

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:08 p.m., Tuesday, June 7, 2022, by Mayor Robert Simison.

Members Present: Robert Simison, Luke Cavener, Treg Bernt, Jessica Perreault, Brad Hoaglun and Liz Strader.

Members Absent: Joe Borton.

Also present: Chris Johnson, Ted Baird, Joe Dodson, Tracy Basterrechea, Kris Blume and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

☒ Liz Strader	☐ Joe Borton
☒ Brad Hoaglun	☒ Treg Bernt
☒ Jessica Perreault	☒ Luke Cavener
☒ Mayor Robert E. Simison	

Simison: Council, we will call the meeting to order. For the record it is June 7th, 2022, at 6:08 p.m. We will begin this evening's regular City Council meeting with roll call attendance.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

COMMUNITY INVOCATION

Simison: We have no one for the community invocation this evening.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Simison: So, the next item up is the adoption of the agenda.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: We don't have any changes to the agenda this evening, so I move adoption of the agenda as published.

Cavener: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to adopt the agenda as published. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the agenda is adopted.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

PUBLIC FORUM – Future Meeting Topics

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

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we did. There is a letter also at your seat -- and I apologize if I mispronounce this -- Laurie Boesch. It looks -- she's not online, so maybe it's just submitted by writing. She did sign in a line and you do have that letter.

ACTION ITEMS

- 1. Public Hearing for Alamar Subdivision (H-2022-0004) by Noble Rock Development, Inc., Located at 4380 W. Franklin Rd. (Parcel #S1210346603), Near the Northeast Corner of N. Black Cat Rd. and W. Franklin Rd.**
 - A. Request: Annexation and Zoning of approximately 7.23 acres of land with a request for the TN-R (Traditional Neighborhood Residential) zoning district.
 - B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 42 building lots (22 single-family attached lots and 20 detached single-family lots) and 4 common lots on 4.63 acres in the requested TN-R zoning district.

Simison: Okay. All right. Then with that, Council, we will move on to Action Items this evening. First item up is the public hearing for Alamar Subdivision, H-2022-0004. Open this public hearing with staff comments.

Dodson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Council. Good evening. It's the Joe Show tonight again, so we will burn through this. First one as noted was Alamar Subdivision. It's for annexation and zoning and preliminary plat. The site consists of two parcels, totaling 5.63 acres of land that are currently zoned RUT in the county, located at 4380 West Franklin. The future land use designation on this site is medium high density residential and is also within the Ten Mile Interchange Specific Area Plan or what us planners just called the Ten Mile Plan. The annexation and zoning request before you tonight is for approximately 8.23 acres of land with a request for the TN-R, the traditional neighborhood residential zoning district. The discrepancy between -- which is rather large between the plat and the annexation, just because they are annexing the Purdam Drain lot directly to their west as well, in order to ensure there is no county enclave. In addition they are

submitting a preliminary plat consisting of 50 building lots on -- six common lots and two other lots on 5.63 acres in the proposed TN-R district. Fifty building lots include 32 single family attached lots and 18 detached single family lots. Designated as medium high density residential in the Ten Mile Plan, this designation allows for a mix of dwelling types, including townhouses, condominiums, and apartments. Gross density should be in the range of eight to 15 units per acre and is noted with a target density of 12 units per acre within the Ten Mile Plan. The proposed plat consisting of 50 residential units is a mix of attached and detached homes and it constitutes a gross density of 8.9 units per acre, which is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Access to the development is proposed via a new connection to West Franklin Road at the south boundary, which is the right side of the screen here. Access to Franklin is intended to be temporary until such time that a future connection is made to adjacent properties. Specifically future access should occur to the east via a local street connection in alignment with West Atomic Street and Ascent. So, they have -- this is Zimmerman Lane, which is a little flag lot in a sense -- it's not a little flag lot. It's a 20 acre flag lot over here that has an access all the way down to Franklin currently, fifty feet wide, and, then, you have the Ascent townhome project. The additional future connection should occur at the north boundary for the future extension of West Aviator Street, which is, again, on the adjacent property to the north northeast, which is the 20 acre parcel that has -- currently has Zimmerman Lane as their access. Staff has conditions of approval associated with both of these future road connections. In response to the staff report, the applicant requested a new or modified DA provision regarding the phasing of the project to include the homes of -- the homes fronting on what's Atomic Street should the timing of this connection coincide earlier than what is proposed currently. Commission agreed to this and the modification and it was reflected on the Commission recs to Council. The determination of the proposed north-south local street of the north boundary deserves some flexibility due to ongoing conversations with the adjacent land owner and future developer. Staff has included a DA provision to allow this applicant the flexibility to revise the road alignment and lot layout within the future phase two should they be able to work out a mutually beneficial agreement with the adjacent property owner. This recommended provision does not require that this applicant revise their plat at any point, but it's intent is to provide flexibility to the applicant to make any necessary revisions to the plat without having to go through the hearing process again for subsequent changes that do not increase the number building lots or drastically change the overall design, but it does and could help the overall road network in this area of the city. The proposed plat has a minimum building lot size of -- I will just keep it here -- of approximately 2,038 square feet, with an average lot size of 2,700 square feet. It includes detached sidewalks and six foot parkways. As noted, the plat is currently proposed to be developed in two phases due to the available access to the site. The phasing plan depicts construction of 27 building lots in the southern half of the site, with three open space lots, including the largest open space lots in the center with phase one, with the public roads terminating less than 150 feet from the internal intersection. Phase two, then, depicts the remaining building lots to the north and east of the centralized Intersection to be constructed along with some remaining open space and drainage lots along the north boundary. Planning and Fire have given their approval of the proposed phasing plan, including the revisions if the access to Atomic Street is constructed to the east. A minimum of 15 percent qualified open space is required for projects over five

acres within the TN-R zoning district per the UDC. Based on the plat area of 5.63 acres, the minimum amount of open space provided should be approximately 36,786 square feet. According to the revised plat and landscape plans, the applicant is proposing approximately 36,800 square feet -- 36,800 square feet of qualified open space, which meets the minimum 15 percent. Specific to the Ten Mile Plan, front loaded dwellings are not preferred and if they are proposed the garages should be set back from the living area façade to help create a more porch dominated streetscape, rather than garage dominated. According to the submitted elevations and floor plans, the applicant has proposed units with the garages considerably behind the living area facades. This design provides for a more porch dominated street façade, compared to traditional single family residential, which is desired. As noted staff has included a DA provision to ensure this type of design is maintained for the project. Overall staff fully supports the proposed home design and street oriented design submitted by the applicant and, frankly, their floor plans are the most consistent with the Ten Mile Plan I have seen in the Ten Mile area. The only outstanding issue for Council is that the applicant has requested a specific DA provision regarding the garage setback behind the living area facade. I have noted that in my Commission recs. Staff is fine with that. I just have a general design guideline DA provision, but you are more than welcome to add that additional DA provision. After that I will stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you, Joe. Council, any questions?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you, Joe. You had mentioned TN-R specific setbacks. Can you remind us of what those are, front, sides and back, please?

Dodson: Council Woman Perreault, off the top of my head I don't remember the TN-R setbacks. I apologize. The setbacks I was referring to are from the Ten Mile Plan that talked about having the garages set back approximately 20 feet from the living area facade in order to just have a more pedestrian oriented design through the streetscape. That's not a setback. A building setback with the zoning district. The applicant has taken the Ten Mile Plan, which is part of the Comprehensive Plan and decided to try to adhere to that more than any of the other subdivisions I have worked with in the area and I appreciate that very much. But the TN-R district does allow -- I believe it's eight feet of living area setback, which is closer than most of the other districts as well, as well as it requires parkways, it requires detached sidewalk, and it has -- it can do attached projects. You can do any of the residential projects that you want in detached, attached, townhouse, multi-family by right. So, we worked with the applicant to do TN-R in order to help meet the Ten Mile Plan even more, since he was already going to propose parkways.

Perreault: Thank you.

Dodson: You are welcome.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Joe, there was a comment in the staff report about needing revisions to the drain easement to create like a closed loop. Just wondered if those revisions have happened. How does that stand?

Dodson: Council Woman Strader, I was -- in reference to that I believe it was -- if he wanted to count that area as qualified open space there would have to be a -- a loop of pedestrian facilities, that additional landscaping. That is not going to occur, which is why he lost a building lot and increased the open space in other areas in order to comply with the open space standards.

Strader: Thank you. So, he's met the standard without doing so?

Dodson: Yes, ma'am.

Strader: Thanks.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Because it's the Joe Show tonight I have got a couple of -- kind of sideways questions. The -- the temporary access coming off of Franklin, my assumption -- and Fire is not here. I assume the -- the thought for the cul-de-sac or kind of the modified cul-de-sac is that would be for a turnaround for a fire truck. Does that access at Franklin -- does that become an emergency access when it's no longer temporary? Does it become walled off? What's -- what's contemplated for it once it shifts from temporary to a more permanent place.

Dodson: Right. That's a great question. So, the cul-de-sac at the south boundary is required as -- because that's the termination of the public road once the access to Franklin is closed. So, that's why that cul-de-sac is there. Be for a fire turnaround, yes. Initially we were just going to close it. The applicant and I thought we were just going to close off the access altogether, but ACHD and Fire both said, well, can we do an emergency and so we all agreed yes and so it will just become an emergency access, so we can have additional access points through this area for Fire.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Joe -- and I'm -- I'm -- I guess I'm asking you to look into your crystal ball a little bit. How -- what's the time frame from when this becomes a temporary regular access to

a permanent emergency access? Are we talking -- on average is it two years? Four years? I know we have got a lot of interest in development in this part of town. I'm just curious -- what happens is we condition -- people get conditioned to using this and, then, as these residents move in they think it's their access and, then, the city, quote, unquote, comes in and takes it away from them. I'm just trying to get a sense as to what that timeline would look like.

Dodson: Sure. I -- obviously, I can't give a direct number, but I -- it's all really going to depend on the access out to the -- what -- yeah -- West Atomic Street and Ascent Townhomes and what the developer and this applicant does for the 20 acre parcel to the northeast, since they control Zimmerman Lane and that's a 50 foot wide area that's a flag lot essentially that's the 50 feet that would be needed in order to access West Atomic. My understanding is that both applicants are working together and -- and that is the intent that both of them want to do, but bigger picture in this whole area, there are some questions still between staff and ACHD that we are having and we are trying to figure that out. So, timing I would say -- you know, phase one I would assume is going to get constructed before that gets figured out, only because I don't know for sure that applicant is proposing to submit in the coming weeks. Hopefully we can meet with ACHD before that and get some of those things buttoned up together. But, if not, they are still going to push forward and we are going to figure it out on the fly like we tend to do sometimes. But it -- I would assume two years'ish. I think the applicant might have a better number for you just based upon their construction timeline.

Cavener: Great. Thanks, Joe.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Joe, to that end how many different parcels with different owners does Aviator go through? So, we had a hearing for a property to the northwest of this and its -- its connection was also dependent on the development of the 20 acres and, then, we have got this property, then, we have got the Ascent neighborhood to the east. Are -- are there other parcels that Aviator is going to go through that are also going to be dependent on this collector development to have access?

Dodson: Council Woman Perreault, that's a great question. So, there -- really Aviator Street will only go through one more, which is the larger Zimmerman parcel is -- I just -- that's what we call it, because it's Zimmerman Lane. But it's probably going to be Newkirk neighborhood. So, I will just keep going with Zimmerman, because that's what I know. But it should only be going through the Zimmerman parcel and I guess Aviation Subdivision, with a little bit here. For reference overall all three -- this parcel and these two parcels are now under common ownership and they are going to propose one cohesive project. They will access Aviator and one access to Franklin. More than likely ACHD preliminary thinks that that's okay as well. So do we. Probably not a public road connection, but a connection Aviator will come through here. Again with the Ascent

townhomes there is questions about whether or not grade will allow this planned connection to occur even, so there could be that lack of a connection there, which, again, with ACHD that might require the temporary access at Ascent to become permanent, which, then, makes the access through Alamar and to West Atomic Street and, then, up to Aviator even more important. So, it's -- it's a lot of different puzzle pieces, but assuming that all of this gets approved, then, the only additional accesses to Franklin should be either the Ascent or Zimmerman Lane, plus one access west of the drain. The access points to Aviator will probably be at least two on its south side, if not three, but at least two. Where those are going to be are going to be dependent upon what -- what the Zimmerman developer ends up wanting to do and how they work with ACHD on the Ascent access on the southeast corner of their site, because there is a one acre parcel here. They have to have access. They are going to have to go to the collector, either through a common drive or something else, or a local street and, then, all of these -- there is three more parcels here that have different ownerships that will have to go east to some type of road here or we assume that this street, which is -- it's really hard to see, but this street here will continue west and, then, head back up and connect to West Atomic Street up here and you could split lots off on both sides through all of the three parcels there. So, there has been some thought to this, which is why the applicant has provided the shape of the cul-de-sac that he has, too, so that we could get a public road connection there, too, and, then, you could have a loop. But without the bigger parcel and, then, ACHD helping guide us onto what they are going to allow or require, it is difficult right now.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for staff? Okay. Would the applicant like to come forward. Please state your name and address for the record and be recognized for 15 minutes.

Wrede: My name is Jeff Wrede. I live at 12805 West Engelmann Drive in Boise. I'm with Noble Rock Development and we are here presenting the annexation, rezoning, and preliminary plat of Alamar Subdivision. Alamar Subdivision will provide a diversity that is key to Meridian's Comprehensive and future use plans, as well as the Ten Mile Interchange Specific Area Plan. These plans stress mixed income, mixed family size and mixed age communities. To balance the surrounding developments in the area, which include three story townhomes and large apartment complexes, the Alamar Subdivision will provide a mix of single family detached and attached duplex homes to provide the diversity of housing types in the overall area to provide for a successful urban environment street oriented design has been incorporated. Alamar Subdivision will consist of porch oriented homes and tree lined streets with detached sidewalks. The front of the homes will be placed close to the sidewalk, while the garages will be set back to the rear of the homes. This will provide a home fronting edge to the public space, which will make the streets more friendly and walkable. This is the vicinity map of the area. We are located on the north side of Franklin Road between Black Cat and Ten Mile Road in the developing area of the Ten Mile interchange specific area. The hatched areas are the developed or developing areas, in addition to which Joseph had just pointed out the two lots to the east southeast are actually -- the one lot is owned by a developer here and he has been talking with the owner of the next lot for purchase to work on developing that

property. For a preliminary plat we are rezoning to traditional neighborhood residential, which emphasizes street oriented design and tree lined streets and detached sidewalks. Our density is 8.9 units per acre and -- which consists of 50 building lots. There will be 18 single family detached homes, which will be located in the southern section of the property and, then, there will be 32 single family attached homes as duplexes in the north section. For open space and site amenities we are providing a total of about 22 percent of open space. As far as qualified open space, that consists of a central open grassy area and the northwest open grassy area, the parkway buffers, the landscape buffer along Franklin Road and two shallow storm drain areas. In addition to that, we are providing a linear open space along the Purdam Drain, which runs the entire west property line and that will be basically covered with road base and also like perma bark or chip rock to make a walkable area. The center image shows the essential open grassy area and both of the grassy areas will have a pathway that will be landscaped according to the UDC and what it will do is it will help -- the sidewalk helps connect this walking path and the sidewalks throughout the subdivision in several loops. For site amenities we were only required one and we chose to put a bicycle repair station and it will be located in the central grassy area. Road connections. The Alamar Subdivision will eventually provide key infrastructure connections for the surrounding developments. In the upper right small image there this shows Black Cat to the west and the Aviator Street, which is the collector that's been -- we have been talking about. This goes through to here and, then, it will go through the 20 acre Newkirk parcel and connect down -- I believe it's Saint Marco Way to get back to Franklin. Excuse me. In our subdivision our north-south road will connect to that collector and, then, we also provide an eastward road connection that will connect with Ascent Subdivision. The Franklin access at the south will be temporary and after the connections are made to the other roads that will be closed and, again, it will be used as an emergency access for Fire and Police. We have spoke with the Newkirk developers and their intention so far is to actually probably pass on that fifty foot strip across property to us. That is currently Zimmerman Lane. We are also working with them to possibly get a right of way and a written approval to use that section of the road now and maybe connect that road sooner. We are providing a full 33 foot road section, back of curb to back of curb, and we will have bulb outs at the intersection for a traffic calming. As far as infrastructure we have existing services of eight inch and sewer and water mains are located at Franklin Road entry and we will be stubbing them to the adjacent properties. We have streetlights located every 250 feet as per code. Same with fire hydrants, every 400 feet. For gravity and pressurized irrigation -- pressurized irrigation will be provided by the Nampa-Meridian Irrigation District via an existing regional pump station that is at the northwest and the irrigation loops will be designed per UDC and NMID requirements. For gravity irrigation we have a small lateral that is at the north boundary of the property and where we plan to tile the entire section. Along the western boundary of our property where the Purdam Drain runs, we are providing a 17 foot wide access road as mentioned. And all the building pads are located still outside of the hundred foot center lane easement that NMID has. Any fencing that's gets put in there will be removable. These are all items we have discussed with them already. The easement will be, again, covered with road base in chip rock and so it will still be, you know, able to be used for walking and families and pets and things of that sort. Our phasing plan -- as Joseph mentioned, we plan to develop the first southern section of that, which will be 18 single family homes and ten

single family attached. The stub streets are less than 130 -- 150 feet. So, we are not required to have fire sprinklers, because there is less than 30 units. Phase two will coincide with completion of the northern collector road and the entry at Franklin will at that point be closed and become a temporary entry. These are some sample elevations per our plans. We have tried to meet the Ten Mile Plan traditional neighborhood residential requirements. We have front porches and homes close to the detached sidewalk. Garages are set back from the front facade and where there is double doors, like in the single family homes, they are actually made with two individual doors. We are using a mixture of materials, color and design elements and including lap siding, stucco, brick and stone accents. The single family detached homes will be three bedrooms with two and a half baths, approximately 1,500 to 1,900 square feet and the attached duplex units will be two bedrooms with two and a half baths, around 1,300 square feet. The lower central image shows how the garage is set back from the front facade as we discussed earlier. These are the floor plans for the two units. One item maybe to note is that on the first floor unit we are incorporating the covered patios -- small covered patios within the building envelope to allow, you know, some patio -- covered patio area and to kind of extend the yard size. That's pretty much for the presentation. That's it. We would like to thank the Planning and Zoning staff for their support and direction during the past year and we concur with all their decisions and Commission recommendations. We would like to, though, address one issue and it's the requirement for the Ten Mile Plan to have 50 percent of the homes have a second story deck included on them. We understand that decks are desired in multi-level apartments and condominium complexes that have limited exterior access, but since Alamar Subdivision will consist of single family homes we are questioning the need for the second story deck in this environment. It's typical that second story decks are rarely used sometimes and they also create a long-term maintenance issue for water infiltration a lot of times and just rotting and things of that sort. We would like to request just to remove the requirement of the Ten Mile Plan, else we would like to request a reduction from the 50 percent requirement to 25 percent of the homes that have street frontage. In exchange we -- you know, we are planning to put porches pretty much on a hundred percent of the units. The requirement is only 30 percent. And that concludes my presentation. Thank you.

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

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Is it Jed? Jed.

Wrede: Jeff.

Cavener: Jeff. Sorry.

Wrede: That's all right.

Cavener: Appreciate you being here. I appreciate your -- your application and your presentation. I really like the -- the mix of the detached and the -- and -- and the single family home piece element. But I guess my -- my question for you is -- is maybe kind of a direct question is why right now and -- and let me give you a little -- kind of where I'm coming from on this. Is this -- this feels a little bit like an in-fill piece, but it's not and when I see -- we are talking amenities about a -- a bike repair station, I say, okay, that's interesting, but, then, I say where are people going to ride their bikes and I -- and I don't see -- I don't see a lot of connectivity right now, because you are coming in before a lot of other stuff that's happening and so I guess kind of help me understand kind of the timeline and -- and why right now.

Wrede: Okay. So, there currently is, you know, sidewalk all the way along Franklin Road there and -- and bike paths there. The only -- the other option in there -- I mean this is, of course, mainly walking right now. You know, in the -- for the pathways. You know, our thought is that this access across Zimmermann to Ascent Subdivision will happen sooner than later, working with the other developer that are submitting their -- their proposals right now. As far as, you know, long-term bike use, of course, the collector road is going to be a big plus for bicyclists in the area.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I guess that's where I come back to, is it -- this feels kind of minimal to me, if I'm -- if I'm being honest about when I look at our neighborhoods and we are a community for families and I -- I don't see a lot for families right now and it's very possible that what develops around me support that, I just -- I'm really struggling with -- that this may very well be a really well thought out addition to our community, but for me, because it's kind of coming in a little more premature, I'm -- I'm not quite sure that now is the right time for it. So, I just -- I want to give you some of that flavor from -- from the get go. I would have liked to have seen more from your application. I just want to be direct with you.

Wrede: Okay. In any specific areas? Or as far as just connection and being an in-fill with, would -- like I said, we do have the connection to Ascent there, which is currently under construction, and it's somewhat in -- in a similar situation. The lot to the east of that is not developed, but that's been put in and so -- I mean my assumption was I'm actually helping to continue this and by the time -- really for timing wise that was discussed earlier, I don't think Newkirk is too far behind me actually.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, if I may?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I don't disagree with you. I think that it's -- it's one of those things that if maybe we are seeing this application six months from now and I have got a good sense about how this part of town is developing, I can say, oh, yeah, that makes sense with everything

else that's going on. Like I said, this feels like -- like an in-fill that's coming in before everything else. I think you have got some open space that could be used better than -- than what you have proposed I think, again, a -- a bike and repair station as the sole amenity -- I think that our citizens deserve better, if I'm being direct.

Wrede: Okay. Would there be a suggestion?

Cavener: Sure.

Wrede: I mean we have, you know, the four large open grassy areas there.

Cavener: Yeah. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Those are easy questions for me. I think it's -- it's -- it's dog parks, it's place structures, it's -- it's gazebos. It's -- there is -- there is lots of options. Again coming back to, you -- you know who you are going to market this to and so if -- if you think that the people that are going to look to buy this house are going to say, oh, wow, we are excited about a bike and repair station, then, I'm wrong.

Wrede: I understand.

Cavener: And I think that I have got a good sense as to what our citizens want and expect and I think that you could provide more.

Wrede: Okay. I think I understand your comment now. I wasn't understanding it completely. We originally in an earlier plat -- this is, basically, I think our third one we have been through. We had a play state -- play structure in the central grassy area and I think I went back to more looking at just the code and because we kind of got hung up in a lot of code issues very specific and in reading the code it only required the one point and so we looked on the list and looked at the options and that's the thing we picked. We have no problem putting a play structure in that park. Like I said originally that's what we had in the central part of the subdivision there.

Cavener: Okay.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Well, I --

Wrede: Want to speak on the same --

Kerner: If I could -- Derek Kerner. Rock Solid Civil applicant team. At 270 North 27th Street, Boise. And so applicant's engineer. So, I just -- hearing the testimony I think I could maybe help answer some of these questions. We have been at this for -- for some time. That doesn't mean that it's not -- you know, it doesn't quite answer your question, but we have been doing a lot of planning as far as the years of prep into -- into this, working with staff on -- on helping pave the road or what this all should be and so we helped this applicant over here just in meetings of Aviator Subdivision. So, we have worked with them on how can we connect R-2? You know, it was, then, going to -- the ultimate plan was -- jumping ahead was we are going to let the connection happen on this larger 20 acre piece to the north, because there was times where we were talking about can we just connect? We do touch for just a little bit. Is it wide enough to put a road in there? Can we make the whole piece. Our piece at one point in time was going to be the main connection, because you could very easily just turn that road south and go straight down. It was just in a strange spot for ACHD. They are like, no, we have already kind of committed to, you know, Aviator connecting further to the east. So, you got Ascent Subdivision coming in and they -- they kind of have that temporary -- we don't know; right? Joe talked to -- about it. It all depends on what agreements are made to cross Nampa-Meridian Irrigation District's crossing. I think it's -- it can all be resolved and -- and get this thing in here. We are -- we are definitely a -- a player coming in as a -- a piece of the pie and so, you know, waiting until the end -- I don't know if that's -- that's the right move for us anyway and, then, we do have 50 lots here. It does seem, you know, spatially we are skinny and you got a 20 acre piece up here. But, you know, five, six acres -- to us 50 lots is a substantial project, not an in-fill like I'm used to dealing with Boise and like six lots here and there type of thing. So, yeah, just to kind of downplay the -- the term in fill on that one, just because it's -- it's -- it's a sizable project. We also -- when Jeff acquired the first five acres -- it's actually less than five acres. So, we were going to move forward with a subdivision less than five acres not having all these normal requirements. Then the opportunity came up to get that one acre and, of course, we are smart guys, so we said, well, hold on a second here, maybe we should play that as a different project, so that we can -- and -- but we were working together and if we -- if we wanted to go that route is the way we could have gone, but we chose not to do that. We wanted to play by the -- all the rules and -- and -- and comply with all of the requirements. We are right at the threshold for open space, because we are not crediting any of the -- the drain and the drain -- we really are going to put a nice pathway there. It's -- it's -- we have to be courteous of the -- of the irrigation district. They have needs for that, they got to get in there and operate. But, really, it's not going to be fenced off, closed off. People are going to be able to use it. We just can't have credit in the city's eyes that way. We can't be putting nice big trees in the way of the irrigation district, even though there is all kinds of trees there that -- that they are kind of ratty and they want them taken out and we are going to do that for them. But it's a really nice deep drain. There is ducks. There is waterfowl. There is all kinds of birds and wildlife in there. So, we were trying to make an argument of it's going to be enjoyable. The people that live on that row, they are not going to back up to more development at their backyard. That is always going to be this nice, big irrigation drain, you know, fully vegetated with -- with water fowl. So, it's definitely a -- a space, amenity where people aren't going to be crowded in all the time for these -- for these people living here. So, it -- we don't get credit for it in any way that the -- that

the city sees, but because of that we get no credit for it we met the minimum otherwise standing on its own. But, you know, if you -- we even talked about like, hey, give us -- give us half. So, suddenly the equations work. You know, half of that -- that drain -- that space, because it is property that he had to buy and, you know, you own it, so -- but it's encumbered by easement. So, working with them. That's all I got. Just those three things just to kind of help -- help add the timing and, then, of course, we could spice up the -- the amenity of the bike -- the bike repair station. But we were going forward just central open space like what Joe wants, instead of putting it just at the end and having a really long block of -- of homes. So, central open space.

Wrede: And the -- the layout of this subdivision --

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Yes, Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I apologize for interrupting. I believe Council -- Council Woman Perreault had the floor and I'm just a little concerned that maybe the applicant is -- is using additional time to testify, instead of responding to a specific question. Sorry.

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Thank you very much, Council Woman Strader. So, thank you for the additional information. Along -- I have a couple of -- of questions I'm going to ask, but I do want to comment very quickly along the lines of what Councilman Cavener was pointing out. I lived in this area for many years and it is very unique from other areas that we have worked in Meridian and that you have these little parcels and many of them and ACHD has not at this point in time put together a specific plan for the road network in this area. So, this is a unique area that we are very aware of its challenges with development. So, while I'm not as much concerned about the timing of where you are coming in in relationship to the other small parcels, I -- I am concerned that the entire area will develop in a way that each individual subdivision isn't like this little island into itself, not only from a road network standpoint, but just from -- from pathways to, you know, the uses of the -- of open spaces. Now, of course, the intention is never for other subdivisions to come in and utilize your open space, but it's likely that that could happen in this area, because each subdivision is -- is little and folks aren't going to necessarily understand those boundaries. So, the question I have for you is, first, thank you very much for agreeing to consider a different amenity and my recommendation would be a dog park specifically because you have a collector that connects two arterials on either side that has a railroad to the north. So, you are not -- you are not crossing over that railroad with pathways or pedestrian activity and there is no neighborhood park in walking distance of this. So, whatever you choose to do is what you choose to do. A place to exercise animals is great. I don't -- I also agree I don't see bicycles being actively used in this area yet. So, I -- I wanted to say that. So, to that end, with the connectivity, the developer to the north had sent a letter in on your application and said, you know, they would like to see some more investigation research done on how the road network

will -- will lay out in this area and to -- to be honest, you know, I sent a message to Joe and I said it seems to me like the highway district is kind of punting this back to the owners of these properties and saying, hey, you guys figure this out and so I just wanted to get your perspective on the letter that was provided by the property owner to the north and how you see your role in the overall development of connectivity in the -- in the area.

Wrede: Okay. So, I have seen their -- their preliminary design multiple times and I have had e-mails back and forth. I have actually sent them and proposed possible road connections for them to meet ACHD requirements and this sort. I have actually sent some information to Joseph and to Bill also when they were working through this. Let's see if I can find the right image. Their drawings right now indicate that they want to bring their road down right along the edge of this western property line right here. They cannot do that. The Purdam Drain is right here and to do that and meet any kind of radius that ACHD requires means they have to be on the edge of the ditch and they can't -- they can't provide any access for NMID to get to the ditch. Basically, the road is -- is right over here and I know that that fits their layout really nice, because if you go north it fits a lot to the left and a lot to the right of that, but it physically is not capable of being implemented right there and I have suggested this and mentioned this, but I think they are just pushing through. I -- I'm willing to work with them. That's why we spoke about -- our road originally went due north straight up. Planning and Zoning requested us to make it angle to the right to make it more perpendicular, which we did. And we also put in the provision there that if we need to tip it to the left we can tip it to the left. So, we are working with them to try to make this work out. I have other drawings showing how the road connections could be easily done through the entire area. I have actually drawn all of them different -- many different ones. And so that would be -- I haven't seen that letter, but I'm guessing that might be part of -- and, hopefully, that response is targeting that.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: It was just a general letter that said we would really like to see more information on how this is all going to connect and we are planning on submitting our application closer to the end of June. So, that got me thinking that, you know, do we -- we wait, which is I think some of what Councilman Cavener was trying to get at is do we wait to see that application come in to discuss your application? There is a little bit of a chicken and egg thing going on in this entire area with multiple parcels; right? So, there may not be a super clean way that we -- that we do this, but we want to do it as smart as we can.

Wrede: Yes. We are -- we are giving them every option to connect and to allow our road to connect to whatever angle of the collector they want to put through there.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Kerner: Talking from a -- from a -- a layout engineering perspective, if I was going to be laying out this larger 20 acre piece, having other people next to me that have a layout and

a road that's that design parameter that really helps, because it's too much of a blank canvas on how you are going to get this road through there. So, when you have those things like we are -- we are saying, hey, this is where we would want it, it's usually just an, okay, thank you, and they make it work. It's not we want it over -- and we are talking like 150 -- 150 feet worth of a -- a shift. That's nothing for them, so -- giving it right where we want it, whether it's straight, curved, whatever, but moving it over to our side there is no reason for them to -- to do that. So, yeah, just working with them on -- on where we want the road to be.

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you. Two things just wanted staff to confirm. So, if we moved forward on this this evening, I'm assuming our typical requirements are that the property to the north would have to connect; right, Joe? So, if you can just confirm that that's how this would play out. It's really kind of like first one past the post drives the road network is my impression.

Dodson: Council Woman Strader, that -- typically yes and that is precisely why I have a specific DA provision that allows flexibility in that and why that is shown in phase two and not phase one, because typically if -- if it's not final platted, then, there is some flexibility. But beyond that understood flexibility I wanted to be even more specific about saying that the city is okay with this alignment on the north boundary changing somewhat to accommodate these conversations and these potential changes. So, we -- we would be in the clear I think to make -- and allow the applicant to work with that applicant to the north.

Strader: That makes sense. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Just a little feedback and, then, I have a question. I agree that the amenities feel a little light, but one thing that did catch my attention is you made a comment that this would be a more affordable development and so I was wondering -- and, obviously, it's preliminary. Do you envision these as rentals? For sale? Do you have any idea of -- of what kind of market -- part of the market you would target with these units?

Wrede: Yes. So, the single family and probably half of the duplexes will be for sale. I will probably keep ten of the units -- ten of the duplex units for rental. They will probably be mainly in just the one acre area there off to the side. As far as market, you know, we are looking -- you know, it's changing every day and maybe a month ago it was much different than it's going to be next year. But, basically, we thought we could be in the 400 range -- four and a quarter range.

Strader: Well --

Wrede: No? That's a starting point.

Strader: Yeah. It's just a -- it's really sad kind of state of the market for everybody in Meridian. That is not affordable for people. So, it's really hard. Thanks for that feedback though.

Simison: So, I don't know if this is a question for the applicant, Joe, or Chief Blume, but if we are going to have an emergency access off of Franklin Road why do we need a roundabout -- or fire truck turnaround at the end of that road or that same location.

Dodson: Mr. Mayor, that's an ACHD requirement. They are going to require that turnaround there. I -- I -- we have asked the same question.

Simison: Okay.

Dodson: Because it is quite a lot of asphalt.

Simison: Unnecessarily. So, why would we leave an emergency access then?

Kerner: It's for pedestrian vehicles, because there will be bollards eventually when they close this thing, so only the fire truck will be able to lower those bollards. So, vehicles won't -- won't be able to get out. But they still need to be able to turn around.

Simison: Okay. Thank you.

Dodson: I promise I understand.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for the applicant? Okay. Thank you very much. Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone signed up to provide testimony?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we did not.

Simison: Okay. Is there anybody in the audience who would like to provide testimony on this application or anybody online that would like to provide testimony, you can either come forward or use the raise your hand feature on Zoom and we can bring you in for comments. Seeing nobody wishing to provide testimony, would the applicant like to make any final comments?

Wrede: Have no further comments. Thank you.

Simison: Okay. Thank you. And I'm sure Council will have additional questions and comments for you, so we will let them drive from here.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I do have a question for staff in regard to the outstanding issues. The -- the 16 feet setback, is that -- that's between the garage and what?

Dodson: The living area facade. So, not a building setback to the property line --

Perreault: Okay.

Dodson: -- but the setback from the living area and the garage, which he's already showing it behind, but he just wants it to be solid in a DA provision to have that listed as no less than 16 feet, which staff is perfectly fine with.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor? Did he step out?

Hoaglund: Yes. Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Council President, thank you. So, the applicant requested two additional outstanding items and that's in regard to the percentages of street facing homes. Can -- can you share with us your thoughts on that? I didn't -- I didn't see that in the staff report, but I apologize if I missed it.

Dodson: Council Woman Perreault -- no, great question. He was only really referencing the design standard, which is one condition, I believe, in my staff report regarding the porches. Ten Mile Plan requires that at least 50 percent of single family homes should have the second story decks. So, I put it in there to help comply with the Ten Mile Plan. So, it's Council's purview on whether they want to reduce that or remove it altogether. With the submitted elevations and, you know, they are not massive buildings, I -- I can understand if Council were to strike that. I'm -- I'm not going to fall on any kind of sword for that. I -- I see both sides of that. So, would some second story decks be nice? Probably. Would it increase maintenance costs for homeowners? Absolutely. I don't want to replace my first story deck, so -- you know.

Hoaglund: Other questions?

Bernt: Mr. President?

Hoaglund: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I apologize I had -- I had to step out earlier and I will be -- I will abstain from this -- you know, the vote on this.

Hoaglund: Okay. Thank you, Councilman Bernt, and so noted. Mr. Mayor, you are back. I do have a question.

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglun: And this is more for -- for Council. I heard -- and I agree that for the upgraded amenity for the site, but, then, I heard play structure and dog park. Are we arm wrestling to see which one it is or is that an option that would be considered? Okay. Thank you. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: Yes. So, can we talk about this and not close the public hearing and see if there is some questions that -- that arise. Yeah. It is -- it is a bit of a puzzle in this area due to the different land ownership and how that looks and I like the term puzzle, because they are here, here, here, here and, you know, we have to make sure the last one that comes in is going to fit and not be -- be left out. But I -- I think the applicant did make a good case of how they are structured and I appreciate staff taking a look at -- at that north end and allowing some flexibility to make that move, if necessary, with -- when that other applicant to the north comes in -- into play. It's -- it's always difficult when you are -- whether you are the last one in or the -- one of the early ones in, there is always that -- that unknown. But I think we have known all along since Hensley Station and the next one and some others, we did have a plan in place of how that road is going to go and where it's going to exit and all these different things and I think there will be some other tweaks that are needed as -- as we go along, but I think we have left a lot of options available for developers to -- to work with and -- and not lock ourselves in or lock anybody out, if you will. So, again, I appreciate staff working on that and -- and trying to make that -- make that occur. So, I -- I think with the changes -- changes made and -- and allowing some options, it -- it -- it can work for me and upgrading the amenity would -- would -- would make this work. As far as the second story decks, you know, yeah, I -- I -- I get it. Maybe we -- we look at their compromise that they had with the 30 percent. I don't have that language in front of me, as -- as an option that -- I -- I'm not sure -- it's not a -- not a huge deal for me, but it's something I would -- I would look at if there is interest.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you. I don't want to unnecessarily delay the process, but I really would like to get a bigger picture under -- understanding of what we should be expecting from ACHD and so I realize that there isn't a formal process to go through, that they don't have a plan in place we can reference. I know our staff has been attempting to communicate with them. I know the applicant's been attempting to communicate with them and I would like to see a joint communication with the applicant to the north with this project and with any other owners in that area that can be brought to the table. Now, if that's already been done I would -- I would like to hear more about it. If it hasn't I would like to see that happen before I'm comfortable making a decision. Again, it's -- it's not something they are going to put a formal plan together on, but to give an indication of -- or have a conversation about any challenges that maybe being faced with a road network and the reason I am saying this is because we have had many different applications in the past where there has been conversations about, well, if the road had only been moved here, if the road

was only here, if the road didn't end here and we have -- now have an opportunity to -- to have that conversation at the front end. So, that's my preference and the situation is continue it until we can get some more information. I mean if -- if the applicant to the north really is coming in this month I don't see the downside of us extending it for four to six weeks, but let the applicant comment on that I suppose.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: It sounds like that was maybe a question for the applicant, but I just -- I, for the most part, am in agreement with Council Member Perreault.

Dodson: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Yes, Joe.

Dodson: To Council Woman Perreault's points, some of those conversations have occurred. Not all of the new developers -- just ownerships are changing pretty quickly these days, so -- but minimally between Alamar and myself, obviously, and ACHD and, then, the Newkirk neighborhood and ACHD, we sat down before they even pre-app'd and I'm -- I don't want to -- I don't know where -- how much I can say, but I will just say that the conversations did not go as I had hoped they would and there wasn't as much guidance on where the road should go as I anticipated getting from ACHD and that has subsequently led to some of the questions tonight, as well as even in the -- we have done two pre-apps with the other application now and we are kind of going in a circle, because people are getting different information from different people and it's -- it's not helping. So, I -- I do understand your point. Minimally with the Newkirk neighborhood that will be submitting later, there should -- prior to that there should be some discussion. In regards to the application tonight, I -- I understand where Council's going. I do think in the grand scheme of -- of the overall connectivity this one doesn't have nearly the amount of impact I think that the others are going to have and it is on the west boundary adjacent to a hard drain that's not moving or going anywhere. So, it -- their road layout is not going to change. It -- it is just a timing thing that you guys discussed, so --

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Yes, Mr. Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Follow up on -- on that, Joe. You know, as -- as the applicant described the situation, is -- is the flexibility that we are allowing in this that staff put in for that northern connection, does that work with what the applicant described that the -- the other property had some limitations, too? Does that -- does that work in -- in the possible scenarios that could be out there?

Dodson: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Hoaglund, I believe they do. I don't see why -- why they wouldn't. The issue is just going to be that applicant thinking that the road needs to go on one piece of it and, then, this applicant saying no. Part of ACHD standards will help dictate that as well, about the radiuses and where they can connect to a collector, et cetera. You know, you like everything to come at a right angle, but sometimes that doesn't happen, especially when you have the shape of that -- this road is going to be. So, I -- the provision for this application provides ample flexibility, yes. I will be okay with this application. A hundred percent.

Hoaglund: Okay. Thank you.

Simison: Council, is there any reason to hear from Kristy from ACHD?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I understand this isn't necessarily Kristy's specific role at ACHD, but if she has anything to share I would definitely appreciate hearing it.

Inselman: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Perreault, I don't know that I have a lot to add as far as the overall roadway network. I mean we -- we do have our plan -- we have our long range plans that we look at for arterial and collector roadways. The entire county has been laid out on locations that we would like to see that network. When it comes to local roadway connections we typically -- it -- it is kind of a puzzle piece. It depends on when applicants come in and how -- we do require through our code that the roadways have to stub to the adjacent properties, but we leave some of those design elements up to the developers as to where they are going to stub those properties that we require them to be stubbed. So, if a property has two adjacent properties to it, if they redevelop, we may require two stub streets to where that road can continue as those properties become redeveloped. We are in a bit of an interesting time right now in that we -- we typically don't see multiple applications in the same area coming in all at the same time and kind of on top of each other. So, I think that has sometimes -- that sometimes creates some issues as far as how is this going to tie in, because you have got designers going at the same time, rather than them coming in after a property is already been final -- at least final platted or designed and they say, oh, I know exactly where I need to tie into this property. So, I think that's part of what's going on with the overall roadway network. But, typically, how we look at it is it's kind of a first come first serve situation. So, if a property comes in and it goes through the process and it gets approved, they dictate where those stub streets are occurring. So, whoever comes in after them has to tie into those existing stub streets. So, we don't dictate where the roadways will tie, unless that's already kind of come in and designated the location. Otherwise, we would be designing the entire county, which makes it difficult.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I -- just to give some feedback. I -- I --- of course, we -- we -- in a perfect world we wish that you guys could sort of master plan the whole thing for us, but --

Inselman: Right.

Strader: I understand, yeah, you may have some constraints around doing that. Yeah, I guess just how I'm looking at it -- you know, if we approve this, this will drive the subsequent development connections; right? So --

Inselman: Correct.

Strader: This is built around those physical constraints. If we approve this tonight, then, the property to the north has to stub in to where this road ends and the same thing is true for the -- the Alamar -- or the subdivision right to the east as well and all the surrounding properties. So, unless -- I guess I would just ask Kristy, you know, did you guys see anything about that sort of intended roadway -- a picture that was put up there that would give you pause? I mean did that seem like it was just generally aligned with what you guys would like to see? Was there anything problematic about this one in particular that jumped out at you or do you feel like this just happens to be that they are all jumbled through the pipeline at once and that's why we are getting this kind of weird chicken and egg dilemma. But if we approve this tonight, then, you know, you will look at all the subsequent ones and make sure they connect; right?

Inselman: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, that's correct. We would -- as the next ones come in we would require them to align with what has previously been approved. I can only -- I can only speak to what's in the staff report and the staff report is recommending approval of the current -- what the applicant is currently showing.

Strader: Thanks. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. Just some feedback. I -- you know, I understand the dilemma I think people are grappling with. I -- I personally think, you know, as a -- as a general approach to housing affordability, with a lack of an affordable housing program, part of what we are doing is creating supply; right? This is a -- a project that seems like well suited for the ten Mile Area. It -- I think it was a little under amenitized. Hopefully we took care of that. And, then, I think if we approve this it will drive the further connections. I don't personally see a huge issue with approving it tonight.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Just a comment. One of the things I have concerns about delaying is -- is the fact that these -- these investments are -- are our major investments when a developer comes forward and I -- I don't want to give various developers -- not that they play the games, but sometimes, you know what, we will just wait, because we want you guys to do this and all of a sudden you are into this situation where they come in and now all of a sudden they are going to have to change their development, because if they don't they are just going to play the waiting game and that's money that's being burned. You know, that's a -- they come in with a good plan, I think according to staff and I looking at it, it seems like there is a good alternative out there for some movement of -- of the roadway to make things work and that -- that to me -- it is something I think the first ones in here with -- with a good plan and -- and it's going to fit into the area and I think Councilman Strader makes a -- makes a good point. The only -- the only thing I keep going back and forth on is their -- their waiver for -- for -- for the 50 percent of second story decks. So, that one -- do we waive it all or -- you know. Or do we just go with the -- change it to 25 percent of the homes with street frontage and have it -- have their alternative one go. Because, as you know, you do one and, then, everyone else wants that as well. So, it's just that -- those things that you are always trying to balance that act, whether it's -- you -- you have them go in and everybody else follows or are there things that are going to take place that we have no control over? So, that's just kind of my thoughts on that.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I -- you know, just -- I'm -- I'm -- I'm willing to give something a try and, then, we will see -- we will see if it goes or not. Mr. Mayor, I move that we close the public hearing.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to close the public hearing. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed? All ayes. Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to approve file number H-2022-0004 as presented in the staff report for today's hearing date with the following modifications: I think we could accept the applicant's requested DA provision for the specific garage setback of 16 feet as described earlier. I -- I think we could, in addition to that, specifically require the replacement of the bike repair station amenity with either a dog park or a children's play structure and, then, in addition to that I think we could reduce the second story deck requirement to 25 percent. That -- just to comment

a little bit on that, that makes sense to me just from a maintenance standpoint and the specific product type, but we could discuss that part.

Hoaglund: I would second the -- the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second. Discussion?

Hoaglund: And a quick question for staff, Mr. Mayor.

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: And, yes, Joe, the ability to modify the phasing plan, that is already in the DA that is already in the staff recommendation, so we don't need to draw that out, do we?

Dodson: Councilman Hoaglund, that's correct, because Commission recommended that as well. So, I already modified it.

Hoaglund: Thank you.

Simison: Further discussion or questions? All right. Clerk will call the roll.

Roll call: Borton, absent; Cavener, nay; Bernt, abstain; Perreault, yea; Hoaglund, yea; Strader, yea.

Simison: Three ayes. One no. The item is agreed to. And one absent for the record. Okay. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. ONE NAY. ONE ABSTAIN. ONE ABSENT.

2. Public Hearing for Burnside Ridge Estates (H-2021-0070) by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., Located Near the Southwest Corner of S. Linder Rd. and W. Victory Rd., Including 2365 W. Victory Rd., 3801 S. Linder Rd., and Parcels S1226142251, R0831430030, R0831430022, and R0831430010

- A. Request: Annexation and Zoning of 121.29 acres of land from RUT to the R-2 (11.76 acres) and R-4 (109.53) zoning districts.
- B. Request: A Preliminary Plat consisting of 299 total lots (275 single-family residential lots and 24 common lots) on 119.31 acres of land.

Simison: Next item up is a public hearing for Burnside Ridge Estates, H-2021-0070. We will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Dodson: Sorry, Mr. Mayor. Give me one second to get this fired back up. Okay. Here we go. Okay. This one's definitely not an in-fill, so we will plug through this. As noted,

this is Burnside Ridge Estates Subdivision. Applicant will call it Jackson Ridge Estates from my understanding, but it was submitted as Burnside, so that's what staff calls it. The site consists of six county parcels that total approximately 120 acres of land, all zoned RUT in the county right now. They are generally located at the southwest corner of Linder and Victory Road. Theoretically it's around the quadrant at the southwest corner. The Comprehensive Plan designations on the properties are both medium density residential and low density residential. The request for annexation and zoning before you tonight is 121 acres of land from RUT to the R-2 district and the R-4 zoning district and a preliminary plat consisting of 299 total lots. That's 275 single family lots and 24 common lots on the 119 acres. The proposed plat shows compliance with the UCD dimensional standards for the proposed R-2 and R-4 lots, with an average lot size around 10,000 square feet and five foot detached sidewalks and eight foot parkways throughout the entire development. Three new accesses are proposed to the adjacent arterials, Linder and Victory Roads. Two of these are new collector streets per the master street map, which is shown as South Farmyard, which is the north-south collector and East Holstein, which is the east-west along the south boundary. All other accesses are to the -- sorry. All their access to the proposed homes is via new local streets. The applicant's proposing to stub the new collector street, East Holstein, to the west boundary for future connectivity. East Holstein is also proposed along the entire southern boundary for future connectivity to the south for the future developer there. The proposed north-south collector, South Farmer, provides a stub street to the east property line adjacent to 1995 West Victory Road, which is this parcel here. No other stub streets were originally proposed. Staff recommended a new stub street from Pivot Drive to the north property boundary be included, which is this right here and the applicant has revised the plat to show that. In addition, staff recommended that a new cross-street from South Red Angus Way heading northeast to South International Way across the Calkins Lateral, in alignment with East Drawbar Street, to create a compliant block length was also added. So, staff recommended basically 9 and 12 -- Lots 9 and 12 of these blocks to become a new cross-street. The applicant has not changed that and wishes not to do that and instead is seeking a Council waiver for the additional block length over 1,200 linear feet. The project is proposed to be constructed in five phases per the revised phasing plan, which is here. There is at least two fire approved access points within the phase one. So, there is no limit on the number of building lots for access points. Staff has recommended including the clubhouse and pool and it's open space lot within phase one, but after discussion with applicant staff -- applicant and staff, the Commission recommended the lot and amenities would be constructed with phase two instead, which is with approximately 148 building lots in the first two phases. The applicant has submitted a revised phasing plan showing that, which is this lot here that has the open space. So, between the first and second phase pretty much the vast majority of the open space and amenities will be taken care of. The Calkins Lateral currently bisects the south half of the project site, which is this here. And at the original time of staff report writing I thought that the lateral was going to remain open, which is just my mistake. Staff's conditions were, therefore, not entirely accurate and they have since been stricken to reflect that this will be tiled. The applicant and staff are still awaiting confirmation from the irrigation district on the correct easement width with the lateral being piped instead of being left open and this would be only to confirm if there are going to be any building lot encroachments, as well as to manage the

required landscaping within the multi-use pathway that's required along the lateral. Again, staff does have conditions regarding this in the staff report already. The application was submitted prior to the latest open space standard revisions last October. Therefore, the project was analyzed against previous code. Based on the proposed plat of 119 acres, a minimum of 11.9 acres of qualified open space should be proposed. According to the applicant's open space exhibit, a total of 12.19 acres of qualified open space, which is approximately 10.2 percent, is proposed meeting the minimum code requirement. However, the open space exhibit does not include any of the parkways throughout the development. Now, should the parkways be vegetated per code because per the landscape plan they are currently not, but if additional trees are added and they, therefore, would qualify, staff anticipates a much larger area of qualified open space would be part of the calculation. A minimum of six qualified site amenities are required to be provided per the old open space standards. One amenity for every 20 acres. According to the submitted plans, the applicant is proposing at least eight qualifying amenities. A clubhouse, swimming pool, children's play structures, pickleball court, multi-use pathway, shaded picnic area, public art and outdoor fitness equipment. The proposed amenities exceed code requirements. Further, the proposed amenities would also exceed the current amenity point requirements in the updated open space code. The subject area contains two future language designations as noted, low density and medium density residential, with the MDR designation taking up a larger area of the project, approximately 80 acres versus 39. The future land use designations are not parcel specific, as I try to explain at every hearing nowadays. An adjacent abutting designation when appropriate and approved as part of a public hearing with a land development application may be used. A designation may not, however, go across planned or existing collector or arterial roadways and then -- and they must not be used on a parcel not directly abutting the designation and they may also not apply to more than 50 percent of the land being developed. Based on this policy the low density residential designation can be floated, quote, unquote, beyond the area depicted on the future land use map up the east side of the north-south collector street proposed, which is the South Farmyard. So, in the future land use map these two forty acre parcels are MDR. This one is LDR. LDR can be floated up to this collector roadway. So, this area can be zero to three units per acre. Everything west should be three to eight units per acre. Additionally, the plan does allow gross densities to be rounded up or down. Therefore, with the three to eight it can be 2.5 or higher and we can round up to three and say that it qualifies. West of South Farmyard is approximately 54 acres and it contains 126 units, which is approximately 2.3 units per acre, which does not meet the -- the minimum density of 2.5. Therefore, the staff recommended the applicant should add at least nine additional building lots to meet the minimum density. However, to increase this number of lots in this area it would require the applicant to amend their plat and propose smaller lot sizes that would likely not meet the R-4 dimensional standards. Definitely not the R-2. Therefore, staff recommended the applicant include an area of R-8 and the -- and the area of the plat for Blocks 2 and 3, which would be these two, these eight rows of houses, would allow for some lot sizes smaller than R-4. Now, granted, not the minimum lot size, but just smaller than the minimum 8,000 for R-4. Commission and the neighbors, as well as the applicant, do not wish to increase the number of lots in the plat. I'm sorry. I'm sorry. I have been sick for a few days and my throat is not liking it. Just died a little bit here.

Simison: All right. Let's go ahead and take a five minute recess.

(Recess: 7:25 p.m. to 7:35 p.m.)

Simison: All right. Then we will go and come back from recess and let you continue your comments.

Dodson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Apologize, everybody. So, I will backtrack just a little bit. Staff did recommend, in order to meet the medium density residential designation to include an additional area of R-8 lots and increase the density west of the north-south Farmyard Avenue collector street, the Commission, the neighbors, and the applicant did not wish to increase the number of lots in the plat. The Commission, therefore, recommended striking that condition. Now, granted -- well, I guess before I say that -- Council should determine if the proposed plat meets the intent of the comp plan and additional density should not be required. Should the Council determine that density should be added, the project should be continued out so the applicant can revise the plat per my condition or some other format or submit a Comprehensive Plan Map amendment to change the future language designation. At the Commission hearing there was one piece of public testimony that I butchered. I thought that they were not in agreement with the staff report -- or sorry. With the subdivision, the project, but they actually -- the Stetson Estates to the west are actually in support of the project. Following the Commission hearing there was one additional piece from -- I believe a Meridian resident. It also provided support for the project. It's -- and it's proposed density and it desires to not have the R-8 lots either and keep the density where it is. Now, Commission did recommend approval with some modifications. They recommended that Council strike the condition regarding the density, strike a portion of the condition regarding a micro path connection on the west boundary from South Agrimony, which is this street, to this, which I believe I said should be in this location. They struck that condition. They modified DA provision 8.A1B to require the pool with phase two, which has been taken care of. Modified 8.A -- 8.A2B consistent with the discussions between staff and the applicant to offer the option of a shared agreement between adjacent land owners and that is for the east-west collector street along the south boundary. Because currently as it's shown typically it's half plus 12 on your side. They are proposing in lieu of that to do an agreement with the property owner to the south to both develop that. I have not seen this agreement. I understand that it is in place and staff -- I have a condition in there that says that they will either do that or amend the plat to show half plus 12, et cetera. So, we have that condition taken care of. Further, the Commission did recommend that the -- recommend to Council that the existing home does not connect to city services, because there is an existing home on some acreage right here. Well, now -- I'm almost done. I promise. The outstanding issues for Council are quite large typically, which is -- which is not typical. There they are seeking a Council waiver to -- for the required -- sorry. They are seeing Council waiver for the existing home to remain and not connect to city services as noted. Again, Council should determine whether or not the increase in density is required. They are also seeking a Council waiver to allow the block length of Red Angus to exceed 1,200 linear feet and, therefore, strike condition 8.A2D, which South Angus, again, is this road here and specifically when -- our code allows micro paths and pedestrian facilities to break

a block length up to a certain point and that is 1,200 linear feet. When it exceeds 1,200 linear feet it -- it can't. You either need a Council waiver or you need a stub -- another street. So, therefore, staff recommended a cross-street in order to have another pedestrian and vehicle connection across the lateral. Further, Council should determine whether the amount and location of open space within the project is sufficient and Condition 8.A3D should be, then, removed based on the applicant's belief that the proposed lot sizes of R-2 and R-4 offer ample private open space and subsequently less need of common open space dispersed through the site. Council -- well, this is based on staff. Following the Commission hearing I'm recommending that we add a DA provision allowing the existing use of the horse boarding to remain on 3801 South Linder until the property redevelops consistent with the approved phasing plan. Specifically because horse -- agriculture horse boarding cannot occur within city limits. So, that would have to happen with a specific DA provision as time progresses per the phasing plan. In addition, any plat or landscape revisions that are not made part of the Council hearing -- so, like the landscape plan doesn't reflect the plat, I did not receive that in time for the Commission recs to go out, so just some of the clean up things. But I believe the applicant does have the updated -- all the updated plans tonight. And after that I am done and I will not cough anymore.

Simison: Council, any questions for staff?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I have a couple of questions. Thanks, Joe. Could you point out where the connection is for annexation? I think it was noted in their report that Brundage Estates is the only connection. Where is that?

Dodson: Council Woman Strader, that's correct, and that is this entire quarter mile block right here, which is R-4 zoning.

Strader: Got it. And, then, I don't know if we have this in front of us or we could pull it up, but I was curious if we zoom out and we brought up and dusted off our old priority growth areas map, where would this fit?

Dodson: Council Woman Strader, I cannot answer that. I don't think I have ever seen that map.

Strader: Oh. Really?

Dodson: Yeah.

Simison: Council Woman Strader, it does not fit in that general defined area.

Strader: I didn't think so. What was the -- do you remember what the westernmost border was? Of which road that was that we were kind of --

Simison: Yeah. Generally Meridian Road was --

Strader: Okay. Yeah. That's what I thought. Thank you. I just wanted to orient myself in terms of where we could cut that off. So, that's very helpful. Thanks.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Question either for you, Joe, or maybe later for the applicant. First, I missed that in the Planning and Zoning about not having the existing home to connect to city services. I remember a conversation that maybe the homes were going to be torn down. Was that -- is that the reason why?

Dodson: Councilman Cavener, so the -- yes. Eventually. They are going to become part of the overall subdivision. So, that's why the applicant doesn't want to extend the water main for the -- really no purpose at -- well, actually, to meet code only to, then, have it be abandoned later on, because it would, then, be within the subdivision.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, one additional real quick.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Joe, you know, the -- I appreciate, you know, staff really encourages open space to be kind of centralized. It's not something that I always get really excited about. So, when I look at this and I see all the open space is centralized, is that for the most part -- is that coming as a recommendation of staff? Is that the desire of the applicant? A combination?

Dodson: Councilman Cavener, the open space code really pushes for the centralized open space. Because it is so centralized -- and, again, this is a bigger project, so, you know, you are walking half a mile from north to south through this site. So, my -- that's why I put it in those recommendations to include some smaller, but still sizable -- one lot here is 10,000 square feet of open space and, you know, the south quadrant -- southeast quadrant and the south -- the northwest quadrant, the applicant believes that with those larger lots there won't be as much of a need for that common open space dispersed, because you are going to have a much larger lot. Personally, I guess I can attest to that somewhat. I mean we -- we don't have a -- we use the school, the middle school, because I don't know have a park close by, you know, for our dog. But our yard is large enough that we can play ball with her in the yard, too. So, I get the idea there. But it is both code, as well as I just think the preference of the applicant to consolidate everything.

Cavener: Okay. Thank you.

Dodson: Staff did not make that recommendation.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for staff? All right. Then would the applicant like to come forward?

Young: Good evening. My name is David Young for Linder Holdings. My address is 849 East State Street, Suite 104, in Eagle, Idaho. 83616. I just want to start out with kind of an introduction to -- to who we are. You guys are, I'm sure, very familiar with big developers like -- like Brighton or -- or CBH. You know, that's not us. We are -- we are a homegrown family, you know, family members involved. We all graduated from Meridian High School. We have several assisted living facilities around the valley with four of them located within Meridian city limits. We are also the -- the family behind the -- the Vertical View climbing wall off -- off the freeway. So, the reason -- how we got involved in this is we have been family friends with the Jackson family, which was -- this was the former Jackson family farm, the dairy out on -- on Victory Road. Mr. Jackson has been -- been on that homestead for -- for three generations and he knew that development was coming -- is coming his way. He had it under contract to another developer and had decided to move his -- his operations -- switch from dairy to -- to beef cattle and move his operation to central Oregon. Contracts fell through at the last minute, but he was still obligated or under contract for his Oregon property. He made -- his son made a phone call to my brother-in-law. We ended up coming to agreement and -- and got involved in this project and I think that's important to understand, you know, that we have an attachment. My -- my wife spent many summers on this farm with -- with the Jackson family. My brother-in-law did as well. So, we have a real respect for this -- this land and this project here. And with that respect it comes along that we want to -- to preserve a lot of what is -- is on the property. So, the things that we are going to incorporate in the design are -- are the silos, the -- the grain bins, a lot of the -- the equipment around the property to -- to pay homage to Meridian's agricultural heritage. We acquired the property in -- in mid 2019. This has been a -- close to a three year process from -- from that date. We have acquired a couple of other parcels. It was originally just 108 acres from Mr. Jackson. We acquired another ten acre parcel and, then, another six acre parcel and, then, a development agreement with the -- to try to encapsulate a full 120 acres and not leave a parcel out. We have had numerous preapplication meetings. You know, COVID was right in the middle of all this. That slowed us down. We -- we also hitched our wagon for a short amount of time to Toll Brothers that tried to bring the Cedarbrook development just to the south of this and -- and, then, just working with ACHD trying to get the roads right, trying to get the -- the collector right. That's taken a lot of time. But here tonight we are glad to be here to show you what we have come up with and -- and hope that's something that you want to see in the City of Meridian. So, before you tonight we -- we are asking for annexation and zoning for -- to R-4 and R-2. For preliminary plat approval and also for a development agreement. Just an aerial of where the property lies. In the darker portion in the lower left-hand corner of that red outline, there is a -- somewhat of a valley that goes through the property. So, there is a -- a bit of a drop off down to the lower south -- southeast corner and we do have the Calkins Lateral that bisects most of the project. Our landscape plan. We -- we did want to bring that central -- trying to draw everybody to the center of the -- the project. So, we tried to design streets and roads that -- that laid with the property

and also alongside the canal, but also to draw pedestrian and bicycle traffic through micro paths and -- and sidewalks. We are asking to -- to -- for a plat of a hundred and -- or a preliminary plat that includes 275 single family home lots. Our average size lot is -- is just under a quarter acre. We do have some one acre -- half acre lots, especially along the -- in the R-2 section along the western boundary. Joe mentioned the desire to put in the R-8 zoning. We -- we would rather not do that. If we had to we -- we have brought this slide just as a description -- or a display of where we might be amenable to do that. But we would like to discuss that. And, then, the typical lot sizing for R-2, R-4 and if we had to do an R-8 section. This is showing the -- the connectivity to the -- to the arterials and to our -- to the adjoining parcels to the -- the east and to the north and, then, this is a colored phasing plan that might show it a little bit better the phase one, including all the frontage along Victory Road and phase three including the rest of Linder Road. With that I'm going to turn some time over -- talk about design.

Rose: Good evening, Mayor and Council. My name is Chris Rose, landscape architect with Kimley Horn and Associates. Address is 1100 West Idaho Street in Boise. 83702. Just want to take a moment to introduce and highlight some of the design considerations going into the open space and amenities and -- and trying to create the sense of place and community that Dave was talking about that -- that pays homage to the heritage of the site. As Joe mentioned, the current open space meets -- actually exceeds the requirements for qualified open space. We also provided a breakdown on here with the new amenity point system and we are currently providing over 42 points against the 24 required for a project this size and you will see where those points come in and -- and what we are trying to create with those areas. I also want to emphasize the connectivity, like Dave was saying. We are trying to bring pedestrians in, give them access from all different areas of the neighborhood through micro paths, through the regional pathway to the open space areas, primarily the ten foot multi use path that goes along the Calkins Lateral as a regional parkway shown on this map. Even as we get into entry signage and -- and the monumentation at the entry of the site, trying to showcase what -- what should feel like a remnant of -- of the family farm with the planting, as well as a windmill and some of the materials and traditional spacings of agricultural type -- right behind the windmill you see kind of layout of what would look like ornamental trees in an orchard to feel like it was a leftover piece of the farm. As we got into designing the open space and amenity areas we wanted to do more than just large open grass areas or simple sidewalks. We wanted to provide something that's a little bit special, so all of these amenity areas are themed and trying to, again, pay homage to the heritage of the site. So, instead, of calling something, you know, the -- the -- park or the grass or the playground, these are themed as the garden and the field and the meadow and the corral and the barnyard as these open spaces. Kind of the idea that, you know, on an old family farm this is where the kids would run down to the ravine or go out and play in the natural areas. So, like the garden -- this is the open space that comes in from the primary entry off Victory Road. This is included in the phase one area. This is the area that includes the large blue Harvestore silo that's currently on site as a landmark. A heritage community garden seating and a path with plaques that actually tell the story of the Jackson farm, of the Jackson family and -- and how it came to be here. The field and the meadow -- instead of just a park, this is the -- the large open space big enough for playing sports, for

families running around, but also we have tucked away picnic areas, a fitness circuit, a graded meadow with art features, incorporating some of the original grain bins and silos used as picnic shelters and wayfinding elements within the open space. In addition, some of the seating along the micro paths is intended to feel like old hay bales left out in the field. The corral is kind of the -- the play area, but instead of a traditional playground structure we wanted the area to focus more on nature play and give children more unstructured play with boulder climbers and logs and ropes and water play, kind of more an experiential play area, instead of a structure. And the barnyard, which is the primary social amenity in the community, includes a clubhouse, pool, lawn game area, a community garden plot, pickleball courts and a lighted fire pit area under a canopy of trees right adjacent to the Calkins Lateral pathway as well. So, all these spaces together, when we talk about central open space, kind of drives home the theme that we -- we want this to feel like a heritage site or pay homage to what this site was and to the Jackson family and kind of create that -- that character -- a really special place in Meridian that feels like Old Meridian as well. And now back to Dave.

Young: The clubhouse concepts and we wanted it to feel more like the -- the old barns on the property, so we got -- got a couple examples of that and, then, picnic shelters, again, trying to use some of the old structures that are there on the property, redesign them for -- for use in the park areas. Home designs -- we would like to see -- we are not going to be the home builder on this -- this project. We are going to -- we want to provide space for custom home builders to come in and do nice projects, you know. The home builders -- I'm not having a hard time finding any home builders that -- that want to -- to be a part of this project. It's going to be something -- I -- I feel like it's kind of the answer to -- Meridian's answer to Eagle's fine homes and some place especially on the -- the half and one acre lot some place that some -- some very nice homes can be -- can be built. Lots will be wide enough for three car garages on almost every lot and nice wide laid out homes. Not all farm houses, but modern spin on country farmhouse, craftsman style homes. There are still some outstanding conditions that we can discuss and I'm sure those will come up in questions about the phasing, the -- the -- the finishing of the roads, the -- the existing service to the -- to the home. The cross-street on Red Angus and any additional lot -- open lots that we need to address -- or adding additional lots. We do request a decision on that tonight, the -- if we do need to condition anything, but for -- for annexation of our development agreement and preliminary plat and with that I will stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you. Council, questions?

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Mr. Young, I -- about your third slide in -- if we could go back to that where you kind of had -- I can't remember -- the satellite view. There was also one with -- it was all yellow with the zoning. I had a question about some property. Go -- keep going. Yeah. It was like way in.

Young: Okay.

Hoaglund: The third slide, I think, of the -- okay. Here we go. That -- that one right there.

Young: Okay.

Hoaglund: Got, of course, your parcel in red.

Young: Uh-huh.

Hoaglund: To the south southeast of that is -- is still rural urban RUT. Right directly east of your property we show the connection to the -- to the city. So, that's part of Meridian city limits and you are requesting annexation and that's your contiguous point. That development to the -- to the north, just east of South Linder Road, that kind of is the right triangle type of parcel that's under development, that is not in city limits and --

Young: It is. It is. It is a --

Hoaglund: Okay.

Young: -- Cory Barton or CBH home development and -- and it's probably about 80 percent complete.

Hoaglund: Okay. So, it is that complete half mile. When -- when you talked about the half mile I didn't pick up, I thought it was just the red part that was the connection, but it is from Victory -- West Victory clear to the end of the southern property of your red line; right? Is the -- everything east of South Linder Road is City of Meridian.

Young: Yes.

Hoaglund: Okay. Just wanted to be sure I got that. Thank you.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: This isn't necessarily in relationship to the project specifics or the conditions that we are considering, but the market has softened intentionally with interest rate increases. As you know, there is a development that I think is going to be somewhat similar called The Keep at the corner of Eagle and Lake Hazel. I'm just kind of curious how you see your phasing and timelines potentially changing and if you have been tracking kind of how they are -- they are selling and their absorption. If you see this taking longer now that -- that we are seeing the softening and not knowing how long it will last.

Young: I appreciate -- I appreciate that question. So, the -- the builders that I have been talking to -- again, they are mostly custom home builders. The backlogs that they have

looking for lots -- they have got buyers that have been waiting two years for lots and most of these buyers are not financing buyers, these are cash buyers, and -- and so that's kind of the customer -- the customer base that we are looking for. On some of the smaller lots it will be a very nice upscale home, but it may be people that are downsizing to a little bit smaller piece of ground or a smaller home, but very nice -- custom nice home. So, I think that market is still there. It might -- it may slow down a little bit, but I -- again, I have had no shortage of -- of talking to these custom builders that just have backlogs of 50, 60 customers waiting for lots.

Simison: And I can speak -- The Keep has no problem moving properties.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Stats that just came out for last month show there was a 50 percent decrease in purchases from the month prior, so just wanted to see what your thoughts were.

Simison: Council, additional questions for the applicant?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: If you wouldn't mind advancing your slides where you kind of show the -- the zoning breakdown of your lots. That one right there. That's fine. So, I want to -- your project's very thoughtful and very well laid out and I appreciate -- I think the previous person who was providing testimony talked about a sense of place. That's something that I get really interested in. Where -- how are we creating community, so that people don't pull into their driveways and create community within their four walls, they are creating it in their neighborhoods, and I think that you have done a really great job of achieving that. I am also sensitive -- and I'm not as concerned about it here, but one of the things that I -- we are seeing a lot of is that these larger lots -- the largest lots are the ones that are most closest to the large open space, where the smaller lots at least appear to be more further away and so I'm just curious to kind of get your guys' thought process around that, because I think so much attention has been made on having this laid out. Was there any discussion about creating maybe like a pocket park or a micro amenity near some of the higher density stuff -- and not that you are creating high density, but in some of the smaller lots as compared to some of your larger lots?

Young: You know -- sorry. Mr. Mayor, Councilman Cavener, I -- we -- we discussed, but the -- the lot sizes we really felt like everybody's going to have a big backyard, you know. I could have taken a different approach and made these a lot smaller lots and maximized the -- the lot count here. We -- when we did the initial look before we purchased the property we could have put 525 homes on this -- on this piece of property. We were especially concerned with the neighbors along the western portion. You know, I -- I

attended the meetings when the future land use map was -- was being presented in 2019 and this is one of the -- the areas that most of the time was spent on that night and the questions from -- from the residents of why medium density on that side and low density on the Linder side, when they really felt it should be reversed. It's -- it's been a -- it's been a hard project to make everybody happy, but -- but we really think that this -- this is the best design doing those large lots adjacent to five and ten acre parcels where we don't have that on the -- on the eastern boundary.

Cavener: I appreciate that context. Thank you.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for the applicant? Okay. Thank you very much. Well, since our clerk is not here, I will see if -- did anyone sign up to provide testimony on this item? If you would like to come forward. State your name and address the record and you will be recognized for three minutes.

Dille: Mr. Mayor, Darcie Dille. 5205 North Sun Shimmer Way, Meridian, Idaho. Hi, I'm Darcie Dille. I'm a real estate professional with Keller Williams Realty Boise and a current Meridian resident. I was born and raised here in the Treasure Valley and have lived in Idaho for nearly 50 years. I was brought in to be a consultant and representative of the project and I was also asked to meet with the surrounding neighbors of the project. From April to October of 2021 we met with all neighbors that were willing and able to meet with us. We met them in their homes. We sat at their kitchen tables and walked the perimeter of their properties. We talked to them about what was most important to them regarding the development of this property. In meeting with them we met some truly amazing people who love Idaho, love Meridian, love the lives they lead here in this valley and were articulate about how they felt about the project. The residents we spoke to just want their lifestyle to be preserved, protected, and respected. They knew the Jackson property would eventually be developed. It was not a matter of if, but more a matter of when and most importantly to them the who and the how. The -- I feel like Dave and his team have been very purposeful about being mindful of the neighbor's thoughts and feedback and creating a community which takes into account their concerns as much as possible. This has been a truly wonderful process for me personally and I have been honored to be a part of it. Being an Idaho native this is a development in which I feel proud to be a part of and I believe it will be a beautiful addition to the south Meridian housing community. I know there are many who would love nothing more than to see the Treasure Valley remain as it is, but I remember when I was growing up that all you could see were lush green beautiful fields and I know that that's when Idaho was truly at its most glorious. But that was my childhood. Unfortunately, when you have something wonderful it doesn't stay a secret for long and I can't blame others for wanting what we have here. We can't shut the gate. People will still want to bring their families here and experience our amazing valley. If development is in our future, then, let's build lovely, upscale, well thought out communities to enhance the beauty that is Meridian, Idaho, and that will contribute to the community and I believe Dave and his team have met the mark with this proposed development. Thank you.

Simison: Council, any questions? Mr. Clerk?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, I apologize. I was helping some people trying to find an event for parks. Julie Langlois representing an HOA.

Simison: Welcome, Julie. Be recognized for ten minutes. If you can say your name and address for the record.

Langlois: Wow, it's been a while. I am happy to be here --

Simison: And if you could choose one or the other of the mics.

Langlois: I will choose this one. Yeah. It's just great to be back and see everybody. I don't remember the pickleball court in the original plan. I guess I just missed that. Okay. Julie Langlois. 3556 Rustler. As we stated during the comp plan, of course we are disappointed that the city is pushing up to our 20 year old subdivision. During the comp plan revision we lost both on retaining the rural designation and on codifying transitions to larger properties as Meridian developers were adamantly against codifying the transition. So, here we are. The developer and his staff, especially, Darcie, have been excellent to work with. They have been respectful, listened to our concerns and tried their best to address them. However, annexations are important decisions and in our reading of the comp plan we also see a directive to discourage fringe, i.e., outer edge development. If you decide to go ahead and approve Burnside Ridge, we would like to have some input. The transition to our rural properties where we grow crops and raise and process cattle in our fields, while not what we were hoping for, is acceptable. The larger transitional properties were also offered to us early in our discussion with the developer. In addition, it appears that Mr. Young is endeavoring to build a subdivision which creates a neighborhood conducive with a half acre transitional lot. We believe it is unfair to require a change in his carefully planned neighborhood -- neighborhoods, which, by the way, have a long border with Stetson Estates, to meet the city's desired density in the northwest corner of Burnside. Increasing the density of Mr. Young's carefully planned transitional neighborhood will nudge the bar lower for Burnside. As to the micro path from South Agronomy to our eastern border, again, this is a transition issue. We have argued in the past that we grow crops, keep livestock and we shoot, kill, and dress cattle in our pastures. Thus we are asking that no additional pathways leading to our properties be added to the current plan, which was agreed upon by Mr. Young and Stetson Estates. We, as a long established neighborhood, have already had to compromise in terms of size of transitional lots, stub streets and open access to our properties at the Givens easement. Again we understand the city's desire for connectivity, but we are asking for a compromise and that there be no micro pathway from South Agronomy Avenue -- Avenue to our pastures. We have a lot of respect for Mr. Young and applaud his efforts to create a development that truly raises the bar for a Meridian annexation. Burnside Ridge seeks to utilize architectural elements that honor and celebrate southwest Meridian's proud rural story and to retain and protect the inherent value of southwest Meridian and its long term sustainability. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Council, questions?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Julie, you came all the way out here. I can't let you off without a question. So, I appreciate you as a citizen who always comes and provides I think good feedback and thoughts for the Council and your work with the Southern Rim Coalition needs to be commended. I -- I don't -- they didn't -- the Southern Rim did not testify at the Planning and Zoning Commission and I'm just curious if you could maybe provide some insight as to why. This is a type of neighborhood that I feel like the Southern Rim Coalition has been asking for for a long time and I'm just curious why we are not hearing from them about this particular project.

Langlois: I don't know why. I stepped away in January.

Cavener: Thanks.

Simison: Thank you.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, next is Patrick Connor.

Simison: State your name and address and be recognized for three minutes.

Connor: Thank you. Good evening, Mr. Mayor, Council Members. Patrick Connor. Address is 701 South Allen Steet, Meridian, Idaho. And I just want to testify in support of this project. We represent -- I represent the owner and developer of the 120 acres south of this project. We have worked with Dave and his team at Kimley Horn over the past eight or nine months as we have designed our application, ensuring that we are coordinating everything from utilities to collector streets to ensuring our boundaries match up. It helps that we also share a like engineer, so it makes that coordination that much better. I just want to give kudos to Dave and his team for designing a project that I think really matches the -- the heritage and the character of this area and I think they have also done an excellent job working with the neighbors, us, and the neighbors in Stetson Estates to field their concerns on this project. That's all I have to say about the project and appreciate the time.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions? Okay.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, next is Tina Dean. And, then, we have Paula Connelly.

Bernt: I can't wait for the pictures. Do you have pictures for us tonight?

Connelly: No. No pictures this time. Sorry. Good Evening, Mayor, Council Members. My name is Paula Connelly. I live at 3878 South Rustler Lane and I wish that every developer in our county and in the Treasure Valley and specifically in Meridian had as much concern for their neighbors and where they were going to build as the developers

here tonight. They have a connection to this land and it makes it feel like a community, Instead of just more sprawl. It doesn't look like all other neighborhoods that we hear about. They truly have spent a lot of time speaking to us. They have spent a lot of time -- and although we, as a community, on -- on the west side of them feel like we have had some compromises, those compromises have come because of the -- the comp plan, not because they weren't willing to work with us. I truly believe if they could have put in one acre parcels next to us they would have, but they just physically could not fit that in there and I'm sure they will make money at their development. That's what businesses do and should. But they -- they are concerned with the feel, from using several different builders so that it doesn't look like every fifth house is the same. And this valley does need an area that makes it feel like community, so that you will go out and you will be part of your neighborhood. I only have one concern and that's the east-west lateral. I realize that is ACHD. I'm concerned with how straight it is. I'm hoping that there will be lots of mitigation for traffic not using that as a thoroughfare. So, thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you very much for coming this evening. This area has been one of frequent conversation since before the comp plan was passed and we have had multiple different proposals, some of which almost exactly matched the property lines of Rustler Lane. So, I'm curious considering this is more dense, you know, along the east side than some prior applications, what is it about this specifically, other than working well with the developer, that has -- is appealing to the residents on Rustler Lane? Because we have really struggled with understanding exactly what the concerns were on some of the prior proposals.

Connelly: I think some of the biggest things are wanting to use, you know, five or six or seven different custom home builders, so it feels more like estate properties which match the properties in our neighborhood. I feel like they have transitioned well. I also feel like the use of the silos and things like that, the farm equipment, makes it -- it gives it the rural feel that's already out there. Thank you.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I just have one question. Sorry. Just one last question. So, I appreciated your comments. I always do. So, my question is I -- I -- it sounds like you are -- you are -- you like the -- the idea of this -- this project, but I -- I can't tell if you are for or against.

Connelly: You know what, my stance just -- much like what Darcie said. We live in an area where we know it's going to grow. Okay? Personally I would love to see it stay just

like it is. However, growth is going to come, so we feel like we have gotten to have a say in this with them working with us and the feel still feels rural. So, does that answer your question? Yes and no? Anything else?

Simison: Thank you.

Johnson: Okay. Mr. Mayor, that was everyone.

Simison: Is there anybody else present that would like to provide testimony on this? And -- or if you are online use the raise your hand feature, so we can bring you in for testimony as well.

McKinney: My name is Wendy McKinney. I live at 6173 Silver Elm Way and I just had to get up. The first time I have been in front of you was Planning and Zoning, February of 2017, for the Linder Village development and I have learned a lot. I appreciate your service. I appreciate all that you have done. But if we could just turn the clock back and have this kind of development there -- it's beautiful. I just really appreciate it. I have a brother who is general contractor in the area. I have a brother who is a doctor in Kuna. I have been visiting Boise since I was a little girl, because my grandparents were here and the last few months I have been mourning the loss of the fields and the silos as I drive out to an appointment and this just brings me joy. Thank you.

Simison: Council, any questions? Thank you. Is there anybody else that would like to provide testimony? And would the applicant like to come forward?

Young: I -- I don't know that I have any additional comments, other than -- than, you know, there is a lot of blood, sweat, and tears put into this over the last few years. It's not often that you get to design a neighborhood that you want to live in, you know. It affords an opportunity to come up with something that I think is pretty special. So, I guess with that I will stand for questions.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Question, Mr. Young. One of the people that testified talked about the east-west lateral too straight. Are -- are you looking at doing some sort of traffic calming, bulb outs, anything that ACHD approves? I mean you are requesting a waiver for the block length, but what -- what are you doing to kind of not have that be a speedway?

Young: We have incorporated chokers all along the project and -- on any of the longer roads and -- and on that collector. Especially because it is -- it is -- it has a curve at the beginning and just a curve at the end, but providing chokers at the -- where the streets meet to slow down traffic.

Hoaglund: Okay. Follow up, Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: And I think the other issue was the micro path not coming -- what -- what -- what does that look like? What was -- what does the end of the path look like?

Young: So, I think -- I think that -- sorry, Mr. Mayor, Councilman Hoaglund. I think that path that they are referring to was the one on Agronomy going to -- and I believe that that was stricken from -- from the agreement, so --

Hoaglund: Okay. Thank you.

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: So, perhaps this was addressed and I missed it, but there was a slide in here that showed potential R-8 area and is that the area you are proposing if Council decides we -- we have got to ask for that or is that -- have you changed your mind about -- about doing that? I wanted to get clarity, because --

Young: Mr. Mayor, Council -- Council Woman Perreault, yeah, we wanted to come prepared if we were -- I don't want to say forced to do that, but -- but in all reality, if I was able to bisect each one of those half acre lots, you know, and -- and make them smaller lots, we would have met that -- that condition. There was really -- because it is based on where that north-south collector lies -- that north-south collector has changed position three times with ACHD and it started out on the -- the -- the boundary of the property borderline. Well, that didn't -- that's not going to work out with the neighbors there. We had a canal in the way. We have a house that's 24 feet off the property line there. It was supposed to meet -- it's hard to see on that very top portion up here where it says Victory Road meet Francine Lane at one time and that would have made it -- I would have had half acre lots on one side of the road and 4,500 square foot lots on the other side of the road to meet that -- that future land use. So, we are trying to say that we -- we are -- we are meeting the spirit -- the spirit of that there and -- and, again, if it's predicated on because of where that -- that collector lies, I think we have -- I think we are meeting the spirit of the -- of the condition there.

Simison: Council, any additional questions? I think you have to -- for a few minutes.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I'm happy to start the conversation. I appreciate the applicant giving us a little bit of a timeline from when they started to where we got here tonight and it's a good reminder that sometimes to get it right you got to go a little slow and appreciate your patience. I touched on this earlier. I love this project. I would love -- wish we could see more stuff like this in our community and I think it's -- I believe it will be a good addition to south Meridian, something our community can be proud of. I really appreciate the -- the

thoughtful approach, the little touches to the open space, to the sense of place to create a community. It shows that even on a big piece of dirt you can do a lot of really cool things to have our neighbors connect with each other and so I'm very much in support of the project. It's also rare that we get public that don't even live near the project to come and testify in favor. I think that's telling that you have created something that resonated with our community. They are going to come down here and tell us they like it. So, appreciate your patience, appreciate your tenacity, and I'm in full support.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Just want to give my -- my view. I think my original questions probably were pretty revealing as to where I stand. I want to start by complimenting you. Although, unfortunately, I won't be in support of the project, it's a beautiful project. It's really well thought out. I think it creates a sense of place that reflects the unique character of south Meridian. I love everything that you have done about it. The criticism I have is not something that you can change, it's just a question of timing, and the philosophy that I'm embracing right now and have embraced, even in my campaign, was trying to avoid sprawl and I'm really concerned about this expansion of our city limits. This is not a priority growth area for the city and we need to build housing desperately, but the more housing we build on the edges of our city, the more it exacerbates our existing issues with traffic, people commuting from far away to a new job, lack of services in this area will make it worse and I personally think that we have bit off way more than we can chew in terms of our capacity to educate our kids in south Meridian and I -- just based on the location of the project don't feel that it's ready for annexation at this time. Thanks.

Simison: And if I could just piggyback on your comments. While there is five people I won't be voting tonight, unless someone knows how to split a vote, but I -- I echo your viewpoints on this. I think the gentleman that got up to testify that the next property is ready to go after this one goes -- this is really a key decision for -- I think for this Council is if you are ready to see more development in this area, well, this is a great project to start that. If you are not, well, then, unfortunately, you have to make a decision tonight in a lot of ways. I'm not going to say the next one has to be approved, but if it comes in looking just like this one as good, it will be hard to prevent future annexations and growth in this area and I don't think that the issues that we -- were discussed when the previous area was -- previous application in this area was talked about was really the -- the connections up Linder and the -- the -- the fact that those roadways were not planned or scheduled to be widened four years ago. Granted, less traffic, because there is fewer homes and fewer density, but those issues are still, in my opinion, out there for the -- for consideration and conversation. But it is a beautiful project. I mean I would love to think I could buy a house there, but I wouldn't be able to, but I would like to think I could, but can't, so -- but, anyways, I won't be voting anyways. I could have kept my mouth shut, but I felt it was important to say thank you for Councilman Strader.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I thought I had noticed on one of the slides -- or Joe's presentation that there is a subdivision already approved just immediately south of this one. Did I see that incorrectly?

Dodson: Council Woman Perreault, those are -- it might be leftover preliminary lines from Cedarbrook. They just never got removed. If not, it could be the prelim lines for the application to the south that could come forward, yeah. But there is nothing approved to the south.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: This one truly is -- is a dilemma, you know, what Council Woman Strader talked about and you talked about, you know, we have had a line, you know, trying to keep development at bay and -- and trying to get the in-fill and have it move in an orderly direction and the -- and yet, you know, when I hear from Julie and -- and Paula from previous times I had to look out the window and ask our pigs flying? What's going on out there? I was not expecting that, so -- and the dilemma is this is an outstanding project. The amenities that they are doing, the thoughtfulness they are putting into it, you can tell that there is care going into this project and it sets the bar high if we were to approve this for other developments that follow. That's -- that's what we want to have and -- and I remember back when my previous stint on Council when we were just holding listening sessions, I think, in 2012 or 2013 in south Meridian and hearing these things that they talk about, you know, knowing if it -- if it transitions -- and back then we had no idea it would happen as quickly as it has -- of the open space and the development that does come out there it's going to be quality and taking account larger properties and those types of things and -- and I do feel there are times we are just missing out on some of these larger properties that folks can -- can purchase that are coming to our valley. You know, I used to work for one of the regional health systems here in the valley and, you know, when you have doctors come to the area and looking for homes, there is not a lot in Meridian that they can choose from. I mean it's just -- we don't have that -- those types of -- of -- of places and it would be nice to have more of them, because that -- that adds to that overall diversity, if you will, of housing and like the earlier product we approved, very nice on -- on Franklin Road. It's great. It's a certain price point. These are certain price points. So, trying to -- trying to balance that and having areas that -- that Meridian is not going to be like other communities and just completely high end, but we want to have that -- that diversity and -- and to the point for the R-8, I -- I do think, you know, if we do want to make sure schools and roads aren't impacted, you don't have the R-8. You go with R-2, stay with R-4, and -- and make it a -- a top notch, non-dense development. But it is -- it is hard from that standpoint. I think we all agree it's -- it's a quality development, very thoughtful. But do we -- do we want to cross that line and, Mayor, as you point out, then, the next one will come and the next one will come and there are impacts to that and -- but if -- if we go that route this one will set the bar I think and it's a

high bar and it's -- it's one I think that people in south Meridian, as we heard, are willing to accept. It is a compromise and -- and I understand that. Being on a rural property at one time and now surrounded by -- by houses, it's -- it's -- it's a tough transition, but one that you have to understand and, hopefully, have some control when working with the developer on what that looks like and in this case to their credit they -- they did have some say into that. So, that I appreciate. So, this -- this one is a dilemma.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I -- I don't think I need to say too much. I echo the thoughts of Council Woman Strader and the Mayor, but I -- I -- I do want to say how grateful I am to the developer, because of the deep thought that went into this -- this project. It's -- it's common, in my opinion, to have cookie cutter development -- happens probably more often than we -- than we would like and it's -- it's -- it's really nice to see someone come in with thought and -- and I -- and I -- and I truly believe that it reflects the -- the region and the area. I appreciate the comments that -- that were made by Julie and the other neighbors that are -- that live in that subdivision west of this project. I -- I take -- we always take neighbor feedback very seriously. So, very thoughtful project. For me it's timing. For me it's the impact of future development that will come in this area if approved. So, those are my thoughts. Thank you.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I agree this is a -- this is a tough one. I am in favor also of having some -- some larger lots in the south side. We have been asking for those for a long time. I appreciate the incredible thoughtfulness that -- that's gone into the design and implementing elements of our history as an agricultural community. As I'm -- I'm sitting here thinking about the many conversations we have had about this specific square mile and this -- this lot in particular and multiple proposals that have come and I'm kind of scratching -- scratching my head at the support for this one over some of the others that we have seen, especially as far as how the lots line up on the west side and -- but that's not essentially what we are deciding. It's -- it's whether or not this community is -- the timing is right for -- you know, for what we plan with our Comprehensive Plan and with our priority areas. So, as much as I like all that's been done, I -- I am very concerned that we will invite some additional applications and -- and potentially not be able to provide the services to those properties, because we are intentionally not investing in infrastructure in that southwest area. So, at this point my -- I'm leaning in the direction of Council Woman Strader and the Mayor in -- in this regard. I just -- it's tough. Tough decision. But we really need to move forward with the commitment that we have made to the community as a whole as far as where we are growing and so I think that's the direction that I'm leaning at this time.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I say this almost every week. That's what I love about local government. Hearing feedback from my colleagues, wrestling with ideas. It's always why I have been very reluctant about this priority growth area. When you look at this particular project, it's within our fire response times, maybe with the exception of a middle school -- that's debatable -- schools can handle the growth from this. As the one Council Member who lives in south Meridian, I think this is great and this is -- we have heard from so many people in our community about this type of development and Council Member Hoaglund hit the nail on the head. If -- if this generates more growth that's like this in south Meridian, man, let's welcome that. Let's invite that. This is the type of thing that we are hearing from our citizens they want to see more of in Meridian. So, I appreciate the -- the feedback, but I think out of respect for the work that the applicant's done, I'm -- I'm going to make a motion that we approve this application. If you want -- thank you, Council President Hoaglund. I guess first before I would make that motion I would -- I would move that we close the public hearing on Item No. 2, Burnside Ridge Estates, File No. H-2021-0070.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Cavener: All right. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I will give my fellow Council Members or maybe staff an opportunity to correct me if I bungle this up too much. After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to approve File No. H-2021-0070 as presented in the staff report for the hearing of June 7th, 2022, with the following modifications: That the -- the existing house not have to connect to city services. In agreement with the applicant's request and the Commission's recommendation to strike condition 8.A2A regarding the addition of the R-8. To provide the Council waiver on the block length requirements. Modifying DA provision No. 8.A1D to concur with the staff's recommendation. I'm -- I'm in agreement with the -- where the open space is. I would like to see a little bit more. I -- I think the response from the applicant is sufficient. To add the DA provision that would allow the existing use of horse boarding to remain until the property redevelops, which is consistent with the approved phasing plan, and I think that's it. Any other questions from staff?

Dodson: Mr. Mayor?

Hoaglund: Second the motion for --

Simison: Have a motion and second. For discussion, yes, Joe.

Dodson: There were a couple additional from the applicant. One being the phasing plan of the -- what is it? Oh, wait. I made a slide for this. Hold on. I thought ahead. Never mind. Oh, yeah. That does -- no. The additional one would be regarding the phasing in the terms of the frontage improvements. Staff currently has a provision -- a condition requiring that all landscape buffers and/or recon -- sorry -- constructed along the Linder Road and Victory, the applicant is proposing to do that with the caveat of -- they are including Victory, but not Linder, except for basically per the phasing. So, they want to do the frontage per the phasing. So, phase one will include the Victory Road improvements, a portion of Linder, but, then, not in front of the existing home and, then, not until phase -- I believe three or four for the southeast corner.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, just for clarification?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Staff's recommending all of it to occur within phase one?

Dodson: Yes. That's typical. That's why we include it.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, I'm in agreement with staff's recommendation on that. So, that's why I didn't make that modification in my motion.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Was there anything in the motion that had to do with the condition about Red Angus Way to exceed 1,200 linear feet?

Cavener: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, I believe that was captured within my motion.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Would you -- would the -- would the motion maker include the applicant's agreement to -- that traffic calming will be conducted on that? It's part of the record, so I don't know if we need to do that, but that would be part of -- part of -- part of it, so --

Cavener: Correct.

Simison: Okay. Is there further discussion on the motion? Okay. Clerk will call the roll.

Roll call: Borton, absent; Cavener, yea; Bernt, nay; Perreault, nay; Hoaglund, yea; Strader, nay.

Simison: Two ayes. Three no's. Motion fails.

MOTION FAILED: TWO AYES. THREE NAYS. ONE ABSENT.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I will make a motion. I'm sad to make it. It is a beautiful project, but that being said, after considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to deny File No. H-2021-0070 as presented in today's hearing date for the following reasons: The first reason is it's not in the city's best interest at this time. The rationale for that, as described previously, is that this is not a logical expansion of city limits at this time. The property that connects through annexation doesn't even have a plat recorded, since it was approved in 2016. At this point it -- it doesn't make sense to extend development here and I could -- I could go on, but I think that's the basic rationale.

Bernt: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second. Is there discussion on the motion?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I just wanted to say that we have made the same decision on other applications that this isn't particular to -- for me this is not particular to this developer and -- and really has nothing to do with how well it's designed. It's just simply that we have told other applicants as well that this isn't the right time because of the decisions that we have already made as a city that are bigger and above and beyond this application. So, I just wanted to state that, so that it doesn't become a concern that it has something to do with this particular application.

Simison: Is there any further comments? Then Clerk will call the roll.

Roll call: Borton, nay; Cavener, nay; Bernt, yea; Perreault, yea; Hoaglund, nay; Strader, yea.

Simison: Three ayes. Two no's. Motion passes. Thank you.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO NAYS. ONE ABSENT.

Simison: Council, do we need to take a break? Okay. Let's go ahead and take a ten minute break before we go into the remaining items for the evening.

(Recess: 8:43 p.m. to 8:56 p.m.)

3. Public Hearing 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.

Simison: Let's go ahead and get going with our next item this evening. So we will come back from recess. Next item up is a public hearing for Grayson Subdivision, H-2022-0014. Open this public hearing with staff comments.

Dodson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Thank you for that time. I was able to scarf down some food. So, I appreciate it. Next two should be simpler I hope and -- yeah. You know. First one is for Grayson Subdivision, request for annexation and zoning and 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. Future land use designation on the property is medium density residential. The request for annexation and zoning is for 3.39 acres of land to the R-8 zoning district and a preliminary plat consisting of 15 single family building lots and three common lots on 3.1 acres. The proposed plat for the 15 units on three acres constitutes a gross density of 4.8 units per acre, which is consistent with the MDR designation. Minimum building lot size is 5,489 square feet, with an average lot size of approximately 6,200 square feet. It's nearly 1,500 square feet above the minimum lot size for the requested R-8 zoning district. So, I just put that note in there to say he's not proposing the minimum lot sizes. The adjacent Estancia Subdivision is of lower density and has larger building lots than what are proposed with this project. There are no more than two building lots proposed adjacent to any single existing Estancia lot along the north boundary. Furthermore, there are six building lots within Estancia along the north boundary where the applicant has proposed seven building lots and one common lot with this project. Therefore, staff does not find the difference of one building lot along this boundary sufficient -- to be significant enough of a difference to recommend any lot count revision. Consistent with the existing Estancia development, the applicant is proposing to continue the parkways and detach sidewalks into this development, which is -- this is a better image for that. The applicant is also proposing a micro path at the southwest corner of the property to add a pedestrian connection from within this subdivision to the required multi-use pathway along Amity. Per the master pathways plan and the pathways coordinator, at ten foot multi-use pathway is required along East Amity frontage. This required pathway should be located within the required landscape buffer and outside of

the ACHD right of way. The applicant is showing this pathway along Amity with their revised plat. So, this one now has the pathway outside of the -- their right of way. The plat complies with the UDC dimensional standards, except for the block length of Grayson. The proposed block length is approximately 550 feet. The UDC allows a maximum dead end street length of 500 feet without a Council waiver. Due to constraints of the existing development, which is an arterial street as a border to the south, no additional stub streets and the project's proximity to the intersection of Amity and Locust Grove. Staff finds that a Council waiver is applicable in this case. Further, the only lot left to the west is -- or the only -- for -- it's been a week. The only lot left is the one directly to the west at the hard corner that could redevelop in the future, but would have minimal lots and only extend their public road, you know, another hundred feet at the most. Access is proposed -- is proposed via extension of the existing stub street East Grayson, which is stubbed to the east property boundary and is proposed to be extended into the site and terminate in a -- was originally proposed to be a hammerhead type turnaround, encumbering one building lot, which is shown here, Lot 7. ACHD did deny that type of temporary turnaround and it was, instead, requiring a temporary cul-de-sac, which is in this one and encumbers Lot 7 and Lot 8. Our staff did anticipate this and already had a condition of approval within the staff report. There was one piece of written testimony, which was from Mr. and Mrs. Jimenez. They voiced their concerns over losing their view. I'm assuming that -- oh, there we go. Right there. Looking south. They also desire for the applicant to replace the existing fence along the north boundary, as they said it's in disrepair, and they wanted to note that there is an existing large Willow tree on the property they would hope to -- is going to be retained. After that I will stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you, Joe. Council, any questions for staff? All right. Would the applicant like to come forward. Yeah. Nice to see you.

Schultz: Good to see you, Mayor and Council. Matt Schultz. 4914 South Colusa Avenue. It's been a while since I have been here and it's good to be representing -- not a very large project. You -- you -- you need one of these every once in awhile. So, I actually live in the area and I have done a lot of subdivisions in this area of south Meridian and love it. I love the fact that I live right across the street. I love the fact that Albertson's is opening pretty soon right down the road. It's going to be awesome. This is to -- to appease some of the neighbors we just kind of came and said, hey, we will do some single stories on the north side, which is what's already on the north side of us is some single stories. So, if that's a problem we have offered that up as well. It's within our development agreement to do single stories on the north tier of lots. But other than that I think it fits in real well. There is a good product that fits on this and it's just -- it's, obviously, straight -- straight forward and -- and we do agree with staff's recommendations for approval and I will stand for any questions. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you, Matt. Council, any questions?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Matt, are you going to put in a new fence, please?

Schultz: Sorry. I forgot about that, Mayor and Council Woman Strader. This is similar to another project where we look at some sections and if there is like a really bad section we would, obviously, go in and repair it and fix it. But I think to replace six people's fence if five of them are still okay, that -- that wouldn't be probably appropriate. If one person is complaining about their fence we would certainly look at their fence. As far as the Willow tree right on the boundary, we will look at that Willow tree. Willows are -- are considered kind of a trash tree and they tend to kind of get old and want to fall down sooner than later, so I -- I can't guarantee that one will stay. But if it looks like it's good it will stay, but we like to save trees if we can. But the fence -- to replace that whole north fence -- I have looked at it. A lot of it is still good and we replace any bad sections.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Regarding the -- the fire truck turnaround, if you have to lose two of those lots are you still good?

Schultz: Yeah. Mayor and Council Woman Perreault, we -- it's one of those things where we think the property to the west will probably -- now that we are extending road and sewer services will probably redevelop sooner than later and the roundabout's going in, it's going to be nice with the roundabout going out sooner than later as well. I think they are at 50 percent drawings right now in the roundabout. That sidewalk is going to go all the way around the corner and attach them to ours and we continue this. We think that little piece is going to redevelop, at which time we will be able to pull building permits and take that out. But until that road does redevelop there will be a building permit restriction on two of those lots for that temporary turnaround, which it is what it is.

Simison: All right. Thank you very much.

Schultz: Thanks.

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

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we did not.

Simison: Okay. If there is anybody present that would like to provide testimony, if you would like to come forward at this time or if there is anybody online that would like to provide testimony you can use the raise your hand feature. Not seeing anybody, would the applicant like to make any final comments? Okay. Do I have a motion to close the public hearing?

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I move that we close the public hearing on Item No. 3, H-2022-0014.

Cavener: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: After considering all staff and applicant testimony, I move to approve File No. H-2022-0014 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of June 7th, 2022, with all of the conditions as noted in the staff report.

Perreault: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve this item. Is there any discussion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

Roll call: Borton, absent; Cavener, yea; Bernt, yea; Perreault, yea; Hoaglund, yea; Strader, yea.

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries. The item is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

4. Public Hearing for Ferney Subdivision (H-2021-0103) by Engineering Solutions, LLP, Located at Parcel #S1109438871, Near the Half-Mile Mark on the North Side of E. Franklin Rd., Between S. Eagle Rd. and S. Cloverdale Rd.

- A. Request: Annexation and Zoning of 5.64 acres with a request for the I-L zoning district.

Simison: And, Matt, if you can, I know Mary McPherson really would like to get city services, so since you are doing all the work in south Meridian, anything you can do to make that connection down there would be really appreciated. I know. Thanks. Next

item up is a public hearing for Ferney Subdivision, H-2021-0103. Open this public hearing with staff comments.

Dodson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. My last one, then, you guys can get rid of me. We have annexation, zoning, and preliminary plat again. So, it consists of 5.1 acres of land, currently zoned RUT in the county, located near the half mile mark on the north side of East Franklin between Eagle and Cloverdale. The subject site was denied annexation and zoning approval in 2020, but because -- it was denied because no development plan was accompanied with the annexation request, but the applicant withdrew the application before the findings were approved by City Council. The future land use designation on the site is industrial, as is to the east -- all the way to the east. The annexation and zoning requests is for 5.64 acres of land with the request for the I-L zoning district consistent with the zoning to the west. It includes a preliminary plat consisting of two building lots on 4.93 acres of land in the requested I-L zoning district. In addition, the applicant is seeking a Council waiver to reduce a required landscape use buffer for the specific use standards for the proposed use of a self-service storage facility. That would be just along the east boundary. The applicant is proposing to annex the property into the city with the I-L district and propose two different uses on the property. Self storage on the south end and flex space on the north end. Both of these uses are listed as anticipated uses within the future land use designation of industrial and for the proposal of the I-L zoning district it also complies with the industrial future land use. Both uses proposed are subject to specific use standards. According to the submitted plan, staff finds the proposed self-service storage facility complies with all specific use standards, except for the requirement to screen the property and a minimum 25 foot buffer to any residential use. It is unclear on the submitted plans whether any fencing is proposed, hence, the requirement to screen the property I'm not sure if they are complying with. The applicant should clarify this and provide any exhibit showing the type of fencing or wall proposed to satisfy this requirement. As noted above, the applicant is proposing and requesting a reduced buffer along the east boundary. They were proposing a 15 foot buffer adjacent to the residential use along the east side. Reducing a landscape use buffer requires a City Council waiver and is not eligible for alternative compliance. According to the resident's child to the east, it is not anticipated for their parents to be in this location long term and this property is also shown as industrial on the future land use map. Staff is recommending denser landscaping is proposed along the first 150 feet of this buffer, measured from the back of the required street buffer. So, in total would be 185 feet from the back of sidewalk with denser landscaping. Further, the applicant is required to provide a solid fence or wall to satisfy the specific use standards. With staff's recommendation, the inclusion of the specific use standards and the fact that the property to the east is planned for industrial in the future, staff is supportive of the reduced buffer of ten feet. The proposed building lots meet all UDC dimensional standards. For the requested I-L zoning district for setbacks, building height, and the proposed uses comply with the UDC subdivision standards. Main access to the project is proposed via two driveway connections to the extension of East Lanark, which bisects the property. It is stubbed to the west boundary currently and is required to be extended to and through. Lanark is not able to be extended further than the subject site because of the existing RUT parcel to the east. Therefore, the applicant is required to terminate Lanark in a temporary cul-de-sac near the east

boundary according to the ACHD staff report. According to the submitted plat, each property is proposed to have one driveway connection to Lanark in alignment with each other, located approximately 45 feet west of the east property line. No other access is proposed for the flex building on the north property. The south property containing the storage use is proposed to have an emergency only access to Franklin, which is required by code by the specific use standards. The applicant has proposed an alternative temporary turnaround by incorporating the needed space for a hammerhead type turnaround within Lanark right of way. So, if you drew a circle here, the radius of a temporary turnaround will fit within this area, which is why the applicant proposed the driveways in this way. This alternative was proposed after the ACHD staff report was issued, so staff is not aware if ACHD has approved this alternative. The applicant should continue working with ACHD on the type of temporary turnaround allowed. Meridian deputy fire chief have given their approval of the alternative temporary turnaround shown on the plat with the requirement that Lanark be signed no parking on both sides and the applicant has agreed to this. Buffers are required along Franklin and on both sides of the Lanark extension. Plans depict the required landscape buffer widths, but do not show the correct amount of landscaping within the Franklin buffer. Per the UDC no more than 65 percent of the buffer area shall be comprised of grasses. An additional landscape design is required along entryway corridors, which is applicable to this site. Therefore, additional vegetative ground cover beyond that of grasses and additional landscape features are required to meet the UDC. For example, a berm or decorative wall or a dry creek design are specifically noted within code to help meet that additional landscape. Staff has included condition of approval regarding this. There has been no written testimony before the Commission or after. The Commission did recommend approval. The only outstanding issue is that none of the revised plans for the conditional of approval were submitted, but that's because -- my understanding is that the applicant's design team got COVID in between Commission and Council and just wasn't able to get the plans to me. But my understanding is that they are in agreement with the staff report and we will all work together with the next steps. And I will stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you, Joe. Council, questions for staff? All right. Then I will turn this over to the applicant.

McKay: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. Becky McKay with Engineering Solutions. 1029 North Rosario in Meridian. I'm representing the applicant Franklin Storage, LLC. As Joseph indicated, this property is designated industrial on your Comprehensive Plan. To the north is the railroad. To our south boundary is Franklin Road, which is a major arterial, five lanes, curb, gutter, sidewalk. This particular property has to take access off of a commercial local street, which is Lanark Street and initially when the applicant submitted -- and their architect submitted to the City of Meridian for annexation and rezone, they had a single use on the property, which was just mini storage and they did not have a detailed site plan or elevations and the Council indicated that, one, they wanted to see two types of uses within this industrial parcel and, secondly, they wanted to see what the buildings would look like and a detailed site plan. So, they came to me and we did submit a detailed site plan with a mixture of two uses. We have flex space on one lot. We have mini storage on the other. We did submit elevations. There

is existing sewer and water in Lanark Street. I did meet with Joe Bongiorno concerning the temporary turnaround. I do have an e-mail from -- from Mr. Bongiorno approving the turnaround that is on the -- proposed on the site plan and, then, I sent that over to Kelly Bruner at Ada County Highway District and she indicated that ACHD will accept an alternative turnaround if first approved by Meridian Fire Department. So, we are good there. We are showing the 35 foot landscape buffer along the entryway corridor of Franklin Road. We will be extending sewer and water through our site. It's right here. I always have -- so, services are right here at Lanark. Public Works has asked us to extend sewer and water to and through the site and out to Franklin Road. We did modify our preliminary plat to reflect the recommendations of the Public Works Department. There are two outstanding issues. We were asked to have our surveyor -- he went to the center line of the railroad tracks and the city asked that we take in the full right of way width for the railroad tracks. However, there is kind of a jog there and there is a school on the other side, so they are going to have to go out there and actually physically get permission from West Ada and, then, survey that in and the whole survey team got COVID, so I did forward the e-mail from the survey team to our staff planner. The landscape architect was confused on what changes they needed to make. I tried to walk them through it, so I did ask Joseph if we could add a condition that we will submit a revised legal description incorporating all of the railroad right of way in our annexation and a revised landscape plan prior to the development agreement being submitted to the City Council. So, that has to go to -- to Joseph and -- and be approved. There is one parcel to the east of us. There is a cow pasture and a house. There is an elderly couple that lives there. My client did contact them. He met with their son, talked to them about purchasing the property, talked to them about building a standard turnaround on their parcel. They indicated -- the son indicated that his parents are elderly, that they would like the cattle and at this juncture they don't have any intentions on developing. However, once his elderly parents have to leave the property they will be selling it for industrial purposes and, then, on the east side of their property is the Ada County Highway District traffic operations site. I got that approved through the city of Boise. It's annexed, zoned in the city of Boise. You guys released a portion of it that was within the Meridian area of city impact. So, ACHD is going to build a roadway north from Franklin that will link into Lanark. So, the only thing we will have to bridge is that five acre parcel that is on our eastern boundary. So, it is a temporary situation and the temporary turnaround that we are proposing is better than the one that the Adler site has right now and they are building flex space and so it's a logical transition as far as the development moving eastward. I asked that the Council support this. It's a good use, a good redevelopment, and all these pieces and parts are fitting together and we are second to the last of these old Ada county long five acre parcels to develop. Do you have any questions?

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions? Seeing no questions. Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone signed up to provide testimony?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, Greg Ferney signed in. I don't know if you wanted to speak.

Simison: Okay. No -- no reason to speak. Is there anybody else that would like to provide testimony on this item at this time? Seeing no one online that I know is for this item or

otherwise, would the applicant like to make any final comments? Okay. Council, turn this over to you.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I move that we close the public hearing.

Strader: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: After considering all staff, applicant, public testimony and move to approve File No. H-2021-0103 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of today, without any modifications.

Cavener: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve this -- Item 4. Is there any discussion?

Dodson: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Yes, Joe.

Dodson: Part of the motion needs to specifically include the Council waiver for the reduced buffer, because I can't make that as a condition.

Bernt: Duly noted.

Simison: Motion make -- and second both agree to that item. Any further discussion or comments? Then Clerk will call the roll.

Roll call: Borton, absent; Cavener, yea; Bernt, yea; Perreault, yea; Hoaglund, yea; Strader, yea.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

5. Public Hearing to Consider the Conveyance of approximately 0.73 acres of City-Owned Real Property for a Minimum Price of \$335,000.00 to the Meridian Development Corporation for Redevelopment Purposes in Downtown Meridian, located at 201, 223, 231, and 237 East Idaho Ave., Commonly Known as the Meridian Community Center and Centennial Park

Simison: So, the last -- not the last item, but Item 5 on the agenda is public hearing to consider conveyance of approximately .73 acres of city owned real property for minimum price of 335,000 to the Meridian Development Corporation for redevelopment purposes in downtown Meridian, located at 201, 223, 231, and 237 East Idaho Avenue, commonly known as the Meridian Community Center and Centennial Park. Mr. Baird.

Baird: Thank you, Mr. Mayor and Members of the Council. As you are aware, Idaho State law requires a public hearing whenever you propose to dispose of a city owned real property. In this particular instance we have a purchase and sale agreement that is in your packet as part of the -- the hearing and it's also attached to a separate ordinance that you may want to consider later after the end of the hearing. Proposed site -- you should be familiar with it. It's -- MDC intends to sell it to a private developer. River Caddis, also known as Meridian Caddis, for development purposes. So there will be a separate purchase agreement between MDC and River Caddis to ultimately put it in the hands of the private developer. Public notice for this hearing has been published in the Idaho Press pursuant to statute and we are supposed to declare the minimum price and that was -- has been set at 335,000 based on an appraisal. The hearing is for the purpose of giving the public the opportunity to give testimony regarding the proposed sale of the property and at the close of the hearing if you need anymore information you could continue the hearing to a specific date and request what additional information might be required. If you have all the information you need tonight you can close the hearing and, then, subsequently consider the ordinance that's the last item on the agenda. So, those are my preliminary remarks. Does anybody have any questions at this point?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you, Ted. And I just want to say I really appreciate your focus at this point. You have served us so nicely over the years and the fact that you are just like finishing out strong. So, I have a concern and -- and my concern is there is a little bit of -- it's a little clunky, the mechanics of how this will work. So, I have kind of an issue with conveying this property to MDC, but we haven't actually seen the OPA or the purchase agreement and what that agreement involves between MDC and the developer and so I personally think continuing makes sense, because I have a couple of concerns and I think they would be addressed, but those concerns were things that I brought up before. So, you know, I want to make sure that we have the right to use the community center for as

long as possible. I think that's really important for our Parks Department to help create a transition plan of how they are going to continue our city services. I also think it's important that we understand -- I -- I appreciated that we have the -- the right to buy the property back embedded within this document, but what I don't see is the mechanics of MDC's right to buy the property back from the developer if something goes wrong. So, I just -- I think it's a little bit of an order of operation thing, but that's just a comment and maybe a question for you would be what is the timing of the MDC agreements?

Baird: Mr. Mayor and Council Member Strader, in the audience tonight we have representatives from Meridian Caddis and an attorney representing the Meridian Development Corporation and I suspect that they have been making notes and can address your questions directly.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, sorry. Ashley Squyres is also online and --

Simison: All right.

Strader: Mr. Mayor that would -- that would be super if we could hear from her.

Simison: Well, why don't we go through regular order, so we can take public testimony and they can address those issues through the regular order of public testimony as they take their three minutes, because I assume they all want three minutes minimum to talk about this. So, Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone who signed up specifically?

Johnson: No one signed up specifically.

Simison: Okay. Well, then, why don't we go to the MDC administrator, since she had her hand raised already to provide any comments generally or specifically to what's been discussed to this point.

Squyres: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. I apologize I'm not there in person tonight. I have caught the cold that is going around the valley right now. To answer your question, I -- we had no idea that Council Woman Strader would want to see the purchase and sale agreement for MDC. If we had known we certainly would have shown the draft that is in progress right now. Our goal is, if this should be approved this evening, is to have it on our June 22nd board meeting for -- for consideration for discussion and potentially approval. I just want to reiterate that it will not be fully executed until River Caddis meets the intentions and all the conditions of the MOA period. So, that is what we had anticipated. I did not realize, again, that you all would like to see that, because we are still kind of going back and forth with tweaking some language. Regarding -- regarding the OPA that was mentioned, Council Woman Strader, that won't come for quite some time. That won't come until River Caddis has a full understanding of what the project costs will be and what the project that will actually be approved. We also need the CZC that we anticipate any land use entitlements with the project to be included as an exhibit to that OPA. So, that comes later. In fact, just for your reference for Union 93, they just submitted their OPA to us for consideration. So, it usually comes several months

after the land entitlements come, because that has to be included as part of the discussion. I think I have answered all the questions. Did I miss anything, Mayor and Council?

Simison: Council Woman Strader?

Strader: Thank you. Yeah. I mean -- so maybe what would be helpful -- thanks for clarifying the timing on your two agreements. I -- I guess I would just ask you directly are -- are you ready to talk about whether your agreement includes the right for the city to use the community center and how the buyback works and, then, you know, any further detail on -- I guess those two items and, then, I guess another question I had is whether you are going to have a condition for their financing to be in place at closing or how you are planning to tackle that.

Squyres: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, yes to all of that. Yes, we are finalizing the agreement. We will -- we will ensure that the closing of the financing at the time that we transfer the property is in place. We will also work with the city to determine and -- and River Caddis to determine the latest possible date in order for the city to be able to utilize the community center. I think River Caddis has said over and over again that they are more than willing to do that. We still need to figure out what that date looks like and that -- what that schedule looks like, but absolutely we will work with everybody and I think there was a third question or a third point and I just forgot it. My apologies.

Strader: Yes. Thank you. Ashley, I had spoken with Ted, our city attorney, earlier on my questions and one thing he had mentioned is that there could be a condition that their financing be in place at the time of closing your agreement. I didn't know if you were requiring that condition and if you are not ready to talk about that yet that's fine, but that was another question I had.

Squyres: Thank you for reminding me. Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, yes, that is -- that is something that we are anticipating putting into the agreement.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I apologize, because I do feel like this is a public hearing, but it's getting a little awkward, which is my fault. I apologize. It's been a busy week, but, yeah, I think -- I think it makes sense -- I understand the OPA wouldn't be ready, but I -- I think if the other agreement was ready it would make sense to have that available for Council to review. Hopefully in advance of your -- obviously in advance of your June 22nd meeting. Just some feedback. I -- I think that's it on questions for Ashley. I do have a different question.

Simison: Well, we will let the next people that want to provide comment come up and, if not, we will invite them up to answer questions. Any other questions for Ms. Squyres? Okay. Then is there anybody else that would like to provide testimony at this time on this

item? Then I will turn it back over to Council Woman Strader for questions. So, hopefully, someone in the audience can come forward and, then, answer.

Strader: That -- that would be great. Yeah. That's -- thank you. I would like to just understand six month due diligence period, that feels like a long time. Just wanted to understand if you need a six month due diligence period to actually finally move forward and what kind of drives the timing there and I don't think that's a terrible thing from our perspective, at least we hopefully have the use of our community center at that time, but help me understand the timing, please.

McGraw: Sure. Hi, everyone. So, good to see you again. Thanks for having us. Or having me. Excuse me. John McGraw. River Caddis Development. 1038 Trobridge Road, East Lansing, Michigan. So, to answer your questions, it was intentional that that is long. It was a long period of time. Mainly because we have a lot of work to do with the Hunter Lateral. You know, we -- we ended up closing the -- the -- the irrigation line in October and, then, we can't turn it back until April, May and, then, we have to wait -- if -- if we finalize all that construction over the winter, then, we still have to wait an additional two months before we can switch over. So, we won't know that we can actually build on the property until later and so our past discussions about making sure that all of our ducks are in a row, so we can get our financing in play and everything else, it kind of triggers that. So, we set it along that timeline. It wasn't for an intentional purpose of, hey, let's just take as much time as possible. It's that's really what set us along for our timeline, so that we can get all those things in a row, close, and, then, your second question as to the community center, that has been -- I mean we have been open on what that looks like. I think the community center requested some time ahead of time to let them know what our plans are to close, but -- but really so is everybody, you know, around the area. So, we are -- we are definitely going to let people know when we plan to do things, but as to allowing them to stay there, of course. The -- the details -- the devil is in the details there what that looks like, but, absolutely, we would work with -- with the city and what that looks like going forward.

Strader: Thanks, John.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Mr. Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Thanks for -- for making the trip out and being here tonight and -- and I -- I just wanted to follow up on discussions we have had and I think you talked about it the last hearing about your willingness to help move some of the park amenities that -- that we have to move off the site. That would be part of the building project down the road and you -- you guys are still fine with that? I think at the time it was not to exceed 150,000 in those park amenity moves. Is -- are you guys still good with that?

McGraw: Absolutely. Yes. We -- we had spoken about trying to work with the city and being further invested into the partnership that we have started with. So, we wanted to

offer that as -- as a way to work together, so that we can find a -- find a new home for the existing equipment.

Hoaglund: Appreciate that, John. Thank you.

McGraw: Absolutely.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for Mr. McGraw or is there anyone else from the public that would like to provide comments during this public hearing? Okay. Thank you.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Would it be appropriate to have a discussion at this point while the public hearing is open?

Simison: I would think that would be the most appropriate, yes.

Strader: Okay. So, I appreciate the feedback from everybody. You know, I -- I take a lot of comfort I think that Ashley is -- is confirming the -- the rough outlines of I think an understanding between the city and MDC about how the community -- use of the community center is going to work, about the -- you know, there is going to be mechanics for some sort of a right for them to repurchase the property if things fall through. I -- I personally think it would make sense to continue this to see that agreement. I don't think we need to see the OPA, but I think we need to see the -- I think the draft purchase agreement. It doesn't have to be signed, but I -- I would take more comfort from seeing their conditions, just given that we are conveying property with -- without any additional recourse or action on our part and I think it would -- I'm just a paranoid banker. That's -- that's why I'm like that, so I apologize. It's just my history and my career. But I -- I personally as a decision maker would prefer to see -- I prefer to see that draft before making a decision.

Simison: So, maybe a question for -- I don't know if it's legal, Ashley, or John. If it was delayed until the 21st, which we would definitely have seen it, then, because the 22nd is a date, so they would have had to have published that. In theory does that delay any aspects of this process to our knowledge?

Baird: Mr. Mayor, the question of delay should probably be addressed by Mr. McGraw. I know that they are -- they are currently working on the Hunter Lateral matter as we speak. Let's -- let's -- let's hear his --

Simison: I didn't know who to ask though.

McGraw: Yeah. Hi again. So, you know, the timing is very important of -- of both agreements to -- to continue this working forward. While I'm up here I was wondering if maybe there is some things that we can work through as -- to kind of make sure that the -- the -- the terms in the MOA that we are portraying, then, in the MDC agreement, that all those things that we are all saying that we are going to work through. I mean we still have to finalize those and -- and your concerns are definitely valid and the questions are great and I'm wondering if even -- if Ashley can also jump on to kind of add some color to things that we are going to have to make sure, so that we are not postponing to postpone, because I think, one, our agreement is very close to being finalized with -- just based on all of our conversations, that we have put these agreements right next to each other and we have been working very closely and -- and -- and it's been a great experience I think from both sides. So, I'm wondering if Ashley can also add some -- some notes to kind what I'm talking about right now as to the process in the MOA, those terms and the like. So, Ashley, would you be able to speak to that a little bit?

Squyres: Yes, Mr. Mayor, Members to the Council. John, I hope I'm understanding everything correctly. I'm on cold medication, so my apologies. So, just to talk about through the process. The only reason why we were targeting June 22nd was because we just assumed we would have an approval this evening and we wanted to be able to get the purchase and sale agreement in front of our board to just have a discussion and see if they were comfortable with it. Again, not fully executing on this, because there are a number of conditions through the MOA that have to be met first and -- and John and I have been working through what a tentative schedule would look like for each of those conditions. So, that way we understand kind of what that timing looks like, when triggers will be pulled, and when we need to come back and have conversations with the Council as well to -- just to give you updates. So, that is -- that's kind of where we are at this time. I perceive that, you know, as CZC application -- John -- and please correct me if I'm remembering the scheduling correctly -- but we foresee having a CZC most likely approved probably late summer, early -- early fall and, then, that would give us the appropriate time to start working through an owner participation agreement with River Caddis as well, too. And, again, we can bring that back and update, you know, the Council as to what those -- those conditions look like and, you know, what that structure looks like. But, again, we do need that entitlement first.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I -- I don't think we are intending to hold up the CZC or anything along those lines. I think the request would just be for City Council -- perhaps we could even close the public hearing, but I -- I wouldn't recommend that. I think the request would be simply to see the draft MOA that you are working on. So, you have to keep in mind we have -- we haven't -- there was no MOA in our packet. So, I'm just giving you a piece of city property -- and I do trust you. I think you are a straight shooter. But we are -- we are giving MDC a piece of property. We have good connections with them. We have an understanding. But I haven't seen anything written down that reflects use of the

community center and these other concerns. So, I guess I just feel like what's the harm in -- in continuing until the 21st? By then that gives us a good over a week to review whatever draft MOA is here. I'm sure it will confirm all the points I'm concerned about and anybody else could be concerned about and we could possibly take action on the 21st right before that board meeting. I guess is that an issue?

Simison: That was my basic question. What -- what -- what does that delay potentially, if anything, from any government entity or individual standpoint? Is anybody --

Squyres: Mr. Mayor and Members of the Council, I don't think it delays anything specifically. Again, we are not on a specific time frame. I think we were just trying to expedite this process as quickly as we could, just to get to the next step and to close as many loops. I think the 21st, at least for MDC's point of view to be able to have our meeting on the 22nd, works. I will just kind of caveat that with our legal counsel has been out of town and is out of town for most of this week as well. We are working on some of those final details. It is not finalized yet, so it will probably be next week before we could get you that draft.

Simison: John?

McGraw: If I could also say -- so, I -- I understand what you are -- what you are requesting and -- and if that's -- if you guys need time to see that and go through it, again, I understand. My big timing is I have a window with the Hunter Lateral and I have a lot of work to do and we have pulled the trigger early to do that and now if we postpone there is a chance also that time doesn't come on our side and something else happens where this doesn't end up going through and, then, we miss another month. All of these things -- just -- just as you are concerned so am I. So, I'm sitting on both sides of this understanding and I want to make it work. I want you to feel comfortable that we are going down the right road, but, you know, we have pulled the trigger on full design packages of the Hunter Lateral. We have already set meetings going forward and -- and we -- you know, we -- I understand that -- that risk.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Just to put a finer point on it from my perspective, if the MOA includes the right for the city to use the community center as long as possible, including during your due diligence period. If it includes the right for MDC to buy the property back if the deal falls apart and if it includes a financing condition, I can't wait to move forward. But I just want to see that reflected in -- in the agreement and maybe there is something in that due diligence period -- because I saw a little gleam in your eye that we need to work out. Maybe there is something I'm missing here, but it seems to me like during that period we should have full use of our community center and perhaps pass that date as long as your site work hasn't actually gotten to a point that it makes it unusable. Am I -- do I have any misunderstanding there?

McGraw: If I'm --

Strader: Yeah.

McGraw: -- understanding right -- and I -- I don't think that there is a misunderstanding.

Strader: Yeah. Perfect. So -- but, Mr. Mayor, I -- I guess you are hearing from only one person so far and I apologize, because this has been really clunky, but from my perspective I -- on -- on the 21st, as long as that MOA reflects those three things I just mentioned, I will be voting in favor. I will be approving that ordinance or however we have it structured. So, you heard from me. So, maybe you want to hear from others.

McGraw: Well, I wonder if there is a -- a median that we can reach possibly where -- I mean Ashley has mentioned that these things are going to be in the agreement.

Strader: Yeah.

McGraw: If they are -- if this changes by then -- right? Because we -- we can't close or we can't execute the agreement without fully approving all of the MOA items, so --

Baird: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Mr. Baird.

Baird: Members of the Council. I got two points to make. I want to discuss what's in the purchase and sale agreement that's in your packet and that's the agreement between the city and MDC. It's been agreed upon. We are just waiting for it to be presented to MDC to sign. It does contain provisions that if the project fails, you know, then -- then the city has the opportunity to buy the property back from MDC. It's in there. The six month due diligence actually works in the city's favor, because we will continue to own it during that time. So, no one can tell us we can't use it. We will still own the property. It's after the city transfers it to MDC that you are going to want to see some language -- aspirational language in the MDC agreement about how long they -- they can do that or -- or they will be in contact. I have seen this before and a lot of it has to do with time of the year, timing of the -- the work on the lateral. If the closing is delayed beyond six months I can guarantee you the developer is probably going to be ready to go when they own the land and that's just the way these things work. So, I have talked to Steve Siddoway, I mentioned the six month due diligence, I told him right now that's all that's guaranteed. Of course, he would like more and I think you will see that in the MDC agreement. So, I just wanted to -- to get that on the record that the agreement that's before you -- if the ordinance is approved the Mayor has the ability to sign it. The Mayor would also have the ability to sign any addenda that we would need to do if there are little pieces that don't match up with the MDC-River Caddis agreement. So, those things can be worked out. So, I do -- I do also respect the fact that you might want the -- the comfort of seeing what's in that MDC agreement. However, I want to talk about the timing. That's the second thing is the timing of that agreement. It needs to be in the packet for the meeting of the 21st,

which means it has to be ready to be published on the 14th. From what I'm hearing Ashley say that might not happen. You might have to consider the 28th. So, I'm going to leave that out there and see if anybody wants to respond, but those -- those are the two points that I wanted to make. Did I -- I think there was a question for me there. Did I answer?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Maybe a different way to tackle it is would you commit that -- because you will have the authority to sign the property over under this agreement, would you commit that if those three things were not in it you would come back? I assume so. It would be in our best interest. Maybe that's another way --

Simison: I will do whatever -- what legal tells me I can and can't do where my discretion is involved in these type of issues, even though it won't be that legal, it will be that legal out there, but --

Baird: Mr. Mayor, the -- and Members of the Council. The ordinance does specifically give you the authority to sign it. It doesn't say when. So, if the ordinance is passed, yet the agreement never gets signed, I think the City Council would need to take some action to rescind that ordinance. You don't want that hanging out there. You may have other legal counsel on the 21st -- the 28th who have other ideas, but there is some flexibility there that we can work around, but it's going to require sort of a gentlemen's or person's agreement on that.

Simison: And I know that's -- that's the difficult part. Yeah. I -- I -- I believe in the -- in the agreement that we are all working towards the same thing, that no one is trying to do anything that they have not stated through that process and, you know, whatever good faith we need to provide I'm willing to do that however we can to make this move forward in a productive manner. That being said, we could do this for one week, because if -- as Mr. Baird says, you know, in theory they would have an agreement close or maybe they just work on those three provisions of what will be in it and the rest -- just so we can see it and, then, do this next week, even though it may not be the final version, you can at least see those three elements and perhaps counsel that's represent -- representing MDC is in the room, could just work out those three tomorrow and -- and, then, there would -- that would be fantastic. But I'm -- I'm -- I'm here to serve at the pleasure with my signature. So, that's my role tonight.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I -- I understand Council Woman Strader's concerns and I understand her intent and I also completely understand what -- what you are saying as well and -- and what's been stated by Ashley. I -- I feel comfortable going forward knowing that there is

safeguards in place that are protecting all parties. I -- I would like to have this information that you are working on and -- and -- and, honestly, it's the reason why I love having you sit right next to me, because of your approach with these -- with these issues, because of your high level experience with your -- your professional employment you had before. So -- but -- but I -- I -- I feel comfortable, you know, with -- with the safeguards that are in place going forward. I -- looking at you and you are looking at me and you are shaking your head and you give me big smiles and so I'm -- I'm in favor. I will approve knowing that you have said you are going to do everything up until now. I have no reason not to believe that that's going to happen. I think we are protecting the --

Borton: Well, Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Yeah. I have been privileged to be part of the meetings that we have held every couple weeks and early morning and getting to work with the people and everything and -- and working with MDC and -- and others it -- it -- it -- it is ready to go. I -- and -- and also I'm just really concerned what we -- Council Woman Strader, you know, acknowledged herself -- her paranoid banker self and I thought, boy, if I agree am I buying into that paranoia? So, I -- that just -- no. Seriously, this is a project that everyone wants to move forward. Yes, there are a few questions about timing of community center and I believe that those can be worked out. We can make that work out. We can -- we can move forward, have -- have these things take place and, then, all those smaller details -- everyone agrees in principle, there is an understanding on that, and we just have to make that move forward when the time comes at the appropriate time. We just know things aren't going to work to the timing of the calendar necessarily, but we just have to do our part and trust the party will do their part and so on and -- and -- and I -- I do believe that's going to work out. So, I'm -- I'm in favor of moving forward tonight, but it's -- it's up to the Council in how we want to proceed. I don't want to delay it beyond the 21st. I think that would give us enough time. If Council does want to delay, then, okay, the 21st we can have a report back and have some of those high level things heard, but, yeah, I -- I'm ready to move forward now. But it's up to the -- up to the Council.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Reading the number of votes and figuring it out pretty quickly -- and I -- I'm in support of the project, but I will just say this, I -- Ashley Squyres is on the public record promising those three things and I have full faith in you, Ashley, that if you don't get those three things you are not going to move forward and I know we have a great relationship and you will make sure that we get those three things. So, given that fact pattern, I almost always would reject a scenario where I can't review something in order to make a decision. I don't like that at all. But given that Ashley has promised it, let's do it.

Simison: So, Ashley, if you didn't promise that speak now.

Squyres: She heard me correctly, Mayor.

Simison: Okay. And while it's not a solution yet, we did -- we did find a good option for back up for the community center with the American Legion across the street. Especially I think during the day for -- for space. They have got two great -- two nice sized spaces that they have made available. But might have to work with some of the other people in there with the classes. Maybe help find them other spaces that maybe work for their needs, but that's been a nice find. It's just right now everything is calendared, so it's hard to find a good solution, so --

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: I would move that we close the public hearing on the conveyance of approximately 0.73 acres of city owned property -- real property for a minimum price of 335,000 dollars to the Meridian Development Corporation for redevelopment purposes in downtown Meridian.

Strader: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Hoaglun: And, Mr. Mayor, it's my understanding action will be taken under Item No. 7.

ORDINANCES [Action Item]

- 6. Ordinance No. 22-1980: An Ordinance (Oaks North Rezone - H-2022-0010) for Rezone of a Parcel of Land Located in the North ½ of the Southwest ¼ of Section 28, Township 4 North, Range 1 West, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho; Establishing and Determining the Land Use Zoning Classification of 12.02 Acres of Land From the R-4 (Medium Low-Density Residential) Zoning District to the R-8 (Medium-Density Residential) Zoning District in the Meridian City Code; Providing That Copies of This Ordinance Shall Be Filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as Required by Law; and Providing for a Summary of the Ordinance; and Providing for a Waiver of the Reading Rules; and Providing an Effective Date**

Simison: Correct. So, we will first move to Item 6, which is Ordinance No. 22-1980. Ask the Clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. It's an ordinance related to Oaks North Rezone, H-2022-0010, for rezone of a parcel of land located in the North ½ of the Southwest ¼ of Section 28, Township 4 North, Range 1 West, Boise meridian, Ada county, Idaho; establishing and determining the land use zoning classification of 12.02 acres of land from the R-4 (Medium Low-Density Residential) Zoning District to the R-8 (Medium-Density Residential) Zoning District in the Meridian City Code; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; and providing for a summary of the Ordinance; and providing for a waiver of the reading rules; and providing an effective date

Simison: Thank you. Council, you have heard this ordinance read by title. Is there anybody that would like it read in this entirety? Seeing none, do we have a motion?

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 22-1980 with the suspension of rules.

Strader: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve Ordinance No. 22-1980 under suspension of the rules. Is there in discussion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

Roll call: Borton, absent; Cavener, yea; Bernt, yea; Perreault, yea; Hoaglund, yea; Strader, yea.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

- 7. Ordinance No. 22-1981: An Ordinance Authorizing the Conveyance of Approximately 0.73 Acres of City-Owned Real Property to the Meridian Development Corporation, Located at 201, 223, 231, and 237 East Idaho Avenue in the City Of Meridian (Commonly Referred to as "Centennial Park" and the "Meridian Community Center") and Legally Described in this Ordinance; Authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to Execute and Attest on Behalf of the City of Meridian the Sale Agreement, Deed, and Other Documents Necessary to Complete the Transaction; Providing For a Waiver of the Reading Rules; and Providing an Effective Date**

Simison: Next item is Item 7, which is Ordinance No. 22-1981. Ask the Clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. It's an ordinance authorizing the conveyance of approximately 0.73 acres of city-owned real property to the Meridian Development Corporation, located at 201, 223, 231, and 237 East Idaho Avenue in the City of Meridian (commonly referred to as "Centennial Park" and the "Meridian Community Center") and legally described in this ordinance; authorizing the Mayor and City Clerk to execute and attest on behalf of the City of Meridian the sale agreement, deed, and other documents necessary to complete the transaction; providing for a waiver of the reading rules; and providing an effective date.

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

Perreault: Mr. Mayor, I move that we approve Ordinance No. 22-1981 with the suspension of rules.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve Ordinance No. 22-1981 under suspension of the rules. Is there any discussion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

Roll call: Borton, absent; Cavener, nay; Bernt, yea; Perreault, yea; Hoaglund, yea; Strader, yea.

Simison: Four ayes, one no, and the ordinance is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. ONE NO. ONE ABSENT.

FUTURE MEETING TOPICS

Simison: That brings us to Future Meeting Topics. Anything in future meeting topics? Okay. Then do I have a --

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: If I might take a point of personal privilege.

Simison: You are recognized for five minutes.

Hoaglund: Five minutes. Oh, great. Starting now. No. We are just -- it -- it's fortuitous that it worked out this way, but we have a deputy city attorney who is sitting in tonight for Bill, who has given us 17 years of outstanding work and just wanted to take a moment to -- to recognize that work. We go way back. I -- I graduated from College of Idaho and Ted was there at the same time. In fact, we would have been in the same class, but since I transferred there I just went two years. I had another class to make up. So, I happened

to find something circa 1981 in the C of I yearbook. So, I -- I just thought, you know, Ted -- he was a good looking guy at one time and now with the beard he looks great. You know, it's a -- so, I have -- I have known Ted a long time and it's just been fantastic to work with Ted here at the city and the -- the service that you have provided to the Council, to the departments, and to the citizens of Meridian has been outstanding. It's something we look to, we trust, and we are sorry to see you go. Maybe it's partly, you know, for the same age I'm jealous, but it's just with much appreciation and well wishes that you -- you move into retirement or whatever else is out there for you. Who knows. I don't see you just totally retiring. But just truly appreciate the work that -- that you have done for our community. It was outstanding.

Baird: Thank you.

Simison: Would the gentleman yield?

Hoaglund: Gentleman yields.

Simison: It's -- it's been a pleasure -- you know, I came shortly after you, Ted, but I think I -- you and I had the pleasure of always engaging on some of the more fun projects for the city during our time frame and some of the more fun people to work with. Railroads. Large agricultural companies in the state of Idaho on -- on -- on -- on projects and -- and large annexations and so you were always there and willing to give sound advice and willing to, you know, work through some pretty tough projects on behalf of the city and it -- while sad to see you go, miss seeing you on your walks around downtown through that, but you can always come back and go for a walk anytime and we will be happy to entertain you in whatever way, shape, or form. It -- it may be grumpy old men, but that's okay. We will take that one, too. But congratulations.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, if I may?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thanks. President yields. I have been fortunate to have a lot of different working relationships with you. As -- as a colleague and as a Council Member and for many years I got to sit where Jessica sits and was appreciated that when you were up here you would placate with my comments sometimes under the breath, sometimes encouraging, sometimes calming me down. When I worked here as an employee I always appreciated that -- how you would explain both complicated and easy topics in a way that I could understand, both as a Council Member and as an employee and I just think that you are a fine and fitting example of a great Meridian employee. You really care about our community. You are a -- a fine legal mind, a fine colleague, a fine father, just a fine man and I have really appreciated being able to call you a colleague and a friend over the past 15 years and really wish you well in this next new chapter. You will be missed.

Strader: Thanks for everything, Ted.

Baird: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman -- Mr. Baird.

Baird: Appreciate the comments. Totally unexpected. I was hoping to leave under the radar. But Bill -- Bill set it up this way. He knew he was going to be gone and he wanted me to stay long enough to take this meeting. So, I guess I appreciate Bill for that. Couldn't have asked to work with a greater group of people and having met and worked with Kurt for the time that he's been here and, of course, Emily and we have a new deputy Tishra, who started Monday, I think you guys are going to be in great hands. Bill -- Bill has a good vision for the office and -- and I don't expect that to -- to change, but it's been a blast. Thanks.

Simison: Here. Here.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I move we adjourn.

Simison: I have a motion to adjourn. All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it. We are adjourned.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 10:02 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

_____ MAYOR ROBERT E. SIMISON	_____ DATE APPROVED
----------------------------------	------------------------

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK