: Madam Chair, I don't have those calcs from the applicant. She said she did some preliminary calcs and it appears to comply with those standards, but I would like to see an exhibit showing exactly what areas are being counted in order to determine that.

Lorcher: Okay. So, before Council you will have to have --

Thompson: Yeah. So -- and I'm sorry I did not -- I didn't bring that, but we do -- we did do some calculations and there is 12 acres. So, there is pickleball courts as part of this -- of what's -- so, what's constructed currently is around 12 acres of qualified open space. So, there is pickleball courts. There is pathways that go to benches and gazebos. There is -- there is little waterfall areas with seating areas. There is the pond. There is -- there is all kinds of different areas. There is a dog park area and, then, that -- there is the golf course area. So, with eliminating the golf course area we are still well over what was required for the original PUD. Like almost double what was required.

Lorcher: Okay. One final question from me. When you had your neighborhood meeting with the community people bought in this community based on senior living and the amenities, possibly even the golf course, you know, being part of it. What has been the response from the community for your adjustments to the open space and, then, the flex space of turning some of that into villas and that type of thing, what kind of response -- I mean the fact that nobody is here complaining leads me to believe that it -- it's not a huge concern, but it is a difference to what they were committed to when they purchased in that community.

Thompson: I would like my client to answer that question, because they have been working more closely with their tenants, if -- if that's fine.

Lorcher: Hi. If you could just state your name and address for the record that would be great.

Benson: Sure. Ryan Benson. Touchmark. Our address is 5150 Southwest Griffith Drive in Beaverton, Oregon. 97005.

Lorcher: Okay.

Benson: Thank you all for your time this evening. I personally hosted a town hall with our residents a few months ago. It was very well attended. We had 50, 60 people there. We went through this entire master plan and we received plenty of comments. We have incorporated all that into our programming. Our executive director at this community, who couldn't be here tonight, we have -- we have registered all of their -- their questions and, to be honest, the golf course is pretty lightly used as is. So, our intent is to reprogram into a more activated space that's going to be used on a day-to-day basis and benefit everybody in the community. So, we are actively engaged with all the residents on this project.

Lorcher: Okay. So, nobody feels like you are taking away anything in particular, especially because if -- with the golf course, if it is being limited attended, but you put something else in there so the community can use it more on a daily basis that could be a benefit to your group.

Benson: Right. Our -- our operations team will probably go through a really thorough process with them to kind of talk through, you know, what -- what more can we do as we



start to program out the villas and what that looks like, so I don't have an answer as to like what it will become --

Lorcher: Right.

Benson: -- but we will be factoring in all of their -- their comments and their thoughts into that.

Lorcher: And what did the community say when you were going to invite families that are not age restricted into your community?

Benson: I think it was -- it was mixed. I think some people were excited. They liked the idea of having more activity around, you know, a mix of uses is fun and engaging and there were some concerns with safety and security. So, we received mixed reviews and we intend to be very thoughtful in addressing their concerns. But overall I would say it was mixed.

Lorcher: Okay. All right. Any questions for Touchmark?

Garrett: Yeah. I'm sorry, what is the demographics of the hotel? What are you looking for -- I mean it seems to be off the beaten track.

Benson: You know, we haven't programmed what exactly that hotel will look like, but I do think that users might be visitors of family members. They could be people using the hospital services nearby. We haven't exactly programmed what the hotel will look like.

Garrett: Well, that's what I assumed.

Benson: Yeah. Maybe those two would be primary users.

Garrett: Yeah. Okay. Just a question.

Benson: Thank you.

Lorcher: Any other questions for Touchmark while he is up? Okay. Thank you very much.

Benson: Thank you, everyone.

Allen: Madam Chair, may I clarify an item that was discussed?

Lorcher: Yes.

Allen: So, the percentage of residential versus commercial uses in the Comprehensive Plan for mixed use designated areas, that is based on the overall larger designated area. It's not on a project specific area. So, that's where staff got our calculations and

what the original calcs were based on. So, anyway, just wanted to clarify and explain that. Thank you.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you. Tamara, did you have any other final thoughts before we close the public hearing?

Thompson: Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, I think I got through everything. The Touchmark mixed use, I think they have been an excellent neighbor in -- in Meridian. They have -- they have shown -- you know, what they currently have constructed is very very high quality and that's what they want to bring to the community and -- and providing an additional service to -- and -- and something that complements the adjacent residential commercial and office uses and this project will provide a vibrant, livable development with a variety of housing options. This fits every single -- checks every box on the mixed use community with all the multiple uses that are being provided for and the commercial component will provide easily accessible and convenient services for residents in the general vicinity. The development agreement modification, the PUD modification and the rezone request comply with the applicable provisions of the Comprehensive Plan and tonight we request your recommendation for approval with those three modifications that I walked you through. We thank you for your time.

Lorcher: All right. Thank you very much.

Perreault: Madam Chair, may I ask a couple more questions?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you. I wanted clarification on the townhouse areas. We had discussion about there being townhome style units, but they are not actually townhomes. Is that just in the multi-family section or would that be in the section that's labeled townhomes?

Thompson: Madam Chair, Commissioner Perreault, that is the areas that are called townhomes. So, those will look like townhomes, they just won't be platted where they can be sold fee simple.

Perreault: So -- so, that's the area where there is the request to raise the height to 64 feet?

Thompson: No. The height request is just for the hotel.

Perreault: Oh. Okay. That's not -- that's not what it stated I believe in the staff report. So -- okay. So, the areas that are light blue that are townhomes --

Thompson: Let me make sure I have that correct. I have -- I have that. So, the townhomes -- the -- the asterisk for the townhomes is -- so, we were trying -- we just

wanted to make sure that townhomes were approved and -- and they are, but they -- they are designated as multi-family, but they are going to look like townhomes, so -- but -- because they are all on one lot. So, that's what that asterisk is for. But the height -- the building height is just for the hotel, just for the salmon pink -- dark pink color.

Perreault: Okay. Thank you for clarifying that. The staff report says that there is a request for a deviation to the maximum building height allowed in the C-C district from 50 to 64 feet for the hotel and inclusion of townhome dwellings as permitted use in the C-C district.

Thompson: Yeah.

Perreault: And inclusion of the townhomes --

Thompson: That's separate. We are not talking about -- those are separate. What we have for the height of the townhomes is -- 35 feet is proposed, which fits within the height of that zone.

Perreault: Okay. One more question. So, with the -- when you come in for -- I don't know what the requirement will be in the PUD when you do the multi-family, if you have to come in and have a hearing like you do with a CUP. I don't think you have to. It sounds like it can just go straight to the zoning compliance process; is that right? So, can you chat with us a little bit about -- and so say that the villas come in and we take some of the open space away from that central area, what is -- what is that multi-family open space going to look like? Is it going to be another smaller version of -- of that where you have got the -- you know, a dog park or you have got seating areas, plaza areas? And it sounds like we are not going to have a whole lot of say in that right now and that's okay, but I just want to make sure that, you know, those open areas are being replaced.

Thompson: They are. So, you -- through the CZC and the DR process -- so, there is a -- I want to say it's a pretty rigorous checklist of -- through the design review where we have a point system for open space and we have -- we have outlined where we are going to have points in every single category for the multi-family and so we are going to have clubhouses and we are going to have a pool and we are -- you know. So, we have outlined what -- what those are going to be and we have given an example in our application of what all those points could be -- will likely be, but we have also committed to having points in each category that will meet or exceed the minimum requirements.

Lorcher: My only other comment is the use of the word townhomes during this entire conversation has been very confusing --

Thompson: It has been.

Lorcher: -- because the city has a very solid definition of what a townhome is and what that looks like on being a single unit, whether it's for purchase or rent, whereas multi-

family is one big parcel divided up into other things. So, I don't know if you and the planning department can come up with another word other than townhomes, because I have been trying to wrap my head around it during this meeting and you are going to have the same challenges when you go to Council.

Thompson: Yeah. I agree.

Lorcher: So, between now and then where it says townhomes that should be labeled something else. Villas. Cottages. Whatever comes up to be multi-family, but not under the definition of townhomes. Because every time you talked about townhomes I'm like, okay, this is not where it's supposed to be and it's not working, but you are telling me, well, it's like a townhome, but it's not a townhome. So, if you can adjust that for Council that would be great.

Thompson: Yeah. That's -- that's -- that's fabulous feedback. Thank you. We will -- we will try to make up a word.

Lorcher: Yes. Come up with something clever. I'm sure we will find something. All right. With that thank you very much. I appreciate your patience. May I have a motion to close the public hearing?

Smith: So moved.

Rust: Second.

Garrett: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing for Touchmark and Meadow Lake Village. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Would it be possible for staff to maybe address any of the things that came up during the hearing that -- it seemed like what I was reading was maybe a little different than what they were presenting and if there is anything that you want to clarify with us?

Allen: Madam Chair, Commissioner Perreault, I can't think of anything other than the percentage of residential that I already clarified in the MUC designated area in the -- you know, the -- in response to the -- Madam Chair's comment, I think townhome style multi-family would be appropriate on the concept plan, as well as -- you know, villas and cottages are something that the city code doesn't recognize either, so -- and as long as

those units aren't being platted on individual lots, which I understand they aren't, then, that would also be multi-family and like the villas would be single family attached style multi-family and the cottages single family detached style multi-family. Other than that if -- unless -- unless you are thinking of something I'm not thinking of that needs clarified,

Commissioner Perreault. I can't think of anything else.

Perreault: Well, the only other question I had was in the presentation this evening about the 45,000 square foot of office and 45,000 square foot of retail space, it sounded like the applicant didn't provide those numbers and I'm trying to understand if that's the total proposed -- I realize that might not be what it ends up to be, but if that's kind of the total proposed idea with the concept --

Allen: I believe there was a total of 114,000 square feet of medical office.

Perreault: That was for medical office.

Allen: And, then, 75,546 square feet of self-storage, 45,000 office space and 45,000 commercial retail space. Is there --

Perreault: Yes. The question I was trying to have answered is are the -- the bubbles that show a commercial there in the northwest and potentially commercial light industry in the northeast, is that enough space to build 45,000 square feet or would the applicant need to use the commercial multi-family flex space? I guess that's what I'm trying to understand is when they came up with this calculation of 45,000 square feet commercial retail, is that just supposed to fit in that northeast corner that's purple? Is that spread out over the whole --

Allen: The purple --

Perreault: -- development?

Allen: Each of those colors in each of those areas on the concept plan -- you can't see it, because the prints too small on the screen, but there are notes on each color coded thing saying how many square feet, approximately, is proposed.

Perreault: Okay.

Allen: And I assume that's a multi-family -- or a multi-story, excuse me, square footage. But it is a concept at this time, but that's what they have guesstimated to fit on those areas.

Lorcher: Any comments about this development?

Rust: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Rust.

Rust: Yeah. I appreciate the effort that's gone into this. I think Touchmark has been aware of them as the business for a number of years. This has been a long-term development. I mean the history -- it's not often we get a history that starts in the '90s and I think there is, obviously, a lot of thought and care that has gone into the development of the existing development. The fact that they had a really well attended town hall as part of their community and we didn't see anybody from that town hall here tonight, I think just speaks to the overall level of care that's gone into this. This is not a development that they are looking to slam things together in the next three or four years. This is going to be phased. This is going to be thoughtful. I'm inclined to give deference to Touchmark and give them wide latitude to fill this out as they see fit. This is they have been good stewards of this property for 25 years now and so I would be inclined to recommend approval to the Council and grant them the three conditions that they are asking for. The wrought iron fence. Let's look at that side connection, but not necessarily require that and, then, give them the flexibility that they are asking for on the commercial slash multi-family piece. I think that they have, again, been good stewards. They are the kind of people that we want to partner with as the city and I want to give them as much latitude as we can.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you. Any other comments? I like the idea that there is a hotel. My -- my -- my mom lives in an adult -- or a senior community back in Illinois and she doesn't let me stay with her, so -- but, then, she is like but I want you close by, but there is nothing there. So having a hotel close by is -- would be a benefit to your community I would think and, plus, the proximity of the hotel -- you know -- excuse me. The hospital would also benefit from that as well. The only thing that kind of threw me off today was the labeling and I'm sure we will come up with some good terms before Council. You know, the market has changed quite a bit since 1995 or '3 or whenever you kind of started this and my only concern is that, though, the people who already live there -- I would hate to see them purchase a property and committed to one thing and it turns into something else with the understanding that things do evolve. So, like if the golf course isn't working and maybe only ten percent of your community uses it, but, then, you change it to something else and, then, now 80 percent of your community can use it. So, I totally get that part as well. Because this is over the next 15 years and it's not going to be all done tomorrow, I'm inclined to approve it as well, with those conditions, so that as -- over the next 15 years as things change and as the market deems necessary they have the flexibility to be able to serve our community.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: I think I generally direction on -- on that direction -- or that's where I'm heading. There are two kind of things that I'm a little bit not -- you know, not the biggest fan of. I think there is -- we are leaving a bit of an open question on that connection -- on that -- that eastern side that I don't love kind of leaving unanswered. I'm okay granting

deference. It seems like this is, again, a longer term period -- you know, longer term development, but there is just some unease that gives me. The only other thing is -- that I recall from -- kind of -- is that -- a question for staff I guess, just having seen the image of the proposed fencing. Along the canal there needs -- does there not need to be like an open view for that fencing or is that -- is -- would you say that that -- what's pictured is adequate in this open view, since there are kind of slats? It doesn't -- it seems kind of obstructed to me.

Allen: Madam Chair, if I could respond. So, our code requires either open vision or -- typically open vision along waterways and that's for -- so, that the irrigation district can maintain their -- their ditches and their easement areas and burn -- burn weeds if necessary and vinyl fences are kind of frowned on along there. I wasn't aware that there was existing vinyl fence along there and I'm not sure that the city ever approved that fencing. Anyway, that's the reason for the requirement for wrought iron. I'm not sure what the metal picket fencing is that the applicant is possibly -- one of the two options they proposed to me that would be the same, but I haven't seen a picture of that, so I'm unsure.

Smith: So, Madam Chair, I guess what I would say is an addendum to maybe that is that just ensuring that whatever goes there along the canal might be -- is open vision in compliance with code is my only maybe sticking point. But beyond that I think I'm -- I'm in agreement with everything. Yeah.

Allen: Madam Chair. And just to add a little bit to that, if -- if that's the motion you make that would allow the possibility of chain link fencing along there. So, typically we don't allow that. More for esthetic reasons than anything, but, anyway, just wanted to clarify. Thank you.

Lorcher: Does the irrigation allow -- district. Thank you. Allow chain link fence?

Allen: As far as I know, yes.

Lorcher: Okay. So, maybe where it ensures that the fencing complies with city code, whatever that happens to be?

Smith: Yeah. Madam Chair, I would be supportive of that.

Lorcher: Okay. Any other comments from Commissioners in regard to this or I will take a motion.

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: So, I agree with -- with the open -- or that the fencing that city code and keeping that wrought iron. With the townhomes versus the multi-family, I kind of got the

feeling -- and I apologize if this is incorrect -- that the townhomes were just kind of apartments, but the outside looked different and so I don't know if that actually is the case or really is a home that has multiple levels and it's just attached. I -- if -- if it is apartment style, but just has an exterior that looks different, I would encourage the applicant to maybe reconsider that, because I'm pretty sure that Council will -- will want to have that conversation. I just -- I think it would be good for the applicant to be really specific and distinct about the difference between the townhomes and the multi-family, how they are going to look, how that -- how they are going to be lived in and how they really are going to be distinctive from each other and, then, act as that buffer. For me that wasn't as clear maybe as it could have been. I realize we are just doing a concept plan here, but, you know, it is important, because you -- we are defining specific things that are going in those bubbles. I'm also sad to hear the golf course may -- or part of the golf course may go away, but I understand, as the chairwoman said, that if that's not an efficient use of that space for the residents, then, I understand wanting to make the change. What I would like to see is whatever acreage that is turned into villas, that that -- an equivalent amount of that be created in the new -- the new areas and I don't mean whether it meets the 15 percent qualified open space, I mean an actual acre-for-acre replacement. I would like to really see that. I think that that would be honoring to the existing residents that had that expectation of a certain amount of space to use, so I assume that is a condition we can request and, then, I would like to say -- I would like to see a follow up on the concern over the old tree. I would recommend that the applicant have some sort of response for City Council on that. Hesitant to put a condition on it, but never -- never try to put a condition on the -- had a few applications that have requested a tree to remain, but I agree with -- with the neighbor that that's a really important piece of nature for our -- for our ecosystem really. So, yeah, those are all the things I wanted to mention. Thank you.

Lorcher: Okay. Any other comments?

Stoll: Madam Chair, if I may?

Lorcher: Commissioner Stoll.

Stoll: I have watched this development sadly for many years and I remember thinking that I was way too young and now I'm --

Lorcher: Right there, uh?

Stoll: I'm at that age and looking at my own mother in law's place down in Arizona, we are seeing a transition where it is getting young -- it's no longer 55 plus, they are going down to 40 plus with the market and in some cases it's causing a reinvigoration of the communities and a greater dynamic with the folks that are living there. Following up on your comment regarding the hotel, my mother in law probably would not be appreciative of the hotel. I would have been appreciative of the hotel --

Lorcher: Right.



Stoll: -- many times, but overall I support what the applicant has submitted and I think there is some aspects of it that I really do like. I caution them to make sure that they preserve the open space and maximize that and the opportunities for the residents. The one that I was surprised was the comments from ACHD and ITD regarding the traffic impact. Franklin and Eagle Road are congested roadways in that area and that they felt that there was -- in one case with ITD there was no comments provided and with ACHD they said it was added level of service E and that -- that was acceptable and that there would be negligible impacts regarding the development. We have a lot of units that are going to be going in here. It's going to have an impact and something that our community is going to need the leadership from the transportation agencies on providing input to the land use agencies on the traffic impacts. But based on the comments that we have today I'm inclined to recommend to Council approval with the conditions that staff have laid out. I -- I'm okay with saying -- allowing the condition that they can work out the 27 foot drop on potential connection. I have concerns regarding wrought iron fence versus not wrought iron fence. I think we need to make sure that -- we only have this opportunity to put in the type of treatments that we want and what was put in or -- and approved or not approved 27 some odd years ago doesn't necessarily have to dictate what we have now.

Lorcher: Right.

Stoll: So, that --

Lorcher: Okay. Any comments? Are you good? Oh, you already commented. Okay. All right. Let me give this a go. After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to City Council for File No. H-2025-0012 as presented in the staff report to include ensuring the fence complies with city code. The flex space to be -- or the -- yeah. The flex space for commercial and residential be fluid. Define the word townhome as multi-family residential and include an exhibit for open space without the golf course. Did I forget anything?

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: The road connection?

Pearreault: Could you just clarify -- staff have recommended that the flex space not be flex space. Are you saying that we are recommending that it's -- that it is?

Lorcher: Because this is, in my opinion, a five to 15 year build out, that the market may deem that residential ten years from now might be more advantageous to our community than the commercial. So, I'm recommending that -- that the flex space be open to either. But that's my motion. And, then, we wanted to add work with the irrigation district for a connective -- was it a connective street? Do you remember?

Smith: Madam Chair, regarding the -- like that cross-connection --

Lorcher: Yeah.

Smith: -- I mean I think the applicant was asking for just the ability to continue working with staff. I guess I think what I would like to -- what I would like to have more in terms of what we can require is maybe something more fleshed out before it gets to Council specifically. I'm not trying to lock them into anything, but I would like maybe Council to be able to discuss the different possibilities more specifically than kicking it down the road.

Lorcher: Okay. One second. Okay. I'm going to try this again, because I have my notes. All right. The modifications include the -- ensure the fence complies with city code. That the commercial space be recommended, but be flexible to residential for long-term future growth. Define townhomes as multi-family residential. Include an exhibit for open space without the golf course and work with the irrigation district and the city for connectivity to the east boundary.

Allen: Madam Chair, may I clarify if your motion included any changes to the applicant's request for the office use in the southwest corner of the site to be allowed to possibly develop with townhome uses?

Lorcher: I did say the commercial to be flexible for commercial or residential.

Allen: Okay.

Lorcher: Does that -- does that cover that?

Allen: There is commercial, as well as the office. There is commercial along Franklin --

Lorcher: Right.

Allen: -- and, then, the office was along the west boundary of the site. So, you meant for both -- both of those areas?

Lorcher: I did.

Allen: Thank you.

Lorcher: Okay. Do I have a second?

Rust: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to approve File No. H-2025-0012 with the modifications listed. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Lorcher: Took us a minute to get there, but we got there. Okay. There was a lot going on. All right. We have another one this evening for H-2025-0019 for Gramercy Townhomes for a rezone, preliminary plat, and DA modification and, Bill, if you can give us less than five minutes for a little break we will go ahead and get -- and that way you can get it loaded up.

Parsons: That would be fine. Thank you.

(Recess: 7:28 p.m. to 7:34 p.m.)

**5. Public Hearing for Gramercy Townhomes (H-2025-0019) by Elton Development Company, located at 1873, 1925 and 2069 Wells Ave.**

- A. Request: Rezone of 6.98 acres of land from the C-G zone to the TN-R zone.
- B. Request: Preliminary Plat for 82 buildable lots and 8 common lots.
- C. Request: Development Agreement Modification to establish a new concept plan and remove the age restriction on the property.

Lorcher: Okay. Let's carry on for Gramercy and we will begin with the staff report. Thanks, Bill.

Parsons: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. So, last project before you this evening is the Gramercy Townhome project. The site consists of 6.98 acres of land, currently zoned C-G in the city. This -- this project has a lot of history as well. This started in 2006 and, then, with this particular property that we are discussing this evening was actually approved by this body in 2021 for an age restricted 164 multi-family development. So, the applicant is here this evening to discuss modifying the development agreement, rezoning the property and platting it to build a townhome development. So, not going to confuse you with this presentation, this is a true townhome development.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you.

Parsons: What they say that -- what we are calling townhomes are actually townhomes. It meets --

Lorcher: All right. Very good.

Parsons: -- the definition. So, you can see on the future land map that's before you this evening this area is also part of a larger mixed use regional area. I think Nick did a good job putting some analysis in there. So, typically, when we are looking at mixed use developments, as Sonya mentioned in her last presentation, we are looking for a mix of uses. Well, you can see here everything around Eagle Road and Overland is

mixed use regional. So, we took a broader lens in looking at this and we said, okay, let's do some comparison here. So, we know there is a mix of employment, mix of retail, mix of residential units in the area. So, essentially, although this project is coming in with a townhome -- as a townhome project, when you look at the greater good -- the greater area it has all of those things that are envisioned with the -- by the Comprehensive Plan, so, therefore, this development in itself is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The other items that we look at in mixed use regional areas is density. So, in a mixed use regional designated area we are looking between 60 and 40 dwelling units to the acre. What's unique about this project this evening is the applicant is actually rezoning from a commercial district to a Traditional Neighborhood Residential district, which is called TN-R is the acronym and, then, in that particular zoning district we want two different residential types -- product types in there. So, either a townhome, single family attached, single family detached. But, again, in our staff report we made it clear to both the Commission and Council that there is other residential happening in the area and as part of the Gramercy project, so although this may have one style of residential, overall the rezone and what's developed in the area and the mixed use regional area is still consistent and, therefore, we are recommending the TN-R zone with the one residential use that's proposed before you this evening. See if this thing will advance for me here. Here we go. Here is the property highlighted as well. You can see it's adjacent to Mountain View High School on the west and, then, also to the south what makes this a great amenity or neighborhood for the city is the fact that it's in close proximity to a city park directly to the south and, then, the applicant will be tying the development into the existing ten foot multi-use pathway that you see. That red dashed line is the multi-use pathway that's built within that development, allowing residents who live here to walk to that -- that amenity that's currently constructed. Here, again, is the rezone boundary. Again, rezoning from C-G to TN-R. This is the proposed site plan slash plat and we are looking at 82 residential lots and eight common lots on -- on approximately seven acres. The other unique thing about TN-R residential zoning standards is we like to have alley-loaded product is the primary push in that particular zoning district. It's a dimension -- part of the dimensional standards, where it's -- the preference is alley loaded, which this is. The applicant's also providing parkways in front of the units, which is also consistent with that requested zoning district and they are also providing traffic calming through bulb outs in front of the units along some of the commercial drive aisles and that will also allow for additional guest parking or parking for the development and, then, you can see here in the central MEW, that's within the middle of the development, there is also overflow parking. So, the applicant is providing additional 46 parking spaces on this site to allow -- account for guest parking or overflow parking. It's not required by code, but the applicant's done that based on staff's recommendation. As the applicant moves through the final platting process they will have to -- currently everything that provides access to these lots is a commercial drive aisle or will be, but as part of the final plat process staff has recommended that they plat these -- or apply for a private street application, so that we can name them so we can address the units appropriately. The applicant will also have to work with the adjacent property owners to the east, because there are existing drive aisles that are stubbed to this property. The recorded Gramercy plat does grant cross-access to this development. However, it's an easement and not a public -- a private

street. So, the applicant will have to work with those potential business owners on naming one of those commercial drive aisles, so that they have -- the private street does touch a public street. So, that's something that will -- again, we will be looking for at the time of final -- final platting. Because the applicant is rezoning to a commercial district and it is -- townhomes are considered single family, they are required to provide open space -- 15 percent open space and to be exact in the plat before you is 18.8 percent. So, they are actually providing more than what the code requires. They are also providing the required amenities with the central parkway -- walkways that you see through the central part of the development and there is also a dog area. So, waste stations, which counts as amenities for the subdivision. So, they are meeting the point requirements for amenities and they are also meeting the -- exceeding the open space requirements of the code. Here is the landscape plan, just kind of highlighting what's qualified and being counted towards that required 18 percent per city code. One thing that the applicant will be working with the city on is typically when we have these micro path lots or these walkways between units we typically see those in common lots. In this particular case the applicant does have some site constraints that they need some flexibility on how to make their units fit on some of the lots and, therefore, they are -- some of the micro path areas will be basically easements on the plat -- on the lots versus a common lot, which is allowed by city code. So, just something different that we don't see, but they have been conditioned to provide those easements on the plat, so that anyone reviewing plans for this development will know that the units cannot encroach within those pedestrian easements that they will be depicting on the plat. So, the plat may not show the 15 foot wide -- it will show the easement, but the landscape plan does show the 15 foot landscape buffer and landscaping required per code. And, then, because this development is part of the Gramercy development a lot of the architectural style in that development does have brick on it and so the applicant's -- when we have met with the applicant during our pre-application meetings and working on their design of the townhome units, we have encouraged them to incorporate some brick on the dwelling unit, so it does blend in with the rest of the Gramercy development and you can see they have added that wainscoting on the ground -- ground floor here. So, again, I -- overall staff is supportive of the rezone of the plat and the MDA, the development agreement modification. Before I came to the hearing I had a chance to look at the public record. It looks like we did get public comment from one of the adjacent neighbors and she had concerns with the traffic. A little misunderstanding on the density. Just wanted to provide some clarification on the record. This particular development is actually less dense than the previous one. So, we are actually 164 going down to 82, so we are actually providing less dwelling units. Where it could get confusing for residents and for maybe even you and Council as we go forward, is typically in a TN-R zone there is -- the density is based off a net density and not gross density and really the difference there is we take out the open space in the roads and that's how we are left with net. So, this particular development, if you look at it on paper, is it at 19 dwelling units net density, but it's approximately 12 dwelling units to the acre if you were looking at the gross. So, again, meets the TN-R zone that they are requesting, complies with the comp plan and it's less dense than what was previously approved. So, anyways, the resident also brought up concerns with utilities, parks, schools, police -- all the typical conversations you have had in the past with other

residents. So, again, this is what was originally envisioned for Gramercy. It was a mixed use development. They are just contributing and reducing the density. So, again, staff is recommend -- recommending approval of this project and I will stand for any questions you may have.

Lorcher: Okay. Would the applicant like to come forward? Hi.

Chidester: Hi. Mike Chidester. 2541 East Gala Street here in Meridian. 83642. Good to be with you tonight. Do you have the presentation? Thank you. Appreciate the chance to be with you. I'm with -- Mike Chidester with Elton Development. We are a local -- local development company. We specialize in -- in senior living. There is a lot of our work, which explains a previous application for this -- this site. Also do townhomes, some large lot subdivisions, multi-family. I will try and be brief tonight. I do want to give just a brief history of this site to give you an idea of kind of what's happened on -- on this site over the years. Principals of our property -- or our company have been working on this since 2014. Initially -- and in that time in 2014 and '15 this is actually a potential site for the new south Meridian YMCA and having senior housing be one of the things that our principals work on, we were looking at potentially with the YMCA and St. Luke's partnering for a facility here, we were looking at doing potentially a facility where we could mix generations and have a senior housing facility adjacent to the Y. As you know in 2018 the Y opened at -- at the current location and so between 2016 and '19 there really wasn't much development there. One parcel was owned by Luke's, one by the Y and one by a charter school. In 2020 we started looking at this as a potential location for a 55 plus apartment complex. We went through the work to do it. We hit -- but, unfortunately, a number of things made it so that project just wasn't feasible. A lot of the difficulties of cost inflation, et cetera, and, then, just some market dynamics and so we -- we worked on that, but -- but really pulled back from that project. But over the years I just want to say that since then we have -- we have looked at concepts of -- the images here you have of 55 plus apartments, we have looked at flex industrial, we have looked at office, we have looked at destination resident. A lot of retail. A lot of different things at this site and it's just been -- the biggest challenge for these parcels in particular is shown here. That red line is a principal arterial, Overland Road, good for traffic and visibility. The blue line is Wells, which, again, is a collector. And these parcels are just off the beaten path enough that with every concept we talk to visibility is the first thing that comes up and, you know, access is okay, but visibility is very difficult and it just doesn't work for a number of things. That doesn't look too far on that image, but the closest point between Wells and our property is 220 feet. So, it's just a challenge that way. So, that's why we have -- you know, the concern always when I come before this board is -- these are commercial. We are changing it to residential. Is that -- is that an issue. That just gives -- I wanted to give you a little context of the efforts that have been made to look at this in the C-G zoning. High level view. You seem to get into the site plan a little bit more, Bill's done a good job of naming it, but I -- one of the challenges of developing this was we have all these access points -- existing roads that we had to tie into and so it took a little bit of work around and I credit staff, actually, for helping us get this to the best place we can. We had a meeting with Bill and Nick and they made some recommendations and, ultimately, what

we came to was we were trying to do what's -- what's wanted in the TN-R zone, which is the alley load. With the exception of that center area we -- we realized we had room to do something larger and so, really, the -- the soul of this project I think is that large common area there. To give you an idea it's -- it's about 300 feet long. It's essentially the exact -- within a few feet the same length as the -- the plaza out in front of this building. A little bit -- not quite as wide, but -- so, it will be a great thing. Dog park. Great amenity. It's the perfect size for the neighborhood Thanksgiving Day turkey bowl. So, we think that's a -- that's a great amenity that we worked hard to have. On-street parking was another thing that we made an effort to have, simply because we all know when places are under parked. We meet the code of four -- four stalls per unit, but that additional on-street parking we think will be good. The red line you see in here, as Bill mentioned, is the connection to the multi-use pathway. And, again, we have some -- knowing we all love our animals, we have some amenities there and I would simply say at the bottom right corner you will see a connection to Gordon Harris Park. That's -- you don't notice it, but if you pull back a little bit it's about a five minute walk to an 11 acre park, which I think will be a huge amenity and even the ball fields being adjacent to this property gave a really nice open feel for this. So, we felt it was -- there is some things that will be nice for residents who want to live here. These are for sale townhomes as we said. These are the real thing. Three and four bedroom units. Three story designed. Bill had mentioned this -- we have worked hard to get this design to fit Gramercy with the exception -- I will say we have not gone to the minutia of dialing the colors perfectly. This doesn't -- this green doesn't work perfectly within -- within Gramercy. We will be working to do that. We work closely with Greg Johnson and Taylor Merrill, who are the folks who would have to approve the design within Gramercy and if -- if you want an idea of really what we are trying to do, this is a project that our principals completed in Garden City called Parkway Station. The design is -- is not exactly the same, but about probably 90 percent on the exterior. So, that will give you an idea of the type of project that we are -- that we are trying to do and with that I will stand for questions. Well, actually, I do want to -- I should mention I -- Hethe Clark, sorry, with Clark Wardle here and I think he wants to -- I'm going to have him -- I'm going to ask him to come up and speak to some of the technicalities.

Clark: Hi, everybody. Hethe Clark. 251 East Front Street. Commissioner Garrett looked bored, so I thought I would come tap dance for a second. I did want to just emphasize one of the points that Bill made there and just because -- again, because I know how concerned folks can be about pulling back from a C-G zone. So, I just wanted to emphasize the -- a couple of things. First on the comp plan, Bill knows that one of my favorite parts of the comp plan is that we only look at these mixed use regional areas between the lines of the arterials. I think that's not the greatest policy, but in this case that's what it is and so looking at that what you can see on the left side here is the area that we are talking about. I decided to pull out a little bit, so you can see both sides of Eagle Road and you can see that there is a really nice mix of uses that's already there and the staff did the calculation for the area that's bounded on the north by Overland and on the east by Eagle and with this project in the residential it gets to about 25 percent. So, you are very much within that ten to 30 percent that the -- the mixed use regional area calls for. And, then, just on the TN-R -- and I'm not sure where

the red stuff is. It's -- I'm just I guess trying to have a party up here throwing -- throwing confetti. We did do the TN-R after conversations with staff. We felt like that was the most appropriate thing. The things that I would add to what Bill said is that there is existing TN-R in that location and so this adds a little bit more buffer, so you go from C-G to TN-R to R-15, so we thought that that was great. And, then, again, the emphasis on the alley load. They have done the alley load on them -- on the -- those two blocks. Alley load, as you guys know and as you have heard me talk about before, is complicated and a little bit hard and -- and so I think the effort that went into putting the alley load in here should be commended, because it really is an effort to try to make sure that we are doing it the way that the city would like to with the planning. And so with that I just would emphasize, as we wrap up, that we are in agreement with all the conditions of the staff report. I think it's a -- it's a good thing that, you know, we had these initial conversations with staff, we reoriented one of the blocks and when we got to the right design, the conditions just kind of fell into place and so we are happy about all that. So, we are happy to answer any other questions and not prolong the matter, so --

Lorcher: Commissioners, do we have any questions for Hethe at this time?

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: True to form I have several. I don't love the statistic that shows that 52 percent of the site is paved area. Don't love that. But I understand what -- I understand why it's happening with the private streets. But when I saw that I was like, oh, wow. Okay. So, my questions -- maybe more suggestions -- are one of the things we consistently see with the narrow private streets and, then, you have the narrow alley, are challenges with trash cans on trash day and then -- and, then, parking larger vehicles, like a furniture delivery truck, Norco trucks and so I think that the extra parking that you have put is fantastic. Love seeing that -- all that guest parking. Would it be possible to put a space on -- on each private street that's like a bigger parking space for like a larger truck or a cargo truck where some of those delivery trucks can drop off at there? I mean I live in a small neighborhood and every day there is, you know, Amazon and, you know, big delivery trucks and so I see them constantly and that's one of the challenges we see with these type of developments. So, would really like to see that happen and, then, the other question I have is about market demand. So, I can see how this would be a really good development in Garden City, but there is -- I don't know if you are familiar with another three story unit -- or three story unit development off of Ten Mile and Franklin called the Entrada Farms. That's a rental community. It's not -- it's not for sale, but they had a real struggle getting those rented because of the three stories. So, can you tell us how -- what you have run into and whether you see that this will be a successful project in terms of --

Clark: Well, maybe I will take the first two and, then, I will --



Perreault: -- getting that sold.

Clark: -- Mike take the third one. So, the first one on the paved area that is inherent with the idea of the TN-R's promotion of alley load. So, alley loads do include more paved area. One of your challenges with alley load is you get the heat areas in the back. So, one of the things that we have done is we have worked with staff and we are going to do some alternative compliance on this, is to add some -- some space that we are going to shrink a couple of those parking spaces -- or the drive aisle spaces back there and add a little more landscaping to try to break that up a little bit. Second item on the parking -- I think you will find that with alley load on the front most of those deliveries come in through the front and so that issue is not quite as big of a concern as you might in some other traditional -- see in some traditional product, but we are more than happy to look at that through the -- with the direction of the Council and, then, I will turn it over to Mike on the market.

Chidester: Yeah. It's -- it's a good -- it's a good question. When we looked at doing townhomes here one of the challenges, here again as I mentioned, was the existing streets and so we had to look at what we could fit within -- within those parameters. A two story townhome requires usually a deeper, you know, a deeper lot and so that was one of the things that challenged -- that challenged us. There will be buyers who are not interested. It's probably someone who wants to be more central valley, maybe younger families, maybe more single. So, we -- we have looked hard at who our target market is and there will be some folks that I think will say, yeah, that's -- that's not for us, because -- because of that. We have done some things like modifying the plan that you saw there in -- in Garden City to allow three bedrooms on the top unit, as opposed to two, so you could have a family with parents and a couple of kids in there. So, we have tried to do some things to adapt for folks who might, you know, be more concerned about that or having that first floor bedroom that isn't really as usable. So, we have tried to do some things to adapt to that. You are not -- you are not wrong, there will be people that won't like that as much. You have -- in Pine you have some two story things, but we feel comfortable in the long-term success; right? So, it's a good question.

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: In that regard I just want to say I really appreciate seeing the three and four bedroom options, because they are very hard to find with attached housing and there is a big need for it, so --

Chidester: Good. That's good to hear.

Lorcher: Any other questions for the applicant? Thank you. Madam Clerk, do we have anybody signed up to testify?

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. No one has signed up.

Lorcher: Anybody in Chambers? Mike or Hethe, do you have anything else you would like to add before we close the public hearing? Okay. May I get a motion to close the public hearing, please?

Smith: So moved.

Garrett: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing for Gramercy. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Lorcher: I know that the city has expressed before that we don't necessarily like to go from commercial back to residential, but your comments of the lack of visibility where this is kind of tucked into both residential and a commercial little neighborhood, it does make sense in this particular case, which is why we do each application individually. So, I appreciate that. I have gotten lost back here quite a bit on the weekends and it's actually a nice little spot, because it's a little bit hidden off, it's -- it's near Overland, but it's not quite on Overland. As long as you disclose to your -- your buyers that there will be baseball and band practice over at Rocky Mountain High School and that they should not complain about it, because they are moving in there we will be fine. I -- there was this one article about some family wanting to sue the city of Boise because the pickleball courts were too loud. But you kind of should have known that before you moved in. But I digress. Anyway, I think this is good. Since you are in a New York state of mind here, a couple suggestions for your private streets. You can do Central Park Drive. You can do Manhattan Drive or -- so get a whole New York vibe thing going over there, too. But this looks great. It's a great little in-fill. It's a nice little spot in -- in this kind of area and even though it's three stories I think they will be -- there will be a good market for it. Any other comments as far as this application is concerned?

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: The only thing I have to say -- and I understand why TN-R and why kind of this density was aimed for is -- one thing as -- I guess as a generality is when I look at how close this is to points of interest and to the freeway, thinking of transit-oriented development, part of me almost wishes this were a little bit more dense, which might not be something that -- you know, that might be an evil sentence to utter in some circles, but I understand this. I think it's -- anytime I hear Hethe Clark say we are in condition -- or in agreement with all the conditions of the staff report it's a good day. So, I fully support this. You know, I think these kinds of areas -- I mean I would like to see a conversation start to be for how can we increase density in these strategic areas that

are closer to the really high volume corridors, but as far as the constraints they are dealing with here I think this is a great development.

Lorcher: Any other comments? A motion?

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: I think this is also a very fitting development for this location. A lot of the acreage in this whole Gramercy area has sat surprisingly -- I remember when it was originally developed and I worked in private finance, so yes -- and I appreciate -- I wanted to say I appreciate the large open space. It's not a requirement. But if there were more -- more opportunities for activity -- I know there is a dog park, maybe there could be something added that is a little more active feature, but, again, can't require that, so -- but thank you for putting so much thought into this and trying to answer our questions before we have them. Hethe has come to attempt to do that every time and I appreciate it.

Rust: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Rust, yes.

Rust: After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend approval of File No. H-2025-0019 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of July 17th, 2025.

Garrett: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to approve Gramercy Townhomes. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Lorcher: I will take one more motion.

Stoll: Move to adjourn.

Rust: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to adjourn. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries. Thank you, gentlemen, very much. Have a good night.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS. )

APPROVED

\_\_\_\_\_  
MARIA LORCHER - CHAIRMAN

\_\_\_\_\_|\_\_\_\_\_|\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK