

**Public Hearing Continued from April 21, 2022 for Grayson Subdivision  
(H-2022-0014) by Schultz Development, LLC, Located at 1710 E. Amity  
Rd., Near the Northeast Corner of E. Amity Rd. and S. Locust Grove  
Rd.**

- A. Request: Annexation and Zoning of 3.39 acres from RUT to the R-8 zoning district.
- B. Request: A Preliminary Plat consisting of 15 single-family residential building lots and 3 common lots on 3.1 acres of land in the requested R-8 zoning district.

Grove: Okay. We will go ahead and jump back in with our next public hearing. So, we will be moving on to public hearing for Grayson Subdivision, file number H-2022-0014, continued from April 21st, 2022, and with that we will pass it back over to Joe for his final one for tonight. Take it away, Joe.

Dodson: Thank you, Commissioner Grove. The application before you for Grayson Subdivision is for annexation and zoning and a preliminary plat. The site consists of 3.1 acres currently zoned RUT in the county, located near the northeast corner of Amity and Locust Grove and actually near the corner, unlike the last one. The annexation and zoning request before you tonight is for 3.39 acres from RUT to the R-8 zoning district and a preliminary plat consisting of 15 single family residential building lots and three common lots on 3.1 acres. The proposed plat for the 15 units on 3.1 acres constitutes a gross density of 4.84 dwelling units per acre, which is consistent with the medium density residential designation located on the property. The minimum building lot size is about 5,500 square feet, with an average lot size near 6,200 square feet. The minimum lot size is nearly 1,500 square feet above the minimum lot size for the R-8 zoning district. The adjacent Estancia Subdivision of lower density and -- is of lower density and has larger building lots than what is proposed with this project. However, there are no more than two building lots for proposed adjacent to any single existing lot along the north boundary and the applicant has placed their drainage lot in the northeast corner of the project adjacent to two Estancia lots, which the point of me calling that out is if he put a building lot there and moved the drainage -- drainage lot somewhere else, then, that one owner would have two lots adjacent to them. So, the applicant was thoughtful on their placement of that. Furthermore, there are six building lots within the Estancia Subdivision along the north boundary and the applicant has proposed seven building lots and one common lot. So, the difference between the two, despite different zoning and smaller lots, is not substantial, at least in staff's opinion. Consistent with the existing subdivision around Estancia, the applicant is proposing to continue parkways and detached sidewalks into the development along Grayson Street to match that design characteristic. The applicant is also proposing a micro path connection in the southwest corner of the property to add a pedestrian connection to their required multi-use pathway along Amity. Per the pathways coordinator and the master pathways plan, a ten foot multi-use pathway is required along Amity. It is required to be located within the landscape buffer and completely outside of the ACHD right-of-way. The applicant is showing a five foot

detached sidewalk instead, so staff has included a condition of approval to include that pathway with -- prior to final plat submittal. The plat does comply with all UDC dimensional standards, except for the block length of Grayson. The proposed block length is approximately 550 feet per the way that we measure it, so we measure it from here until where ever it ends. It's approximately 550 feet after it gets to here, because we measure at the center of the cul-de-sac, which is -- this is just a preliminary that the applicant did as a potential redevelopment of the corner property. It will be I think just over 600. So, still under the maximum 750 period, but it does require a Council waiver to exceed the 500 foot, which the applicant is seeking, because they can't connect to Amity and they are not going to connect the Locust Grove to the west, so it is basically required. Access is proposed via extension of the existing stub street East Grayson, stubbed to the east property. It's proposed to be extended into the site and terminate in a hammerhead type turnaround by encumbering building lot number seven, which is here. That's how it was originally proposed. ACHD did not approve this. They are requiring a temporary cul-de-sac and so we have the revised primary plat that now shows building Lots 7 and 8 encumbered by this. Staff already has an existing condition regarding this potential outcome, so there is no need to have any motion addressing that. I just wanted to note that for you. As of about 4:00 there was no written testimony for the application and staff does recommend approval. I will stand for any questions.

Grove: All right. Thank you. Could we get the applicant to come up, please.

Schultz: Hello. Matt Schultz. 4914 South Colusa in Meridian. It's good to be here. It's been a while. Good to see some faces I know and some good to meet. I have been out here in south Meridian forever, about 20 years, doing developments for different people over the years, like Tuscany and Bear Creek and Reflection Ridge, Kings Bridge, Wells and -- and Calistoga and it's -- it's -- it's home for me and I'm excited about Albertson's. I just live just off Amity just down the road a little bit and an associate came to me and asked me to help him with this little in-fill that he found and I went, cool, it's in the neighborhood and I like to fill in these little blanks and I think this little blank -- there wasn't a whole lot of options that we could do with it, other than we could do R-4 lots or R-8 lots. So, that was pretty much it. So, what we are doing is kind of an R-8 light and that we are not going for 40 foot lots, we are not going to -- to the low-end of R-4, but we feel like that 50 foot minimum, single story on the north, to be more compatible, even though it could be argued that we are compatible anyways, we are adding that -- that single story in the north as a development agreement condition with them and if you look at the home sizes north of us we are proposing the same size. They are in that 1,500 square foot range north of us and that's what we are -- 15 to 17 hundred is what we are proposing. The issues that were kind of unknowns originally is how much the proposed roundabout might impact our site. We did a preliminary drop-in of a template to see how that would -- we were confident that we were just going to squeeze on by, hopefully, and nothing was going to hit us and that we got to dedicate two more feet of right of way, so instead of 48 we are giving 50 on our side, which is not a big change, and this revised preliminary plat does indicate that. We just did that yesterday and ACHD did want a no build on two of the lots, instead of one. Okay. Do that. And, then, the city would like us to expand the five foot pathway from a five to a ten, like you see on the newly rebuilt Eagle Road, Victory

and Amity, those nice little yellow lines down the middle. You know, it's -- it's cool and so we will be the only one on Amity now that has that, but whenever ACHD does go through and widen out Amity they will continue the ten foot on the other side. So, we have -- we have got the room to do that. So, we do agree with all staff and ACHD's conditions of approval. We have added our own. We have offered some development agreement conditions in our -- in our narrative about the homes in the single story and we think we have a piece that fits and it's going to be good to kind of further -- not that what's there is too trashy, but it's going to clean up the neighborhood a little bit. It's -- it's going to be better. So, we appreciate the opportunity and I'm really excited about that roundabout. I had to come in on the way here tonight at 5:30, it's really backed up all the way to the entrance of Estancia, you know, going -- going west on -- on Amity, so that roundabout is going to be nice. So, thank you.

Grove: All right. Thank you. Commissioners, any questions for applicant or staff?

Yearsley: Mr. Chair?

Grove: Yes.

Yearsley: Isn't there a cell tower? Is that what your one lot is at your drainage lot? Isn't there a cell tower on there as well?

Schultz: Commissioner Yearsley, Commissioner Grove, it's that -- it's that very corner lot that dash, dash, dash, on the corner of -- I think it's even in the right of way that's shown here. What we show as the future expanded right of way, I think that thing's closer to Locust Grove. It's off our property, but it is right there on that corner --

Yearsley: Okay.

Schultz: -- and that roundabout is going to, obviously, have to take that into account. That's why I think that roundabout is going to shift a little bit to the west to clear that -- that cell tower is my guess. That's why I was even more confident we weren't going to get clipped by whatever went east.

Yearsley: Right.

Schultz: So -- but, yeah, it's -- it's nearby, but not on our property.

Yearsley: Okay. I -- I knew it was there, but I -- I wasn't sure where it --

Schultz: It's Victory I think.

Yearsley: Couldn't get that last corner piece, huh.

Schultz: Well, now that this has utilities it's obviously -- I think it's going to become available and I wouldn't be surprised if ACHD might buy the whole thing. You don't know.

They might need some drainage there. But they are I hear about the 50 percent stage on their drawings right now and I'm sure they are negotiating for right of way right now of with all those owners on the four corners. So, we will see what comes of it in terms of how much ACHD needs out of it.

Yearsley: Okay. That makes sense, because -- yeah, if I was that owner I don't know if I would want what's left.

Schultz: Yeah. There is -- there will be utilities right to it with us.

Yearsley: Okay.

Schultz: So -- and access.

Wheeler: Mr. Chair?

Grove: Commissioner Wheeler.

Wheeler: I have got a question here, Matt. So, that -- that's a little park area there, right, that northeast spot; right? Okay. And is there -- is that going to be -- are you going to be kind of like, hey, this is only for us 16 people here or is it going to be like -- I'm sure there is going to be some people are going to trickle over from the other, but --

Schultz: Yeah. Commissioner Grove, Commissioner Wheeler, it was going to be an open space lot, depressed, grassed. It would never hold water, except for when it rained a really bunch and, then, staff recommended we put a bench in there, a little passive sitting area, which that's a good idea. That would be cool. But, you know, the enforcement of -- of -- of that I -- I doubt it. You guys couldn't be that overkill. You stay off this. This is for these 15 people only. Do you have a pass? You know, I -- I just don't see that happening.

Wheeler: Good. Okay. Just -- I was just double checking on that then.

Schultz: I -- I think it was a great idea to put something in there. You know, a little sitting area and people walking the dog and just hang out.

Wheeler: Yeah. And, then, this is -- this doesn't have a gate or anything, it's just straight open road; right? All the way --

Schultz: Open road. We are continuing the detached parkway, park strips. The geometry works to where our lots are appropriate. They get a little bit shallow abutting Victory, but they are deep enough to meet all setbacks and get what we need in there, so --

Yearsley: There is no modifications to the deal, so I'm looking for -- at the -- who is making a motion that there is no modifications to this, you are okay with all the --

Schultz: I'm okay with everything.

Yearsley: Okay. Perfect.

Schultz: Thanks.

Grove: All right. Thank you. All right. At this time we will take public testimony. Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone signed in for this application?

Johnson: Mr. Chair, we did not.

Grove: All right. Is there anyone online or in the audience that would like to testify on this application? All right. Seeing none, would the applicant like to have any closing? All right. Making it easier. So, can I get a motion to close the hearing for file number -- I'm going to mess it up. H-2021-0099 -- nope. Wrong one. Let's try that again. Can I get a motion to close the public hearing for Grayson Subdivision, file number H-2022-0014?

Wheeler: So moved.

Yearsley: Second.

Grove: All right. All those in favor aye. All those opposed? All right. Motion passed.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Grove: Any prevailing thoughts?

Lorcher: Commissioner Grove. It's pretty straightforward, so -- they came up with a thoughtful plan to be able to use that space. They are following ACHD rules. Their connectivity. No modifications. So, I'm good with it.

Yearsley: Mr. Chair?

Wheeler: Commissioners, is there any significant discussion or do you guys just want to me to pitch this one through?

Yearsley: I'm good.

Wheeler: Okay. All right. After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony I move we recommend approval to the City Council of file number H-2022-0014 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of April 28, 2022, without any modifications.

Yearsley: Second.

Grove: Motion has been moved and seconded. All those in favor say aye. All those opposed say nay. All right. Motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.