

Meridian Planning and Zoning Meeting

May 15, 2025.

Meeting of the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission of May 15, 2025, was called to order at 6:02 p.m. by Chairman Maria Lorcher.

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

Others Present: Kurt Starman, Alexandria Breshears, Tina Lomeli, Barbara Conly, Bill Parsons, Linda Ritter and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

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

Lorcher: Good evening. Welcome to the Planning and Zoning Commission for May 15th, 2025. At this time I would like to call the meeting to order. The Commissioners who are present for this evening's meeting are at City Hall and on Zoom. We also have staff from the city attorney's and the city's clerk's office, as well as the city's planning department. If you are joining us on Zoom this evening we can see that you are here. You may observe the meeting, however, your ability to be seen and talk will be muted -- be seen on screen and talk will be muted. During the public testimony portion of the meeting you will be unmuted and, then, be able to comment. Please note that we cannot take questions until the public testimony portion. If you have a process question during the meeting please e-mail cityclerk@meridiancity.org and they will reply as quickly as possible. If you simply want to watch the -- the meeting we encourage you to watch this streaming on the city's YouTube channel. You can access it at [meridiancity.org/live](https://www.meridiancity.org/live). With that let's begin with roll call. Thank you. We would like to welcome our new chairperson Matt Stoll to the dais tonight. So, welcome.

Stoll: Thank you.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

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

Smith: So moved.

Rust: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

- 1. Approve Minutes of the April 17, 2025 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting**
- 2. Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for In-N-Out Burger (H-2024-00058) by In-N-Out Burger, located at 5985 & 6037 N. Ten Mile Rd.**
- 3. Final Order for Sadie Creek Drive-through (TEC-2025-0001) by Mike Maffia, MGM Meridian 2, located at 3030 N. Cajun Ln.**

Lorcher: The next item is the Consent Agenda. For tonight's Consent Agenda Commissioner Stoll is new to our commission and since you were not present for these items your choice is to abstain; correct?

Stoll: I am -- Council, I am going to abstain.

Lorcher: Okay. So, for tonight's votes Commissioner Stoll will not vote on the Consent Agenda. That includes the -- the meeting minutes of April 17th, Facts -- Findings and Facts and Conclusions of Law for In and Out Burger and the final order for Sadie Creek Drive-Through, which was a request for a two year extension on the conditional use permit. Could I get a motion -- could I get a motion to accept the Consent Agenda as presented?

Smith: So moved.

Rust: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSTAIN.

ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

Lorcher: At this time I would briefly like to explain the public hearing process. We will open each item individually and begin with the staff report. Staff will report their findings on how the item adheres to our Comprehensive Plan and our Unified Development Code. After staff has made their presentation the applicant will come forward to present their case and respond to staff's comments. They will have 15 minutes to do so. After the applicant is finished we will open the floor to public testimony. Each person will be

called only once during public testimony. The Clerk will call the names individually of those who signed up on our website in advance to testify. You may come to the microphones in Chambers or you will be unmuted on Zoom. Please state your name and address for the record and you will have three minutes to address the Commission. If you have previously sent pictures or a presentation for the meeting it will be displayed on screen and our clerk will help you run the presentation. If you have established that you are speaking behalf -- on the behalf of a larger group, like an HOA, where others from your group will allow you to speak on their behalf, you will have up to ten minutes. After all those who have signed up in advance who have spoken we will invite any others who wish to testify. If you wish to speak on a topic you may come forward in Chambers or press -- on Zoom you press the raise hand button and if you are listening on a telephone you can press star nine. If you are listening on multiple devices, such as a computer and a phone, please be sure to mute those extra devices so we don't experience feedback and we can hear you clearly. When you are finished if the Commission does not have any questions for you you will return to your seat in Chambers or be muted on Zoom and no longer have the ability to speak. And, please, remember we will not call on you a second time. After testimony has been heard the applicant will be given another ten minutes to respond to public testimony. When the applicant is finished responding to questions and concerns we will close the public hearing and Commissioners will have the opportunity to discuss and hopefully make final decisions or recommendations to City Council.

ACTION ITEMS

- 4. Public Hearing for Adero Mixed-Use Neighborhood (H-2024-0068) by DevCo, LLC, located near the NWC of N. Ten Mile and McMillan Rd.**
 - A. Request: Rezone of 11.18 acres of land from the R-4 and C-C zones to the R-8 zone; 35.82 acres from the L-O, C-C and C-G zones to the R-15 zone; and a portion of the C-C zone (approximately 10 acres) to the C-G zone which in total is 21.37 acres.
 - B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 270 residential lots, 44 commercial lots, 4 office lots, 31 common lots, 2 common drive lots and 1 park lot on 69.18 acres of land in the R-8, R-15, L-O and C-G zoning districts.
 - C. Request: Development Agreement Modification (Inst. No. 2019-055407) to create two (2) new development agreements to develop the Adero Mixed-Use Subdivision.

Lorcher: Tonight I would like to open the public hearing for Adero Mixed-Use Neighborhood, Item No. H-2024-0068 near Ten Mile and McMillan, for a rezone, a preliminary plat and a request for a development agreement modification. We will begin with the staff report.

Ritter: Good evening, Commissioners. I'm Linda Ritter. So, tonight before you, as the Chair said, is an application for a rezone, preliminary plat and development agreement modification. This site consists of 69.8 acres of land. It's currently zoned C-G, L-O and C-C and it's located near the northwest corner of North Ten Mile and McMillan Road. So, the Adero Mixed-Use Neighborhood consists of, again, 69.18 acres of land that was annexed in 2005. The property will be developed as a mixed use development consisting of single family detached residential, office and commercial. So, this is the rezone for the C-G. So, it's approximately 21.37 acres. This is a rezone for the L-O. It's about two point some odd acres. This is a rezone for the R-8. It's about 35.82 acres. Sorry. I may be wrong on that one. Hold on. Yeah. And this is the rezone for the R-15. So, again, the modification of the development agreements, we want to take the current development agreement and make two new development agreements, one for the residential and one for the commercial use. But, again, even though they are requesting two development agreements this is one project. So, it's one property, one project, but two separate things being done, commercial and residential. This is the phasing plan for the application. So, the commercial portion is within phase five, because at this time the commercial portion -- they are unsure what will be built in this area. We have a concept of what it may look like and the applicant will show you several different scenarios of what it could look like, but we don't have a -- an absolute concept of what it will be. So, the development agreement has several conditions for that for when they come in, but they will have limitations on what can and can't happen there. So, we are trying to make it where they don't have to come back in and do a development agreement modification, but we have put some strict restrictions on it as far as how it is to be developed. So, this is phase one of the residential. The applicant will be providing -- showing you a modified phasing plan that takes out the amenities, which will be done in the second phase. Again, their landscape plan. We have several pathway connections. They have -- they exceed their open space qualifications. This is their pedestrian connection exhibit. As you can see there is good pedestrian connection -- pedestrian connectivity throughout the proposed development. These are the amenities they are proposing. So, they did submit elevations and any homes that are built along the collector road, if they are two stories they will need to adhere to modulation and different materials to break up the monotonous of the sides of the housing along that collector road. So, we are going to talk a little bit about the residential. So, they are proposing to develop 270 homes to be constructed in phases. To accommodate these -- the residential component two zoning districts are proposed, R-15 and R-8 and, again, they are providing a mix of lot sizes and housing options. As part of the project the applicant is also contributing an additional acreage to the existing park located on Lot 46, Block 5. This contribution will fulfill the requirement outlined in the existing development agreement to establish a 10.2 acre park, enhancing recreational opportunities for the surrounding community. This is the park I was talking about. So, this Bridgetower West neighborhood, it was originally preliminary platted under the development agreement that required the dedication of the park. However, the majority of that park was never formally dedicated to the Bridgetower West Homeowners Association and the prior approvals for the neighborhood have since expired. The Adero Park Mixed-Use Neighborhood application addresses this issue by incorporating the remaining portion of the park that was never deeded to the HOA. This

application creates a clear path forward for the current property owner to record a final plat that establishes the properly sized park parcel, therefore, fulfilling the original development agreement and, then, when the parcel could be dedicated to the HOA. This park will not be associated to the property owners within the Adero Park Mixed-Use Neighborhood and the office portion of this, which is the L-O -- so, that is the development of four lots -- it could be less -- at the corner of Ten Mile and West Malta Drive within the area designated for the limited office zoning. This location was strategically selected by the applicant as it sits between the proposed Adero Park Mixed-Use Neighborhood and the existing Bridgetower West Subdivision. The applicant views this as an ideal site for office use, providing a natural transition between residential areas and supporting the overall goal of creating a balanced and integrated mixed-use environment. And, again, the commercial. So, they were -- they proposed to defer the development of the commercial portion of the property to the future phase, which is the last phase, as specific end users have not yet been identified. So, this bubble drawing is kind of a concept of what -- where the commercial is located and access points throughout the site. So, prior to proceeding with the commercial component the applicant will be required to submit some updated plans and demonstrate alignment with the mixed use principles outlined in the Comprehensive Plan. So, the commercial portion of the property -- so, what they are doing is they are working with -- they are -- requested a waiver for right-in, right-out turn onto Ten Mile. So, they have to work with the highway district. They will need to provide an updated transportation impact study, because a transportation impact study was not done on the commercial portion, so they will need to provide that to ACHD for them to evaluate and determine if that is warranted and if that -- the city decides that -- the Council decides to grant them the waiver based upon the fact that ACHD has accepted and approve their transportation impact study and deem that that right-in, right-out is warranted. Again this is the commercial access and pedestrian access plan that the applicant provided. So, this is coming in from -- this is Adero Park and this is the access point they want out to Ten Mile. So, they are asking for an access point off of the new collector road here and, then, there will be an access point that goes down to where that Walmart area is right there to get people through this area. So, this collector street -- it will be constructed as a 36 foot wide residential collector street with two travel lanes. It can either be -- have on-street bike lanes, vertical curb, gutter and a minimum of eight foot wide strip and five foot wide detached sidewalk or it can be constructed as a 26 foot wide residential collector, two travel lanes, curb-gutter, a minimum of eight foot wide landscape strip and ten foot wide multi-pathway on both sides. So, the applicant has chosen -- so far the drawings show that there are -- the ten foot multi-pathway on both sides. So, it will be constructed as a complete street. The applicant -- if the residential portion comes in first we are asking that the landscaping, the pathway, the travel lanes and the curbs and gutter be put in, but minus the pathway and the landscaping. As the commercial comes in we are asking for the same thing on their side, minus the pathway and the landscaping on the residential side. Again this is a concept of a layout that could potentially happen, but, again, there are no specific layouts that have been approved with this. These are concepts or images of things that could potentially go in the commercial. They are not intended for architectural references as noted here. These are potential things that could happen in the commercial area. Again, this is a

picture of the park. So, we are going to talk about the collector road again. The staff is asking at this time that this collector road be built, but the entirety of the collector road be built prior to any occupancy within the first phase of this development, because what we don't want to see is that when they start building homes out here that people have to go back out onto Ten Mile to get south to the businesses that are down here, because there is no connection. This road is the missing link to get people to the south. So, once the road is built that the applicant does have the option of building this connection on the commercial side and taking it down south. That is an option for the applicant. Or they can continue to build it down to connect to -- I think it's San Vito Way, which will allow that connection to the south, because if the applicant builds this portion and this portion right here is to be done by a third party, they have to build this section and I think the applicant is building this, so there is some kind of agreement between the applicant and the third party to build this section here, but, then, we will have this missing piece, because without this built these apartments cannot receive occupancy for their development. So, this is going to come sooner or later -- sooner rather than later I would assume, because they are working with the city to revise their plans to get into this development. So, we don't want to have that missing gap and, then, have people going up through the neighborhoods to get up and around and come down around to get down to the south. So, that is not what we want to happen. We don't want them going back out on Ten Mile and we don't want them cutting through the neighborhoods to get down and around to the businesses at the south -- on the south. So, staff has been working really hard with the applicant on this project. We have had some very good conversations and the applicant has been receptive of the things that we have talked about. There are still a few outstanding issues that we will be working on and we should hope to have those resolved before they go before City Council. So, we are proposing a couple of changes to some of the conditions that we have in this document and the first one is under the commercial portion of the development agreement we would like to kind of change some of the language and add that conceptual plans providing -- provided including and, then, are intended to serve as a general guide -- guidance for future required commercial applications. So, that was a recommendation from the applicant and the staff has no issues with that and, then, another one was 1-C where we are talking about the transportation impact study for the commercial lots and we added, as determined by ACHD in there, because it is a requirement from the highway district. 1-G. Staff is still working with the applicant regarding this condition. And, again, for now the condition stands as presented. 1-J. As far as the plaza it was kind of -- there were two different conditions. One said first phase and one said second. So, we just wanted to clarify that it's the phase that is adjacent to the plaza. And, then, again, on the commercial portion of the road we are excluding the pathway and the landscape on the residential side. And, then, 1-P, again, we are working with the applicant on this and hope to have it resolved, so the condition stands as presented and, then, we want to remove condition 1-V, because that is moving to the second phase. And with that I will stand for any questions that you may have.

Lorcher: Would the applicant like to come forward?

Clark: Hey, everybody. Hethe Clark. 251 East Front Street in Boise, representing the applicant. It's nice to see a familiar face. Welcome back. I guess back; right? Back to the halls. Something like that. Okay. So, we are here tonight to talk about the Adero project and let me see if I can get this on full screen. The mouse is not reacting to me.

Lorcher: You may want to try the arrows.

Clark: Not getting anything right now.

Lorcher: Yeah. Tina, can we get it full screen -- or on the big ones it's full screen up there, so -- oh, no, not -- I guess not.

Clark: Oh, I wonder if my monitor --

Lorcher: Oh, it's not on presentation mode.

Clark: Yep.

Lorcher: If my kids were here they would figure it out in a second.

Clark: I can see it, I just can't control it. That looks better. Yep. I think we got her. Okay. Off we go. Okay. Thanks, everybody. So, just a couple kind of initial thoughts as we start this. This is not an annexation, just to kind of set the stage; right? This is a rezone of some property that's had this zoning for over 20 years. In that time there has been a Comprehensive Plan update, such that it's now -- has a different designation than it did back then. There would be -- now it's got a mixed use commercial designation on it. And so in proposing what we have, we have a commercial component and we have a residential component and as you know we are typically residential developers, so this is a good opportunity for us to be able to bring something to you in the mixed use area that actually has all of those things, so you can see it and take a look at it. And in addition to that I would just point out that I don't think I can emphasize enough just how important it is that this project brings in the mid-mile collector. That area -- it has some traffic struggles. That mid-mile collector is something that everybody's been waiting for to be able to take some of that pressure off of that Ten Mile and McMillan intersection. This provides that on Lock. So, it's very important for the -- for the area to be able to have that. So, as was mentioned this is between Chinden on the north, McMillan on the south, Ten Mile on the east, so you can kind of see the context here. I think this is important, because if you look at the four square mile area centered on Ten Mile Road, this is really one of the last pieces to develop in -- I know that Bill raises his eyebrows whenever I say the word in-fill, because the city has a very technical definition of what in-fill means, but the general sense of -- of the -- of the word this is an in-fill project. It's filling in. It's providing the connections that are needed as you go forward. And you -- as you can see there, you know, the areas that are -- that don't have the little green marks on them for -- for platted lots, those are primarily -- you can see Heroes Park just to our northeast. You got the school sites. There is -- there is one piece of MDR, medium density residential,

on the far southwest. But other than that that four square miles this really completes it. The Comprehensive Plan also speaks to that 15 minute city concept and this is -- this is one example of how that really works. So, as we are able to come in and complete these connections and get this development in, you can see that there are pathways that allow pedestrian connectivity to the grade schools, over to Heroes Park. They also allow you to get much more easily to the commercial opportunities that are within the immediate area. I mentioned before that there was a Comprehensive Plan designation, so -- a change. So, as you know the current designation is the old kind of C-C. We are taking a chunk of the property and really right sizing the commercial to that. I think it's approximately 24 acres with a property that's closer to Ten Mile that has the visibility and, then, in accordance with the new comp plan designation, increasing some of that residential to get it to, like we say, kind of the right size. So, the mixed use commercial designation speaks to up to 15 per -- 50 percent of the development area being residential. The mixed use zoning band is between six to 15 dwelling units per acre and we are on the very low end of that at seven. So, we -- we believe that this -- one of the benefits of this project is that it does kind of update everything for that area to make it consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. We have the variety of zoning here to make this all work together. So, you can see on the far west we have the R-8 with the somewhat larger lots to kind of -- facing to the neighbors. The park on the south. And Linda did a nice job of explaining what's going to happen there. She's correct that this will be its own new parcel at 10.2 acres, which is what the develop -- the old development agreement called for. Creating that parcel will allow for it to be -- the rest for it to be conveyed. And, then, we have a little bit of -- we have some limited office on the north and, then, the commercial C-G area on the -- on the east and southeast. Again, the collector road is really important. This is about a half mile of the collector that will be completed and one of the things that it does is the -- the location of the collector road is largely driven by the two access points on either side; right? So, as we drive the collector road through the middle of it that provides a lot of the transition that's needed between the residential and the commercial. So, as Linda mentioned, we will have our collector through the middle. You got a hundred plus feet of right of way and, then, you also -- and within that you also have the two ten foot regional pathways. So, that creates this nice transition and buffer between the two. It also leads into the -- excuse me -- the plaza area that you can see that is at the entry to the commercial that will also be part of that transition. Again this -- this kind of backs up and kind of helps you see how these -- these mid-mile collectors are laid out and how they function. Again this -- the red is the mid-mile collector that we are going to be completing and that is what we anticipate and ACHD anticipates and anybody who understands a mid-mile collector would understand it's going to take some of that pressure off of the arterials by allowing people to get through the block, rather than having to go out onto the arterial itself. As I mentioned, the -- the arterial as it comes through will have the -- the regional pathways on either side and you can see the -- that -- that pedestrian connectivity grid. Linda showed you this -- this drawing before. But one thing that I want to emphasize, too, is that that will allow folks to walk from either the existing Bridgetower neighborhood or from these new neighborhoods along these regional pathways up to the -- there is an existing HAWK signal that will allow folks to get over to Heroes Park as well. So, it's a -- it's a nice connection. As we always do we went well above and beyond with the

amenity points. So, 27 when eight are required. I just would make another point there that we are the -- I mentioned before the park parcel on the far west, that is not proposed to be part of our HOA, that is going to the existing HOA. It's theirs. It will be their amenity, just how it always has been. We are developing our own amenities on our side and we are not proposing a cross-use type of arrangement. We will have -- we will have our own amenities. I mentioned before the plaza. So, we -- one of the conditions that Linda mentioned requires that construction with the first commercial phase that touches it and that will be part of that kind of drawing the -- the residents -- or, excuse me, the residential occupants into the -- into the commercial area and try to help promote that mixed use feel. We did supply a number of concept plans. You saw a few of these and -- but, really, what we are looking at is the commercial area developing when the users come in accordance with the bubble plan that we have here and the one element of that to emphasize is that before you have a -- a significant, you know, larger scale type user that comes in there, they are going to need that right-in, right-out that would be proposed where that -- where the arrow is pointing out onto Ten Mile and so as Linda mentioned that will require an updated traffic impact study based on that specific use that would, then, go through ACHD. So, they will -- that will still be under control. This isn't a carte blanche kind of a situation. That access has to be studied with ACHD, but we are requesting the waiver now to kind of set that up so that that can happen. We have worked really hard to, you know, work through any of the issues on this one. We have had a number of neighborhood meetings. We have had meetings with the Bridgetower HOA board. We had a bunch of meetings with staff that they enjoyed thoroughly, including one this afternoon that -- where we made some -- some good progress on those conditions of approval, as -- as Linda mentioned and I think the -- the way I would wrap this up and, then, obviously, be happy to answer questions, is I would say, one, we are in agreement with what Linda mentioned with regard to the modifications to the conditions. That includes some direction for us to continue to work with staff on those -- those two that she mentioned having to do with some of the timing questions. The only additional one that I would just mention -- and I think this is one you -- if I have got the numbering right -- is the condition that requires the completion of all of the collector road with the first phase and I just kind of want to give you a little bit of background for that. We -- we agree that that's an important element. It's a half mile of collector and so a half mile of collectors, three and a half million dollars. The way things -- and I kind of want to give everybody a little bit of background, because this is not something I understood until I got into this, but when you put in these -- this infrastructure, if you have a three and a half million dollar roadway you need to put a surety up for 120 percent of that -- of that roadway. So, that three and a half million, 700,000 surety, 4.2 million. Now, while that surety is up you still have to pay for putting in the road. So, the -- essentially what it's -- what you are talking about is nearly eight million dollars that's committed in order to make sure that that gets in. So, what we are working with with staff and what I would ask for direction from -- from your folks if you -- if we are fortunate enough to get a recommendation of approval, is to also work on that one with staff in order to get to timing that makes sense in light of the fact that during that first phase you are only going to have a few -- handful of folks and they will have a connection out to Ten Mile and, then, we just need to figure out the right number to limit us to make sure that that collector gets in just as quickly as

possible. So, with that I'm happy to answer questions or maybe I can come back on rebuttal if there is not.

Lorcher: Okay. Commissioners, do we have any questions for the applicant at this time?

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: So, I know the commercial side of things is still early, very conceptual and things, but I did notice a lot of the elevations and a lot of the ideas. There is kind of a lot more big box kind of looking things and more parking area and I actually just looked into the -- the comp plan just to make sure that I was remembering it right, but I know that in mixed use part of the intention is maybe higher floor ratios and maybe less of a reliance on parking and I'm just curious if -- if that is the intention to go more of a big box route given that Walmart and Costco are also kind of in that corridor and what, if anything, might be limiting -- if that is the direction why that direction and maybe not something that's more in line with the comp plan.

Clark: Commissioner Smith, so the -- the elevations were provided to just kind of give an idea of what might happen. Certainly not a crystal ball of who is going to be there. The point you made about the fact that you got Walmart just south of us and Costco just north of us probably drives that market to a certain degree, like, you know, probably looking for something in between on the mid mile of that block. A couple other points. One is that in order to attract a user for this site one of the things that you really need is a preliminary plat, so you can tell the user, hey, we have got a path forward. We can -- we can get you to an approval in a -- in a relatively quick amount of time. Another point I would make is that -- as I mentioned before, any significant user is going to need that right-in, right-out to be able to have some -- before they are going to have some -- some comfort there. So, there is that TIS element of it as well. But in addition to that I would just note that if you look at the conditions of approval we -- there are a number of limitations that have been included there with regard to how the commercial will develop. That's a lot of the arm wrestling that we have been doing with -- with Linda is to try to make sure that we understand that. But that's in addition to the requirements of code. So, the code, when it comes to the commercial areas, has screening requirements, has, you know, fronting up on Ten Mile type requirements, that sort of thing and so the -- a lot of that is going to be code driven in addition to condition driven. So, I guess the long and the short of that is that we are trying to create a palette for someone to be able to paint on, but we are certainly not presupposing any sort of big box or anything else there. It's going to -- we are just trying to give some folks some ideas.

Smith: Thank you.

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault, did you have a question?

Perreault: I do. Thank you, Madam Chair. A couple questions. Good to see you, Hethe.

Clark: Yeah.

Perreault: So, we didn't talk a lot about the multi-family. I realize there will be an additional -- or, you know, future application that will come in with that, but I'm curious if you could take us through access in that multi-family area.

Clark: And, Commissioner Perreault, when you say multi-family you are talking about the single family residential area or --

Perreault: What's that?

Clark: I'm --

Perreault: I understood that there was going to be 16 acres of multi-family. Is that not the case? Okay.

Clark: I don't know what --

Perreault: My apologies.

Clark: Yeah.

Perreault: And, then, as far as the -- the collector and traffic that will be heading north on Ten Mile from the collector, is there going to be a left turn lane there?

Clark: On the collector itself -- let me check with Laren. Are we -- yes. I assumed there would be, but wanted to confirm, yes, there would be a left turn lane.

Perreault: Okay. Thank you.

Lorcher: Okay. I think we are good.

Clark: Thank you.

Lorcher: Thank you. Madam Clerk, do we have anybody signed up to testify?

Conly: Madam Chair, we have both web and paper sign-ups. May we start with the web sign-ups, please, as we see a Bainbridge HOA president is the first sign up.

Lorcher: Okay. And did you say that's on Zoom?

Conly: We believe he is present.

Lorcher: Oh, you are here.

Conly: He signed up online.

Lorcher: Okay. Good evening.

Ramsey: Nice to see you again.

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

Ramsey: Wade Ramsey. I am a resident at 4013 West Lost Rapids and I'm the elected board president for Bainbridge.

Lorcher: Are you speaking on behalf of the HOA or for yourself?

Ramsey: HOA. Yeah. There are a few residents here as well, but yes.

Lorcher: Okay. And the residents here have given him permission to speak? Yes?

Ramsey: I only need three minutes. I'm fine with three minutes.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you.

Ramsey: Bainbridge is the 573 homes that sits directly north of Adero Park; right? So, we are going to connect into Adero Park on North San Vito and, then, on the eastern side of that is Farley -- Fairborn. I'm sorry. Fairborn. We have -- I have two things I'd like to communicate. One, look, we prefer -- this is kind of the lesser of three options for us. Something's going to go into that field. We would prefer less density, R-8 throughout; right? But it's not apartments and it's not huge slabs of parking lot for businesses and those are both things that we would be hostile to; right? So, there is that. Single family homes. It's in our interest for those to be single family homes there with nice amenities, good traffic through. The collector road. I think that's going to be -- Gondola is what that is likely to be. Good landscaping, those sorts of things. And that's our preference. That's our vested interest in and this seems to be some of that. Second, more importantly I suppose, I wanted to say thank you. My community has now been here six times in the last few years on various issues that we felt strongly about and you have always treated us with respect, politeness, you have listened, you have given careful consideration to everything we have -- we have talked about and I appreciate that. This is a thankless job, so I wanted to make sure to say thank you for all of you. I appreciate that. Even if we disagree on some things, you guys have always been great. That partnership has been great and I appreciate that. Okay?

Lorcher: Thank you.

Ramsey: Thank you. Madam Clerk.

Conly: Robin Campbell.

Campbell: My name is Robin Campbell. I live in Bridgetower West. 5561 North Joy Way. I bought one of the last lots to be developed in this HOA. So, I thought I was pretty set. Never in my wildest dreams did I think you guys would ever connect this to Ten Mile. This was sold to us as a vast region of open space. Pool. Courtyard. A smarter master design, comprised of pod neighborhoods to lessen traffic on residential cobblestone streets. It is not right that our builder has the ability to make these decisions affecting our HOA open space. By taking advantage of being -- of undeveloping one lot -- I'm learning this as I go. And I guess more recently they have changed it, so after 75 percent is developed they have to turn it over to the HOA. So, I guess that's why he is allowed to slice and dice our common space -- our green area and now turn it into a connector all the way to Ten Mile. It just seems really wrong. This will put an undue burden on the existing traffic system, because it already has. Trying to exit onto McMillan. Try to get your high schooler to Owyhee where we can barely exit to McMillan or Black Cat as it is. There are police officers in the North Oaks that sit there and patrol, because cars are trying to cut through their neighborhood to get to high school, to get to the businesses by Costco. It's already a huge vehicle burden and -- a traffic burden and I think that's why you guys denied the building on Chinden and Black Cat, because it was calculated there would be 80 cars per minute on Black Cat. The traffic report that I was given was from November 2023. It's completely changed since then. We have a new community on Daphne that's being built by Lennar Homes. We have Brody Square that is just now being completed. Those numbers are grossly different. The connector will go right past our HOA green space where our kids play basketball. They ride their bikes to the park. Where our little pool is. Where our one basketball court is and our ten acres of green space that has the pond that you -- is used for all the water. So, a lot of that's not usable because it's the pond that everybody's going to be using I guess for irrigation. But they ride their bikes to school along that path where you want to put the connector and it's unsafe. It's completely change our community and our lifestyle and what we thought we were buying when we moved into this community and this HOA.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Conly: Madam Chair, asking a brief clarification. Our next speakers have listed themselves on the same line, Will and Patricia Fritschle. The question is would they each like to speak or would one person like to take three minutes.

Fritschle: Hi. I'm Patricia Fritschle and this is my husband Will. I really just wanted him to have it on record that he objects to this development and this proposal.

Lorcher: I need your name and address and you will have to get closer to the mic.

Fritschle: Patricia Fritschle.

Lorcher: Okay.

Fritschle: 5824 North Botticelli.

Lorcher: Okay.

Fritschle: We are directly behind and one of these -- these homes would directly line back up to our --

Lorcher: Okay.

Fritschle: We are not here saying don't develop. We bought knowing that this was going to be developed, but we also bought with the understanding that this was going to be an extension of what our subdivision was and what it looked like. So, we were here back in -- a few years ago for a different developer. Since then our developer has sold our area, which included our green space and I don't know how that is even possibly legal when -- you know, I understand you guys have all had a very different experience with these developers. Our experience have been very disrespectful, very rude treatment and bullying, in essence, is what we have experienced from them and that is what it is. But when we were here -- I want to say it was four years ago that concept was denied, which looked very similar to what this -- this is and that was denied due to density and stated to follow the concept -- the original concept. That original concept still has 150 to 170 homes and that is adequate. The density that has developed around and in that community with -- what's Prescott Development, Hubble Homes, how many homes is that? Daphne? Like there is still development. Currently on Zillow I believe there is 97 homes available for rent and I don't remember the number of apartments, but there is ample residents -- homes that are available that are up for grabs and this is only going to make a dense community, a high traffic area even worse and it doesn't suit the community that is asking this panel to reject this and stick with the original concept. We knew it was going to be developed. We just don't agree with this.

Lorcher: Okay.

Fritschle: And it affects our lives, because we live there.

Lorcher: Right.

Fritschle: And our San Vito -- is it San Vito? That we come in off -- by the pool? Huh? Gondola? It's already a speedway and it breaks my heart to watch these kids struggle -- they can't -- the south side can't even get over to enjoy the -- what is the left -- or what we currently have as a park, because of traffic. And the apartments that are to already be developed is supposed to add, what, 400 and something. The emergency response is -- what was, 6.4 -- 6.4 minutes to respond and that's supposed to be adequate? Somebody's life is on the line and 6.4 minutes is the response time? I know. I'm sorry.

Lorcher: It doesn't work that way, but thank you. So, if you can conclude that would be great.

Fritschle: So, I just want to reiterate. We know that this is going to be developed. The original concept was what we were expecting and we -- we are just asking that you stay with that plan.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much. Madam Clerk.

Conly: Tom Callison.

Callison: I'm Tom Callison. I live at 3922 West Milano Street in the Bridgetower West development.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Callison: I have been there from day one and with only a few homes there and I have seen the good, bad and the ugly for all this period of time, but this is -- this is just adding the ugliness that we have had with this developer. The biggest issue -- I'm not against development and that I knew was going to happen sometime or the other, even though he owned that and that was supposedly to be part of our Bridgetower West development. We bought because that's the way it was going to be and was going to have a ten acre park with a dinky swimming pool, which I'm sorry if you guys approved that you don't know what you were doing, because all around the other developments they have huge swimming pools. For the size of this development it's --

Lorcher: Too small.

Callison: It's a joke. It's a joke. But, anyway, getting back to the development. The issue is traffic. The biggest issue is traffic. If you travel to McMillan and trying to get off of San Vito, you are waiting forever to get out and it's almost impossible. Adding the other development going out to Ten Mile is not going to help reduce that. Someone said it's going to be a left lane turn. Go ahead and try to get on Ten Mile and make a left turn there with no signal. You are not going to make it. You are going to have accidents quickly. You can make a right turn and that's it. So, now you are limited. You are spending 3.8 million dollars to put a road in and that's going to cause issues. They need a light at San Vito. A light definitely has to be put there. Not a crosswalk, because Ada county said originally, well, it's too close to the intersection of Ten Mile and McMillan. It's not. You drive anywhere off Eagle and you will see less distance where there is stop lights. If you don't put a stop light there and when they put Highway 16 in with all those developments going out there, Ustick and McMillan are going to be inundated with traffic and Ada county has to build a light system. That's the only way it's going to make us safe to get in and out of that development and what they said about speeding, it is. Someone -- when they get on Gondola they are speeding. Those kids -- people are speeding and when they get off at San Vito they are speeding across there and when you are adding 270 homes and the 72, which are planned for that those apartments behind Walmart -- or 69, you double that by two cars per -- per residence. That's the max. If it's half of it it's still 340 cars that's going to be added to that development. So, it's a safety and a concern to traffic.

Lorcher: Thank you very much.

Callison: Thank you.

Lorcher: Madam Clerk.

Conly: Thank you, Madam Chair. Patty Scales.

Lorcher: Good evening.

Scales: Hello. Patty Scales. 3673 West Windhill Drive. I'm in Bainbridge. And I also oppose the density of this community. When we first moved into Bainbridge I think it was about 120 homes and, then, three years ago I believe it was about 170 homes and those have both not gone through. The homes that are going to be built, he has got 254 where their square footage on their lots are three to five thousand and he has 16 that's 5,000 and above and in his paperwork and proposal he says each home will be able to accommodate four vehicles and there will be an additional 130 cars -- spaces to park in the community. I know that people won't have four cars, but there might be some that do and if you do the math on that that's 1,200 cars without the commercial side and I have heard many times today the right-in, the right-out, but they are not addressing the left-out and Bainbridge is their left-out and that's the community that I'm in and they are opening San Vito and Fairborn and I'm three houses off of San Vito. There is 13 houses on my street and there is 24 kids, ages two to 12, and when those kids are out playing the other neighborhood kids come over and there is a lot of kids. If they choose to take the street behind me, which is Ladle Rapids, it's going to send them right by our community pool and there are kids running in and out and across the street on their bicycles, on their -- on their skateboards, you know, on their scooters and they won't be able to see these kids, because they are going to be running from the cars that are parked on Levingham, which is what Ladle Rapids turns into. So, the safety of the kids are very important and not only will they use our community for their left-in and left-out, they are going to use it for Costco. They are going to use it for Rock Harbor Church. For the LDS church. To go get gas. And we aren't built to accommodate that kind of traffic. We don't have main thoroughfares. They are actually going to be driving on our streets that our kids are on and it's incredibly unsafe. Incredibly. And I'm also not opposed that they build. I expected it. And if they want to do 270, which in a perfect world, don't open up our access roads, but that won't happen, because they said they are required to. But they also said they can't accommodate a light, that that's not up to them. So, unfortunately, the residents will be using our community, because it will be the easiest way for them to get out of their community and go left and it's going to make our community unsafe and I think if you lived on these streets you wouldn't want this to happen to your kids.

Lorcher: Thank you very much. Madam Clerk.

Conly: Thank you. Richard Boyle.

Boyle: Good evening. My name is Richard Boyle. I live at 5230 North Botticelli. I am right on the back side as well that meets up to the R-8. When I purchased the lot for my home custom -- my custom built home, I bought it with the -- in mind that I had a park behind me. They are taking the park away. They are going to give me a 20 -- 30 foot strip behind me instead. I paid a premium for that lot, because the park was behind me. So, I'm not -- I'm not opposed to the development, but I am -- as everyone else seriously opposed to the density. Way too many houses. Nobody's really brought up schools, other than the kids going to and from. They built the new -- whatever -- Pleasant Valley -- whatever it is. It's already over capacity. You are going to put a -- all the apartments in and, then, you are going to add 270 homes, they said, well, they are -- they won't be -- they won't be kids, these are going to be empty nesters. Well, I'm not far from an empty nester and I can tell you the size of the house is going to have to be narrow and it's going to be two story for the most part. Empty Nesters don't buy two story -- two story homes with their bedrooms upstairs. Sorry. I don't buy that. So, I -- again, not opposed to developing. I knew they were going to do something back there. I am opposed to what they have done to the property behind me. Again I paid a premium for that lot to have the park behind me. For the developer to -- oh, I overdeveloped that. It never was supposed to be a park. That would been nice to have been told when we were buying. It's kind of sad that the -- nobody said, well, we are going to take half of that out and put it into homes someday, so -- and we have paid to maintain that area -- that space for years now. I guess that's about all I have to say. Other than the traffic, as all of them have said, leaving to come here tonight, San Vito getting onto McMillan, I was over five minutes sitting there, left turn signal on, trying to get onto -- left on the McMillan. This is not going to help. Thank you.

Lorcher: Thank you. Madam Clerk.

Conly: James Ferguson.

Ferguson: Hello. James Ferguson. 3629 West Renhold Drive. I am also a resident here at Bainbridge. Pretty much everything's been said that I want to said, but I will just add -- I oppose this -- this level of -- the -- the density of this project. It doesn't seem to fit the surrounding communities in my opinion from what you see there, from all the -- the four square miles that Hethe had pointed out, this seems far denser than any of the other areas surrounding there and like multiple people brought up, the -- the traffic -- the safety is the biggest issue. You know, I look forward to having some more neighbors. I got some great neighbors now. I look forward to having some more -- some more great neighbors. But it needs to be done in a safe fashion, because this isn't a project that's going to just get built and go away in a few years. This -- this is going to last decades. Decades and decades and decades; right? So, I think there needs to be some careful consideration to the traffic lights that people have spoke about, the traffic safety -- you know, an updated traffic safety setup, because, yeah, it's -- I'm sure you -- some of you guys have been over there, but it's -- it's mainly for the kids, like -- like Ms. Patty had talked about. There is a lot of kids in our neighborhood. We are very fortunate for that. And I think safety -- you know, Meridian's a great place for everybody. It's a great place to raise a family and I think we need to maintain that level of -- of -- of home and safety

for the kids and so appreciate your time, Commissioners. Thank you once again. Best of luck.

Lorcher: Thank you. Madam Clerk.

Conly: Thank you. Again asking clarification. We have Mike and Janice Borchard. Asking if each prefers three minutes? Just you? Okay. Thank you.

Borchard: Good evening. Thank you guys ever so much for being here and for listening to us. Just kind of a little bit of a recap with what everybody else is talking about.

Lorcher: Before you start if you can --

Borchard: Oh.

Lorcher: -- give your name and address for the record.

Borchard: Been here before. I should know that. Janice Borchard. 5466 North Botticelli Avenue, Bridgetower West.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you.

Borchard: So, we all kind of knew that there was going to be a development behind us. A lot of people moved in knowing -- and I have copies, but, anyhow, we had a concept of what the future development was going to look like. You know, it was R-4 with some commercial along Ten Mile and, then, a few years back, you know, all that changed. We love Meridian. We love the abundance of parks. The spaciousness. You know, everything that you guys have on your -- your web page. Back in January of 2021, a proposed development -- and it was R-8 and I have documentation. I have -- it's -- they were five to seven thousand square foot lots was proposed and denied by you all, because it was too dense and it was the row housing concept and when everybody looked at the pictures it was like no green spaces, fire services. Safety was a huge concern. This was only like 169 lots, not 270 -- or 269 that's being proposed now. So, you all shot down a much lesser density before in January of 2021. Okay? And, then, the application was pulled by the developer. Just kind of taking a little bit of a recap for the general area. The apartments -- there is 245 apartments that you all approved in '22, you know, between us and Walmart. This used to be a senior development. It was proposed to be that. The zoning didn't get changed. The use did and all of a sudden now from seniors, without having a lot of cars, we now have 245 apartments going in with cars now and people -- you know, kids using the schools. So, you know, keep that in mind for apartments that are going to be in that area in and out. But it's a -- the Black Cat and McMillan, it was denied by you all and there was major modifications. It was approved -- 80 acres. There was a huge reduction in their R-15, 80 acres total, and now it's only eight acres of R-15. So, most of it is going to be larger single family homes. There was 23 and now it's only eight. Prescott Ridge, which was approved in

May of '21, 128 acres. They only have eight acres of R-15. The rest is 99 acres of R-8 and, then, a hospital. So, you have got some multi-unit, you know, townhouses and four-plexes in there. So, keep in mind the number of R-15s that we have going on. Bridge -- Bainbridge, which is just north of us, they are primarily R-4 and they have 13 5,000 square foot lots, which are where it connects at that buffer between Bainbridge proper and Ten Mile. So, again, you take, you know, all the hundreds of homes there and you are seeing that. I really hope you guys notice the difference in this proposed Adero neighborhood. They are way out of proportion for R-15 versus R-8. Not consistent with our neighborhood at all. So, thank you for your consideration. You guys have always been amazing in doing what's right for us neighbors that are already here. So, thank you.

Lorcher: Thank you. Madam Clerk.

Conly: Thank you. Moving to our online meeting participants. Roger Soucy signed the online sign in-sheet. Did Roger wish to speak?

Soucy: No. That's okay.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you, Roger. Madam Clerk.

Conly: Thank you. And just verifying one more person. We saw a hand up earlier. We believe Christian Jensen. Did Christian wish to speak?

Jensen: Hi. This is Christian Jensen. 3833 West Daphne Street in Bridgetower West. So, we are directly to the west of the approved apartment area and I -- everyone -- all of my neighbors have spoke very eloquently and I agree with everything they would say. I live right by that intersection and I just want to attest that when I leave for work, if it's anything after 7:00 o'clock in the morning the wait is five or six cars deep and the weight is long and I do believe, as was said earlier, there are safety concerns as we go forward with pulling out onto McMillan, particularly when you are trying to cross traffic to go -- go left towards Ten Mile. So, biggest concern is traffic once again. I'm sure new homes will look good, because they are new, but when we think about the density we just don't have the road infrastructure to support that density of population, especially since the apartments have already been approved and we have now got two different developments wanting to use San Vito, which is already overtaxed because of the -- all of the neighborhoods that have grown to the west of our neighborhood -- west of Black Cat. So, thank you very much.

Lorcher: Thank you very much.

Conly: Thank you, Madam Chair. No one else online has raised their hand.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you. Is there anybody else in Chambers that would like to speak? Sir? And, then, you. Hi.

Carniglia: Hi. My name is Troy Carniglia. I'm at 4029 West Philomena, Bridgetower West.

Lorcher: Okay. Perfect. Thank you.

Carniglia: I just had a question. He -- the developer mentioned seven homes per acre. Would that include the pond is how we got up to that statistic?

Lorcher: He will answer that question in his remarks.

Carniglia: Okay. And, then, I find it interesting that if they are using that pond we pay in our HOA towards maintaining the pond and the grass area. So, I'm not sure how that transfers.

Lorcher: Okay. I will ask him to answer that as well.

Carniglia: Okay. And, then, also wanted to talk about the apartment and homes that's already been approved. That's approximately -- I -- it's -- I heard it was 249 acre -- or 249 residents or --

Lorcher: That application is not in front of us tonight --

Carniglia: Right.

Lorcher: -- so I don't have the --

Carniglia: But with 270 units the average amount of people per home is 2.66, which would be 718 residents and that would be 1.83 cars per household, which would be about 500 cars per -- per that area, on top of the apartments if it's similar in the amount of residents, that would be a thousand cars in that -- in that area. Like they said, the infrastructure, it's -- we can't handle that. I do agree that that area needs to be developed, but I don't think it needs to be 270 homes. It needs to be similar to what we have already in our -- in our area.

Lorcher: Okay.

Carniglia: And that's it.

Lorcher: All right. Thank you very much for your testimony.

Carniglia: And I appreciate you.

Lorcher: Thank you. Ma'am, would you like to come up?

Garrison: Hi. My name is --

Lorcher: Pull it down. Yep. There you go.

Garrison: My name is Tracy Garrison. Three eight -- or 3898 West Lucina Drive.

Lorcher: Okay.

Garrison: I'm in Bridgetower West. And the only concern -- I just want to say everybody has done a phenomenal job as far as expressing all of our concerns. But I just want to reiterate the schools. I -- I work in the schools and I know that we are over capacity at this time and I just think the higher density will just add more stress to the school system as well. That's it.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you for your testimony. Anybody else in Chambers like to speak? Ma'am.

Ratzesberger: Good evening. My name is Megan Ratzesberger. 4000 West Cedar Grove Court. Also part of the Bridgetower West development. I wanted to agree with everything that's already been said and I wanted to add just a little bit of -- shoot. Took a picture. Here we go. So, as she just mentioned, the schools that they have listed as the schools going -- you know, the families going to these schools, I just wanted to add as of yesterday -- one second. I -- I thought I had the thing pulled up. I did not. I just want to agree with everything that everybody -- that everybody's said already. We do need stop lights. We need wider roads. Anyways, my husband and I are here to object.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you for being here. Anybody else like to testify before we close the public hearing?

Conly: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: We will -- oh. Sorry.

Conly: We have one more online request.

Lorcher: Okay. We have a lady here and, then, they still have a rebuttal. Ma'am, would you like to come up first and, then, we will take the online.

Rice: Hi.

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

Rice: My name is Allison Rice and I live at 4305 West Anatole Street in the Bridgetower West Subdivision.

Lorcher: Okay.

Rice: And it's the part of the Bridgetower West Subdivision that's north of McMillan.

Lorcher: Okay.

Rice: And I'm terrified of public speaking, so --

Lorcher: Okay.

Rice: -- got some notes here. My husband, daughter and I have lived here since 2020. My child attends Pleasant Valley Elementary School, which is within the Bridgetower West community on the north side of McMillan. I'm a member of the community that is for responsible development. Based on the materials provided as part of the application for a rezone, I don't think that the residential component of the rezone is really responsible action at this time for several reasons. Due to the time limits I would like to focus on one key issue area and that is school capacity. The immediate schools in the vicinity are over capacity. It's evidenced in the numbers provided on the project website. It's evidenced in the trailers put up at Pleasant Valley Elementary. It's evidenced by the members of our community that are south of McMillan that now will have to leave Pleasant View Elementary and be bused to Hunter Elementary down the road in the future school calendar years due to the overcrowding at the school. Just wanted to note that in a memo from Heather Hill to Linda Ritter that's available on the website, it notes that within the past five years within a one mile radius of the project location 1,156 school aged children have enrolled in schools. The proposed development will contain 270 single family units, resulting in approximately 133 school aged children. The memo also states that there for the calendar year 2024 to 2025 all three of the closest zoned schools that are identified in the application, which includes Pleasant View Elementary, Star Middle and Owyhee High School, were all over capacity. I have got a couple of notes here about, you know, capacity from a cumulative perspective in the other developments that have been recently approved for construction and just the amount of kids that that will add to the existing schools -- it's a lot. The application narrative online I think is a little bit misleading with respect to schools and what it says from the developer. It doesn't reflect the current numbers in the school's capacity memo. Exhibit N states that Pleasant View is at capacity, but Hunter and Willow Elementary are under, Star Middle is near capacity, but Sawtooth and Heritage are under. Owyhee is near capacity, but Rocky Mountain and Meridian are under capacity. I just didn't think that that was accurate based on what the city had presented in the materials online. I would like some clarification on that if I could get some. I just don't think they are supported as part of the materials provided. The narrative says that a simple boundary line adjustment by West Ada is a solution. It also says that the state legislature has recently provided funding for schools for building. I haven't seen plans for building of more schools. I just -- I would argue that the people in Meridian are pretty exhausted with redrawing of school district lines to accommodate new development and I'm sure that the folks that are south of McMillan and our Bridgetower West community have a lot to say about redistricting and now being bused to Hunter school in the future school years.

Lorcher: Okay.

Rice: That's all. Thank you very much for the time.

Lorcher: Thank you. We do not have a representative from West Ada here this evening, so we won't be able to answer your questions about the schools. If you do have questions about the schools I would suggest you give their office a call and they could probably clarify the numbers, the boundaries and the redistricting. Okay? Thank you. Madam Clerk, you said there was someone online?

Conly: Thank you, Madam Chair. Calling David McAdams.

Lorcher: Okay. David, if you can state your name and address for the record that would be great.

McAdams: Yep. David McAdams. 5552 North of Asissi Avenue and that's in the Bridgetower West HOA. I raised my hand and everybody kind of right before me was saying exactly what we wanted to say, which is the -- the overpopulation of the schools, having two communities built in those two areas behind Walmart and, then, above Walmart that we are talking about today is concerning for us, because Pleasant View is so overtaxed. I have friends and colleagues that I work with that have people in Owyhee that is also overtaxed and these are going to continue to draw more families there and overburden the schools even further. The fact that, you know, they had to put out an exclusion zone this year and send people who are getting ready to start their kindergarteners to Hunter Elementary, rather than letting them go to school with their siblings at Pleasant View and make the families decide whether to send everybody to a different school or let them continue with their friends just shows the overtaxed and overburdened system that's in place and this area is in dire need of increasing the capacity before -- of the schools before we increase the number of residents living here. So, not opposed to the development, just opposed to the density and the speed at which it's happening before we have the rest of the infrastructure in place.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much. Is there anybody else in Chambers that -- or online that would like to speak? All right. Would the applicant like to come forward? And, please, keep in mind in regard to the comments about schools, we do not have a representative from West Ada here this evening and so I'm sure your research is well thought out, but without them to be able to verify anything -- West Ada tells us that they can accommodate the kids, but also keep in mind that there is Cole Christian and Gem Prep and other private schools in the area as well and so those need to be in consideration when we talk to schools. But, again, those representatives are not here tonight. All right. Hethe.

Clark: Thank you, Madam Chair. So, Hethe Clark. 251 East Front Street in Boise. Just to kind of go over a couple of items here, I think a lot of what we are talking about -- and, you know, we -- we, obviously, met with the neighbors, we want to address concerns, but a lot of what you are hearing tonight is elements that the city and ACHD

had already put into place quite a long time ago. So, for example, the Adero -- excuse me. The collector road. That collector road has been shown on the master street map for quite some time. It is planned for that location across the south of the -- the Bridgetower HOA facilities that -- it is stubbed right there. It's going to continue on. That mid mile collector, though, is something that really is needed to get people off of Ten Mile and McMillan. Experience has shown time and time again that when you have the mid mile collector network in place it takes pressure off of the arterials. Now, with regard to the light over at Ten Mile where we are going to connect with the collector. As it stands right now -- and you guys all know this -- that ACHD has certain warrants is how they refer to it before they can put in a -- before they will put in a traffic light. Even with our project it doesn't warrant a traffic light there, but we fully expect that once their commercial goes -- once the commercial goes in that it will warrant and as the staff report has as part of its comments that that TIS would study that element as well. Similarly, when we talk about the -- the densities and whether this is consistent with the area and, you know, whether it's appropriate -- a lot of the neighborhoods that we are talking about in the neighborhood of this project as you can see are in a different Comprehensive Plan designation. In other words, the city has planned for something a little bit different here. We have put R-8 on our far west of the project to be consistent with the medium density residential density, but as I mentioned in the mixed use commercial there is a higher -- there is a -- the floor of six dwelling units per acre and we are doing seven. So, we are doing the very low end of what the city planned, but it is absolutely what the city has planned for. With regard to schools -- well, actually, let me -- I will end with schools and let me talk about the pond. The pond is not included in this seven dwelling units per acre calc. The pond, as I mentioned, that -- that whole park area -- the development agreement that currently exists calls for a 10.2 acre park. We are going to make that available to be able to be conveyed. The pond in the middle is anticipated to be shared between the two associations and as you probably have had experience in some of these applications, when it comes to irrigation ponds if you can collect more water in the pond the thing tends to function better and so those water rights from our property, the -- those rights will be allocated and, then, there will be storage over there. So, that's the really the only interface. But that will be a benefit to both associations. But that HOA open space is being preserved and -- you know, so -- and one other thought on that. There was a lot of comment about the developer, the developer, the developer. We are not that developer. We are buying from that developer. So, you know, I'm hoping that I haven't bullied anybody. I -- you know, will -- you know, I don't know what happened in the past. I can't speak to that. But we are -- we are not that developer. We are somebody else. So, then, the last element that I would just mention is the schools. So, just a couple of thoughts on that. Now, you -- you guys have heard -- not all of you, a few of you haven't heard the speech, but the city has worked with West Ada for years to try to understand how and when West Ada is going to increase capacity and there is a letter that West Ada will typically send that has, you know, how they deal with student enrollment and they talk about how as student enrollment increases they are going to look at busing, they are going to look at redistricting, they are going to look at portables and, then, eventually they are going to -- they will build a new school when they deem it -- deem it warranted. But they try to be very good stewards of the tax dollar by not building a school until it's actually -- they

know that's actually warranted. So, in this area we have -- we have, obviously, paid attention to the schools. There are the three that are shown on here, Hunter, Willow and the one that everyone's talking about Pleasant View. In addition, Madam Chair, as you mentioned, there is a couple other options that are nearby. If you look at the -- this is data from the West Ada School District's website. If you look at the enrollments you can actually see that the Hunter enrollment is -- from its high of above 800 is down almost 300 students. Willow Creek is also down from its high and as a result that led the school district to already have issued the letter that was mentioned before during testimony. So, what is happening is exactly what West Ada has told this group and the City Council will happen is that as it evaluates this, it looks at the various capacities and it considers its options. One of those is redistricting. And so we would anticipate that that would continue and as I showed you on the prior maps, there is really not a lot left to develop in this Willow-Hunter-Pleasant View area. That was one of the reasons why I showed you that map, so you can understand what's coming. So, with that I'm hoping that that answered that question and I'm happy to answer any others.

Lorcher: Commissioners, do we have any questions for the applicant?

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: I do have a question regarding kind of transition space and ratios. I know you mentioned R-8 on the west side. Looking at the north end -- the north side of the project, it does look -- like I did some rough math just counting pixels on a screen, so this is probably a little off. It looks like on the -- that west side it's closer to one to one, maybe 1.5 to one ratio -- home ratio. But the north end it looks a lot more like a two-to-one kind of ratio and I'm just curious -- has thought gone into -- I'm sure thoughts gone into the application. But has any particular thought or focus or efforts gone into trying to ease that transition space anymore and seeking alternative -- perhaps increasing density on the south side to offset, for example? But just curious of your thoughts on that.

Clark: I understand, Commissioner Smith. So, we did look at transition, try to make sure that that -- it was adequate here. So, this is on the west side and you can see these are the dimensions of those lots. When -- you know, some -- some -- for some of those lots is a little harder, because they are -- they are pie shaped, so it's harder to judge. We usually look at the frontage to try to judge that fairly and that frontage is pretty consistent between those and as you mentioned it's -- we think that matches pretty darn well. On the north -- and I should have mentioned this before. So, my apologies for that. On the north we did look at that transition as well, but what -- what you have on the north is we had existing irrigation facilities that need to be relocated and so what we have done with those facilities is run them up to the north side and we have added a 30 foot wide landscape buffer and pathway that actually will get folks over to the -- to the HAWK signal to go over to Heroes Park and so rather than doing the --

adjusting that density, we felt like that actually, in and of itself, provided for an adequate buffer there.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Thank you. That helps. I -- and this is -- I'm not trying to, you know, just do some engineering -- overengineering this, but just -- I guess from my perspective I think it doesn't necessarily mean, you know, you can't look at those ratios as well; right? It's, you know, belt and suspenders, it's always nice to have that buffer, plus a more even transition and I'm just curious if there is any particular reason why it seems like density is maybe a little -- or just even slightly lower on that south end that you would want, in my mind, closer to that -- you want some higher density close to that commercial aspect. It just -- I guess it seems to my eye -- and I haven't run all the numbers, so I could just be wrong here, but it just to my eye in looking at the map it seems like the density at that top line is even more dense than some components on that southern -- maybe eastern edge that you could, you know, out of your neighborliness or out of kind of just -- just trying to keep that cohesion and transition space you could reallocate potentially. And I just -- just curious on that and that's my last question.

Clark: No. Noted. And, like I mentioned, we were really focused on the distance, because that's typical. The other element is that you are crossing a comprehensive plan designation when you cross that line and so it's going from the medium density into the mixed use commercial as well. So, it's a different planning zone and so, anyway, we did -- we felt like we were trying to address that with that buffer and so we would prefer to stick with that.

Smith: Thank you.

Clark: No. Thank you.

Lorcher: Commissioner Rust.

Rust: Madam Chair, thank you. One question. The staff recommended approval and, then, they had a bunch of recommendations and modifications on conditions and you brought up one additional one on 1-U for the conditions that the staff want to change. Are you guys, as the applicant, in favor of what the staff has put forward here?

Clark: Madam Chair, Commissioner Rust, yes, that's -- that's correct. We are in agreement. So, the -- the slide that Linda put up reflects the conversations that we have had since the staff report was released and the modifications that we have arm wrestled over and agreed upon. So, that -- that slide is accurate and, then, there -- there was the three conditions where there would be direction for us to continue to work with staff. She had two of them up there and the additional one would be 1-U, which is the collector construction timing condition.

Rust: Thank you.

Lorcher: Any other comments? I guess my only comment was as -- did we -- did we answer the question about the pond?

Clark: I think so.

Lorcher: So, you are nodding, yes, you are -- you are good with that? Okay. That was -- that was taken care of. Well, the pond is used for irrigation; correct? And it will be shared between the two. Yeah. We will just have to talk about it without getting comment from the -- sir. He needs to be able to speak. Okay. Thank you. Can you address the pond, please?

Clark: Yes. So, the pond is within the park. Park will be maintained at 10.2 acres per the development agreement --

Lorcher: For Bridgetower.

Clark: For Bridgetower.

Lorcher: Okay.

Clerk: For Bridgetower, not for our -- yeah. And I mentioned that during my main presentation is that that park is being put on -- platted so it can be conveyed, so that Bridgetower can have control of their own park.

Lorcher: Okay.

Clark: Our HOA will have its own amenities. We won't be -- we are not going to be playing in their park. It's -- it's theirs.

Lorcher: Okay. All right. Any other comments from the Commissioners? Okay. Thank you very much.

Clark: Thank you.

Lorcher: Can I get a motion to close the public hearing?

Rust: So moved.

Smith: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith, would you like to start?

Smith: Yes. Sure, Madam Chair. I will start. I have kind of an abstract version of notes that's just kind of become chaos on my page. I will try to keep it a coherent string of thoughts. I fully empathize with issues on traffic and with schools. I spent I think probably half of my elementary school days in portables, so I understand the -- the -- I understand kind of the benefit of being in a full classroom. So, I get that. And if I could have my way ahead and dump a billion dollars and have, you know, new schools everywhere and teachers getting paid more and things like that.

Lorcher: Okay.

Smith: That is not really the purview of the developer though and so where I stand on -- the same thing on the stoplights. I will say the applicant is fully correct regarding warrants. I have the pleasure of serving on the Transportation Commission as well and one of my favorite people to wrestle with in that commission meeting is John Wasson from ACHD.

Lorcher: Okay.

Smith: Oftentimes we will ask about ways to improve things and -- and the response is that with ACHD's limited budgets and resources they have to prioritize certain things that make certain warrants. So, those aren't necessarily -- not that they are not concerns to me, but I can't hold them against that app -- the applicant on this. I think that the real thing that I -- I do -- I would love some -- maybe some conversation on and I don't know if there is any language that would be, you know, a perfect kind of broad brush, I do -- I would like to try to limit the -- you know, the big box potential on the commercial side. I think, you know, that the purpose of a mixed use isn't to just say half of it's housing, half of it's, you know, commercial, it's -- there is -- there is -- you know, the comp plan has reasons for kind of new mixed living and better integration and I know that big box isn't the intention of the developer, but I would love to see if there is a way -- and if the Commission is amenable to it -- trying to slightly guide the direction of that to be more in line with the comp plan to limit any potential of kind of a sea of asphalt if you will from developing and I don't say that to necessarily limit the viability of the development, but just to try to kind of drive that alignment with the comp plan. That's really my main concern. I do agree, the city needs to build more and things like that. I guess the only other item I would say is it sounds like that traffic interconnectivity is going to be, you know, an important component. So, regarding the collector issue that was mentioned by staff and by the applicant, I personally -- I understand it might -- might be a little difficult, but I -- I would strongly prefer that being completed in phase one just because it seems like that southbound exit out of -- out of Bridgetower seems like it's an issue and so having that additional interconnectivity to be able to get out east might be -- might ease that pressure a little bit. So, I think the applicant might -- some of the benefits of the development might actually be a reason for accelerating that -- that connectivity to that connector. But those are -- those are my thoughts, so hopefully I kept that relatively in line, but would like to hear from the rest of the Commission.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Rust: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Rust.

Rust: I'm going to keep this brief. Just looking up some stats on Meridian pedestrian-vehicle incidents. Those numbers have been dropping steadily since 2019. I think we are down 25 percent in the last data set that's available to 2023. I said this a month ago at our In-N-Out meeting, but I really feel like safety gets thrown around way too often. We design our roads safely. We have a hundred years of -- a hundred plus years of motor vehicles on roadways and how they interact with pedestrians and this idea that -- that we are going to endanger children I just reject that completely and I don't think that that's a valid argument. There -- there is plenty of areas that are completely developed in Meridian that have R-15 zoning just like this where -- that this is not an issue. Is there going to be more traffic? Absolutely if this gets approved. But the -- to use safety as a cudgel, I just -- I find that distasteful and reject that out of hand. To that point also there R-15 areas in similar areas around north Meridian. So, this is not out of step with other things that have happened in the surrounding -- I will say six square mile area if you look at the zoning map on the GIS. I -- I understand the -- the desire from Commissioner Sandoval and others. I don't know that we need another Hobby Lobby or something like that necessarily, but I also think that it's -- it's -- we start getting out of our lane as Commissioners when we start trying to -- to parse things out. I would rather the market speak and if we believe that the zoning is applicable for this area, then, we should keep it to a zoning discussion. So, if there is a way that we would -- we would want to tailor to the zoning, change it from C-G to something else, that we think would be in the best interest of the city, I would be open to that discussion. But in my mind that's -- that's probably where we can draw the line as far as how we can influence the process of what actually goes in there. So, I'm in favor of the application moving forward. I think this fits with the general character of the area, continuing to provide more diverse types of homes for people to come in and buy. That's something that I talk about a lot in my responses. And I'm also very inclined to work with the applicant to give them a chance to work with staff and try to come up with a way to fund that road better. I have been on that side of the -- the aisle and it -- anything you can do to minimize having millions of dollars sitting there unused I'm on board with -- with working in a way that will benefit the city and benefit the developer and get to a good solution and I think giving them time to do that before they get to Council is in the best interest of everyone.

Lorcher: Okay.

Rust: Thank you.

Lorcher: Thank you very much.

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you. First let me apologize if I created any confusion with the -- with the multi-family question. I was looking at a map that included the Bridgetower project and had assumed it was included in this one. So, I apologize for that. So, our role as Planning and Zoning Commissioners is pretty narrow and we look at whether the applicant is meeting elements of the Comprehensive Plan and meeting the -- the zoning that is stated in our future land use map and in this situation the applicant has met all of those requirements. So, just a note for the public that the Comprehensive Plan, it has been approved with votes from the public. So, it takes about a year to go through that process with many many opportunities for public input and so the decisions regarding what are going in these open areas of Meridian have had a lot of public input that have gone into them. It's not just the developer comes and requests the specific -- the specific project that -- those decisions about the density and the zoning and the intended future use of that has already been decided in a conceptual way prior to this. So, as far as that goes in our narrow purview, the applicant has met there -- has met the -- the requests of the city for what is intended for that area. So, that is challenging for us when the applicant comes in and agrees with all the conditions of approval and is within the -- is within the Comprehensive Plan intentions and so with that being said it's -- it's challenging for me to say no to this application. They are agreeing to all the conditions of approval that the city is requesting. The other note I just wanted to make quickly is that for those of you that have concerns about speed and traffic, please, do contact ACHD, because they do have traffic calming measures that neighborhoods can apply for, like speed -- like signage and speed bumps and those kinds of things. So, if you have had any challenges getting a hold of ACHD and having those conversations, I would just encourage you to keep running it up the line and keep making those requests. Thank you.

Lorcher: I will make a few comments here. I think that the street -- the Gondola connector street is -- is the best -- well, not the best solution. It is a great solution to be able to alleviate traffic on Ten Mile and McMillan and all the things around, because it gives families another opportunity. That street may go 20, 25 miles an hour and it will be nice and slow for the safety of families, but -- and, then, when the commercial comes in there will be some other traffic measures. Since we do not have the ACHD representatives here as well and this -- ACHD is the one who kind of controls the roads, hopefully, the conversation with the developer and to get a light where it's needed would be very helpful and I agree that Eagle's got lights super close to each other, but -- I mean if everybody is stacked up for a mile and, you know, they are not timed right, then, it -- it makes it even worse. I'm surprised there has been so much objections, because there is no apartments, there is no townhomes, they are all single family homes and they are -- they are going to be homes that are going to be owned by families. They are -- they are not rentals, they are not short-term Airbnb -- you know, they are not that. They are single family homes where people will take pride. I imagine the price point is -- is going to be -- you know, I probably should have asked that question, but they will probably be somewhat significant and I think you will get a quality neighbor in there as well. In regard to the commercial, I agree with Commissioner Rust, it's not within our

purview to limit what it is, but if we have a Walmart on one side and a Costco on the other side, I don't know what big box can go in the middle that would be even greater than what those two already exist and -- I mean I use Ten Mile and McMillan, Ustick on a daily basis and it can be challenging at times, there is no question about it, but something is going to go here one way or another and if your developer or your sales person sold you and said, no, it's always going to be a park or that it's going to be this and it's going to be that, they don't know. Especially if you have been in your house for a while we cannot predict or commit to what's going to happen on the dirt that exists in front of your subdivision. The market changes, life changes, ownership changes and the vision of the first developer -- if they choose to sell that's within their right; right? If they have somebody who wants to buy it and they told you one thing and, then, that buyer -- or that developer is no longer there, then, the next developer is not held to those standards and so as a Commission we want to make sure that what goes in here is in the best interest of the city, that it follows the Comprehensive Plan, like Commissioner Perreault had mentioned and, then, City Council will, you know, reevaluate all of those things, along with the ACHD traffic study, to make sure that this is the right plan. Personally I do think the density is a little bit high compared to some of the other ones, but that probably wouldn't stop me from saying no either. Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Madam Chair, as -- I guess I have one kind of -- one -- one or two things I want to tag on just to the previous Commissioner's statement and, then, I also have a question for staff. One thing I will also say, to echo Commissioner Perreault, if you are not getting a response from ACHD, again, like I said, I'm on the Transportation Commission. Over there we love getting feedback and being able to hold ACHD's feet to the fire and so always feel free to also reach out to city staff or your member of City Council to also convey that to us and, then, you know, I'm not going to beat a dead horse on the -- on the mixed use commercial aspect. It seems like there is not an appetite. I would maybe like to start introducing that discussion in the longer term of the commission. I think -- I generally agree with Commissioner Rust's views of let the market do its thing, but -- but at its core zoning is also not that; right? There are cities like Houston, for example, that zoning effectively doesn't exist and the market truly runs -- runs free and -- and that works for them. I don't think that's necessarily how we want Meridian to run and so it's -- I think it's about kind of finding that balance and if -- if my taste is maybe not in line with the majority, that's fine.

Lorcher: I think Linda had said that when the commercial portion comes up that's going to be re-evaluated. The bubbles were there as kind of a placeholder; correct?

Smith: So, I -- I understand that to that effect. I did have one question for staff, just because it seems like we are probably nearing the end of discussion, I wanted to confirm -- the components in the staff recommendation, the clarifications and things like that, those are not already included in the staff report; right? Any motion would need to include those as --

Ritter: Right. Right.

Smith: Okay. Thank you. That's it.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you. Any other comments?

Sandoval: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Sandoval.

Sandoval: Yeah. I generally agree with the other Commissioners on this one. You know, it fits really well with the Comprehensive Plan. I think it fits in the neighborhood and it's -- it's fair and equitable to everyone around this development and as far as the transition with ten foot pathways on the left and right side of the road and a single lane. that's how I understand the east side to be, I think that's a pretty good transition to that commercial space. So, regardless of what they put in there I think that addresses that pretty well. So, I'm definitely in favor of recommending approval.

Lorcher: Would you like to add anything or you just want to listen tonight?

Stoll: I just want to ask a question --

Lorcher: Okay.

Stoll: -- if I may. So, does staff recommendation include having the collector built prior or beforehand?

Ritter: Commissioner Stoll, staff's recommendation is that no certificate of occupancy be issued prior to the road being completed in its entirety.

Stoll: Okay. And, Madam Chair, if I may?

Lorcher: Uh-huh.

Stoll: And staff is not recommending right-in, right-out on Ten Mile; is that correct?

Ritter: The applicant is requesting a waiver from City Council. So, if City Council approves -- recommends that, that they will approve that, but they have to do the traffic impact study update and ACHD will determine whether or not that right-in or right-out was warranted.

Stoll: Okay.

Lorcher: Okay. With that in mind, after considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to City Council of File No. H-2024-0068 as presented the staff report on May 15th to include the changes of condition of approval as presented.

Garrett: Second.

Rust: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to approve File No. 0068. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries. This will go to City Council in a couple of weeks. Thank you.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Lorcher: I will take one more motion.

Rust: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Rust.

Rust: I move that we adjourn.

Smith: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded we adjourn. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:51 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS.)

APPROVED

MARIA LORCHER - CHAIRMAN

_____|_____|_____
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK