

Public Hearing for UDC Text Amendment ZOA-2022-0001 by City of Meridian Planning Division.

A. Request: UDC Text Amendment for a text amendment to amend certain sections and add new code sections to the City's Unified Development Code pertaining to the regulations through Chapters 1-5.

Seal: All right. Okay. Now, we will go ahead and open up File H-2022-0001 for the UDC Text Amendment and the floor is all yours.

Hood: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission. Caleb Hood, Planning division manager. I will be presenting the 2022 UDC Text Amendment application on behalf not only of city staff, but of a UDC focus group that met -- had a series of meetings over the last several months. Don't ask me exactly how long we have been meeting. Probably six to nine months I would say to put this round of proposed UDC text amendments together and get them before you. Bill Parsons usually presents that and he does spearhead that group, too, and facilitate those meetings. He is unavailable tonight, so I am -- I will cover and I have been part of that group and the meeting, so I'm pretty comfortable with what I will be proposing and presenting to you this evening. I'm not going to run through all the changes that are entailed. This application I will scroll through them. You have them in your packet. There are a few I want to highlight. A handful that I want to highlight, but, please, feel free to stop me as we are scrolling or you have reviewed and you already want to talk about something or get some explanation on, an interpretation, why the change, whatever the case may be. So, I think I will just jump in, then, and, again, kind of run through the highlights if you will of the proposed changes to our code. So, the first one I want to highlight is actually on page one. It's in the definition section. So, we have had a couple three projects over the last year or so where the projects were kind of skirting the definition of either a home occupation or a live-work unit or even vertically integrated project. So, what we have done by adding this definition is make it pretty clear the conditions that must exist to be in this case a live-work residential project and you will actually see live-work show up a couple of other times, like we are adding it to the schedule of use control. There is some other parts of our code as well. I believe like the alternative compliance section and some parking standards and those types of things that also address this new definition and use that we are adding, again, to differentiate between the different types of integrated -- so, commercial and residential uses in one structure. So, that's one I wanted to -- to call to your attention to that. And we are also amending the -- the existing definition for vertically integrated residential project to just kind of clarify that. Again, this is not -- not an accessory use at a home occupation and -- and it's not that live-work definition that I just pointed out to you. I'm going to scroll to the next page. Sidewalks and parkways. I want to just talk about that a little bit. Ada County Highway District is in the process of -- both with their capital projects, but also through their development review and in their policy manual, getting away from bike lanes. So, the bike lanes that you will see below the curb on a lot of arterial streets today, generally five to six feet wide, striped on the travel lanes, basically, again, in the street, basically, and, then, the curb, gutter, and the sidewalk usually is up a little bit higher, they are getting away from that cross-section in the street and, instead,

what they are going to do is a ten foot wide -- typically ten foot wide multi-use pathway. So, that will be shared by cyclists and pedestrians, skateboarders, anyone else that nonmotorized travel will be using that, instead of being on the asphalt it will be a concrete. So, what we have done here -- and, actually, in another section or two noted there is talk about, you know, can be sidewalks or multi-use pathways when applicable, depending on if it's a local street, a collector street, an arterial street. But for the most part on your major roadways or arterial roadways and collector roadways you will start to see these multi-use pathways, instead of the bike lanes.

Seal: Quick question on that.

Hood: Uh-huh.

Seal: On the motorized use, does that include electric?

Hood: I was hoping you weren't going to ask me that, Mr. Chair. I am not sure. That -- that's going to be an ACHD policy manual. I know the Greenbelt in Boise has some allowance for that. I'm not sure on ACHD sidewalks and, again, this -- these aren't sidewalks, but they serve a similar purpose. I have got to look into that and get back to you, because I'm -- I'm not a hundred percent certain how -- today how that reads and there may be -- that's changing in our society and in our -- in our county --

Seal: Yeah.

Hood: -- and they may be amending that. So, I -- I'm not --

Seal: That's why I ask, because I have -- there is actually a person that rides an electric motorcycle on the sidewalk down Locust Grove every day, so -- and it's electric, so, you know, they take that as it's nonmotorized, even though it's an electric motor. So, there is -- you know. But, obviously, an electric scooter is going to leave a smaller footprint than that, so -- and I think we are probably rambling down the road where they are going to have to kind of decipher what an electric vehicle is versus, you know, something else.

Hood: What -- what I can let you know, Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission, in city -- city code we do actually address that and it's -- it's kind of tiered. So, on your local streets 20 -- I believe the cutoff is 25 miles an hour or less. You can ride them in the street, basically, and, then, it's on higher speed facilities where there isn't a bike lane or other facilities you are encouraged to ride up on the sidewalk. But, again, I don't know if that's a countywide ACHD allowance or not and we haven't had a contract with any -- we call them shared vehicles -- provider for a while, whether it be bicycles or scooters or any other mode -- hybrid mode for that matter. But in city code we do address that and, again, it's -- it's tiered, so -- on -- on local streets it's -- that's okay and on the arterials it's not, so --

Seal: Okay. And I did have one question on the live-work. We have had a few applications come through where they are trying to integrate the live-work on the same

floor and basically have doors that come through, where -- and the concern has always been if they are going to do that, you know, essentially, that sets it up to where that can become a bedroom or a playroom or something along those lines and it's -- not that that's their intention, but, obviously, that's something that could happen where you have a -- you know, row of live-work that all of a sudden just becomes rentals.

Hood: Uh-huh. Yeah. Mr. Chairman, there wasn't really a question in there. But again --

Seal: Yeah. I mean is -- is there going to be further discussion about that or maybe something to help guide us in that, because it seems like it's outside of our purview to try to enforce something like that, but at the same time it -- it is a -- you know, it's a -- it's a question that needs to be asked.

Hood: Yeah. So, a couple of different things, certainly related in the same vein as -- as your question there. So, we are hoping that this provides you better guidance to know what we are approving initially.

Seal: Yeah.

Hood: The enforcement of that over time gets a little bit trickier. This code still applies, but we are not regularly doing inspections to see if it has been converted to a bedroom. If we get turned onto that, there is a code enforcement complaint, something like that, we can investigate it, but that gets a little bit trickier, again, as time goes on to -- again, we don't have a regular role to go and inspect these structures to make sure they are used that way. But, that being said, we have worked with our building codes and officials and fire marshals are in the loop and so there is some of that oversight. So, it's not like bait and switch and you can present something and, then, day one you are using it -- either for all residential or all commercial. There is some oversight in that, but there is probably still some gray or some holes, but I think with -- with these cleanups we are on a better path to seeing a true mix of uses on those projects where they are proposed and required.

Seal: Okay. Thank you.

Wheeler: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Go right ahead.

Wheeler: Staff, I have a question, too, concerning this ten foot wide bike way, that multi-use pathway. Is this going to be something that will still operate like a shoulder or will it be something that will be an elevated place or it will be something that will be curbed off? Is it something that will be distance between like a roadway and, then, you will have some green space or something -- or can you explain just a little bit more about that?

Hood: Sure. Yeah. Mr. Chair, Commissioner Wheeler, so that's kind of a case by case, depending on how much right of way is there and any power poles, fire hydrants, trees,

other things that may be in the way. But as -- for the most part the cross-section will be your travel lanes for the roadway and, then, a 12 inch gutter and, then, a curb and, then, when possible it will even be detached or striped. Sometimes they will use the stamped concrete that's colored that's kind of to detach it from the curb if you will. We are really pushing for even there to be a minimum of four foot, six and eight is great of a detached -- it doesn't have to be sod or turf, but some landscape material in there and, then, this ten foot wide multi-use pathway. Again, sometimes that will, just because it gets constrained, have to come back and pull back towards the curb and even be attached. It may even get, you know, in certain circumstances have to go down to like eight -- seven or eight feet in some circumstances. But for the most part that's the ideal cross-section. Detached from the curb, ten feet wide, up above the center line and the travel lanes.

Wheeler: Okay. One of the other things I did just want to speak on -- just two things here just real quickly just for input purposes. One is when it comes down to the electric bicycles -- electric vehicles on that side, that, Chairman, you -- you have talked about that. I know that -- I think it's the Department of Interior passed something back in 2019 that stated that anything that was under 750 watts, which is about one horsepower, would be considered a nonmotorized vehicle for their access into their departments of lands and the BLM land and it sounds like there might be something similar to the way that our code lines up a little bit maybe would have some influence on that, so that might give some sort of guidance as you guys kind of tighten up a little bit about what might be seen. They also had like a limit on how fast that those vehicles can go and it was somewhere right around that 20 -- I want to say it was 25 miles or less or 20 miles and less, where there was actually a speed limit on that side of it. If it went faster than that or if it was on 1,000 watt, which would make it one and a quarter horsepower, even though it was electrical -- electric vehicle, it was considered motorized and was not allowed and those kind of things. So, just something as a reference for -- in the future. The other thing is that I -- I just want to encourage to have some sort of striping or marking, because this is going to be off the normal path from -- from a roadway and if someone is to fall down or if someone is to get injured or whatever the case is, to have some sort of a marker to say, hey, instead of say by mile post such and such, maybe to say that, hey, I'm at, you know, this marker point off of Eagle Road or this marker point off the Ridenbaugh Canal or whatever that case is and that way for EMT services or for whatever that can be just called in on something like that. I think that might be something to do for just safety purposes. I know everybody's got a phone and they can share their locations and things of that nature, but sometimes in the frantic of it all to be able to just point and say, hey, you are at 6.3 or whatever the case is and whatever that might look like, whether it be a stripe on the road or on the pathway or whether it be a small little post, every -- however -- however often. That's just something to consider. Just something to consider.

Hood: So, Mr. Chairman, if I may. I appreciate those comments. I will share those with ACHD. Again, these are under the jurisdiction of ACHD, but I think those are both good comments and points and I will -- I will look into that and reply to the rest of the Commission on what currently the policy talks about with that. Just so you know, I mean it is still relatively new at ACHD.

Wheeler: Yeah.

Hood: They are still trying to figure out do they stripe even a center line down the middle of this to -- you know, drive on the right, you know, you can pass on the left, but, you know, basically, the right hand -- stay to the right. Two way traffic. One way traffic. How does that work? Crossings of roadways because this is so wide how do you -- are you bringing them behind the first car? So, there is a lot going on here that they are trying to figure out and standardize. So, I will share those -- those comments, look into that and, then, follow up again with an e-mail to the Commission on -- on some of your answers. Some of it may not be an answer just yet, but something for them to consider.

Wheeler: Thank you.

Seal: Caleb, does the -- I mean are most of these amendments applying to that ten way path as it relates to ACHD in the roadways and not really kind of the ditches and canals and things like that or is it --

Hood: Correct. Yeah. So, I think we do have a -- is it right here? I mean if you look at the -- the -- the 11.3A5 part, the multi-use pathway constructed in accord with Ada County Highway District. So, most of this is the intent. It doesn't change our multi-use pathway and the pathway network system and our cross section for those.

Seal: Uh-huh.

Hood: So, maybe even some of the comments that Commissioner Wheeler had I can share with our Parks Department for those off-street multi-use pathway segments, too, because a lot of times Locust Grove -- okay, I know where Locust Grove -- but if I'm on the Bud Porter and I'm in between Meridian and Linder, having a mile marker or something, some identifiable, yeah, mile marker or some post or something that you can talk to EMS about where you are at. I think those are good comments for both cases. But, again, Mr. Chair, primarily to accommodate ACHD's change to -- towards multi-use pathways in lieu of bike lanes and doing a combined sidewalk and bike lane.

Seal: Okay.

Wheeler: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Go ahead.

Wheeler: One other quick thing. Staff, I would -- I would encourage that those markers actually not be mile, but they would be closer than that, because of pedestrian access and stuff. That would be my only suggestion on that.

Hood: Okay. I'm going to keep scrolling a little bit. But, again, if you see anything you want clarification on or to talk about -- next one I had down to talk about is one that comes up I think with about every multi-family project and that's parking. So, first, I will just start

by saying we aren't proposing any changes to the guest space requirement. So, it would still be one per ten. That seems to be working pretty well, although it's still a relatively new standard in and of itself. So, we haven't seen a whole bunch of projects come online yet that have built out with that requirement. So, this was a pretty big topic of a conversation and, in fact, I have got a -- kind of option two for you to consider. What we ended up landing on -- and I don't think there is anybody opposed to this on that focus group, but there was some conversation -- is this the best answer? It's a -- it's a good answer, but there may be a couple of dissenting opinions if you want to say that, that thinks that option two is better and I will get to that here in just a second. This -- it's actually pretty easy that -- this change that we came up with, it is just, essentially, taking the three bedroom units where we are required two car parks and said if you have three bedrooms you need three car parks per -- for multi-family. We added this note as well that clarifies that any amenity within that multi-family project is not subject to those -- those -- the parking requirements, basically. We have had some inconsistencies on the square footage of a fitness center needing to provide parking stalls with the one per 500 square feet, basically, so some of these that have them integrated. Just clarifying that. They can certainly provide them and a lot of them do, but it's not a requirement of code. The option B for that -- I think I have it pulled up here. Yeah. Pretty simple. So, what this does it just says two per. So, on average you get someone bedrooms, you get some three bedrooms, there is a lot of two bedrooms, two per easy match. How many units do you have? Forty. Okay. Eighty parking stalls. I can do that math pretty quick. How many are one better? How many are three bedroom? Okay. And so that's -- that was the other thing and if memory serves I think some of this -- I think the city of Boise -- don't quote me on that, but that's what I'm recalling from some of the UDC focus group discussion, this is where they are going with some of that. Irregardless, studio to four plus bedrooms two per. And, again, on average that seems to work out okay. So, this was not the majority vote or recommendation, but it was one that had some momentum and no one was totally opposed to it either. Again, primarily for -- why I mentioned. This is pretty easy to calculate. So, something to consider and I'm kind of on the fence myself. Like I kind of like that and I kind of tend to agree and almost everything is usually in the one to two -- yeah, you get some three bedrooms, but that's probably going to be okay. You know, on average about the same number and it's really easy to do the math, so -- and that would be the same, then, for the vertically integrated projects, too. We are looking at bumping those up. Right now it is -- once Meridian really has an urban core or some of these areas that have additional transportation options and things like that, I think we could probably go back to something -- excuse me -- that -- that -- like what's currently on the books, which is just one per dwelling unit, irregardless of how many bedrooms, but they are more -- excuse me -- most of the families of the units are occupied by multiple cars and so when you have two or more bedrooms they are, essentially, a multi-family project, not a vertically integrated project I guess is another way to say it. So, that is something we are proposing is to step up the amount of parking stalls required for vertically integrated as well.

Seal: Quick question on the one just above that for the parking standards, the parking stall sizes.

Hood: Uh-huh.

Seal: Does that also apply to Old Town and -- I mean, essentially, everywhere?

Hood: So, no -- and, Mr. Chair, if I can just clarify the one above it. I just closed the screen or minimize --

Seal: Oh. Sorry.

Hood: Does this one work? You want me to go back to the other one?

Seal: Just the 11-3C-5A6.

Hood: 3C --

Seal: Yep. Right above where we are talking about here. Just says the design for standard vehicles.

Hood: So, this one actually was at the request of our City Council and if you read it it's not actually a requirement. It just says that they should be designed per standards and/or oversize vehicles. So, the -- the intent here is to get the design professional to think about that. Are we likely to have a landscaper with a dually, you know, here? Should we accommodate and designate some of these stalls for -- stalls for that? So, we as staff are not recommending that we require that and that say one every -- out of every 20 needs to be for an oversized Idaho truck, but it is something where, again, we want the design professionals to think about it. Hey, you know what, yeah, we probably shouldn't design everything for a compact type vehicle, because this is Idaho and people do like their trucks. So -- so that -- that -- that would apply everywhere, but it's not a standard.

Seal: Okay. After dropping my son off at the downtown Y for a week for a camp, I appreciate this new thing, so -- because all the stalls down there -- and my wife has a compact SUV that I drove down there. It was horrible. They could not get out of the doors.

Lorcher: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Lorcher, go ahead.

Lorcher: So, with these standards that you are suggesting here for the standard vehicles and the multi-family housing developments, so this goes to City Council for recommendation, then, it's adopted; correct?

Hood: Uh-huh.

Lorcher: So, does it go effective immediately, any application that comes in they start following these standards of -- you are suggesting two spaces per unit regardless of the size.

Hood: So, a couple of things just to clarify, Mr. Chair, Commissioner Lorcher. So, these would go into effect after -- so, yes, the Council will act on them. The ordinance will be updated and there will be an effective date. Anything submitted to us prior to that effective date is -- legal is going to glare at me -- grandfathered in. So, they are under -- someone submits a -- a code amendment, even the day verbally Council approves this, they still go through our process under the old code, if you will.

Lorcher: Right.

Hood: Anything we accept after the effective date of this, then, has to follow these standards. So, you will see some projects probably for the next three or four months that are going to be -- you are using the old code or our current code. Did I catch all of your questions? I know there were a couple three in there.

Lorcher: No. You got it.

Hood: Okay.

Seal: Commissioner Grace, do you have some?

Grace: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, thank you. So, you described what we are looking at and, then, you described an Option B and I just want to make sure I understand it in my own mind. So, what I'm looking at is the -- the second column would be the size of the unit and the third column is what you are suggesting you have for parking spaces there. The obvious question in my mind is what does 1.5 mean, but it -- it -- when you -- is that a one bedroom?

Hood: Correct. Yeah. Okay. I'm sorry. Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Grace, I didn't put the heading on this, so you are right, this is number of bedrooms. So, studio, one bedroom -- this -- under our old code, current code, two and three bedrooms were lumped here. What we are doing is taking the three bedrooms and we are lumping it with three and four bedrooms and more to say, you know what, at three bedrooms you really need three car parks. Back to your other question -- and I thank you for bringing that up, because I think Commissioner Lorcher mentioned the two car parks per. That's Option B. That is not the proposed -- that's not Option A, that's Option B. If you want to make it Option A to the Council, that is certainly within your purview, but what the UDC focus group recommended is what you see on the screen. So, 1.5 is an average. You don't usually have just one one bedroom, you are going to have two, three, four and, then, we round up. So, if you had an odd number we would round up to the next highest.

Grace: And, then, is it fair to say that -- I'm calling it Option A, but the one that I'm looking at provides a little more parking than Option B?

Hood: You know, I --

Grace: Because you said the numbers were pretty close.

Hood: Yeah. I -- I think it's going to average out over time. The exercise I did not do is go to count how many multi-family units had one, two and three and, then, say, okay, if we would use the old two per what would we have ended up with the car parking requirement? I did not do that. Just anecdotally I'm saying it's going to be real close, because 90 some percent of your apartment buildings are probably one and two bedrooms. You get some studios and you get some threes, but most of them are right in there where we would require two car parks anyways and you have some on the high side and some on the low side. So, overall, it kind of just averages out to around two. But, again, I did not go through the exercise to say if we had a requirement of two would we have gotten more parking or less parking?

Grace: Yeah.

Hood: Because I don't know how many bedrooms are in all the apartments in Meridian.

Grace: Just to follow up. And I was going to ask you at the end, Caleb, but since you kind of brought it up, who -- who makes up -- who made up that focus group?

Hood: Good question. It's made-up of architects, engineers, developers, we have one member of the citizen group, if you will, that -- that asked to be part of that as well. But they really are professionals that work in our code and kind of know the code and what works. Staff. We have members of our legal team. Police is here this evening, they sit on that. Fire. So, it's -- I can read you the names if you would like.

Grace: No. No. I just wanted to get a kind of a -- a gauge of who was on it and it sounds like, you know, what I thought, what I presumed was that some deference needs to go to their deliberations and their expertise. So, it sounds like they wrung their hands on this one. I just wanted to give it the same attention. That's all.

Hood: And, again, this one parking in particular got quite a bit of time on our -- on our docket. We spent quite a bit of time talking about this.

Grace: Thank you for that.

Hood: Uh-huh. All right. I'm going to move on then. This one, just to call to your attention, I think -- you don't get too many of these, but we are seeing more and more requests for private streets in the R-2, R-4 and R-8 district, which they are currently prohibited in, just because we do have street frontage requirement per lot on public street frontage. So, we are opening that up to allowing public -- or private streets, excuse me, in the R-2, R-4, R-8 district. I want to say, though, the purpose statement is not changing. We are not really trying to encourage many more private streets, because over time they can be a burden

on those homeowners when it comes to maintenance of those things, but we are open to it. So, the door is opened a little bit more of a crack in the door, if you will, but as staff we really want to see for connectivity reasons and long-term maintenance reasons we still generally are pushing for public streets. But private gated communities in an R-2 and R-4 are appropriate from time to time. So, this does allow that to -- to occur. The next one I wanted to just quickly let you know -- again, just a change kind of in our society. We are adding to the table of potential amenities when you have to provide open space and amenities in subdivisions, charging stations for electric vehicles, installed with a business center, clubhouse, or fitness facility. So, this wouldn't be a standalone one in this case, it would -- this would be, you know, the parking for the clubhouse, you have a couple of charging stations for EVs. So, that would be a couple of points, so -- back to parking again. So, drinking establishments. We -- we did -- probably three or four years ago we amended our code. Our general requirement for car parks for -- for commercial enterprises, one per 500 square feet. Restaurants and industrial buildings and our downtown all currently have different standards. We are -- we believe that drinking establishments function more like a restaurant and parking usually can't -- it can be a concern. So, one per 500 square feet hasn't worked at some of our bars and so it sounds kind of weird to require more car parking for people that are going to the bar, but we have had problems where initially a retail business goes in and, then, a drinking establishment takes over that space and there is not enough parking, because it was meant for the yarn shop and now it's a restaurant bar and there is four times the traffic and it's spilling out into the adjacent neighborhood. So, when a drinking establishment goes in we are going to apply that one per 250 square feet. So, doubling the car park requirement for drinking establishments. Almost done. There is the -- the secondary dwelling. Again, this -- this one is something that's gotten some press recently over the past year with the housing prices and inflation and all those other things. We are really trying to encourage and allow maybe more accessory dwelling units. Otherwise, known as, you know, Granny Flats or Mother-In-Law's Quarters, those types of things on your property. So, we have added some -- kind of loosened some of the restrictions on an ADU or our accessory dwelling unit standards. So, where they can be placed on the lot. We are allowing up -- to have two bedrooms. So, maybe they can -- and a little bit larger, if people want to make them a little bit bigger and nicer that isn't a minimum, it's -- it's a maximum. So, just a couple of changes that we think may -- may allow a few more to be constructed in Meridian, where some have said, yeah, that's -- it's not worth the effort. If it would only be 700 square feet and one bedroom I'm not interested. Probably -- I will just disclose. There may be more to come on this as well. So, as we talk more about accessory dwelling units and what we can do about attainable housing in our code, there may be more coming. We are kind of also keeping an eye on what other cities are doing in our area and even across the nation.

Seal: I was going to -- going to say that the manufacturer of mobile homes where tiny homes kind of fit into that, so -- and they are becoming wildly popular, so --

Hood: Yes.

Seal: -- wonder how that's going to fit into the community or --

Hood: Yes. Mobile homes, tiny homes, RVs, defining them and trying to figure out what -- yeah, how that all works. So, like I said, probably more to come on not just accessory dwelling units, but what we do with structures, mobile structures, those types of things in -- in the near future probably.

Wheeler: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Yes, go ahead.

Wheeler: Caleb, can you go back -- yeah, to that section there. I'm reading about the garage section there on that, for the under parking under E. It looks like the -- what's the -- what's the right term for it? Accessory dwelling unit? Is that what it's called?

Hood: Yep. Uh-huh.

Wheeler: Okay. So, there is going to be accessory dwelling unit there under E. It looks like they do not need to have -- or they are -- or they are not allowed to have a garage on that.

Hood: No. We do require a parking for the ADU. That is one of the -- the concerns we get from adjacent neighbors when there isn't parking provided, because this is a standalone dwelling for a new family. It can be a family member, but this is a separate standalone dwelling and so they do need to provide required parking, yes.

Wheeler: So, that means that they could -- and -- and because garages are not part of the square footage, they could have a 900 square foot unit and, then, also have a 900 square foot three car garage?

Hood: There is potential. I will say there is not a whole lot of lots in Meridian where you can fit that on.

Wheeler: Understood.

Hood: But, yes, in theory you could do that.

Wheeler: Okay.

Seal: I will say it's good that there is some work to be done on this, because it's -- I think this is coming at us quickly.

Lorcher: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Lorcher, go ahead.

Lorcher: I guess my only comment was if mobile homes and especially -- specifically manufactured homes, it's very cost prohibitive for most families in Meridian to be able to

have a second dwelling. So, you are requiring that it has a foundation and that it has -- you know, you -- you put all the plumbing in the -- and it connects the sewer and all of those things currently.

Hood: Yeah. Yeah. So, Mr. Chair, Commissioner Lorcher, there is -- there is a lot to this topic, so I don't know how deep you want to go.

Lorcher: I mean just --

Hood: Yes. What you just said as a -- as a general synopsis is correct. To be a dwelling unit it must be on a foundation, must be connected to sewer and water. The other thing that comes into play there is most of our zoning in the city is R-2, R-4 or R-8. Single family residential, when you bring another dwelling -- even if you put it on a foundation and hook it up to sewer and water, that's two on a lot. So, it's prohibited not only by definition -- if it's on wheels it's a mobile -- it's mobile right now and -- and by definition it's a recreational vehicle. So, you either license it and register it through the state, right, as a vehicle or it's a dwelling and you go through our building department and get it certified as such. You got to be one or the other and it can't be both simultaneously. So, again, there is a lot there, but you got zoning codes and definitions and building codes and definitions that all kind of intermingle. So, yes, we are -- we are exploring that and recognize that, yes, it's not super cost efficient to require, you know, again, a foundation like you stated and hook up to sewer and water, but if you are going to be a dwelling that is what's required. Your -- your single family lot was only sized and you are only paying for electric and the garbage and for one family, not two or three or four and all that, so -- but we are -- we get it. Times change and we are -- we are -- but there is a lot that goes into that when you start to say, okay, well, it's not -- it's not a Jayco, it's a home. Well, what are the differences? What are the similarities? How is that different from my brick and mortar home that's right there. So, anyways, we will be back and be talking about that more I'm sure here in the future.

Lorcher: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Go ahead.

Lorcher: I'm sure most R-8s wouldn't be able to have -- like you said wouldn't have the space for it, but R-2s and possibly R-4s would.

Hood: There -- there are some. Absolutely. And that's why, you know, we are opening this up -- and even for -- back to your -- your comment about like a tiny home, depending on how we -- we define that, again, even meeting a minimum five foot setback, you know, things like that, there are lots where you can do that. So, again, we are developing a list of pros and cons and how that could work and, again, just back to the parking question or comment, there is -- there is real impacts to existing neighborhoods, too. So, we -- we -- we have got to factor that in. Yes, be empathetic to some of those that, you know, want to live or need to live in something like that, but also realize that there is a neighborhood that others have bought into that weren't expecting maybe to see people living out of tiny homes and clogging up the streets with more cars, so -- it's a fun one. Moving on. I don't

know that I have anything else highlighted and I will scroll through -- yeah. Again just more things on vertically integrated. Live-work. We need to talk a little bit about some of these where there is concurrent applications for CUPs and development agreement modifications and with Council and so some of those have been -- are proposed to be amended to make that process hopefully work a little bit smoother. I think that's pretty much it. The rest of these are pretty much administrative changes. So, with that, Mr. Chair, I will stand for any other questions. If you want to double back or anymore comments you have on --

Seal: Just real quick. I did the pathway stuff here recently and there was just a presentation for Parks and Recs that they did on that on the -- what was the organization?

Hood: ULI.

Seal: ULI did that. And as part of that one of the -- I can't say complaints, but one of the concerns that was brought up by folks was in planning out the pathway system, that because it is going to be so integrated with the irrigation systems, that it's almost impossible for them to put any kind of shrubbery, trees, or anything like that in with that. So, they get -- they are reluctant to do it, because they get no -- basically they are giving up some land to do it and they get nothing for it. So, essentially, it's not counted as an amenity when they -- when they do that. So, is there -- you know, hopefully there is some discussion on that, because I think that the pathway system here -- to me it's -- you know, I mean I ride a bike a lot, so that -- that's one thing. But I also spend a lot of time riding my bike in areas where they have made it a priority, especially in the Eagle area, and what I have seen happen with that is not only are they protecting some of their farmland, historical lands and things like that, it's been integrated in with pathways, because the people that own that land are more than open to having, you know, pathways and things like that. They don't want cars. They don't want houses and things like that, so they have integrated that into their communities, where now not only do you have the land owners, which are oftentimes because they have large tracts of land, a minority in -- in the proceedings, now you have a different group that's out there and kind of swinging the bat for them as -- as I would say, to kind of keep that land as it is or to develop it differently to kind of keep that, you know, more rural appeal to it. So, I -- I guess coming a long ways around to -- hopefully there is more discussions on how to kind of give more credit for pathways, especially interconnecting pathways to anybody that's willing to do them and, hopefully, eliminate some of the -- you know, the -- the requirements to try and provide trees and -- and things like that and there was actually -- there is a section that we passed over for the riparian areas, you know, try to integrate some of that into it -- into the pathways portion of it to where anything that is natural it was there before, you know, essentially, the building started to happen, if that's left alone and the pathway is part of that, that's also a good integration into it as well. And, then, the -- there was also some stuff in here as far as the -- was it low water or not water abatement, but is that -- it was I think on page one or page two. It was -- I think it was up further than that. I can't remember what it was called off the top of my head. Yeah. Water conserving design. Is that something that's going to be given credit as far as an amenity or is that just something that's -- it's just in here for definition?

Hood: Mr. Chair. So, there is some credit. I don't know how you want to define credit, I guess, but, yes, you -- you can count it and it is eligible. You don't get like a bonus or anything like that for doing water conserving design, but you can see some of the standards that would qualify you going from kind of a non-traditional turf design when you use these xeriscape principles. So, it's kind of in lieu. So, yeah, again, credit, you don't get an extra pat on the back or anything necessarily. We may go there where we encourage it by saying, hey, you can provide less if you do it this way. We haven't gone -- gone there just yet. So, I hope that answers your question. But this -- this is another thing that's evolving in our world these days. As water becomes more and more precious and we need to conserve it, we are moving towards highlighting these things and, hey, we do have options to do it this way and would encourage you to come up with these innovative designs that, you know, they are not as green, but they are a little more friendly.

Seal: Right. Well, they are more cost effective. I mean you live in a subdivision that has acres and acres of grass to mow, where if they could put something in more to this kind of standard it would actually in the long run save money and it's -- a lot of this would be native, so it's going to grow here anyway. Instead of trying to prevent it from growing out of the ground, why don't we try to make it grow out of the ground, but -- okay. That was the only question I had. Commissioner Grace, go ahead.

Grace: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, can we just return to that secondary dwelling conversation? Is that -- I'm sure it is, but is that term -- it says down below in paragraph what is not, but I'm wondering if that term is defined -- and I'm sure it is probably somewhere and if it's defined to require that secondary dwelling to be affixed to the land.

Hood: Correct. Yeah. And that's what I was kind of alluding to in our -- in our definition of dwelling. So, there is -- there is more to it than this, but, essentially, it has to be on a foundation, it has to be hooked up to sewer and water. It also has to have a kitchen and it also has to have a bathroom and it has to have -- can be a studio, but living quarters. So, to be a dwelling you have to check all those boxes. You can't be -- so, like a hotel is not a dwelling, because it doesn't -- it doesn't check some of those boxes for -- and have a garage. So, that's another thing for single -- a dwelling. You can have a multi-family dwelling that has a carport. There is still parking associated with it. So, yes, there is multiple definitions you look at and go, okay, are you a dwelling? Are you, again, a mobile unit? Are you a recreational vehicle? And so on and so forth. So, I don't know if that --

Grace: Yeah. It does.

Hood: There is more to it than this.

Grace: You did -- you did say it had to be on a foundation. So, my apologies. But I just know there is different types of -- there is modulars and there is -- they are making living units out of containers now and so our -- our requirement is that it has to be on a foundation.

Hood: Correct. And just -- just to take that, again, down in a little further into the weeds, mobile homes even we define as -- I think it's -- have to be manufactured before 1972 or '3 or '4 or something like that. So, we even define it like these are the old school single wide, double wides. Those are -- again, I will use the term grandfather. Those are -- those are a separate thing. There is a new standard and I can't remember off the top of my head -- national standard for energy efficiency and all those manufactured homes that are different standards, so there is -- there is just this array of what can be -- someone could live in, but it may not be a dwelling.

Grace: Right. It's June 15th, 1975, when --

Hood: '75. Okay.

Grace: -- HUD started taking over regulation.

Hood: Somewhere in there. Yeah. Early mid '70s. Yes.

Grace: All right. Thank you.

Wheeler: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Wheeler, go ahead.

Wheeler: Caleb, it's me again.

Hood: Hi.

Wheeler: I have another question for you and I think it kind of goes up if we can go to the landscapes -- landscaping and also the parking requirements. So, Table 11-3C-6 and also kind of seeing how that kind of coincides -- or kind of comes in with -- where was that at? The landscaping buffers that were under 11-3B-7C and things like that. I will let you know what's kind of going on in my mind and seeing if there is anything in the code that can address this specifically. Also wanted to know if this is something that we can address here with this motion of this update with the code or if it's something that just has to wait and be taken care of differently, but I will let you -- here is the scenario that's in my head. Okay? So, on these major mile streets that we have or half mile streets where we have residential subdivisions that have a direct turn off into them, there is hundreds of these around the valley, right, in Meridian. Sometimes in order to just make it a little more pleasant to come into the subdivision there is some sort of landscaping island that comes there; right? That just kind of opens it up so that way you are just not pulling into a two lane, three lane road straight away. I -- I -- sometimes those -- those houses, though, that are next to where those islands are at will also park their vehicles in that driveway coming in, which, then, narrows the access down significantly and to me I find it actually an emergency issue. I find it a big safety issue, because if there is a fire this is the main access in to get to a house that's maybe one or two, you know, quarter mile in, but they can't, because now they have a vehicle that's parked there or they have to maneuver

around it or they have to figure out a way to get there or whatever the case is, right, and time is of the essence. Is there anything that's in here that says something along -- that there can be a -- a distance between these islands that are in -- like, once again, I'm getting really specific here, I understand, but I didn't if there is anything addressed like, you know, a hundred feet, what path, that's where the first parking can happen or no parking within 50 feet of this. Or I mean just -- these are the kinds of thoughts that are going through my head.

Hood: So, Mr. Chair, Commissioner, yeah, good concern and question. So, there is nothing in the UDC that -- that addresses what you are describing. However, there are at least two, if not three, other sections of other code that do address that. So, the Fire Marshal will require -- so, those -- excuse me -- splitter islands, the entryway features, one side of those has to be at least 20 feet wide, so that they can declare it a travel lane and usually it's just one side. Sometimes they will make them both 20 feet wide, but if you look usually the exiting one is a little -- because I have a dedicated right turn or a left through or something like that. But the entrance one is usually a little bit narrower than -- the entrance off of the arterial into the subdivision is usually narrower. But our fire code will require that any street -- and that would even include that area between the island and the curb be at least 20 feet. It used to be that the Fire Marshal would require that to be painted red and signed no parking. It's not very pretty. So, it's still the code, but they have gotten away from the -- the -- the painting the curb and a lot of times even the -- the signage. But if there is an issue we can have -- it's still -- it's still the code, it's just not signed that you can't park here. So, if there is an issue somewhere let me know, let the Fire Marshal know, we can go out there and either put a sign -- and ACHD also, so that their state code is the one I'm not positive about. There may be something in state code, because I know there is sections of state code that talk about how close to like a stop sign you can park and things like that, so -- in an intersection. So, kind of depending on the exact situation and what violation there may be, you may be looking at three different sections of code. But it's not the UDC, just to tell you. And it's -- and just to be quite frank with you, it's not the right place to put something like that. That's more in our vehicles and motors and Title 7 or 8 that we have of city code than in the UDC, but I -- it's covered other places. I think it's really enforcement. So, if someone is violating that and parking where they shouldn't be we can -- we have police officers and fire marshals and -- that can look into that.

Wheeler: Perfect. That's what I wanted to know. That's perfect. Thank you, Caleb.

Hood: Uh-huh.

Seal: Anybody else? Okay. Thank you, Caleb. Appreciate the presentation. Madam Clerk, do we have anybody signed up testify?

Hall: Mr. Chair, we have no one signed up online or in person.

Seal: Anybody in Chambers want to come up? No? Seeing none, can I get a motion to close the public hearing for File No. H-2022-0001?

Grace: Mr. Chairman, so moved.

Wheeler: Second.

Seal: It's been -- actually, let me go back and do this again. I know it's -- right now it's file number ZOA-2022-0001.

Grace: Mr. Chair, I move to close the public testimony.

Wheeler: Second.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded to close public testimony for file No. ZOA-2022-0001. All in favor say aye. No nays. Motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Seal: Okay. Any further discussion or have we beat up on Caleb enough? Bring it on; right?

Wheeler: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Yes, sir. Go ahead.

Wheeler: I'm sorry. I'm sorry I'm talking so much tonight. I don't know what happened. So, thank you, though, for listening. But the -- my only thought is on those dwellings with those standalone units, so secondary auxiliary units, is to maybe have something in there that talks about the -- do we want to add something that says something tiny homes, too, based upon kind of what you are thinking?

Seal: I -- I mean considering the price of housing -- and I have mixed feelings about all of it. I -- I do agree with what Caleb alluded to, which was -- I mean you are going to have people in subdivisions that aren't necessarily expecting something to pop up behind their house. You know, I mean if my neighbor built something like that in their backyard I would kind of question whether or not that's viable or not. That said I also have a son who is in his mid 20s that's trying to buy a house and every time he thinks he has enough saved up to buy a house, you know, the finish line moves on him, so, you know, I'm -- I'm interested to see where this goes, honestly, and -- and I think we are going to see probably a lot more people that want to try to furnish their -- you know, essentially, their properties this way and not just in a -- you know, an acre or five acres, you know -- I mean there is a -- there is a row of houses down Ten Mile that are on one to five acre lots that have mother-in-law quarters, so -- almost bought one early 2000s myself. So, I think that's going to move more into the rural areas, just because of the cost of housing and I mean some of the demographics we saw earlier as far as what was the -- was the amount of people paying more than 30 percent for rent was like -- had grown by 40 percent. I mean

it's -- it's a -- it's a big number. So, I just think the affordability of housing is getting -- it -- it's starting to become out of reach for a lot of people, so --

Wheeler: Understood.

Seal: -- I'm -- I'm interested to see where this goes and to see what we start to allow and what the public will allow, honestly, you know, because there are good ways to do this and bad ways to do this and everybody has a different opinion about what's good and bad about it. So, I'm more interested to see where it goes than to try and put wording into it.

Wheeler: Okay. One of the only things that I was thinking about was on that garage side of things, I'm -- my only caution or my only thoughts on it -- and I'm just kind of opening this up to you for -- for -- for Commission here to just kind of give me maybe some thoughts on it or their input on it is you could have somebody go ahead and build like a 500, 600 square foot detached, right, auxiliary secondary dwelling and, then, go ahead and build a 900 or 1,200 square foot garage on top of it and so far that would be okay and I think that's just a bit disproportionate, not what we are -- not what this is supposed to be kind of trying to help with and so my only thought is maybe to have some wording in there that says, you know, a limit or a percentage of the dwelling being allowed for a garage unit. So, in other words, somebody would say, okay, you can go up to 50 percent of the size of the dwelling up to a maximum of, you know, 800 square feet or whatever, 900 square feet, because that's a three car garage or we say, you know, a garage should only be limited, because it is a secondary up to 600 square feet, which is a two car garage size. But those are just my thoughts that initially come to me just first time through. I don't know what the rest of the Commission thinks.

Grace: So, Mr. Chair, I -- to your first point, yeah, I guess that's why I asked the question about the definition of a secondary dwelling unit. It's my understanding that the tiny home is -- is -- is a -- is a structure on a foundation built of the IRC. So, it's -- it's -- it would be allowed if that was your concern. It would be allowed under that definition and so if that -- I didn't know if you were -- that was okay with you or not, but that's -- I was okay with that.

Wheeler: With it being a very large -- having like a large shop?

Grace: No. No. Just to your first point about the tiny home.

Wheeler: Well, the tiny -- oh, got you. Yeah. Okay. All right.

Grace: And that's -- that's how I understood it.

Wheeler: I'm okay with the tiny homes, too, unless staff corrects me.

Hood: You left a window there or I interrupted. I don't know. And I'm not trying to correct you, but -- but I do want to clarify. So, a tiny home can be -- this is where it gets confusing,

even in the words we use; right? It can be a small dwelling where -- where it becomes a -- I don't want to call it a problem, but where it's not a dwelling in Meridian is when it's not on a foundation. So, I don't know if you guys are even talking about the same thing, because a lot of -- when I hear tiny home, a lot of people in their mind think mobile. It's on wheels. It's on a trailer. It's got a hitch and I can move it. So, I don't know if you are talking -- you are talking to IRC and that's what I'm saying. Now -- now we are under our building codes that's foundation, hook up to sewer and water, versus mobile. So, just --

Wheeler: I don't want it on wheels either. I like the tiny -- I just know that that's just kind of a --

Hood: Small dwelling is different than tiny home to a lot of people.

Seal: And -- and that's what I was more alluding to is I mean the -- kind of the -- the tiny home, there is a lot of people that have transitioned to this kind of tiny home and it is -- generally speaking it's -- it's a homemade trailer type of dwelling. So, yeah, not that you couldn't put something like that on a foundation and -- and, you know, plumb it, electrical, and all that stuff. It's just, you know, as we go down this path I just see that -- that becoming more available to where, you know -- it used to be that, you know, you would push baby bird out of the nest and now, you know, there is nowhere for them to go, so -- I mean they -- they can't afford to stay here anymore. So, I just see that this is probably become a wider -- something that more people consider as we go down that path. I mean I'm fortunate to where my son can afford to live in the area still, but he can't afford to buy. So, as those options become less and less then I can see people, you know, myself included being more open to something like that just as a citizen, not as a -- you know, Commissioner or anything, but that's my personal thoughts on it.

Hood: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Yes, sir.

Hood: Not to get into the middle of your guys' deliberation too much. I have already inserted myself. But I do just want to let you know -- I mean Council is also talking about this. So, I think -- and -- and they are trying to look at it, again, comprehensively. I appreciate the sentiment in talking about that here now. I don't want to knee jerk and I'm not -- don't take that the wrong way, but there are implications to words and making changes now that just trickle down and you got to change a whole bunch of stuff. So, what I was going to say mainly is to let you know there is discussions at Council -- I think it's going to be on the Council workshop agenda coming up in the next few weeks again and what I was going to offer -- so, Council Woman Perreault, who used to be on the Planning and Zoning Commission, has kind of volunteered to take -- spearhead that effort and is looking to potentially put together a work task force, working group that is going to try to tackle this for our community. So, I'm not asking for volunteers now, but I will let her know of this conversation and that maybe one or two of you may be good to serve on that, since there is at least interest from a couple few of you and she may reach out. So, I just -- I don't want you to think that nothing's going on, although all you -- the changes

you see are pretty minor at this point. We are evaluating this to see if there is longer term broader solutions to the attainable housing issues we are -- we are facing right now.

Grace: And -- and given that, really, what's on -- what's before us is -- in terms of strikethrough and underline are just some of those minor things, I might heed that advice and -- and wait for the -- the people who are probably smarter than me to -- to figure that out.

Wheeler: Very good. Very good. Yeah. Like I said, I just wanted discussion on it and see what you guys thought, so --

Seal: Yeah. I mean, honestly, I appreciate the fact that we are having this much discussion on this, so -- a lot of times this is very -- you know, I mean a lot of the stuff in -- in here is more just for cleanup and things like that, but where we are moving forward into a -- you know, a new era, basically, the stuff really starts to have teeth, if you will. So, I'm glad we are having a lot of conversation on it. It's a good conversation. With that --

Lorcher: Did we close the public hearing?

Seal: We have closed the public hearing, so if anybody wants to make a motion I'm more than ready to listen.

Lorcher: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Lorcher, go ahead.

Lorcher: After considering all staff comments I move to recommend approval to the City Council of File No. ZOA-2022-0001 as presented on the hearing date of August 18th, 2022, with no modifications.

Grace: Second.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded to approve File No. ZOA-2022-0001. No modifications. All in favor say aye. No opposed, so motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Seal: And with that I will take one more motion.

Wheeler: Mr. Chair, I motion that we adjourn.

Lorcher: Second.

Seal: It's moved and seconded to -- that we adjourn. All in favor say aye. No opposed. Motion carries. Thank you all very much.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:24 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS.)

APPROVED

ANDREW SEAL - CHAIRMAN

_____|_____|_____
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK