

McCarvel: Okay. Then motion approved.

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

5. Public Hearing for 1160 W. Ustick Annexation (H-2021-0092) by The Housing Company, Located at 1160 W. Ustick Rd., on the north side of Ustick Rd. Between N. Linder Rd. and N. Venable Ave.

- A. Request: Annexation and Zoning of 4.54 acres of land with a request for the R-15 zoning district for the future purpose of constructing an affordable housing, multi-family residential project.

McCarvel: Okay. Next on the agenda is H-2021-0092, 1160 West Ustick Annexation, and we will begin with the staff report.

Dodson: Thank you, Madam Chair. I will let anybody who is leaving just clear out for a couple of seconds. Okay. Thank you. As noted, the application -- the next application before you tonight is for 1160 West Ustick. The site consists of 3.81 acres of land, currently zoned RUT in the county and per the application name is located at 1160 West Ustick. It's near the quarter mile, but -- you know, the quarter mile and a half mile mark of -- on Ustick -- on the north side of Ustick, west of Venable, east of Linder. The applications before you tonight our annexation and zoning only. You are a recommending body on that of 4.54 acres of land, with a request for the R-15 zoning district for the future purpose of constructing an affordable housing multi-family residential project by The Housing Company. So, the discrepancy in the property size of 3.8 and 4.5 is to do -- is because of the right of way. Right of way has to go to the centerline of the road, so you have that extra area. So, again, the property is 3.8 acres. West Ustick Road abuts the site along the entire southern boundary and it is a relatively odd shaped parcel. It is widest at its west boundary and smallest at its east -- east boundary, approximately 390 feet for the west and 90 feet on the east. There are no public streets currently abutting the site, except for approximately 11 feet of right of way at the very northwest corner of the site. At the northeast corner of the site there is a relatively large residential lot -- I will go back to the maps. You can -- that's a lot and, then, you have just a corner of right of way there. The residential lot in the northeast is 3335 North Cooper Lane, that was annexed and zoned as part of the Woodburn Subdivision. That is directly north. That contains -- or sorry. That does not take access through that subdivision, but does have a stub road to their north property boundary. Instead, this property takes access via a private road easement through the subject site out to Ustick. Between this parcel and the Woodburn Subdivision and runs along the -- almost the entire northern property boundary is a common lot owned by the Woodburn HOA and contains an irrigation facility, the Lemp Canal, and is piped. It does not appear that this area is currently fenced off from this parcel. The majority of the adjacent parcels are single family residential, with the exception of the C-C property directly to the east, which, again, only share about 90 feet of frontage with shared boundary. That property, Settlers Square, recently received development agreement modification approval to include multi-family townhomes on the north half of their site, while keeping commercial pad sites along Ustick. Cross-access

was required of Settlers Square and staff is requiring this cross-access be reciprocated and the applicant does agree with this. In general, the property is a relatively odd shaped parcel with its own set of challenges derived from previous planning decisions, its dimensions and its general location. As noted -- well, I guess I didn't know note it, but the subject site does contain two future land use designations, mixed use community and medium density residential. Mixed use community is the brown. The yellow is the medium density. Staff finds the proposed use to be in alignment with the anticipated uses in both designations. Furthermore, future land use designations are not always parcel specific when more than one exist on the same project area. In short, the city has allowed applicants to utilize one or both of the designations for their project. However, in order for the proposed 52 affordable multi-family units to meet the gross density requirements, the project must be analyzed against the mixed use community designation, because it allows dwellings at a gross density of six to 15 units per acre. To note, the proposed use for this is multi-family, so it will require a future conditional use permit in the requested R-15 zoning district and will be subject to specific use standards in the UDC. The subject mixed use community area is located around a mid mile corridor and has minimal commercial uses currently developed. Previous applications in the area have allowed a reduction in commercial area due to the viability of commercial being -- or sorry. Lost my place. Due to the viability of commercial being lower in these mid mile locations than on the arterial intersections, like Linder and Ustick or Meridian and Ustick. Staff does anticipate that most of the remaining unannexed land to the east that is part of this mixed use community bubble will be commercial, because they directly abut Ustick Road, which the unannexed parcels are these ones here and I believe one right here. In addition, as seen on the future land use map, the area to the north of the subject parcel was specifically carved out of the MUC bubble to allow for more traditional residential uses. This choice, coupled with the existing stub street locations and the larger annexed, but not redeveloped parcels, one to the west and one to the northeast, they have created a site that cannot viably meet the fundamental goals and policies outlined in the comp plan for the previously envisioned mixed use designation. Minimal opportunities exist for shared spaces with other MUC parcels to the east and even cross-access to the C-C parcel is only attainable through 90 feet of shared property line. Because of these constraints to the site and nearby area, staff does not find it feasible for the applicant to meet all of the mixed use policies, provide additional commercial area, and should, instead, be an affordable multi-family housing project. Again, the proposed use is multi-family residential, but affordable housing. The applicant is proposing this project with a couple of notable differences from traditional multi-family seen elsewhere in the City of Meridian. First, the submitted concept plan and elevations show six-plexes and eight-plexes that are no more than two stories in height. They are accessed from one side of the building and look similar to a townhome, instead of a garden style apartment. Secondly, the applicant proposes this multi-family product to be affordable housing in the form of deed restriction rents -- deed restricted rents for the entire site. Staff finds that the specific use of affordable housing, no matter the type, is a greatly needed use within the city and is in itself its own residential use. Staff has worked with the city attorney's office to propose adequate development agreement provisions to ensure that the proposed use of affordable housing is maintained on site. Outside of the proposed use the concept plan itself should be analyzed against the Comprehensive Plan. The

submitted concept plan depicts six six-plex units and two eight-plex units. The eight-plex units are along Ustick, the rest of the buildings are six-plex buildings. They, again, are all two story in height. The site is shown with a looping drive aisle due to its relative odd shape of being wider at the west end and the drive aisle has parking on both sides, with the clubhouse and playground area in the center of the project for pretty equal access by all future residents. At least three of the homes closest to the subject site in the Woodburn Subdivision on the north are two story in height. I believe there is five properties that abut it. Three of those five are two stories, the other two are single story, but they do have the common lot of the Lemp Canal between them, so there is a pretty far physical separation between their back fence and the proposed project. In addition, the applicant is showing open space directly adjacent to the single family home in the northeast that takes access via the private drive. Along the west boundary the applicant is showing a 15 foot buffer that would be adjacent to a future road extension Northwest 11th for a majority of this shared property line. The existing single family home on this adjacent property, the one to the west, is located on the west side of their lot and is approximately one hundred feet from the shared property line. So, that's overall 115 from the proposed buildings. Therefore, staff finds that the applicant has provided appropriate building massing, open space locations, and buffer widths and appropriate transition of the residential use and density to the adjacent residential uses. I would like to go -- jump forward a little bit just to see the future right of way. As noted there is a small area of existing right-of-way in the northwest corner of the site -- or -- yes. Northwest corner of the site and it is for Northwest 11th Avenue. As you can tell there is a very small area that abuts the property. Obviously, extending it into this site would make the most sense, because of the existing right of way and a potential issues with the adjacent property owner. It is anticipated that this road would be extended wholly on the property to the west, except for this sliver of right-of-way, which is this exhibit that ACHD provided and the applicant has been -- is -- has agreed to with ACHD as well. The property to the west has an additional public street stub to their west boundary from Tetherow Crossing that is currently under development. Code does call for cross-access between parcels, but because of the proposed development and the site constraints staff does not find it necessary to require a stub to the west boundary for future connectivity. Further, staff finds if a connection were to be required it would promote cross-access through the drive aisle that is meant to serve future residents of this site and would, essentially, create a thoroughfare for residential traffic through the drive aisle, rather than through a public road. Commission and Council should determine if cross-access to the west is, in fact, needed in spite of these factors. There is one existing structure on the property that appears to be some kind of concrete structure -- I don't have any pictures of it, but it will be removed upon the project development. In addition, there is existing five foot wide detached sidewalk along Ustick Road that will be protected and maintained during construction and any driveway curb cuts will also be closed in lieu of the proposed access. Initial review of the conceptual elevations depicts a six-plex building with varying group profiles and varying -- and varying materials, including stone, fiber cement lap siding, and board and batten in different layouts. The elevations also depict the tallest portion of the buildings to face inwards towards the site and helps with building massing facing both Ustick, as well as the adjacent residential properties. Access is proposed to West Ustick, which is an arterial road, via construction of a new local street segment and this is a very short

segment. It aligns with North Blairmore on the south side of West Ustick Road, which is why ACHD wants it here. It extends from Ustick and, then, terminates at the north boundary for a total length of only about a hundred linear feet. Access to the multi-family is clearly off of this local road in the form of a driveway connection for the drive aisle. All parking and access to the proposed units are off of this drive aisle that loops through the site. As with other projects when there is a private easement that is shared on a property, that is a point of discussion and in my staff report I went into more detail, but in general the actual location does not depict it here, which is where it is. It actually is along these boundaries. So, all they are going to do is just maintain the existing easement, shift a portion of it, you know, on a private matter and, actually, pave a portion -- a portion of the dirt driveway for the existing residents. It's my understanding that this applicant and that resident have had multiple discussions and they are perfectly fine with the proposed layout for their private drive. In addition, there is a five foot wide detached sidewalk along Ustick as noted. The applicant is proposing attached sidewalks, another micro path throughout the site as seen on here with the light gray, both to the northwest, southwest and, then, along the east boundary to the future cross-access to the Settlers Square parcel for access to the future commercial uses. The -- sorry. Skipping around. In addition to the proposed sidewalks and micropaths shown on the concert plan, staff did recommend an additional pathway behind the buildings and along the north boundary to help activate the already existing open space from the Woodburn Subdivision that is the area of the piped Lemp Canal that is behind six -- or five or six existing homes over there. That area is not improved, but it is open and so staff does believe that a gravel pathway suitable for at least walking should be entered through this area on this site, so that this open space area is not walled off anymore than it already has been from the Woodburn Subdivision. The applicant has not agreed with this provision. Staff does feel like it would be an added amenity for this area, not both -- not just for this area -- this project, but also the Woodburn Subdivision that would allow them to have easier access from their subdivision down to Ustick and/or to the east. The applicant is in agreement with all other DA provisions, except -- so, again, the pathway is A-1.I and A-1.B is regarding the affordable housing component and there are some legalese type of information in that -- that DA provision and there is no need to go into too much detail at the hearing in that, but staff anticipates continuing to work with the applicant to make sure we have a shared language that we are all in agreement with as we move forward, but still allows the city to maintain that the future use will be affordable and not market rate apartments. With that staff does recommend approval of the subject annexation for an affordable housing project and after that I will stand for any questions.

McCarvel: Thank you. Would the applicant like to come forward?

Dodson: I believe she's online.

McCarvel: Oh.

Anderson: Yes. Hi. Let me get put up here. Hello. Greetings. I'm Erin Anderson. I live at 2238 North Astaire Way in Meridian and I am with The Housing Company and the applicant. We have a presentation that -- I'm not sure if it's automatically going to be

loaded or if I should load it.

Dodson: You can share your screen, Erin, if you would like.

Anderson: Okay. Again, I would thank you for your time, Madam Chair and Commissioners. This is a really exciting opportunity for us. As I mentioned, I do live in Meridian, but I -- I don't think that the City of Meridian is familiar with The Housing Company and since Mr. Dodson did such a thorough job of describing the nuts and bolts, really, from a planning and design standpoint of our project, I'm going to do a little bit of background on our company and also a little bit more information about affordable housing, because there seems to be a lot of interest in learning more about what we mean by that. So, The Housing Company is a nonprofit organization that started in 1990 with the mission to address the concern of inadequate supply of affordable decent rental housing within the state of Idaho and recently we are also developing in adjacent states. We play an active role in bringing affordable housing resources to the areas of the states that are not being adequately served. Through local public and private partnerships we have been able to bring creative housing solutions to areas struggling with insufficient housing. Our role is to partner with local government and other interested parties to solve local housing needs. We have developed more than 800 units in 2,000 affordable rental communities. The Housing Company provides professional on-site property management services for our affordable apartment communities serving low income families, seniors, and the disabled. We own our properties in the long term and take pride in building an asset for the community that will stand the test of time. We are able to put together complex financing in order to make these housing communities a reality. Our newest developments to the subject property are Moon Valley Apartments in Star, Nampa Duplexes and Hazel Park in Caldwell. We also have Canyon Terrace in Nampa and Sunset Landing in Caldwell currently under construction. A common question that I receive is what is affordable housing? What do you mean by that? There are a number of affordable housing programs. The most common one is utilized to pay for new construction, which is a surprise to many people is actually an IRS program, not a HUD program, and it's called Section 42 of the Housing Tax Credit. It's not the same as what people think of as subsidized housing or Section 8. With this program a private investor, such as a bank or insurance company, will actually become a partner in the project and provide equity to the project in return for ten years worth of federal tax credits and with -- with that equity we are able to keep the rents lower in perpetuity. Residents must be income and program eligible. The rent that a Section 42 resident pays is based on a fixed rental fee for the unit size that is lower than the average market rent in the area. So, it doesn't adjust with their income as their income goes up or down, they initially qualify and, then, once -- once they initially qualify they are set with that fixed rate. It is difficult to identify which rental properties participate in the Section 42 programs, because they look like just any other apartment building. We require income verifications, criminal background checks, credit checks, student verification and household composition verification. A common myth is that people who live in affordable housing won't fit in my neighborhood. But the fact is that people who need affordable housing already live and work in your community. In Meridian the average two bedroom rent costs 1,842 dollars, according to rent -- rent.com. This is a staggering 43 percent increase from last year.

The rent affordable at the median renter income, however, is around a thousand dollars. So, there is a very significant gap. Access to safe affordable homes builds a strong foundation for families and even hardworking Idahoans often lack good housing options. This is a chart that kind of just shows a potential resident profile, a few different scenarios, ranging from a single person in a customer service job who needs a one bedroom apartment at 741 dollars, to a single mother with two children that's a cashier that needs a two bedroom of 946 dollars, to a four person household that needs a three bedroom at 1,089 that might work in the food -- food service industry. These are a couple images of the quality level that I'm talking about when I say that people are surprised that it's affordable housing. This is The Springs Apartments in McCall, Idaho, and, then, this is a collage of photos of Moon Valley Apartments in Star and this is the elevations that were provided and the overall design concept is -- is based on this design and we are working with the same architect on this project that we did with Moon Valley. Mr. Dodson did a great job of going over a lot of the details as to the flow of the site and connectivity, but I think I just want to make it clear that with our neighborhood meeting and the comments that were received I think it was -- I would just want to stress the importance that we wanted this to really be a moderate -- moderate -- not a high density development. We wanted to keep it to two story buildings for two reasons. One, to fit in with the neighborhood and as well as really for fire access reasons two stories is much preferred. We provided the pedestrian connections along all corners of the site and we worked with -- in initially looking at this site, meaning that one of the most unique challenges of this site is that there is a single family residence with access through the site. The good news is that their existing easement does run where our proposed Cooper Lane is. In reviewing our title work we were pleasantly surprised to find that out, so -- so, essentially, we are just moving it to where it wasn't -- it was recorded ten years ago and so the site really -- you know, it does have -- it's an in-fill development. There are so many positive things about in-fill development, because the connectivity to the neighborhood, the access to Settlers Park, the fact that it's a walkable community, but, of course, you know, it's not ideal in terms of -- there is -- people who can't get -- it's in-fill, so we don't have the option to do everything on all sides of the property that -- that would be in an ideal planning situation and so what we have done is the very best we can with all the comments between ACHD and the fire department and city staff that we can do to make this a functional and comfortable housing community of 52 units that fits in with the neighborhood context and I think Mr. Dodson also went over kind of the importance of the exterior design appeal or the building height with various heights and fenestrations for interest and quality finishes. Our overall timeline involves this first step of zoning and annexation, which is required before we can even apply for any funding for the project. We also are going to be required to submit a CUP and a certificate of zoning appropriateness and I would anticipate that would run us through February and March and, then, we will have a variety of funding applications between January and August, depending on the final determination of sources available for this project. We plan on submitting a building permit application sometime this summer and, then, closing on financing and construction start between July and October of this year hopefully. If not then it might move into spring of next year, depending on funding availability. This really is the first step in the entitlement process. I think we have this -- these details about the affordable housing and the rent structuring typically don't come up this early, but we are

really excited to be able to share what we do. Very passionate about it personally and I'm happy to answer any questions. Thanks.

McCarvel: Do we have any questions for the applicant or staff?

Cassinelli: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Cassinelli.

Cassinelli: Erin, thank you for all that and kind of interesting to -- to learn. You mentioned that there is on-site management. Is that -- can you --

Anderson: Yeah.

Cassinelli: Is that 24 hours?

Anderson: It would not be 24 hours necessarily. Sometimes we are able to have a resident manager, but I'm not sure if we will have that in this case. If it's not 24 hours as a resident manager there would be set office hours. The clubhouse has an office space for that manager and, then, there will also be on-call emergency maintenance phone number for people to call for situations that are after hours.

Cassinelli: So, they are there to kind of make sure that the property is maintained and --

Anderson: Exactly.

Cassinelli: Okay.

Anderson: Exactly. We would typically have about two part-time jobs with this size of project -- a part-time property manager and a part-time maintenance person.

Seal: Madam Chair? Excuse me. Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: Quick question on the -- it looks -- looking at your website it looks like two of the three local developments that you have are age restricted. Would this fit into that as well or is there going to be no age restrictions on this as far as a senior living community?

Anderson: Currently I'm envisioning this not having age restrictions, mostly because I feel like there is a huge need -- a huge need in all ages and I think that we would really benefit by having an opportunity for both seniors and younger people alike to live in this housing community. I think there is -- there is a demand for both, frankly. It's just that I feel like there is a higher demand for non-age restricted affordable housing.

Seal: Okay. Thank you.

McCarvel: Thank you.

Anderson: Yep.

McCarvel: Commissioner Grove.

Grove: Madam Chair. Thanks. Erin, could you speak to the condition that Joe mentioned with the gravel pathway and your feelings towards that?

Anderson: Sure. I can pull up this site plan, but the main concern we have is how close that path is going to be to the building, to the -- you know, the residential building. It's I think seven feet away or -- or something is what we estimated. It's very close. So, it's going to feel -- especially since it's public pathway it's going to feel really really close to those residential buildings. That was the first issue. The other was a cost-related item. I -- I got an estimate of about 8,000 dollars for that gravel pathway, which isn't terrible, but everything that we are doing, you know, is trying to whittle down gaps, instead of the other direction, and so that's -- that's why we are asking for your consideration. But I think the main issue that I have with it primarily above cost is the proximity to the building.

McCarvel: Thank you. Any other questions?

Cassinelli: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Cassinelli.

Cassinelli: I have got one -- a couple here for -- for staff. Joe, can you -- it sounds like that you are making some -- or wanting to make some adjustments for the fact that this would -- for the proposed land use and that -- that being the affordable housing component there. So, what -- can you maybe give us an idea of what differences that that you are approving this under that -- under that observation versus if this were just a standard 52 unit in-fill project? And, then, also a couple other questions I have. What's -- can you go in a little bit more detail about Cooper Lane and is that going to go all the way -- all the way into the existing subdivision? And, then, also -- I don't know if we talked about parking in this.

Dodson: Great questions, Commissioner Cassinelli. I will hit the parking one first just because it's easier and you said it last. I believe it is -- let me share my screen, actually. What am I doing? Here we go. They actually do have it on their site plan, which I do appreciate. It would require one hundred spaces based on the unit count and the number of one bed, two bed, three bedrooms. They are proposing 115. So, that also -- they did this without doing the amended code that says one space for every ten units for guests. So, again, that would be 105.2. But 105. So, they are exceeding that. They are meeting their minimum covered parking. I imagined some of the parking issues would come up. I do see a couple spaces where they have some landscaping specifically here that they would probably fit two more spaces in there and maybe one more here that would still be able to meet there -- our code doesn't allow more than 12 in a row without a planter island.

So, they have some space to include a couple more if they need to. Again, maybe even another one or two here. Not overly concerned with the parking there, but they are -- that would be handled more specifically with the future CUP, which you guys would hear. But tentatively I think they are going to be fine. Cooper Lane is -- there is -- again, there is a stub street on the north side of that property. You can kind of see it here and this road would line up with -- their property boundary -- this house eventually -- or this road is going to have to meander around the house or the house is going to have to get demolished eventually, but, yeah, the reason why ACHD -- instead of just having a curb cut for a drive aisle for the multi-family is wanting this as a local road is so that the future extension would just go straight up to the north and there would be another avenue for those in Woodburn to exit out to Ustick, other than just Venable. So, that is, you know, future planning for the roads there. Back to your original question. To be clear, I'm -- the proposed project I did not analyze down to the tee about the amount of open space and the parking counts and all that, again, because we are just at annexation, but my preliminary stuff is that they meet all of their dimensional standards -- they are going to meet all their dimensional standards, so any discussion that I have had about affordable housing versus market rate, the two things that I kind of -- I don't want to say relaxed on or anything, but the two things that I am saying that affordable housing is better than requiring them would be probably cross-access along the west, you know, and extending a public road to the site. Even if it was market rate I don't necessarily know if I see a public benefit to that. It would just eat up so much of the site and is it necessary when that road is also going to connect up to the west when they have an access to Ustick there and the other people -- and, again, the only people that would be using it would be Woodburn Subdivision. They are going to have another one in the future to the east. Secondly would be the overall discussion of the Comprehensive Plan and that mixed use community area. Again not a major difference between looking at it affordable versus market, but I would probably be more inclined to -- to say there needs to be some kind of commercial component if it was market rate apartments. Again, I can definitely make the case either way. I think that there is a massive need for affordable housing and so that -- that outweighs the need for commercial space along Ustick. So, it's a give and take with that. It's not that I am in no way waving anything or saying they don't have to comply with anything, they are complying with everything in my opinion, it's just apples and oranges when it comes to meeting the comp plan in those terms.

Cassinelli: Madam Chair, I have got a follow-up question for him on that. Can you also address -- 11th Avenue to the west there, so in lieu of cross-access is that -- that will feed -- do you have a -- is there a larger map of -- similar where you could see -- is that -- is 11th going to be internal or is there -- is that going to open up to Ustick at all?

Dodson: There is a connection to Ustick Tetherow Crossing -- or will be once it's fully constructed. They have a stub street to their east boundary, which is this property boundary -- the west boundary of this site. So, the -- this is showing that they are going to dedicate right of way. This would continue down the shared property line here. Probably head west and have a nice L of sorts in the -- in that property. You can build homes on both sides and, then, that would connect out to Ustick, yes.

Cassinelli: Okay. So, from that standpoint there is -- there is access through the subdivision of the north and what's going in on the west to --

Dodson: Yes, sir.

Cassinelli: -- to Ustick. Ustick -- this isn't going to -- and this won't be landlocked or anything?

Dodson: Correct. No.

Cassinelli: Okay. Thank you.

Dodson: You are welcome.

McCarvel: Any other questions for staff or the applicant?

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: Question for staff. So, the applicant said that if they put in a ten foot gravel path that would make it to where it's about seven feet away from the backside of the complex there. Is that a true statement?

Dodson: It would be a five foot pathway, not a multi-use. So, just be a regular five foot pathway. Theoretically if they put it right up against -- yes, because they only are showing a 12 foot buffer. They technically have some physical room to shift everything south and create more space along the north boundary. I do understand that that would be in lieu of losing some of that open space and I don't -- I haven't seen a rear elevation of these, but I'm assuming there is probably some back patio space that might be technically reduced from the green space perspective if we shifted those units to the south, but, again, I -- I don't want to fight to the death over that pathway, but I do think it would be an overall good amenity, not just for this project, but also the Woodburn Subdivision on the -- in the north to be able to have another avenue of accessing Ustick that they currently don't have because of the existing development and future connectivity to the commercial to the east. Again, they do have some physical space to make some of that work and increase that separation of seven feet if they did it right along the north property boundary, but if Commission and -- and future Council it doesn't seem that that's a good idea in lieu of losing some of that green space along Ustick, then, I -- I understand that finding as well.

Seal: Okay. Thank you.

Dodson: You're welcome. I hope that wasn't too much of a political answer.

McCarvel: Any other questions for staff or the applicant? We will open up to public testimony and I understand the sign-up sheet is not in the back, so if there is anybody in

the room or online that wishes to testify on this application, please, raise your hand. Okay. All right.

Dodson: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Yes.

Dodson: Sorry. Real quick. I did want to note. I didn't put it in my -- my staff report -- my presentation. It's been a long year already. The -- there was no written testimony as of about 6:00 p.m. So, I just wanted to note that. There is no for or against the project.

McCarvel: Does the applicant have any further comment?

Anderson: No, other than just to point out that we did contact the parks and rec department regarding that path and they felt that the pathways that we have internally through this site provided adequate pedestrian access across the site, But -- and, again, in the grand scheme of things that's probably a pretty minor -- minor issue. Just wanted to point that out and just wanted to thank Mr. Dodson for his help in this and the presentation and I wish I could be there in person. Just wrapping up the end of a COVID quarantine.

McCarvel: We appreciate you staying on Zoom then.

Anderson: Yeah.

McCarvel: Any other questions before we close the public hearing for H-2021-0092? Could I get a motion to closed the public hearing for H-2021-0092?

Seal: So moved.

Cassinelli: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to close the public hearing for H-2021-0092. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: I like everything about this, so I agree that there is a -- there is a need for this, so I like where it's at. I mean it's kind of a little off the beaten path. I would like to see the path go in. There is a piece of land that's on Linder that abuts the school and when they went in we did have them do a ten foot paved path that goes along the northern boundary of these properties, so in anticipation of connecting two properties all the way to follow

that canal down into Ustick Road, so in the grand scheme of things it would cost money to put it in, but it also costs less money to maintain it, since it's, essentially, gravel. It doesn't have to be mowed. And it would provide for, you know, better access I think for anybody that's on a bike or walking up to those schools. So, I would like to see that go in. I do agree with the staff report on that one. Everything else about it I really like. I like that they limited it to two stories, not three stories. I mean there is a -- there is a need. I mean if we are going to go through the three story or four story and almost be in a place like this, I would like to see it. That said I'm appreciative that they did go with the two story just to blend in a little bit better. It looks like parking is adequate. Amenities are adequate. And, you know, they -- they met everything that we were asking them to do here.

McCarvel: Yeah. I -- I like this project. I think going three and four stories, then, you start into parking issues and I think anytime you can have this where it feels and blends in more with the community and its surroundings, the better it is. I applaud the architecture and the surroundings on that. I'm -- I'm on the fence about the paths. I will give -- just because it does come so close to the back of those buildings and I hate to see them scrunch that in, because I think a little -- that little bit of openness in this community will be nice. But I can -- I can see the need. I will be with Joe and give the most political answer I can give and see both sides, but, yeah, I think being seven to ten feet away from the back of the buildings is a little tight, but other than that I like it.

Grove: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Grove.

Grove: I will -- I will go ahead and make a motion, unless other people wanted to weigh in, but I would just say I like that we are -- we have this product coming in. I think that it balances out some of the other things that have been going in. We definitely have a need. I personally don't -- don't think the pathway is needed, but if it stays I -- I wouldn't fight for it either way, I guess. But I -- I personally don't see a need for it as much. There is plenty of other options, either going through or around this, so I'm going to make a motion to remove that. But I did have a question before this. With the one that you said we didn't really need to talk about, but they brought up was the A-1.I Is there anything that we need to condition in regards to that condition?

Dodson: Commissioner Grove, A-1.I is the pathway one, but A-1.B is the affordable housing component. But, no, there is no need to make anything. Mr. Starman and I will continue working with the applicant to massage that language to make sure, you know, by the time we get to Council and after Council we have it all buttoned up and in agreement for everybody.

McCarvel: Yeah. I would agree that -- I mean I think it's the position of this Commission that we do like to see this stay classified as affordable housing, because this seems to be done right. Yeah.

Dodson: Agree. Yeah. There is just I think a few hiccups on some of the language in it and the way that they will do the -- the rents versus what we put in the original provision and, again, it's just a wording thing.

Cassinelli: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Cassinelli.

Cassinelli: Before a motion is made I got another question for staff. Is -- is the path -- is that something that could be -- that they can work with the -- the HOA that -- was it Wood -- Wood something there to the north and -- and put that on the -- can it be even put on that -- the easement -- over the piped lateral there?

Dodson: Commissioner Cassinelli, I called that out in my staff report is I would love for them to work with that HOA and try to get that open space area more activated. So, yes, I mean you could modify the condition and say, you know, work with the adjacent HOA and, if not, keep it along the north boundary. Sure. Absolutely.

Cassinelli: Okay.

Grove: Making notes. You all good?

McCarvel: We are good, unless Mr. Yearsley raises his hand.

Yearsley: I have no comment.

Grove: All right. After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend to the City Council file number H-2021-0092 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of January 6th, 2022, with the following modification: That condition A-1.I is modified to have the applicant work with the HOA to the north on relocating the pathway as listed to the lateral.

Johnson: Madam Chair, my apologies. Commissioner Grove, I think you left out the word approve or deny. We didn't get a verb there.

Grove: Oh. Approve. Do we have that in where ever I said it? Do you want me to do it again?

McCarvel: No. We can put it in there.

Grove: Thank you.

Johnson: That's perfect. Thank you.

Seal: I will second that.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to recommend approval for H-2021-0092 with modifications. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

McCarvel: Would the Commissioners like a five minute break?

(Recess: 7:58 p.m. to 8:06 p.m.)

6. Public Hearing for Friendship Subdivision (H-2021-0083) by Mike Homan, Located Near the Southeast Corner of N. Meridian Rd. and E. Chinden Blvd.

- A. Request: Annexation and Zoning of 10.058 acres of land from RUT in Ada County to the R-8 zoning district.
- B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 41 building lots and 7 common lots.

McCarvel: All right. We will resume with H-2021-0083 and we will begin -- Friendship Subdivision and we will begin with the staff report.

Tiefenbach: Good evening, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. This is Alan Tiefenbach, associate planner, City of Meridian. Okay. This is an application for an annexation and zoning to R-8 and preliminary plat for 41 lots. The property is located south of Chinden and west of Locust Grove. The Brookdale Estates Subdivision is to the west, which is here. The High -- and that's zoned R-2. The Hightower Subdivision is to the east. That's here. That's zoned R-8. The Saguaro Canyon Subdivision, which is down here, is zoned R-4. There is an existing church that is located here. This property was proposed for annexation and zoning to R-8 in a plat for 48 lots. That was the Bull Ranch Subdivision. That was proposed in 2015. That was subsequently denied by the Council with density being cited as the primary concern. This property is recommended for medium dense -- or excuse me -- designated for medium density residential, which is eight to 12 dwelling units per acre. This application is for annexation of just a little over ten acres of land with the R-8 zone district and a preliminary plat, like I said, to allow 41 building lots and seven common lots. North Elk Ranch Road, if you can see my pointer, if I'm not doing it too quickly, this is a private road and it presently provides access from the subject property, which right now is a house, which is here, to Chinden Boulevard. This subdivision proposes to connect to three existing local streets, which already stub at the property. So, one of them will be East Lockhart Street to the west. That would be here and you can see it down here, but I will show you on the plat here. East Lockhart to the west, East Tallinn to the east. This is from here. And North Senita to the south, which is down here. They are also providing a stub to the church to the north, just in case that property develops in the future. The Uniform -- Uniform Development Code states that when a property has an existing access from a state highway and an applicant proposes a change or increase in intensity of use, the owner shall develop or otherwise require