

## **Meridian Planning and Zoning Meeting**

**June 26, 2025.**

Meeting of the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission of June 26, 2025, was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chairman Maria Lorcher.

Members Present: Commissioner Maria Lorcher, Commissioner Jared Smith, Commissioner Jessica Perreault and Commissioner Brian Garrett.

Members Absent: Commissioner Matthew Sandoval and Commissioner Sam Rust.

Others Present: Tina Lomeli, Ali Breshears, Caleb Hood, Bill Parsons, Linda Ritter, Brian McClure, Carl Anderson and Dean Willis.

### **ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE**

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

Lorcher: Good evening. Welcome to Planning and Zoning Commission meeting for June 26th, 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. We may have another Commissioner join us later on Zoom. We also have staff from the City Attorney's office and the City Clerk's office, as well as the City 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 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 of the meeting. If you have a process question during the meeting please e-mail [cityclerk@meridiancity.org](mailto:cityclerk@meridiancity.org) and they will reply as quickly as possible. If you simply would like to watch the meeting we encourage you to watch the streaming on the city's YouTube channel. You can access it at [meridiancity.org/live](https://meridiancity.org/live). With that we will begin with roll call.

### **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

Lorcher: The first item on the agenda is the adoption of the agenda. There are no changes to tonight's agenda. Please note that Item No. 4, Durango Subdivision, has vacated their application and Item No. 5, Pine 23, has requested a continuance. So, if there is anyone here tonight to testify on these applications we will not be taking public testimony this evening. Could I get a motion to adopt tonight's agenda?

Garrett: So moved.

Perreault: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

### **CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]**

- 1. Approve Minutes of the June 5, 2025 Planning and Zoning Committee Meeting**
- 2. Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for El Pollo Loco (H-2025-0018) by ADN Architects, located at 3471 W. Chinden Blvd.**
- 3. Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for Elite Fitness (H-2025-0021) by Chelsi Spencer, located at 2640 E. State Ave.**

Lorcher: The next item is the Consent Agenda, which include to approve the minutes of the June 5th Planning and Zoning meeting, Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law for El Pollo Loco and Elite Fitness. Could I get a motion to accept the Consent Agenda as presented?

Smith: So moved.

Perreault: Second.

Garrett: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

### **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 have 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. 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 on behalf of a larger group, like an HOA, where others on that 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 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 if in Zoom please press the -- press the raise hand button in the Zoom app and if you are only listening on a telephone please press star nine and wait for your name to be called. If you are listening on multiple devices, such as a computer and a phone, please, be sure to mute those extra devices so we do not experience feedback and we can hear you clearly. When you have finished if the Commission doesn't have any questions for you you will return to your seat in Chambers and 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 all testimony has been heard the applicant will be given another ten minutes to come back and respond. When the applicant has finished responding to questions and concerns we will close the public hearing and commissioners will have an opportunity to discuss, hopefully make final decisions or recommended -- recommendations to City Council as needed.

## **ACTION ITEMS**

- 5. Public Hearing for Pine 43 Mixed-Use Subdivision (H-2024-0071) by DRB Investments, LLC., generally located on the north and south sides of E. Pine Ave., between N. Locust Grove Rd., and N. Hickory Ave.**
  - A. Request: Modified Development Agreement to (H-2017-0058 - Inst. #2018-000751) to update the conceptual development plan and certain provisions and include additional land area.
  - B. Request: Annexation of 7.21 acres of land with I-L (5.29 acres), C-G (1.36 acres) and R-15 (0.56 acres) zoning districts.
  - C. Request: Rezone of 3.07 acres (0.91 + 2.17) of land from the C-G to the R-15 zoning district.
  - D. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 41 buildable lots and 3 common lots on 36.58 acres of land in the R-15 and C-G zoning districts.
  - E. Request: Conditional Use Permit for a multi-family development consisting of 270 units in two (2) buildings on 6.28 acres of land on Lots 2, Block s1 and Lot 2, Block 3 in the C-G zoning district.
  - F. Request: Alternative Compliance to UDC 11-4-3-27B.3 which requires a minimum of 80 sq. ft. of private, usable open space to be provided for each multi-family unit and to allow zero (0) for studio units, and UDC Table 11-2B-3, which restricts building height to a

maximum of 65ft. in the C-G zoning district to allow a maximum building height of 76ft. on Lot 2, Block 3.

- G. Request: Conditional Use Permit for a height exception for a vertically integrated residential building on Lot 2, Block 2 from 65ft. to 87ft. in the C-G zoning district.
- H. Director's approval for Alternative Compliance to UDC Table 11-2B-3 to allow an increase in maximum building height in the C-G zoning district from 65ft. to 76ft. on Lots 1-3, Block 4 (hotel and vertically integrated residential buildings) and to UDC 11-4-3-41G to allow a decrease of private, usable open space for studio units in vertically integrated residential from the minimum requirement of 50sq.ft to zero (0).

Lorcher: So, we are going to open the application for Pine 43, which has asked for a continuance. We really didn't talk about this in the premeeting. Do we have a date that is considered for continuation for this application?

Lomeli: Madam Chair, August 21st.

Lorcher: Can I get a motion to continue the application for Pine 43 for August 21st, please?

Smith: So moved.

Perreault: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to continue Item No. H-2024-0071, a mixed use subdivision of Pine 43, for August 21st. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

**6. Public Hearing (Continued from 6-5-2025) for Idaho Power McDermott Substation (H-2025-0008) by KM Engineering, LLP., located at SW corner of McMillan Rd and Owyhee Storm Ave.**

- A. Request: Annexation of 2.69 acres of land from RUT in Ada County to the R-15 zoning district.
- B. Request: Conditional Use Permit to allow the development of an Idaho Power Substation.

Lorcher: Item No. 6 on the agenda is the Idaho Power at McDermott Substation for annexation and conditional use permit at the southwest corner of McMillan and Owyhee Storm Roads and we will begin with the staff report.

Ritter: Good evening, Commissioners. Linda Ritter from the planning department. So, tonight we are here for a request for annexation of 2.69 acres of land from RUT in Ada county to R-15 zoning district and a conditional use permit to allow for the development of the Idaho Power substation. So, this property went through a property boundary adjustment to allow for a new lot. The county allows for a one time split. Normally the lots in Ada county are five acres, but they do allow for a one time split for smaller lots and so it went through that process to create this new lot. So, this property is located at the southwest corner of McMillan Road and North Owyhee Storm Avenue. So, the applicant is proposing the construction of a new substation to enhance the reliability and resilience of electrical service in Meridian and the surrounding areas of Ada county. Currently customers in the region are served by Can-Ada station in Nampa and the Ten Mile substation in Meridian. So, with the rapid ongoing growth through the Treasure Valley it has placed increased demand on the existing facilities leading to service strain and reduced liability. The proposed substation is strategically designed to accommodate future growth and development, while alleviating pressure on the existing infrastructure by rerouting service lines. The new -- the new facility will not only serve new residents and commercial customers, but also improve service continuity and reliability for current users. So, as you can see on the site plan they are proposing up to two transformers to each serve four distribution feeders up to two breakers beneath the transmission termination structure, up to two metal clad structures, which manage switching of distribution feeders. One small control building, which houses racks of switches and communication equipment. One transmission and dead-end structure, which connects the transmission line to McMillan Road. So, public utility major and public infrastructure is the permitted use within the R-15 zoning district upon the approval of a conditional use permit and compliance with the specific use standards per the UDC. Staff has determined that the proposed project aligns with these standards and is essential to support the area's long-term utility needs and as you can see from the site plan access will be from McMillan Road and the Owyhee Storm and this will allow for safety to accommodate the maneuvering of large transport vehicles doing infrequent deliveries of major electrical equipment, such as transformers, breakers and the metal clad switch gear to the substation. Under typical operating conditions there would only be a single access point, but for this particular development it was determined that two access points would be needed. So, although the development of a power station is located within the residential zoning district, the applicant is proposing 30 feet of landscaping buffer to the west and south of the property to mitigate any noise that may be generated from the substation and there is no building, but the applicant is proposing an eight foot tall precast stamped concrete wall along McMillan Road and Owyhee Storm Avenue frontage, but staff is requiring the wall be extended around the entire substation, because to the west and to the south will eventually be residential development. The application will have to go through a final design, then, they will be required to meet the standards of the architectural standards manual and go through a certificate of zoning compliance prior to building permit issuance and, then, residential

zones, the maximum height of any fences are six feet, but the applicant is requesting eight feet, so they will be going through a separate permit process outside of this to increase the height of the proposed wall to eight feet and that is based on site security and to deter trespassing and the applicant is also requesting barbed wire on top of the fence, but within residential districts it is prohibited per our UDC. So, this is just an aerial of the area. This is the area in which the substation will be placed. So, that is all the information I have on this project and at this time I will take any questions from the Commission.

Lorcher: Would the applicant like to come forward? Hi. If you could state your name and address for the record that would be great.

Lomeli: Give me just one second. Okay. You can try it now.

Hopkins: Hello. Okay. Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, Stephanie Hopkins with KM Engineering. Our address is 5725 North Discovery Way in Boise and joining me is David Hazel with Idaho Power.

Hazel: Nice to meet you guys.

Hopkins: I'm here on behalf of Idaho Power to request annexation and conditional use permit for a planned substation near Owyhee Storm and McMillan in northwest Meridian. Staff covered our request really well, so we will try to keep our presentation pretty short and David's here to provide any technical information you might have on the operation of the substation. So, the purpose of this project is to fulfill a need that currently exists and future development that will happen to fulfill that need as well. So, we are requesting to locate it near -- it's in The Fields sub area plan, which is anticipated to include a variety of uses in the future, including commercial, residential, industrial and, then, public uses. So, a new substation in this location will well serve the community. Substations are the point in which Idaho Power serves their customers directly with power. As this graphic shows there are multiple ways in which power is generated. Those are all grayed out, but you could have natural gas or there could be purchased power. Those all go to -- they are moved to a larger switching station and, then, those are moved to transmission lines. From there it moves to a substation, like the McDermott substation, and it's distributed to homes and businesses. So, the objective of this project is to meet the electrical growths and demands in this area with a new substation. This will help to relieve existing facilities. Customers in this area are currently served by the Can-Ada substation in Nampa and the Ten Mile substation in Meridian. This substation, the McDermott substation, will connect to the existing North Side substation with a new 138 kilovolt wire from the existing 230 kilovolt transmission line poles. Those really large facilities along McMillan. Linda covered where this is located pretty well. So, there are two points of access proposed to the site. One is to McMillan. The other is to Owyhee Storm. Both accesses will be gated and the entire site will be secured with a fence. As Linda mentioned, we are requesting that the south and west boundaries of the site, which are adjacent to currently undeveloped property, in the future they will be residential and I think multi-family kind of uses, with a chain link

fence. There is a 30 foot buffer area there that we believe will buffer future use as well and we think that the chain link with that buffer will provide adequate spacing and buffer to future uses. A precast concrete wall eight feet, as Linda mentioned, will be located along McMillan and Owyhee Storm. This site will include up to two breakers, two metal clad structures, a small control building, which will house a variety of controls for the actual substation and one transmission dead-end structure on the site. So, the transmission will come in from the dead end. It will go to the transformer, which steps the electricity down to 130 -- or from 138 kilovolt to four 12.5 kilovolt distribution feeders and that will go to customers through the metal -- metal clad. So, this is -- this is our -- this is what the precast concrete wall looks like on the left-side of your screen and, then, the chain link that we are proposing to locate on the south and west sides of the site would be more like the right picture and we have been working with Public Works on pressurized irrigation requirements for the landscaping that we are showing here. Our intent would be to try to work with them to delay the landscaping if we can to coincide well with development that's planned in the area. So, we are still working with them on that and trying to find a good solution and this is just basically saying that we are complying with the Comprehensive Plan and the city's codes for each of the uses that are -- for the uses proposed. So, the specific use standards as well as the annexation and conditional use permit standards. We have enjoyed working with staff and are really excited about this project. Think it will provide a really necessary service to residents within this area and will help alleviate some of the constraints that are currently being noticed in the area, too. So, I will stand for any questions.

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

Garrett: Yes.

Lorcher: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Question. I heard that barbed wire is not permitted. Now, how else will you harden the site given that there has been a lot of threats on the various water and electrical systems?

Hopkins: Madam Chair, Commissioner Garrett, David might cover that.

Hazel: Yeah. So, that's -- I mean that's kind of the whole intent of the increase had on that concrete wall and what we typically do, because I know that barbed wire is not allowed, sorry, but we will kind of cantilever that on the inside of our fence, so it's not seen, so it's pretty much obstructed by that wall; right? But that's really part of our security protocol as far as detect, deterring, delaying, if anybody was to enter our site without authorization. So, that's kind of our main intent there. And we do that with a combination of fencing, you know, barbed wire, cameras, all that good stuff.

Garrett: Okay. Thank you.

Hazel: Yep.

Lorcher: Do you plan on having cameras at the site?

Hazel: It's still kind of determined at the moment. We will at some point in the future, but I don't know if -- once this project is energized I don't know if we will have cameras on at that point. It's kind of security -- Idaho Power's security is kind of evaluating these distribution stations and the level of security required. So, our standard right now doesn't require that, but we are currently re-evaluating that given the history right now, so --

Lorcher: So, in regard to this particular site, I can't really speak to the one at Pocatello, but this one seems to be surrounded by residential, you know, with McMillan being one, you will have residential across the street, you are going to have all three sides residential. How common is it to have a station like this engulfed in residential areas or are you more kind of on the sticks a little bit with the Ten Mile and the Nampa facilities?

Hazel: Are you -- just the general location? Is that kind of questions? Would you mind going back to that main map? So, there is kind of a few things in play here. So, that existing line -- sorry. Which we are showing on this depiction; right? So, you can see basically from northside down McDermott at that intersection there is an existing line there. So, we are basically pulling conductor up north side, tagging on the existing line, which goes -- runs right by that property we purchased.

Lorcher: Right.

Hazel: So, it's also -- I mean convenience that our transmission lines there, right, without having to build new lines through the city, but at the same time it helps us relieve some of the capacity on our existing feeders.

Lorcher: Right.

Hazel: So, location is critical to our existing feeders that serve that area and taking some of that relief off with this new station.

Lorcher: Let me clarify my question.

Hazel: Yes.

Lorcher: The substation specifically. The location of the substation, which is totally fine.

Hazel: Yeah.

Lorcher: But in this case right now there is just empty lots around you.

Hazel: Correct.



Lorcher: But five years from now, ten years from now, you are going to be surrounded by residential, which, you know, electricity and kids is a concern. So, you are proposing a brick wall on a portion of it. You are proposing a chain link fence on the other proportion of it. Is that the best materials to use, knowing that you are going to be here for a long time, along with the development that's coming up, is that sufficient materials enough to be able to be a good neighbor to the future residents who will be moving in next to you?

Hazel: Yes. And so a lot of our standards are written around the chain link right now and we actually put concrete curbing under the chain link fence as well, so that people can't access underneath the mesh material. So, I mean chain link is our standard currently. We have been kind of converting to some of these concrete walls in specific situations; right? And so it's just trying to make sure that with the change in material that we are used to is making sure we are capturing all of our security elements given the location like you had mentioned.

Lorcher: Right.

Hazel: So, to answer your question, yes, we do everything in our power to secure our site as much as possible from the general public.

Lorcher: Okay. I think from an esthetic point -- I live at Ustick and McDermott, so it's -- it's somewhat right down the street. Not that it's in my, you know, peripheral vision, but as a neighbor I would prefer to see the whole thing walled in, as opposed to having a chain link fence and that way you are your own little island and nobody can kind of see in, you know, deters any kids from jumping in the wall. You are down the street from the high school and it would just create more of an esthetic, especially with the landscaping that's around it. Would -- would putting a wall around the entire unit be within your periphery or are you committed to the chain link both sides?

Hazel: It's certainly an option, but I do want to back up to that security feature; right? That -- I mean either material we choose we are meeting specific safety standards that aren't only within our company; right? I mean we have other entities that regulate us, so we are strict to those guidelines as well. I mean we certainly have the option to do the concrete if you would like. That's just an increase in cost for us.

Lorcher: Right.

Hazel: And maintenance and that kind of stuff can be a little bit tricky. You know, ten to 15 years from now if concrete starts falling versus just replacing chain link, you know what I mean? So, there is some caveats there. But I mean all in all we are open to either option, whichever you guys would prefer. But our initial intent would be to stick to our standard where we can and that's why that chain link is shown.

Lorcher: Okay. As you go to City Council I'm -- I have a feeling that's going to come up again, so it might be something you would like to talk with the city planners with --

Hazel: Absolutely.

Lorcher: -- as far as just, you know, a conversation one way or another. Commissioners, any other questions for the applicant before public testimony?

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: So, perhaps you could speak to that in regard to your station at Black Cat and Franklin, because you have a school right next to that and residential right next to that. So, the concerns that Madam Chair has, could you address whether you had issues with that substation -- substation?

Hazel: Not to my knowledge. I would have to check our security team, but I'm not aware of any issues and --

Perreault: Okay.

Hazel: -- I haven't heard any issues with that site, so --

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much.

Hazel: Yeah. Thank you.

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

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. We have Eli Hyman.

Lorcher: No? Not for the power station? Okay. Thank you.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, Patty Golden. Same?

Lorcher: Same? Okay.

Lomeli: No one else has signed up.

Lorcher: David and Stephanie, did you have anything else to add before we close the public hearing? Okay. Can I get a motion to close the public hearing, please?

Smith: So moved.

Perreault: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing for Idaho Power McDermott Substation, Item No. H-2025-0008. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Lorcher: I mean it's pretty straightforward. We can definitely use the power. You know, McMillan's got huge power lines that make sense of where they are going. I'm just kind of -- knowing -- knowing the area, because I live in that area, knowing that all of The Fields is going to be developed in a long term plan -- I'm not a fan of chain link, but that's just me. So, if it was my choice to be a neighbor of the substation I would like to see it cemented in, but I wouldn't hold the application back just on an esthetic.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: I think I tend to agree with you. I think there is probably also some argument to be made regarding security -- increased security of a concrete wall. It's harder to see through and see what's going on inside. I think there is a higher chance to deter anyone getting an idea of jumping over if you don't know if there is someone on the other side of the wall, et cetera. But, again, I think -- I don't think it's going to be something at -- you know, at the end of the day I don't think it's going to make or break this. I think where I'm at is I prefer to just maybe have that in the recommendation and have that so city -- City Council can have a conversation, which I think they will have either way, but if that's how the Commission intends to be feeling, maybe we just recommend that. But that's just kind of where I'm at.

Lorcher: Any thoughts?

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Given how many of these substations are in the area and how experienced Idaho Power is with this, they are obviously highly committed to security in their locations. It wouldn't be good for the community if they weren't committed to that. So, I'm -- I'm not as concerned about that. I mean they have had many many opportunities to try out different areas and if there were concerns about access or security I would guess they would have already run into those at some point.

Lorcher: Right. Okay. With that after considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend File No. H-2025-0008 as presented in the staff report for the hearing of June 26, 2025.

Smith: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to approve the -- or recommend annexation and a conditional use permit to City Council for the Idaho Power McDermott Substation. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

**7. Public Hearing for Habit Burger (H-2025-0022) by CDR West, located at 445 Innovation Ln.**

- A. Request: Conditional Use Permit for a new 2,426 Sq. Ft. Habit Burger including a drive-through and escape lane located within 300 feet of an existing drive-through facility on approximately 1.16 acres of land in the C-G zoning district.

Lorcher: The next item on the agenda is Item No. H-2025-0022, Habit Burger for the conditional use permit for a restaurant drive-through at 445 Innovation Lane and we will begin with the staff report.

Parsons: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. Next item on your agenda is the conditional use permit for the Habit Burger. The subject site consists of 1.16 acres of land, currently zoned C-G, located at 445 South Innovation Lane in the Ten Mile Center development near I-84 and Ten Mile. We are here tonight to talk about the conditional use permit, because this particular drive-through is within 300 feet of another drive-through and that's way the -- later on in the evening we will talk about some changes to the drive-through standards, but as it's currently -- currently on the books today this does require a CUP when it's adjacent to another drive-through. Up to the north is the Costa Vida drive-through that you guys have approved and, then, also south of it is Cafe Zupas. South Innovation Lane itself was a private street that the city approved with the subdivision of the property. You could also see on the future land use map that the -- this area is designated commercial, where we anticipate a mix of commercial, restaurant, drive-through uses on the site. So, again, this is consistent to the plan that is currently in place with the city and the development. And, then, on this graphic here you can see where this is sandwiched between the two sites that I had mentioned previously. So, the applicant is here tonight to discuss an approximate 2,400 square foot restaurant with that accessory drive-through use. They are proposing two access points from South Innovation Lane, which is technically a commercial drive aisle slash local street. So, there really is no restriction on the number of curb cuts that they could have on that particular local street. You can see customers enter the drive-through from the northern portion of the site and there is adequate stacking for those vehicles. In addition to that, the applicant is providing the escape lane per UDC standards along the outer rim of the proposed lot, which runs along the north and, then, the west boundary, so cars can exit if they need to without picking up from the ordering window. Looking at the overall proposal, both the use and the drive-through use do meet UDC standards. Because this is a restaurant use the UDC does have a higher parking ratio than our typical commercial uses. This particular site is required by code to provide a minimum of ten parking spaces and the site plan before you this evening

depicts 57 parking spaces, which is -- far exceeds what UDC code requires. Looking at the public record we did not receive any public testimony on this site and as the applicant moves through the process with us they will have to get their design review approved from the Ten Mile Center design review board and they come back with a future certificate of zoning compliance to finalize their site design. But, again, everything that's before you this evening does meet UDC standards. So, with that I will conclude my presentation and stand for any questions you may have.

Lorcher: Would the applicant like to come forward? Are they in Chambers? Oh. Wong is raising his hand. And you just muted your -- oh, no, you are not.

Wong: Yes.

Lorcher: Okay.

Wong: Hi. Good evening, everybody. Thank you so much for the application. This is Tom Wong with Commercial Development Resources. CDR. We are consultant to Habit Burger. Burger is spelled with -- with the b-u-r, as opposed to b-r-u. Anyway --

Lorcher: Can we get your address for the record, please?

Wong: Sure. It's 695 Town Center Drive in Costa Mesa, California. 92626.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you.

Wong: Yeah. Basically it's a pretty straightforward, you know, layout. Pretty much very similar to our south property where we have a drive coming in from north and coming out to the south and, you know, we -- we did as best we could with the site. So, it's -- looking forward to moving this forward. But did you have any specific questions for us?

Lorcher: Commissioners, do we have any questions for the applicant at this time? Nope. I think we are good. So, I will have you sit back for a moment and we will see if there is anybody signed up for public testimony, okay?

Wong: Okay. Thank you.

Lorcher: All right. Thank you. Madam Clerk, do we have anybody signed up?

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. No one has signed up.

Lorcher: Mr. Wong, do you have any other comments before we close the public hearing?

Wong: I do not have any other comments or questions.

Lorcher: Okay.

Wong: Thank you.

Lorcher: May I get a motion to close the public hearing, please?

Smith: So moved.

Garrett: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Lorcher: This is restaurant row. So, you know, adding -- adding another one we knew it was coming it was just a matter of time, as long as it fits the city's descriptions of filling out the codes and making sure that there is through traffic and its design standards, I don't see why it would have any, you know, complications of offering a conditional use permit. This makes it closer to my house. So -- and, actually, for this side of Meridian we don't have a drive-through Habit. The one in The Village is a walk up restaurant. Any other comments about the Habit?

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony I move to approve File No. H-2025-0022 as presented in the staff report.

Perreault: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to approve the Habit. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much, Mr. Wong.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

**8. Public Hearing for Mogul Industrial Park Subdivision (H-2025-0006) by The Land Group, generally located at the northwest corner of Black Cat Rd and I-84.**

- A. Request: Preliminary Plat to subdivide two (2) existing parcels into eleven (11) building lots across three (3) phases in the I-L zoning district on 88.20 acres of land.

Lorcher: Okay. Moving right along. The next item on the agenda is Item No. 2025-0006 for a preliminary plat to subdivide two existing parcels into smaller lots across

three phases for Mogul Industrial Park at Black Cat Road and I-84 and we will begin with the staff report.

Parsons: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. You nailed the description of the project. Thank you. It is a preliminary plat on 88.2 acres of land currently zoned I-L. As you mentioned it is adjacent to I-84 and Black Cat. If you recall this project was before you in 2022. We received this annexation with that I-L zoning designation. As part of that approval there is requirements for road improvements. Amount of uses were restricted through that development agreement. Timing for thresholds for extending the collector road through the site. So, I want to make it clear to this body tonight that this property does not require it to be subdivided. The applicant is just proposing to do that. So, under that current DA there is nothing in there that doesn't allow them to move forward with additional development on this site. Again, for construction purposes and phasing is what I understand being the primary driver for subdividing the property. You will also notice looking at this map that it seems like the two parcels are disjointed or not connected. That isn't a typical subdivision that you see in front of you, but I can assure you based on what you are seeing here the applicant has done a series of property boundary adjustments to carve out the configuration that you see here, so they are legal parcels and, then, in our coordination with the Ada county assessor's office they have said as long as the right of way touches between the two parcels and ACHD signs the plat and it's within the same section of the city it could be considered as one preliminary plat. So, even though you see it connected by a roadway, the county still sees this as one plat and so we have moved forward with that determination from the county. The other pieces that are gray around this area are still part of that development and the applicant does have CC&Rs in place that basically align all of these properties to share in the landscape responsibilities, roadways and cross-access between all the properties. You can see here on the future land use map that it does have two Comprehensive Plan designations. I won't go into that too much, just for the fact that it's already been annexed and zoned and there is a DA. So, again, currently there are six buildings constructed on the site and ready to be occupied on the site. So, they have already moved forward with a large portion of the site and they are ready to get tenants and businesses operating in this part of Meridian. So, here is the preliminary plat. It does consist of 11 industrial lots on 88.2 acres of land. You can see here in the preliminary plat these four lots here have existing buildings on them. This larger parcel just to the west is St. Luke's that was purchased from the applicant and that's developed and there is an existing building here that was just recently signed off by planning as well with all parking and landscaping in. So, really, what we are looking at is the remaining of this portion here and, then, as you recall a few -- three, four months ago this property was annexed into the city by the same developer. Enter into a DA, which that property is still part of the overall development for this site. So, again, it's one cohesive development, just coming in on different phases and different parts and pieces or different -- and different timing. As part of this development the Ten Mile Interchange Specific Area Plan calls for specific collector roadways to be built within this development. You can see that here on the concept plan. So, this is the east-west collector portion of that master street map required collector road, which is called Grand Mogul. It's currently built to about this location -- about a third of the way into the site

and that's been essentially deeded to ACHD and constructed per their development agreement and per ACHD standards. As I mentioned to you and as -- as the Chair mentioned, this -- this preliminary plat will be phased in three developments. So, again, this middle portion will be phase two and, then, the last phase will be this northwest quadrant and a portion of the north-south collector road here. So, probably it's -- there is a picture of the phasing plan here, but it's probably -- we have got a blown up picture here probably for you, so you can see the phasing a little bit more here. So, phase one those first two lots and phase two are the three interior lots and, then, the last phase is Lot 3, Block 2, which also includes a portion of the north-south roadway that we will spend probably some time discussing this evening. All right. Also with industry -- this is the other unique part about this development is some of the landscaping is already in along the street frontage and so anytime a developer has to subdivide the property the code either requires those street buffers to be in in a common lot or a dedicated easement and so as the applicant works with staff on their phasing and their plats and their plat submittals they will have to graphically depict those easements on their final plats to ensure they are meeting the required landscape buffers per city code. So, along Black Cat they have installed a 25 foot buffer and, then, on the collect street require a 20 foot buffer. The other part of it -- of the street network the applicant's also providing ten foot sidewalks on each side of the roadways as well. So, they are -- rather than having the multi-use pathway along the interstate within the 50 foot buffer. During the annexation of the property the Parks Department agreed to allow the applicant to put those -- add those to the on-street network with the collector street. So, that's why you see ten foot sidewalks on each side of that collector roadway, along with the northern portion of the north side -- north-south collector roadway, which is along the west boundary here. Again, here is -- you saw where I was mentioning the existing conditions. So, you can see they have progressed quite a bit on the property and, then, here is the landscape plan that coincides with their phasing. Again those required buffers are depicted on all on the roadways. Again, they will have to indicate that here, because of these four parcels that's a requirement or a condition of approval in the staff report and, then, along the freeway we require a 50 foot buffer and so they will -- again they will do that and I will let the Commission know that the landscaping will be phased consistent with the phasing plan that I just shared with you. So, really, if you had a chance to look to the staff report the applicant did send me an e-mail, had a few items of discussion they wanted to take up with you this evening. Probably a majority of it is really the extension of the north-south collector roadway along Lot 3, Block 2. So, this area here. So, this is a schematic that I put together to explain what we are trying to achieve at least in the area and with -- with the extension of the collector network. So, I asked the applicant to provide an exhibit how the east-west -- or the north-south collector road could be extended in the future and that's the red line that you see on the graphic here. You can see that it jogs off -- runs up about three quarters of the property and dead ends. The turnaround would -- the required ACHD turnaround will be on Lot 3, Block 2, in this general location. So, don't be alarmed that there is not a required turnaround at the end of the street. There is. They are just working with ACHD on that and when they come in with their final plat they will provide that -- show that turnaround easement on their buildable lot and, then, ACHD construction or review staff will -- will approve that turnaround. And, then, as it heads north off their site it is running on the



adjacent property on the west side of the Rosenlof Drain, which you see here. The reason why I brought it up in the staff report is because our long range planning staff is working with ACHD on the widening of West Franklin Road and so the connection point -- or that intersection isn't quite laid out or planned yet and so now that we are here with -- we have some vacant properties in the area we are subdividing, now it's maybe the right time to have that conversation to make sure the plans that we are working on align with what we are trying to achieve in the area. There is some pros and cons to that. So, the exhibit here, the lines in the blue is what staff's recommended as far as the -- as the alignment for the north-south collector. The applicant would only be required to stub to this portion. So, the blue north of that is just a graphic representation of what it could look like consistent with the master street map. As you head on the other side of Franklin Road -- you see my yellow line here at the top of the graphic. That's where it's depicted on the north side of Franklin. That's where the master street map shows it aligning. So, if the applicant were to -- or if this road was to connect into Franklin where the applicant is proposing, there is a possibility or chance that that intersection wouldn't align and it would be offset, which could be problematic. It's not uncommon, but it could be problematic. When I looked at the recorded development agreement for this site and the concept plan in that DA it did show the road along the entire boundary stubbing to their north boundary. So, it did -- this -- this plan or this plat does fall short of it going to the north boundary consistent with the concept plan. But I don't want you to get into the weeds on that too much, because, again, they are still providing that north-south collector roadway consistent with the master street map. ACHD has approved the location as proposed by the applicant. So, really, I wasn't trying to derail the conversation tonight, I just wanted us to have the conversation as what -- when the timing and what is the best location for that roadway, because we are -- the city is starting to see some development happening in this location on the east-west side of Black Cat and it's starting to funnel westward. So, we are starting to build this existing east-west collector road north of this development and so we really have to be cognizant on how all of this connects and aligns in the future. But, like I said, again, collector road was required with the DA. It's there. ACHD has said yes. Keep in mind the other reason why staff has recommended that I go on the east side of the drain versus the west side is just a logical expansion of city services and development in the area. But when talking with the applicant they raised some valid concerns, too. By moving the road to the east you are impacting smaller developments, which have a harder time carrying the cost and building those roadways when you have a large property to the west that's still vacant and could also easily facilitate the extension of that roadway. So, again, more discussion points. I know the applicant is going to discuss with you kind of their rationale for why they located where the road is, but I just wanted to at least have that conversation and show you that there is other alternatives here than just putting it on the north and south. I mean looking at the -- again, staff is recommending approval with conditions. There are a few modifications that I would like the Commission to make tonight as far as the conditions of approval go. So, like I mentioned to you earlier in my presentation, the applicant -- one of the concerns we raised with the applicant before we even processed the application was how is cross-access going to work with the parcels that aren't part of the subdivision? We can -- when you subdivide a property we can have them add a note on the plat that addresses

cross-access, but how does it work when you have a portion of a project that's platted and a portion that isn't, but it's still all governed by one DA and one -- one master plan and so the applicant did provide us a recorded copy of their CC&Rs and the entire property is encumbered by those. So, in my e-mail discussion with the applicant staff feels comfortable, as long as the plat notes that their CC&R is in effect and that cross-access are bound by those CC&Rs. We are good with changing the language that they don't need to either add a note to say cross-access is provided or add a note that references the CC&Rs that we have on file and, then, that way we know cross-access is covered by -- for the entire development, just not a portion of it. The second request is to strike condition 4-B. That was a redundant condition that did not need to be in there. It referenced landscaping on both sides of the pathway and because the ten foot multi-use pathway or sidewalks are within -- contained within the 20 foot buffers, the code doesn't require us to double dip and get -- require twice the landscaping along that. So, they are only required to meet those subdivision -- or the street buffer requirements of the landscape ordinance, not the pathway requirement. So, again, it was just a redundant condition that needs to be stricken from the -- the record. And, then, the applicant also wants to -- staff also had a condition five in there. It speaks to adding additional landscaping adjacent to the collector roads. We ask that they provide an additional five feet of -- if parking was going to be adjacent to the street buffers, because we don't want vehicles overhanging into that buffer or overhanging the pathway. I don't know if that necessarily needs to be a plat condition. It's something that we can work with the applicant on as we go through that CZC design review process with them. That's really a parking lot landscape requirement that we look at as we get farther into the weeds. But we just at least want the applicant to be on notice that if there is parking they are going to have to mitigate that somehow by adding additional parking, whether it's three feet of parking with wheel stops, curbing or adding five feet and shortening their parking stalls and allowing the vehicles to overhang a little bit more into that parking. But, again, had a conversation with the applicant and they understand that and, again, if you feel desire -- so desired to strike that condition you can. Again, we will get it with CZC design review. I haven't formally asked you to strike it, because it's -- it only says it's required if it abuts parking, so it wouldn't be applicable if they didn't have parking there. So, I will let the applicant try to sway you or advocate for that as they present to you. But other than that I think for the most part we are pretty -- pretty much in alignment with the applicant. Looking at the public record there was no public testimony that came in on this application. Again, I will conclude my presentation, stand for any questions you may have.

Lorcher: Bill, a couple questions. In regard to the item five parking, is it for consumer parking or employee parking or any parking?

Parsons: Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, it's any parking.

Lorcher: And one other question before the applicant comes up for clarification. So, phase three talks about the north-south access. Do we know when Franklin is proposed to be widened?

Parsons: Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, I can look that up on ACHD's website, but maybe the applicant knows more. They work more directly with them on that. I can tell you -- the one thing that I can tell you is when the applicant was in front of you with the annexation they tried hard to work with the adjacent property owner to build that road as part of this development, so we could get that out sooner -- get it done sooner rather than later, but it just couldn't get that easement in place to extend that roadway as I showed you in their exhibit. So at least I -- you know, they tried and they can't -- and they couldn't. But, again, this is consistent with the master street map. We just want to make sure is it in the right spot and will it align in the future with Franklin. If not keep in mind it's the third phase. So we do have time to work with the applicant. They have the time, they will work with ACHD. So, I think whether or not we don't solve that tonight we can certainly continue to work with the applicant and maybe have some more definitive answers as we go to City Council and bring up this topic.

Lorcher: One more thing. Can you bring up the slide that shows the -- the shadows of the property -- property lines that you had before with your -- with your blue lines and your red lines there. So, is this -- is this an existing road that goes north-south or is that just between properties? So, I'm looking at the storage lot and, then, I think I'm looking at the plantation house I think is currently for sale. Is that a street that goes through there right now or is that just access for the farms? The red line.

Parsons: Oh, this red line here?

Lorcher: Uh-huh.

Parsons: Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, that is their proposal where they think it will connect to Franklin. So, there is nothing there. That gravel road that you see adjacent to that red line is the ditch. It's the irrigation district's access and probably to -- along Rosenlof Drain there.

Lorcher: Okay. And so the McDermott Road is further west than the two parcels shaded gray?

Parsons: You got it.

Lorcher: Okay. Okay. Just want a point of reference. All right. Any other questions for staff before we invite the applicant up? All right. Would the applicant like to come forward? Hi. If you can state your name and address for the record that would be great.

Densmer: Sure thing. I don't know if I can quite get to the microphone.

Lorcher: That's fine.

Densmer: Thank you. My name is Jason Densmer. I'm a principal civil engineer with The Land Group. Our address is 462 East Shore Drive in Eagle. I'm pleased to be here

tonight on behalf of the applicant. The other members of the development team are here also should you have any questions that I need to fall back to them. Bill and the staff have done a great job of analyzing our application and summarizing it for you. We are pleased to be here tonight almost in full support of his recommendations. As he mentioned the project was annexed in 2022 and has a development agreement. Since, then, the development has been progressing pretty rapidly. There are six buildings complete today. We have completed the first third or so of the east-west collector road called Grand Mogul Drive and dedicated that to ACHD. We have constructed street frontage improvements along Black Cat, including landscape and multi-use pathways and we have gotten to a point now where the proposed subdivision would allow us to continue the regular development of the project. As Bill mentioned we could continue under the development agreement, but having these parcels separated into individual lots allows greater flexibility for the owner in terms of financing and ownership. The layout of the project and the design is still consistent with the development agreement, we are just asking for approval to superimpose new property lines on top of that development. So, do I --

Lorcher: You might have better luck with the arrows up and down.

Densmer: There we go. Regarding the conditions of approval we are in support of all of them, including the recommendations for modifications that Bill described tonight, with the exception of condition number two and you will notice there is actually two condition number twos. So, I mean the second one that's in bold text.

Lorcher: I'm not sure if that's in front of us right now. Can you tell us what -- do you know what that is?

Densmer: It has to do with the north-south collector road.

Lorcher: Oh. Okay.

Densmer: The condition number two requires that we resubmit updated preliminary plat materials within 15 days of the City Council hearing to redesign the north-south collector road to the east side of the Rosenlof Drain. As Bill said there has been a lot of prior work on this and we would like to just talk through the logic of it, because until the staff report was issued last week we didn't realize that there was any concern from the city about where the north-south collector road ran. As I mentioned we have been working out here for a while and have coordinated with ACHD and reviewed the master street map and have ACHD's support through their staff report for our proposed location of the north-south collector. It's a little bit of unique situation, because along the north boundary of the Mogul Industrial Park or Meridian Commerce Park as we are putting on the sign, is the Rosenlof Drain and as it gets to the west edge of Meridian Commerce Park the Rosenlof Drain makes a 90 degree corner and heads due north, both on our property and as it extends to the north the drain is centered on the property line and so the easement, which is Nampa-Meridian's easement, affects both property owners, both us in the case of the south and our neighbors to the north and, then, once the drain

turns to the north and heads towards Franklin, Nampa-Meridian's easement affects both property owners on each side and so stubbing a road due north at the corner actually puts it right on top of the Rosenlof Drain and in conflict with Nampa-Meridian's easement. So, it seemed to us early on that it was going to be necessary for that north-south collector to diverge either to the east or to the west, because it clearly can't be on top of the drain. ACHD and Nampa-Meridian get along in a lot of ways, but they will not let us put a road on top of a drain easement and I think ACHD had realized that also, because the master street map also shows that the road will be located west of the Rosenlof Drain. So, we thought that that was what agencies had laid forward as far as groundwork for us and it also made sense logically that the roadway be west of the Rosenlof Drain, because that's a single large parcel. So, about 103 acre parcel. It's under single ownership. There is a lot of flexibility with a parcel that size to develop and accommodate construction of a road in a -- kind of a logical way. Conversely, on the east side of the Rosenlof, which is staff's recommendation that we consider, the -- there is two parcels. They are both smaller. One of them is currently being used as a storage parcel and just by the virtue of the fact that there are two getting the road from our project to Franklin Road will require two parcels to develop, which sequentially may not happen as quickly as a single large parcel could. In addition to that the two parcels being smaller are more restricted from a planning standpoint and a road is much more impactful in terms of percentage of the land area. The smallest parcel there is about eight acres and just a conceptual design for the road suggests that almost 20 percent of it could be consumed in the roadway, which is a tremendous amount of land area for that one parcel to have to dedicate and not leaving much flexibility for anything else to happen. So, we think there is logic in our proposal. It was supported by the master street map at ACHD and supported by ACHD's staff report that agreed with our location. So, it would be our request that as you are considering the conditions of approval tonight you strike condition of approval number two, part two, that asks us to redesign the project on that one element. Other than that we appreciate staff's support and agree with those conclusions and we would love your support as we move forward to a City Council meeting.

Lorcher: I have a few questions. In regard to the property to the west where you are suggesting that the road goes, you have no ownership in that parcel; correct?

Densmer: No. The parcel to the west is owned by a third party.

Lorcher: By a third party. And that's not going to be part of your subdivision where the north-south -- and I'm talking about the one that hits Franklin where you are proposing the road to go and, then, what you are suggesting is that you want it to the east -- no. You want it to the west; right? And, then, city is suggesting to the east, which would affect those two smaller parcels. So, from a business standpoint, you know, if -- if ACHD and the irrigation companies, you know, want those roads -- and now you have got a drain in the middle of all of this at the same time, the marketability of the western property just gets compromised, because the road goes there. You know, because of your buffers and your land and all those other types of things. So, there may be some financial impact to that larger landowner and, obviously, a significant financial impact to

the two smaller parcels. So, ACHD has their wish list. You have yours. What does the irrigation company prefer? Where would they like to see it? Do they want to see it east of the drain or west of the drain?

Densmer: Madam Chair, that's actually an interesting question. I don't think the irrigation district weighed in in providing a staff comment on that question. We have worked with them extensively on the other areas of it and, in fact, under the development agreement the city agreed that the Rosenlof Drain should remain open. I think that's the irrigation district's primary concern is just that the drain remain open and continue to function.

Lorcher: And when you say open you mean not tiled. Open as -- okay. So, now we have a property to the west who is -- if the land -- if the road goes to the west you have got a property who is going to lose, what, 40, 50 feet of marketable area, because of the road and the drainage ditch or if you move it to the east now you are compromising two smaller parcels with an open drain and a road. If I'm that small guy, not the storage guy, but if I'm that little guy right there you just took about 20 percent of my land in order for me to sell that to anybody and as much as the collector road would be fabulous for In-N-Out, but now my parcel is a tiny little rectangle compared to what it is before. So, the placement of this road actually becomes a bigger picture for future development and, technically, it shouldn't be yours, because you are to the south of that, but it all kind of ties together, right, and we have time because of the phasing and, then, you add on top of that Franklin Road being expanded in the future and the city wants alignment, because we don't want to be zigzagging all over the place so -- for continuity, I would be interested to hear what the irrigation company -- besides the fact that they want it opened -- of where they would prefer the road and how that's going to affect all three of those landowners. So, you know, if I owned any one of these parcels I would have concerns, because that road -- whether it be done through eminent domain or however it's going to become, is going to become a big issue as we go forward -- as the city grows, as you create connectivity with your third phase, so as you go forward to City Council I would implore you to talk to the irrigation district to see what -- if they had their -- they were king for a day where would they want the road and, hopefully, between -- you have already seemed to get your blessing from ACHD. The city has their proposal of what they want and what you want and hopefully everyone can come to the conclusion of what the best impact is -- not only for today, but five years from now or whenever -- whenever those roads are going to be developed. Does that make sense? So -- okay. Commissioners, do we have any other questions for the applicant before we open public testimony?

Garrett: Yeah. I mean just from an economic standpoint I agree that if you could go west that's a much less impact on that larger property than it would be on the two smaller ones. You are almost negating the value of the two smaller ones with a road.

Lorcher: And that's -- and that's what they would like. The city would like them to go east.

Garrett: That's correct.

Lorcher: Okay.

Garrett: That's why I'm -- I see the -- the east as the most favorable compromise and that's what it is as a development.

Lorcher: Okay.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Simison: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Question I guess for staff or the applicant. I just want to confirm that both -- on the north side of Franklin and the south side these would be left in? Oh, like is that -- is that -- they are not going to be right -- right-in restricted -- right-in, right-out or like that.

Lorcher: I don't think so.

Smith: I just wanted to confirm, because I think that's the -- that's the one thing that we have not discussed I think in terms of takings and, you know, the -- the most equitable move, I think that's -- I think we have had that conversation, but also just making sure we preserve the connectivity. I don't have as much of a concern if -- rather than I'm trying to go northbound -- instead of going straight up I take a right and, then, a left. I don't have as much of a concern there, as long as that's not somehow being prohibited by the configuration of the street. That's -- that's why I was asking, but --

Densmer: Madam Chair, Commissioner Smith, of course the intersection with Franklin of this north-south collector is not part of our application or our project, but my belief is that ACHD envisions that to be a full motion intersection when it's constructed in the future and in addition to that there was a question earlier about the status of ACHD's Franklin Road project. I think it was articulated in ACHD's staff report that that's currently under design. They intend to do property acquisition over the next couple years, but they haven't yet identified a construction year for the project.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: That actually raises a question for me. If the intention is for it to be a controlled intersection are you saying that it's your belief that they intend to move the north connection also to the west or -- and I guess what I'm struggling with is their plan for that to be a full controlled intersection. How would that work if this moves to the east and is now out of alignment with that northern, you know, collector?

Densmer: Commissioner Smith, it's pretty hard for me to design ACHD's intersection from the dais here, but I'm sure that they would figure out a solution that's safe for everyone. The -- maybe the -- I guess the pertinent point that we wanted to bring forward is that this north-south collector is anticipated to be built by development. It won't be an eminent domain. ACHD is not going to go acquire property to construct the north-south collector and it will wait until the property owners between us and Franklin Road develop. Looking in the crystal ball you have to consider whether you think it's more likely for the two small land owners to develop and make that connection or if it's more likely that the single large landowner would bring forward an application to do that. Ultimately, you know, everyone I think would like to have it connected as soon as possible, but it's under the control of those other people that aren't here tonight.

Lorcher: Right. And also understand our purview, too, is to do what's -- what's in the best interest of the city, not just at this point in this application, but looking at the future land use map and how that all connects together and when we are dealing with undeveloped land, even though we are evaluating your application individually, it does connect and that is something as a commission we need to look at as well, so -- okay. Thank you. Let's open for public testimony and we will go from there. Madam Clerk, do we have anybody signed up to testify?

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. No one has signed up.

Lorcher: And no one online as well. Jason, do you have any other comments that you would like to make before we close the public hearing? Okay. Can I get a motion close the public hearing, please?

Smith: So moved.

Perreault: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing for Item No. H-2025-0006. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

**MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.**

Parsons: Madam Chair, I just wanted to go on the record. Got some new information on that. It looks like ACHD is moving in Franklin Road up to 2029.

Lorcher: 2029? The only portion of Franklin Road that's not wider, because Black Cat is right up until that second or third parcel and, then, ITD is doing just down the street at McDermott. So, we are less than, what, a mile that just needs to be widened, so that everybody is the same width and length and because you are industrial or light industrial and access to the freeway and Highway 16 is going to be a big part of your marketability of your project, you know, it's important that all these pieces kind of fit together. I guess -- you know, I'm looking at it as a landowner who is in the impact area of Highway 16 and very familiar with people taking -- developers working with land,



ACHD working with land, widening roads and things like that, I understand your point of moving it to the west, which makes sense for the larger land owner to assume the financial costs of that road. It would be very detrimental for the two smaller parcels to do it, but what I have learned in this valley is that water trumps everything. So, you know, I have seen people do improvements along the irrigation district based on the county -- specifically Ada county and, then, had to rip everything out, because Nampa-Meridian Irrigation said that's not allowed. So, as long as those two agencies continue to work together, the irrigation and ACHD, along with the developers, I think -- I think will be fine. The fact that they want it open surprises me considering we are looking at industrial development mostly in that corridor. I'm not going to hold back this application based on the location of the road, but -- and phase three it sounds like it's going to be a few years away, so there is time, but before you go to City Council you might want to get a weigh in from the irrigation district of where their preference of the road might be and that might help with long-term planning as far as whether it should be east of the drainage ditch or west of it. I personally I'm -- I'm not inclined to -- I guess -- I guess I don't feel like I have enough information to say we should strike item number two to redesign for the east, but I would like to hear from the other Commissioners and see what they think.

Smith: Madam Chair, I think -- I think I'm in agreement with you. I think especially -- and I know this isn't the prerogative of the applicant, but this does factor into the decision what ACHD's plans are about that intersection. If it's -- if it's an uncontrolled intersection that -- I think that is one decision, but if there is intention for it to be a controlled intersection I think that -- that really changes the calculus on whether it's important for there to be a straight through connection or, you know, a right angle kind of turn scenario. So, I think if the road gets moved to the west by City Council I don't think there is -- there is -- it's the end of the world. I think this is still a good application aside from that, but I don't think I'm comfortable moving to strike that language at the moment, just lacking that knowledge and I don't know that this is a big enough issue to need to continue over, but I think it's definitely something that is -- lacking that information I think my judgment is defaulting to staff's recommendation absent kind of some of that clarity.

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: I apologize if I wasn't tracking on this. I have a question for Bill. As far as that applicant is concerned, they are only responsible for taking that section up to the northern boundary of lot -- of Lot 3; right? So, they are not -- I mean their responsibility is just to take that up to the section of their property. So, we are talking about whether we are moving to the east or the west and ultimately they are not the ones that's -- that are going to put that road in, so help me connect the dots here on whether we are just talking about how they design it up to their northern lot line and how we are tying that to the decision of the preliminary plat. Like how are we making that a condition of the

preliminary plat? Because all the time I have been doing this I don't recall us having this specific type of decision.

Parsons: Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, Council Woman -- or Council -- wow. Commissioner Perreault, you are -- you are correct. We are only talking about that much of it and, like I mentioned to you, the concept plan that's in the development agreement did show it going all the way up along that boundary, but as the applicant mentioned as you start having those discussions and figure out where this road lands, sometimes those things change. In a DA it's a concept plan and, then, when you are starting to get actual development plans and looking at constraints and trying to align everything, things can change and that's where as planning we -- we lean on ACHD to say, hey, what is the best approach? And, then, we also coordinate with ACHD on the master street map and so, yes, the conversation is broader than it needs to be, but at the same time I think it's an important conversation, because if we don't get it right where are we shifting that burden on one or the other property owner, it's -- at the same time we have to do what's in the best interest for the city and the future development of this area. So, ultimately, you are right, 20 percent of the smaller property is being affected, but what if somebody buys all of those properties and now it becomes -- and consolidates it and it's one larger project? Now it's not such a burden, because they have consolidated properties to do something different. Not saying that's going to happen, but we have seen it time and time again where people can come consolidate properties and get a larger piece to offset some of those costs. I agree with you, if it was just that road on that small piece of property, it looks like it is burdening the smaller property owner versus the bigger property owner. But for tonight's purposes the plat is a mechanism for extending roadways and if the condition is written that they stub it to their north boundary, not --

Lorcher: All the way.

Parsons: -- where it aligns on Franklin, just you stub it to your northern boundary and, then, where it goes from there will be determined. But that's how the condition is currently written.

Lorcher: Okay.

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: So, that piece has to be completed and built to the northern line by the certificate -- by the time the certificate of occupancy is issued for that lot.

Parsons: That is correct.

Perreault: And there -- will there be other opportunities for the same conversation to be had prior to that or is this the last opportunity for Commission or Council to have -- to put teeth into that or to create that condition?

Parsons: Correct. Like when we go to a final plat we can't change the condition of approval or we provide more restrictive -- or new conditions on the applicant. So, this -- this is the time to get it right. Again, the condition can be flexible. It can say work with Nampa-Meridian, work with the city, work with ACHD. As I mentioned, this is their third phase, so it may be some time before they have to get that resolved, but there is time, but this is the time to figure out where we generally want it located.

Lorcher: On another note, all of the other items that you have as far as your development look great, but like Bill said, we want to make sure we get it right not only for your business plan and your move ability for your tenants to be able to use that collector road in an efficient way, but also what's in the best interest of the city. So, as far as conditions are concerned, you know, honestly, I know the city likes it to the east, but I have to say if the -- if the burden of the road is going to be on the developer those two smaller parcels, I agree with Jason that would be a huge financial burden compared to the west, regardless if it gets consumed by a bigger one or not. I think the only condition I would want to put before it goes to City Council is that the applicant works with ACHD and specifically the irrigation district of where they see it happening, because the water is going to be one of the most essential parts of that construction at the end of your development and the future connectivity of where your tenants will be able to move around; right? So, it's -- it's in your best interest that we get this road right, that not everybody's doing all these little S curve -- curves and all these other things and that -- especially if the irrigation district is going to be open and you have box trucks and possibly 18 wheelers going through. So, any other comments from Commissioners?

Garrett: Yeah. I would like to see maximum flexibility, because, as you say, the variables between the irrigation district, whoever is going to own those properties, if there is going to be an additional owner or new owner, I think -- and that length of time between now and I think Bill said 2029, I mean, gosh, we -- I mean that's a long time.

Lorcher: It is.

Garrett: And we don't know what the irrigation district is going to say and so I think committing to a certain position I think is just too unknown right now.

Lorcher: Any other comments before we make a motion?

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: I agree with Commissioner Garrett on that. I would like to see maximum flexibility on this and wonder if there isn't even a way that we can change the wording of

the condition to make sure that when Council does the same deliberation that we have -- that it's reflecting we believe there should be some flexibility in that. I understand staff's recommendation to -- to make it a condition that that shift -- that that section shift to the east. I just have -- I have some concerns of -- of setting that condition in how it's currently worded, but the revised wording I can't recommend.

Lorcher: And, then, Bill, you also wanted to add to our motion that the CC&Rs in effect include cross-access throughout the property is provided and did you want us to strike 4-B, which references --

Parsons: Correct.

Lorcher: -- landscaping on a street buffer requirement?

Parsons: Yes. Madam Chair, that is correct. The requirement for pathway landscaping is not required.

Lorcher: Pathway landscaping.

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: To pathway landscape.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: I guess this is -- I guess this is a legal question regarding, you know, in terms of requiring things prior to the City Council hearing. If I could wave my magic wand I would say something like, you know, you need to get feedback from NMID and ACHD on this. That sounds like that's also putting the prerogative on them that -- or it's -- it's -- it's contin -- it's placing a condition that depends on ACHD and NMID getting back to them in time. So, I'm just curious is there a way that we can do that legally, but not -- I don't know if you get what I'm saying. If -- if someone at NMID is on vacation or drops the ball, I don't want it -- that's a -- you know, be -- I don't think we can make that the developer's fault, if that makes sense.

Breshears: Madam Chair, a way you could word that would be to say that you require them to reach out to ACHD and the irrigation company by X date requesting feedback and, then, they have done their part, you know, in two weeks or a week or whatever it is, however long you want to give them and, then, if they hear back great and if they don't then they have at least complied with the condition.

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Bill, Madam Chair just mentioned adding that plat note. Is that not already condition 3-D.

Parsons: Yeah. Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, it is. It's just modifying -- we will wordsmith it a little bit, but it says and and it can probably be or. We will wordsmith it a little bit more. Because they -- like I mentioned to you in my staff presentation, we have the CC&Rs, so we know cross-access is out there. We just need to make sure that it's referenced correctly on the plat.

Lorcher: Okay.

Densmer: Madam Chair, I'm sorry, I realize I'm completely out of order because the public hearing has been closed, but as I hear you wrestle with this north-south collector road alignment question, we are happy to reach out to Nampa-Meridian, ACHD, whoever you would like. There is risk that, you know, ACHD has already said that they were comfortable with our proposal. There is a risk that we wouldn't get a response back and even if they did respond I think that we are all trying to figure out what the right thing will be several years from now and to make that decision over the next couple of weeks before a council meeting might kind of circumvent the natural evolution of this area I would be in -- I think we would be in -- in stronger favor of a rewording of the condition of approval, just to provide us flexibility to resolve the final alignment of that street as we get towards phase three of the project in a few years. Certainly the picture will be clearer then than it is today or will be in the next week or two.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you. Okay. Do you want to take a stab at this or do you want me to?

Smith: Well, Madam Chair, I think that raises a question, again, kind of defaulting back to that question of when do -- will we get another, you know, at bat or, you know, if -- when is the latest that we can kind of require some -- some compliance. I think what -- what the applicant said it makes sense to me, but I don't know how we could, essentially, delay past the final plat.

Lorcher: Oh, I wouldn't want to delay the application. I mean just say have due diligence to communicate with the agencies and, you know, take it more information to City Council.

Smith: Yeah.

Lorcher: And, then, they can deliberate, like Jessica said, to -- you know, based on their knowledge of the area as well.

Smith: Yeah. Madam Chair, I think I'm specifically talking to the -- the desire to require some reconciliation prior to phase three, but not within the next few weeks of City Council. I don't know that there is a mechanism and if there is any -- staff can correct

me if I'm wrong. I don't know there is a mechanism by which we can do that. Is that -- is that right?

Parsons: Well, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, they are -- they are phasing the project. So, again, if you want a condition on their preliminary plat you can say prior to submittal of phase three they have the alignment of the collector road figured out whatever that is. I don't have the wordsmith either, but we can come up with some language if that's the desire of the Commission to do that. Like I said it could be -- could be tomorrow. The risk that we run is keep in mind that there is a development agreement and in the DA they don't need to subdivide the property. So, it really becomes a plat condition, not necessarily a DA -- DA provision. Again, like I mentioned to you, the concept plan and the DA showed it along that east -- their west boundary stubbing to the north. But, again, it was a concept plan. There is nothing in the DA that says thou shalt do that, other than the picture. And, again, we -- we try to give applicants flexibility, because we know things can change as you talk with the different agencies and understand what's occurring around development, so -- but I'm comfortable if you -- if you like that verbiage, if you want to do that, and, again, like you said and it's going to go to Council and Council can -- can discuss it and see whether or not they agree with that or not and I'm sure they will -- they will watch this and will report back to in your commission rec that this was a topic of discussion and they will probably want to know more about it and, hopefully, the applicant will get some more information and we can continue to work with the applicant as they transition as well, though I'm sure they will reach out to us and say, hey, what can we do to try to get this resolved before City Council?

Lorcher: Right.

Parsons: At least that's my -- been my experience with them.

Lorcher: Okay.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: I can try taking a stab at this.

Lorcher: Okay.

Smith: All right. After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend approval of File No. H-2025-0006 as presented in the staff report with the following modifications: To modify Condition 3-D to read -- or to change the word between subdivision and add -- to modify that from an and to an or and, then, to strike condition 4-B and, then, lastly, to modify the second condition to -- to require the applicant -- have alignment of the north-south collector road with staff and NMID and ACHD prior to submittal of phase three.

Perreault: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to approve File No. H-2025-0006 to City Council with modifications mentioned. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries. Thank you for your patience. We appreciate it.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Lorcher: Okay. Do we need a break or you want to keep going? We have got a few Comprehensive Plan map and UDC text amendments. It's 8:00 o'clock. Why don't we take five minutes and, then, we can reconvene for more of the land use applications. Thanks.

(Recess: 8:00 p.m. to 8:08 p.m.)

**9. Public Hearing for AOCI Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment (H-2025-0029) by City of Meridian, located citywide and at 12504 W. Amity Rd.**

- A. Request: Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment (CPAM) to modify the boundaries of the Future Land Use Map (FLUM), along with a subsequent request to Ada County to re-establish the modified boundary of the Area of City Impact (AOCI), which includes the removal of 38 parcels totaling approximately 507.34 acres and adds one 5.06 acre parcel.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you for your patience. Call the meeting back to order. The next item on the agenda is Item No. H-2025-0029 for a comprehensive plan map amendment to modify boundaries on the future land use map and we will begin with the staff report.

Anderson: All right. Good evening, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. For the record and for those of you I haven't had the pleasure of meeting yet, my name is Carl Anderson. I'm a long range associate planner here with the City of Meridian. Tonight what you have before you is a request to modify the city's future -- Comprehensive Plan land use map amendment, modify the city's future land use map, along with the city's area of city impact. I will go through that request before you tonight. This request, after Council -- it's heard by Council will go to Ada county for the reestablishment of the city's area of impact. Thank you. That is better? Thank you. So, why this -- this request is before you tonight -- during the 2024 state legislative session Idaho Code 67-6526 was amended modifying the area of city impacts criteria. A few key highlights of that state code. Those amendments in there were -- the requirement for areas of city impact must be within two miles for municipal city limits. Also considerations for service planning. Some of those criteria evaluating those areas of city impact was included in there. Those are listed in the staff report on pages ten and 11 with review there as well. Additionally to clarify that areas of city impact fall

under the jurisdiction of Ada county or the -- the counties that those cities or those municipalities lie within. It also establishes that cities may have planning activities, including comprehensive planning outside of the area of city impact. So, the change before you tonight -- the request includes the proposal to remove 38 parcels totaling 507.34 acres, not including right of way, and the addition of one parcel total in 5.06 acres. This request is located at 12504 West Amity Road. This was recently removed from the city of Boise area of city impact and that resolution is contained within the staff report. This parcel would be designated as medium density residential on the city's future land use map. Additionally the modifications would include entryway corridor modifications accordingly. So, for those areas being removed extending through the portions that are remaining within the area of city impact and along West Amity Road. All noticing requirements have been met. Courtesy notices were sent to all property owners for the parcels involved with the request. Staff did receive one phone call from a property owner whose parcel was being removed from the city's area of impact. Staff detailed the -- what -- what the request was involved in and answered questions. The property owner didn't indicate whether they -- whether they were in favor, neutral or opposed to the request. So, the map on the left is the area that's located in southwest Meridian area of impact. This area includes 512.95 gross acres. The difference here being areas that are right of way that are inclusive therein. The map on the right is the area that's proposed to be added to the area of city impact. It's 507 gross acres. Again this is inclusive of right of way. This would have the designation as shown here as medium density residential as is consistent with the properties within Meridian city limits, which are medium density residential on the future land use map as well. Staff is recommending approval of H-2025-0029 to Meridian City Council is recommended. One point of clarification just to the staff report. A little bit of a scrivener's error in the first finding. Seventeen, it's consistent with all statutes of LUPA, all 17 statutes as written out, followed by the 18 in parentheses. As of today it's -- it's 17. We did evaluate all 18 in the staff report. I think it's pages 11 and 12 in the staff report. Well, it will be 18 as of July 1, 2025, due to a recent legislative change, which adds an additional criteria that we are required to find for in our comprehensive planning efforts. So, next steps. This will be followed, as I mentioned earlier, with a requested to City Council to hear -- hear the request. That would be followed by an application to Ada county to go through their formal process to re-establish the city's area of impact. I'm happy to stand for any questions that the Commission may have.

Lorcher: Okay. So, since the city is the applicant, we don't have an applicant to come forward. Is there anybody -- do the Commissioners have any questions for staff at this time? Do we have anybody signed up for public testimony?

Lomeli: Madam Chair, no one has signed up.

Lorcher: Okay. Anything else you would like to add before we close the public hearing?



Anderson: The only point I would like to add is the property owner of the 5.06 acres are proposed to be added to -- to the area of impact and future land use map is present. They may wish to speak or -- just as a point of order.

Lorcher: Would the homeowner like to speak? Which -- who is the homeowner? Jack Frans.

Lorcher: Mr. Frans, is that you? Would you like to speak at all about the -- okay. Thank you. And he is in agreement?

Anderson: Yes, Madam Chair.

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Question for staff. First let me say I can't describe how far my eyes rolled back in my head when I saw this, because I remember the many painstaking months of Kuna and Meridian determining where their line -- where their boundary lines -- their area of impact lines were going to be. So, my question is is -- so, now this goes back into Ada county's comprehensive plan, into their future land use map is my understanding. It will be removed from ours and -- and put back into theirs. So, then, in the future it's possible that the line that was created for area of impact for Kuna and Meridian could shift again; is that correct? And, if so, what is -- how is Kuna approaching this?

Anderson: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair, Commissioner Perreault. That is correct. I believe those parcels that are here -- at least the majority do appear to be within two miles from city of Kuna city limits. I don't know if all 38 of those in that area -- I don't know if all 38 of those in that area are included or all 38 of those parcels proposed to be removed from the city's area of impact are within two miles or not. I believe a good portion of them are. It's possible that the city of Kuna could look to include them as well. I don't have an answer as to where they are at with their process as it stands today. I would draw your attention back to -- it's not just the two miles. Those areas would need to be included as part of their capital improvement planning programs and so forth. They would need to plan for services in those areas.

Lorcher: Okay. Can I get a motion to close the public hearing, please?

Smith: So moved.

Garrett: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing for Item No. 2025-0029. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Lorcher: It seems very straightforward. It looks like legislature made some changes for the impact areas that we need to comply with. I know that the City of Meridian probably went to great lengths to incorporate it and now we are putting it back out and maybe that will come to us again at the future, but right now we need to comply with the legislature's request for impact areas. Any other comments about this application before we make a motion?

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: I just have one more question. So, as our city limits expand southward how often is this two mile radius reassessed?

Anderson: Thank you, Madam Chair, Commissioner Perreault. State statute requires that we reevaluate the area of city impact every five years as has been amended. I do believe it can be amended more often. I'm going off memory. So, if there were a need to take a look at it within a few years with conditions changed significantly, it could be something that the city looks at in a more near time frame. And as previously stated, just a point out on -- the city does anticipate continuing to plan for these areas outside of the impact and its other planning efforts, it's just not as shown on the future land use map.

Hood: Madam Chair, if I can almost reiterate what Carl said, but I think he covered it well. I think we will monitor that and I don't expect it to be five years. I -- you know, depending on what annexations occur over the next coming months we could look to renegotiate it with Ada county sooner than that is the hope. Like you said, we spent quite a bit of resources, including this area. I would like -- I'm hoping this is a temporary thing where we comply with state code, but we come back relatively in short order and reincorporated in our area of city impact.

Lorcher: After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend File No. H-2025-0029 as presented during the hearing of June 26, 2025, with no modifications.

Smith: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to approve of the Comprehensive Plan map amended -- amendment. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Lorcher: Carl, thank you very much.

Anderson: Thank you.

**10. Public Hearing for UDC Text Amendment (ZOA-2025-0001) by City of Meridian Planning Division, located citywide.**

- A. Request: UDC Text Amendment to revise certain regulations, add new definitions, figures, and update specific use standards throughout Chapters 1-5 of the City's Unified Development Code (UDC).

Lorcher: The next item on the agenda is Item No. ZOA-2025-0001 for a UDC text amendment and we will begin with the staff report.

Parsons: Thank you, Madam Chair. Give me one moment here and I will get -- get things pulled up here. There we go. That's -- that's better. So, again, another city application before you this evening. This is this year's 2025 code changes. Not sure if we will be back in front of you with other ones later in the year, but at least that is the plan after we get these ones moving forward. But I think as the Commission knows the city set out with a group of stakeholders and community support members and stakeholders and groups of developers where we formulated a UDC focus group four or five years ago, maybe six years ago and we get together once a year. The city tracks these changes on a spreadsheet. We take suggestions from our development partners as well and members from the community and we formulate these code changes and city code requires that you are the recommending body and City Council is the decision making body on code changes. This is one of the only times -- most of the other code changes just go to City Council and they act on it and it's presented typically by that department or legal department, but the Planning and Community Development -- the Planning Division takes the lead on UDC code changes with those various partners. I won't go through all of the details, but Caleb and I are actually tag teaming this or partnering some of the -- part of this this evening. He will primarily cover flex space and secondary dwelling units, which under the current code provisions in front of you are the proposed changes, we are changing that to accessory dwelling, so you may see it in the list of secondary dwelling, but it -- moving forward we hope to change that to accessory dwellings, so it aligns with the building code. I will spend time on drive-throughs, maybe some home occupations if you have time for it. Private streets and, then, fencing. We also have Lacy Ooi, who is our code enforcement supervisor. She is part of that group and she also lends a lot of valuable insight to these code changes, because she is the one out there explaining it to the many residents that have questions when she's out there serving violations or trying to educate the public on how our processes work. So, I do appreciate everyone being here to support and answer any questions you may have. Also mention to you that one change that's come about is Caleb and I were actually in front of City Council about six weeks ago before the application was transmitted at a workshop and we shared these code changes with them as well. That's one of their requests that they wanted to get in front of that and look at and look at these code changes ahead of time as well, so they could digest those as well, which I think was a great suggestion. So, I'm sure they are eager to see what you guys do on the changes

tonight and as this moves to City Council they will be interested in what you have to say and I'm looking forward to that discussion with them as well. So, like I mentioned to you, we are not going to hit on all of these. In my staff report typically when we do code changes it's tip to tail. So, this round of code changes we started with chapter one and we ended it with chapter five. So, there are a total of seven chapters in our unified development code. So, we have touched -- we have touched five out of seven this time, which is pretty typical when I come before this body and as you know usually it starts out at a smaller code change, but by the time I get the application to you based on the discussions that we have with all the stakeholders and the UDC focus group, it typically morphs into something bigger, which isn't a bad thing. I think what we are presenting to you tonight is -- I'm pretty proud of where we started -- from where it started to where we are tonight. Feel pretty good with what we are going to be sharing with you. So, I'm going to go ahead and kind of go through these very quickly and just go down and start right out the gate with drive-throughs and that's something that I know we have talked about over the last five years particularly since COVID and we have seen quite a few drive-throughs -- mostly fast food restaurants with drive-throughs, but it's a full gamut and I think as this body knows not all drive-throughs are created equal and so really this particular code change was probably the one that we broke off into -- got with some industry experts, looked at other city codes and, then, came up with a mesh of what we felt would work well for the City of Meridian. So, as this body knows typically when there is a drive through within 300 feet of a residence or another drive through, it's an automatic conditional use permit. In this particular case we are trying to make drive-throughs what we call a principally permitted use. So, less hearings and -- but having more express standards, so that we can approve them at a staff level versus them coming to this body. It's not that we want to take work away from you, but at the same time we want to make things efficient as well for our applicants and make sure that we have a solid code in place. So, this particular code change does not -- there will still be instances where a CUP will be required. We have not removed the requirement for that 300 foot radius to a residential use. So, that will remain in place. But what's really unique about this is -- if we do have more specific design standards, but if you here -- look at number four, if an applicant can't meet those design standards, then, they have the ability to come to you through a conditional use process and you guys can take that under consideration whether or not they can eliminate an escape lane or do something different based on their operational needs and not necessarily -- or how they operate versus on the specifics of the code. So, I think there is going to be some -- not only greater flexibility for the city, but also for you as a recommending body on conditional use permits -- or a decision making body on conditional use permits I should say. So, in working with the UDC focus group we broke drive-throughs -- I know they are through -- into different categories. So, we have a tier -- tier one, a tier two, a tier three, because we know they are not all alike and, then, there is some criteria for how they are classified in this definition. So, that's one criteria -- or one way to get there and, then, also we made it clear that stacking lanes have to be away from a residential district, at least 20 feet, again, consistent with a landscape buffer required by code. We still are keeping a stacking lane requirement in for an escape -- or, excuse me, an escape lane. And that's something that we have recently had a discussion with the UDC focus group. We haven't quite figured out what we want to do, get rid of it or keep it. For now we

think there is an importance to keep it. I know City Council has some interest in that topic as well. So, again, as we transition through the public hearing process would love to get your insight on a requirement for an escape lane. Caleb and I talked about it quite a bit as well and we feel like item four addresses that topic. If someone does not want to comply with the escape lane standard they have the ability to go through a conditional use process and have that discussion with you and see if they can explain their operation characteristics and see if that -- if an escape lane isn't necessary. One other portion about this code that I -- that I like about it is it does speak to a minimum width for the drive through or the stacking lanes, which is 20 feet total. One for the drive-through stacking lane and one for the escape lane. At a minimum it has to be 20 feet wide and, then, we do put a minimum stacking lane capacity for specific tiers. So, again, your tier two and your tier threes are probably going to be your fast food restaurants with ordering boards and menu boards and, then, tier three are your drive-throughs with the dual drive-through lanes. Again a tier three could go through a staff level approval if it met all the criteria. I know when we shared this with the Council they asked staff if tier three would be conditional use permits and I said the way it's drafted currently we are not proposing that in this code change. So, anyways, that's our requirements for drive-throughs. Certainly happy to stand for questions unless you want to hold your questions and, then, continue -- have Caleb and I go through our -- our list of high level changes with you.

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Yeah. Let's go subject by subject, because by the time we get to number five we might forget number one. Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you. I have a question about D-3. So, the way that the text is -- is stricken it -- I'm trying to follow it. So, the stacking lane shall not be located within 20 feet of any residential district; is that correct?

Parsons: That is correct.

Perreault: That -- that number of feet isn't changing; right? It's just clarifying how it's written here. Okay. Thank you.

Parsons: Yeah. When -- so, the change is from ten to 20. So, the strikeout -- so, anytime we give you code changes the underlying is new and, then, the strikeout is the current and, then, the underline is the --

Perreault: It looks like it's going from 120 feet to ten feet.

Parsons: Yeah. I can see that. Yeah. That's how -- that's how they like it when they go ahead and make the changes. The publishers have a specific criteria that we have to meet.

Lorcher: Okay. Any other questions about drive-throughs at this time? Okay. Let's go to the next subject.

Parsons: So, it looks like the next subject here is secondary dwellings, so I will go ahead and turn it over to Mr. Hood and he can give you the background and what we are trying to achieve with this code change.

Hood: Thanks, Bill. Madam Chair, Commissioners, thank you for having me this evening. I will -- I will tackle ADUs as they are going to be known going forward. Not secondary dwelling units. And maybe before I jump into some of the things that are on the screen now, when Bill was doing his introduction he actually had some -- there is some impacts to our definitions. I won't go through those, but, basically, we are adding primary to a lot of them to talk about the primary structure that's on there. Typically a single family residential dwelling unit as being the primary and, then, we are taking the secondary language and, again, making that accessory, but it is still ancillary or secondary to the primary. So, I will also just say before I jump into some of the more detailed specific standards for what constitutes an ADU. There are some impacts as well to Title 8 and like Bill mentioned at the beginning Title 11 is unique in that it has two bodies that actually review and approve that; right? Planning and Zoning makes a recommendation to City Council. Title 8 is not subject to that same process. However, we have Brian McClure here who is going to run through some of the ancillary related changes that he needs to go forward to City Council concurrently with these UDC provisions and you are actually -- in Title 8 and 11 you are charged with looking at some of those appeals -- when someone appeals an address or a suite number. Doesn't happen very often, but it happens from time to time. So, we thought was a good opportunity to bring him along to explain some of that, so when you do -- when if you do see those in the future you have a little bit of that background information. So, again, the definitions are largely the same. Some of that also is -- like we did with drive-throughs even, look -- you know, we -- a lot of things in our code we are proud of, but we didn't -- it didn't maybe originate with us. We are not -- we are not too proud to steal from other communities. So, we are -- you know, ADUs is a pretty typical term used throughout the country and some of the standards you are about to see are, you know, us seeing what other communities are doing and picking and choosing the ones that are right for Meridian, but also evaluating and saying why did they do this, what do they have? So, with that kind of background into this I think I'm just going to start with D. A, B and C are largely -- there is some change there, but they are not -- they are just a definition really in what they are, that an accessory dwelling unit really does need to be accessory to the primary dwelling unit. You need a permit to have one. D, E, and G -- the proposed -- I'm sorry -- the proposed D, E and G aren't really changing substantively either for the most part, but they got a lot of discussion at the UDC focus group. The owner occupancy piece of that is debated throughout the country. If I live out of state seven months of the year, but I call this home, does that count? The dirty little secret is we aren't, you know, checking on that too terribly much; right? At all really. If someone complains and says, hey, I think there is two renters here, we may investigate something like that. It is kind of on the honor system, but the intent is that an owner live in one or the other at least the majority of the year. And, again, that's something that

not everyone agreed on, but this is where we landed and thought best for our community is to have some oversight of the property by an owner and either the ADU or the primary dwelling unit. That really isn't changing though. That's -- that is our current standard, just some -- again, some wordsmithing there to make it a little bit cleaner if you will. And, then, on E, the location. Again nothing really is changing with location. But there was a lot of talk about -- over the last few years, actually, about the location. Should we give some -- I will use the word variance. It's not really a variance, but some allowance for setbacks. Should these be able to encroach into a rear setback, closer than your primary dwelling or a side or even a front. So, we had some conversations about that, but at the end of the day the location needs to comply with the setbacks of the underlying zoning district. That's where we landed as a group. That's the proposal to you this evening. Again, that does vary throughout the country from neighborhood to neighborhood. Sometimes you can have even in front of your primary dwelling or encroaching in other setbacks. That's not where we landed with this. And, then, G, parking. Again, this can be seen as a negative for communities that are looking to install these. It takes up more area and we don't have a lot of larger lots in Meridian that can even accommodate these. You account for setbacks, garages, everything else, now you need a pad for your up to 900 square foot ADU and a parking pad that's a least 20 by 10. You cut a lot of the lots out of the market. You can't do one. So, we had a lot of conversation about that, but, again, at the end of the day where we landed as a group was we think the community character of the neighborhood is important to have on-site parking -- not on-street parking. You can park on the street if that's allowed, but you need to have a dedicated spot on your property for the dwelling unit. I will say, however, though, that's a -- a combined number. So, it's number of bedrooms combined. If you have got two in your ADU and three in the -- in the primary residence that's five and you would need to meet whatever that requirement is. So, it's a combined number. So, could trigger more parking if you already have a three car garage and three parking pads you may be able to just get away with building the ADU and still counting the parking for that, because in whole on the -- on the parcel you have enough parking for that, so -- so, again, no real changes to those, but those were kind of the sticking points where we had a lot -- a lot of dialogue on those things. The other ones I think I want to highlight just relatively quickly are the proposed J and the new L. They do need to be constructed on a foundation. We have had -- historically we have had some issues -- questions with that and so we are clarifying that to -- to be classified and permitted as an accessory dwelling unit it does need to be connected to utilities and on a foundation. Part of the discussion with utilities was do they have to have their own separate independent utilities and as you will see in what's proposed we landed on no. So, you can use the utilities of the primary dwelling. So, trash service, electrical, water, whatever, but you have to be hooked -- you have to be using those services. You can get a separate service, but you don't have to have a separate service, so -- but, again, a lot of conversation about that. And, then, again, just to kind of close this out -- and Brian will talk a little bit more about this, but we consulted with fire code, building -- it just overall at the end of the day made sense to give these a standalone separate address. So, we will be addressing these going forward, assuming this -- this goes through at City Council. So, I think those are the things I wanted to touch on regarding

previously second -- well, still currently secondary dwelling units, proposed to be accessory dwelling units going forward.

Lorcher: Caleb, have you -- has the city gotten a lot of requests about ADUs? I know there was some press about it a couple years ago, maybe even less, where it was a mobile unit. I don't know if it was RV, but it was something on the trailer. It wasn't on a foundation and it kind of made the press a little bit, which kind of spurred the conversation again for affordable housing here in our community. But are you getting -- as a city as a whole getting requests? Is this why we are kind of revising this portion of our code, because we are seeing that happen more often?

Hood: Yes, Madam Chair. Certainly, the interest is peaked more over the last -- Bill said five years for drive-through, so we will just go with that. I don't know. Over the last recent history anyway. We are getting more and more inquiries of that. You know, the cost of housing and some call it a crisis even. It is a lever we can pull a little bit to kind of encourage -- again, that's where we have these conversations about location and parking. Every time you regulate it more and more you see people out of that potential market though. So, that is something where we struggled with quite a bit was how much do we open this up and how much do we kind of preserve and protect neighborhood character that's existing? So, that was kind of the push and pull. But, yeah, there is definitely more interest. I can even just tell you, you know, anecdotally -- I don't have a number, but monthly, if not weekly, we get inquiries about this from our staff and we are -- we are working with these -- with these -- our residents to figure out what we can do with the current standards and talking to them even about what's being proposed. So, yeah, certainly more interest. It's tough, though, there is -- actually, Brian did some research -- it's been a couple three years now. At that time we had about 40,000 dwelling units in Meridian and I think it was around ten percent of them could even fit one on their property.

Lorcher: Right.

Hood: And we don't know how many of that ten percent even wanted to have one. It's a pretty small percentage. We are not going to solve the housing crisis with these changes.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you.

Parsons: Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, just to add a little bit to your -- your question that the city actually has a separate ADU permit now that they apply through the building department. So, we even created a separate record so we can keep better track of these as they go forward, because a lot of times that's kind of the caveat with this, too, is that we are trying to align our code with building code. It's step one. And, then, determine what do we call these? Is it really a remodel, expansion of an existing home, versus a true ADU and that's why we have -- we have separated it out and try to provide that clarifying language in the code that Caleb shared with you to try to align with that. So, we know we can -- when someone asks us how many have



we permitted, we can run a report and share that information with the community, because we -- we are seeing more and more in these permits being submitted to the city.

Lorcher: Commissioners, any questions about ADUs before we go to the next subject?

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: I do have one regarding owner occupancy and it's -- it's kind of what happens -- say you are in compliance and, then, you decide you are -- the owner decides they want to move or they are temporarily moving or something like that, are they able to still rent out the entire property as a whole just not to two separate renters or does the ADU have to, then, be taken down?

Hood: So, Madam Chair, Commissioner, a similar example. If I live in the home and I am going to move away forever maybe even, but I want my kid to stay there, they don't technically own it, but it's my kid, is that an owner occupancy if they are an heir or, you know, by blood or they are going to inherit it eventually or those types of things? You know, we haven't run through all of those potential scenarios. I don't think -- to qualify as an ADU you would need to meet these qualifications. We haven't gone to the point of, okay, you have to -- you have to deconstruct it, raze the ADU necessarily. But, in theory, I guess, it could come to that. I don't necessarily see us being that heavy handed, but in theory I guess yes.

Smith: Thank you.

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you, Madam Chair. My favorite subject. We have been talking about this how many years, gentlemen? I'm very excited to see these come about, because it's been a long long conversation. So, good job on everything. I just have a couple of questions on wording. Under 4-312 when we are talking about the permits required under C, it says that they shall obtain a permit prior to building, placing or maintaining an ADU on any property. Can you give some more description on the definition of maintaining? When does that start? When does that stop? How does that look?

Hood: I don't -- I don't know that I can actually. So, this -- this was done on all of the UDC changes just sort of as an aside. We are done with legal present and I believe one that Ms. Emily Kane came up with, so -- and she is not here tonight, so I hate to put anyone else on the spot that way, but that is something that our legal staff -- certainly the placed and constructed I get. The maintained may just be a conversion piece, because we get -- a lot of the inquiries are actually taking a garage area or garage-like area and converting it type of a thing. So, then, you are maintaining a living quarters even though you may have not converted anything with permits or whatever. So,

speculating there a little bit, but -- but that's some of I believe the intent. No way, shape or form can someone be living -- should anyone be living there without the proper permits.

Ooi: Could I -- could I add to that, what I would think? It's not maintaining as in maintenance, but I would assume that if we in code enforcement was notified that someone was already living in one that had been built, then, we would ask them to get a permit, so it would be as maintaining the structure that was already there, as opposed to it being placed or built, but that someone was already utilizing it and, then, we ask them to get the permit, to make sure it goes through all of the proper channels.

Perreault: Thank you. Madam Chair, I have another question if I may.

Lorcher: Go ahead.

Perreault: Thank you. That makes sense. Thank you very much. My next question is actually farther up on the definitions for dwelling and for townhouse or detached -- single family detached. It says that the dwelling unit is located on a separate property, so it's a separate taxable parcel; correct? I'm wondering if -- getting technical here, but I kind of feel like separate property is really too broad of a term. I feel like we should narrow that down and just say, you know, separate taxable parcel or -- or separate subdivided piece or I -- I don't know. I just -- it seems kind of generic to me.

Hood: So, I think I can respond to that. Sorry. Madam Chair, Council Woman Perreault. You know, I appreciate the wordsmithing there a little bit. We do have definitions for property, though, too. And even some of the ones you just put out there. You know, you can go create a tax parcel with the county and we don't really want to go there, because a parcel doesn't make it a legal parcel for building type of thing. And not everything we have in Meridian is part of a subdivision either. You have section ground land that you can do it. So, it is intentional to have property. What we don't have on the screen is -- we do have a definition of what is a parcel, a property, a lot. So, it does -- it does all sort of work together and tie together. Again, I appreciate you looking and even the comments and questions and making -- let's make sure that it reads the way we want it to and intend it to. The last comment I will just have on that is we aren't proposing to change that. That's been the way it's read, separate property, for quite some time, so that isn't underlined or strike through. I can verify with our -- again our legal team again, but I believe this is the way they would prefer it read for those reasons.

Lorcher: Okay. Any other comments about ADUs before we go to the next subject? Okay. Thank you very much.

Hood: Okay. It looks like I'm up again, so, sorry, you are stuck with me for one more and, first, I think I will apologize. I have done a pretty poor job of marketing these changes to our development partners and -- and with -- with everyone else that -- that's read it. So, hopefully, this presentation will help clarify some of that. I did discuss and

try to explain these with -- with assistance from others. It wasn't just me, but I am the lead on this one. We did go to the Building Contractors Association of Southwest Idaho. Obviously, the UDC focus group and others. But there still seems to be some confusion and even concern over the draft standard. So, we did -- we do have four letters. Some of them came in just this -- two of them came in just this afternoon. So, I would call your attention to those in the packet. Again, if you -- if you checked back at even at 4:00 o'clock you would have missed one of them, so -- but there are four letters. They are all very similar and I will -- I will address those. I think the first one that I can hopefully just put to bed early, three out of the four, I believe -- I don't think all four of them talked about parking, but, actually, the -- at one point in time we did have a 500 square foot parking. So, the E that Bill is just kind of hovering over, a 500 square foot parking per and as you can see we have -- we have had a thousand, but at one point in time we did have a version that talked about having a 500 square foot. So, I think that puts at least the parking concern that -- that is in some of those letters to bed. This is more consistent with a hybrid industrial commercial type of a standard for parking. I think the other thing I want to just start off with is the definition of flex, because I think that's where we can kind of get things confused sometimes. Flex is just a land use designation or a land use definition when we are looking at a myriad of options that a -- that property could be and I want to just start with the definition of what it means to be a flex space building. So, flex space is defined in the UDC as the use of a building or portion thereof for small scale warehousing and/or light industry with associated office and/or retail showroom space. Period. Flexibility in the use of interior spaces and low scale attractive exterior appearance character -- characterized flex buildings. That's on the books. We aren't proposing to change that. That's -- that's how we generally define what a flex building is. We are -- the intent of flex buildings is in the name. We do intend for them to offer some flexibility in how the square footage is allocated for different uses and it is appropriate in a lot of situations. However, the ratio of warehousing and light industry to office and retail is critical in both establishing and maintaining business neighborhood integrity and meeting some of the city's goals for targeted industries. Some control through minimum and maximum square footage allowances is necessary for the stability of areas that may tend to have more retail or office than envisioned for those that are like in industrial areas or more industrial warehousing than envisioned in planned commercial or mixed use areas. So, the letters really speak to it being too -- requiring too much office or retail showroom type of a site, but could be the other way. You could have someone that wants to go in an industrial district and really is a retailer and they are saying, hey, I want to be in this district, because it's cheap land and let me go there. No, the flex building is to allow some flexibility, but really where we were seeing flex buildings a lot are kind of those tweener zones, where it's -- it's commercial or retail areas -- it's okay to have some warehousing and we could even call you a flex building. It doesn't mean you have to be necessarily a retailer and that's -- we had a conversation this last week as staff even where we had some corporate offices want to come in for office equipment and they wanted to have their corporate offices, pretty substantial retail component, as well as some back stock warehousing for it and we talked about it. In fact, okay, they are bringing offices and retail, do we call them flex? Do we call them retail? Do we call them office? I mean it could be any one of them, because it's all about a third and --

and, again, that's -- that's kind of the intent with flex is to allow some flexibility, but not to allow industrial in commercial and just call it flex; right? If that makes sense. Or the other way around. That's why we have a cap on the amount of retail office you can have, because we don't want to see those retailers go in an industrial zone. So, some flexibility. The other thing I just want to point out -- we thought we were being helpful here as right now it requires 30 percent in all zones everywhere all the time to qualify as flex and we are like, okay, that -- maybe we don't need as much of that like in industrial zones. We can have those pair back. But in -- again, in commercial -- C-C, community business district, we thought having a higher percentage of that building be allocated for, again, nonindustrial warehousing type of uses, office, showroom, retail, whatever made sense for that character of that zone, of that business park, of that whatever. So, I think just within that what I wanted to say is we are definitely as staff willing to work and understand what that business model is and their floor plan and -- and put -- you know, fit you in a nice classification. We got to -- we got to call you something and flex is -- is a nice one where it's -- you are doing a little bit everything and you are primarily, you know, warehousing even, but you do have that -- that component. Other uses, though, that I will just call out real quick that are -- that are similar and often get confused with are wholesale sales, warehouses, light industry, food and beverage products processing, building materials, garden equipment and supplies. Those are all separate things that you could also do, but they are a different land use than flex. There is a very specific, you know, definition in these standards that I will jump into here for just a minute, so -- so, again, we -- we hear the -- the -- the industry. We understand that. I think there is a little bit of a, you know, push and pull there of, yes, we are trying to be flexible, but not to the extent where we just get, you know, a hundred thousand square foot warehouse buildings in our C-C district. So, you can see the changes are actually pretty straightforward. It wasn't rocket science. This is, again, where I think we looked at a couple of other codes but we just said, hey, how about five percent, you know, as you go up or down the ladder on zoning. So, it's certainly not scientific, but it is thought out. Understand it doesn't go quite as far as -- as again some folks would like it to go, but we think this is appropriate for our community. Again, there is not a laundry list of changes -- two kind of changes of substance that are more -- it's adding more flexibility to the definition of flex than currently on the books. But with that I think I will pause for any questions or comments or discussion or whatever you want to do. That's, essentially, where we landed on flex space.

Lorcher: So, in a flex situation if I'm a landscaper and, you know, I'm putting in sprinklers and I'm -- to me flex has always been -- when I have been in the business community has always been kind of -- I have always seen it synonymous as temporary, you know, a flex -- you could be there multiple years, but I'm not buying a building because maybe I don't know if my business model is going to work. So, what you are telling me is if I'm a landscaper and I have a bunch of hose and I want a showroom where I can show my cool sprinkler things. I have an office. I have a receptionist and a little warehouse in the back holding my hoses, flex space wouldn't be for me, because you have a separate designation specifically for landscapers?

Hood: So, that's -- it's a very good question, Madam Chair. Potentially. It kind of depends on your floor plan and your site; right? A lot of landscapers we actually call a contractor's yard. It kind of depends on what you are doing and how much of the site is used for what purpose. How much is -- you know, how much are you really retailing versus wholesaling? How big is your warehouse? How big is your yard? How big is your parking area? So, there is a lot of things that factor in and we -- we don't have -- well, we may have a definition for a landscape something, but basically contractor or landscape contractor would -- may be the definition in your -- your hypothetical. Could be flex. Could be. That's what I'm saying. There is -- there is a lot of, you know, wiggle room or quite a bit of wiggle room, but when we let one of the qualifications to be flex, though, is you need to have at least -- whatever percentage, depending on the zone, of an office showroom component. If you don't have that, then, you won't -- then we got to look for something else. We got to call you -- we -- you know, some other classification. So, that's why we do have these standards as -- as some metric within defining a flex building you need to have an office showroom space.

Lorcher: Okay. I guess one of the other examples I wanted to ask about was -- we are starting to see more manufacturing of -- and retail of some food service within kind of industrial and flex space spots. So, for example, say I have a gelato store and I want to make it there, but I also want to have a retail component, my showroom. Is that eligible for like a flex -- is that one of the reasons flex space is there because it's a small business that I can no longer cottage out of my house and I want to have some more space, but I also --

Hood: Sure.

Lorcher: -- need commercial type of thing happening?

Hood: Yeah. Madam Chair, it -- it may be eligible. It may not even be the best fit for you. Again, depending on what you -- you know, if you really think that your retail side of that is going to be successful and you are setting aside a good chunk, but you are still just making your ice cream or gelato or whatever you said in the back --

Lorcher: Uh-huh.

Hood: -- it may be better to call you a restaurant, you know, for Central District Health purposes. You may want to be classified as something else. So, we factor all those things in. But, again, I think some of the genesis of flex was more to your point of a ma and pa wanting to do the next step and kind of have a dedicated space where they could still mess with wood or do whatever and it is -- and that's why we don't have a square footage on small scale, but that's in the definition. I mean it isn't -- it is meant for -- maybe I have a couple roll-up doors, you know, but -- but -- but it is a smaller space, however you want to kind of define that. It's not 20 roll up doors with docks and everything. That's not -- that's not flex; right? I mean unless the building's huge. We wouldn't -- I don't think you would qualify for that. So, that's where I -- I kind of want to just -- the definition and what we are trying to do, that's going to be warehousing or

distribution. That's primarily what you are doing, so -- now, if you added some corporate offices to that now we can talk flex potentially, but even that square footage, though, small scale.

Lorcher: Right. Okay. Any other questions on flex space before we move to the next subject? Okay. Thank you very much.

Parsons: Next item I just want to quickly touch on. I know it wasn't part of the four that I talked about, was just because we are on specific use standards, is home occupation. So, I think the Commission is aware you can operate a business from your home if you meet a certain criteria. Well, we are broadening that a little bit this time, this round of code changes. So, essentially, we have some residents in Meridian that like have an outdoor swim pool -- swimming pools and they like to do outdoor lesson -- swim lessons from their home and currently the way the code is written they are not allowed. You are not allowed to have any outdoor activity associated with a home occupation and this went before City Council and City Council directed staff to come up with code changes to allow that type of use. So, really, that's what this is achieving -- attempting to do. Again, this was shared with the Council back last year when I did the last round of code changes. So, we have added that as an allowed use for outdoor swim lessons for six or fewer students and, then, the other important portion of that is the fact that, again, it's only -- it's capped at a certain time of year. Obviously you can't swim in an outdoor swimming pool unless it's well heated throughout the whole year. So, there is a perm -- a limit. They don't need to renew their permit every year, just their approved home occupation permit would allow them to operate between those months.

Lorcher: Okay. Very good.

Parsons: But pretty straightforward.

Lorcher: Any questions about that?

Smith: Madam Chair? Madam Chair?

Simison: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Just curiosity. Why swimming specifically? And is there any discussion -- I mean say I'm the basketball coach. I have a hoop in my backyard or something. Is -- is there a reason swimming specifically came up and that's considered?

Parsons: Yes. And that was the discussion that we had with -- with Council when we were hesitant to change the code, because, again, if it weren't so specific we could end up with someone having a batting cage in their backyard and you are hearing people hitting baseballs throughout the day and basketball court and all of those things, so -- again, like Caleb says, like the home occupations -- or the accessory use permits we are trying to maintain neighborhood character and we feel like if this is a limited amount of children or a very specific purpose, that that does that. Not saying you won't have

noise associated with it, but the other part of that is we would allow in-home daycares with six or fewer. So, even if kids are playing in the backyard that's kind of how we found the nexus with allowing the swim lessons versus a daycare use and that's why the six or fewer aligns with also the daycare standards.

Hood: Madam Chair? If I can just add one more thing that I recall from last year is there are some swimming pools, but not a whole lot in Meridian, and a need for swim lessons. So, there was a niche there that some could serve. Basketball courts are a little more prevalent and you can go hold that at a park or whatever, but with only having a couple of public swim pools and those types of things, it was like we want kids to learn how to swim and if we can even to some degree encourage them, still have neighborhood character, but this was one of those lessons types of things where we have a safety thing and for people that have backyard pools and are willing to do some lessons -- anyways that was part of the conversation, too.

Smith: Thank you.

Lorcher: Yeah. I wish I had it 20 years ago, because I had to take my kids to Boise, because the only other option was Meridian pool back in the day and they were booked up. So, I could only imagine with our increase in population having that flexibility -- especially with subdivisions having pools -- having these kids have lessons is a good move overall for safety. Okay. So, home occupation. Any other questions before we move to the next subject? Bill, what do you got?

Parsons: We have fences. So, again, this is a joint effort between planning and code and legal. As Caleb mentioned, we have -- as we can attest over the last couple of years we have gotten some interesting fencing showing up in our community and so this is our attempt at what we call -- this is something unusual that I haven't done, but it's called repeal and replace. So, rather than giving you a bunch of strike through underlined text to read through, this is actually going to repeal the existing fence code and replace it with the new code. So, it's just a way that's allowed under the law -- the state statutes that we can effectively modify the code without strike through, underlining format by introducing a new code. This essentially takes a lot of the existing code that we currently have in place. It reorders it, restructures it, with some additional wordsmithing from code enforcement and our legal department. But it also takes it one step further where it allows somebody to do some decorative features in their backyard. Currently the way the code -- fence code is written and where people have found loopholes in the fence code is they may put up a fence -- put up trellises and, then, they -- eight foot trellis in the side yard and they think it's a decorative feature and they put vegetation on it and they don't understand that that can be construed as an extension of their fence. Or you have probably -- we have had code enforcement cases where someone's put lattice on the top of their existing fence or another lattice adjacent to it, so they can raise the height of the fence. And, again, just because it may not be attached or even if it is or adjacent it's still considered an extension of the fence and currently in the residential district you can't exceed six feet in height and that's where we see a lot of these issues coming up for us is -- so, this code tries to do that. Again, we

-- we thread that needle to say six foot fence is allowed and if you do these things it's something else -- or it's allowed if it's a decorative feature and we put parameters on that. The other part of the fence code is just updating our graphics. So, I wanted to share this with you. So, a lot of times residents come to us and they want to know what type of fencing they can put on their property. So, we do have graphics in the fence code -- in the code currently. This was just a way that we could modernize that moving forward and share all the different scenarios someone could face with a -- go to erect a fence on their property. I would mention to the Commission that we are going to tweak this a little bit. Currently on some of the graphics here the way the code is currently being presented to you tonight there is a requirement for a 45 degree angle when a side yard fence abuts the front yard of an adjacent property. The code doesn't explain whether it needs to be 45 with a six foot fence or it just says a fence. It has to go in at 45. So, we feel like there is an opportunity that we should probably clarify that language in the fence code that says six foot fence needs to be 40 -- six foot solid needs to be a 45 degree for visibility, but if it was a three or four foot -- three foot solid or four foot open vision fence that it would be allowed to run along the property line. So, we will -- we will get that clarified and update that graphic, but at least wanted to share that with you and -- and point it out in code because I did have a chance to look at that before I came to the hearing tonight and that's this number five here in front of you. You can see here it just says fence. So, we will -- we will put some -- some sideboards on that and, then, update that figure as well. The other piece that's a little bit different than currently in code -- and we have been dealing with this issue is currently the fence code -- fence for -- so, when someone goes to construct fencing on their property they -- we measure the fence setback from property line. Not sidewalk. So, that causes some issues, too. And, then, what compounds it even more is if you have a corner property the code says your fence has to be in ten feet from the property line, so you never get to truly use your side yard, because your fencing is ten feet in and so, then, neighbors are walking their dogs in the evening or you buy this corner lot thinking you have this great side yard and you find out you can't use it and, then, people are putting up fences in the wrong spot and, then, we are going to have -- we are going out there knocking on their doors telling them to tear the fencing down. So, this particular code gives greater flexibility to that standard. So, in this particular case what you can see here -- if there is a detached sidewalk adjacent to the street, then, we are going to allow the homeowner to put their fence two feet from the sidewalk, so rather than ten and we are going to define the setback from the sidewalk and not the property line. Unless there is no sidewalk, then, property line would still apply. But most of the residential subdivisions there are sidewalks, either attached or detached and so if there is an attached sidewalk the graphic down here below says you can go up to five feet. So, we are giving them five additional feet and the reason why we landed on that is, one, if it's two feet from the sidewalk it allows someone to get a lawnmower between the fence and the sidewalk. Or also if you are walking in the evening or biking, you know, you have some elbow room there and you don't have to worry about hitting the fence or doing damage to somebody's property. It just gives a little bit more space and that allows some more comfort to that pedestrian or bicyclist on the sidewalk. But really those are the draft changes. I know Lacy has a lot more history with fence code issues, but I think we were



able to get on the same page with these changes and they feel pretty good that it's going to be -- hopefully easier enforcement on their end to explain those standards.

Lorcher: Okay. Any questions on fencing?

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: One question on the definition. It looks like there is -- some of the language just struck that specifies as manufactured materials. Would that make, for example, vegetation -- say shrubbery or hedges, fence, and, if so, is that the intention?

Parsons: Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, we are -- we do not regulate landscaping on buildable lots. So that's still in play. So, you are right, just because we are trying to maintain visibility at a -- from people backing out of their driveways or -- they still can put up multiple shrubs there and block those open vision fencing. But, again, the city code does not require landscaping on buildable lots, only common lots.

Smith: Thank you.

Hood: If I can maybe just add to that a little bit though. So, what Bill said is correct, but manufactured, faux -- that was some of the issue and I'm getting into Lacy's business a little bit, but we are getting some pretty creative folks. That's not a fence that's on a screen. That's not a wall. So, that -- that is a lot of what the intent is of the definitions is to clarify. You can't put up a blue tarp and say that that's okay, that it is a fence or isn't a fence, so we went back and forth a lot on what that -- what defines a fence or a screen or a wall and those types of things. So, yeah, I probably shouldn't even said anything, but that is -- that is something we saw quite a bit was -- was some of the manufactured ivy type of things. We wouldn't regulate it if it were living, but when it's a manufactured material -- depending on where it's placed, it can constitute fencing material, because it's screening potentially.

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Are we seeing a lot of this issue with line of sight problems, like around corners? Obviously, if you have a four foot fence at a 45 degree angle and somebody puts up an eight foot arborvitae you have just lost your line of sight. You know, that that 45 degree angle is useless at that point. So, is that kind of what we are trying to prohibit?

Hood: So, I will maybe give the first stab at that and feel free to jump in. That wasn't the nexus necessarily for some of these changes, but that has been a concern that's been brought up, particularly in some of these corner lots on a side yard where they are bringing a six foot fence up and now someone's driveway is only five feet off of that. Backing out of your driveway you can't see around the fence to see if any car is coming

to back out. So, yes, that was thought about and is a result of some of these changes. It's not necessarily why we are making the changes though.

Lorcher: Okay. Next subject.

Parsons: Well, the last topic on -- for my portion of the presentation, then, we can certainly open it up to questions or even public comments as this is a public hearing, is private streets.

Lorcher: Private Streets.

Parsons: Yes. And this -- this one actually wasn't even on our radar, but we met with some of our UDC focus group members and they had expressed a need to change or modify this section of our code and like Caleb said to you on his portion with the accessory dwelling units, this was one that got a lot of feedback and a lot of conversation around it, because as we know, you know, for longevity public streets are better than private streets; right? For maintenance. We all pay that. There is taxes. There is a way to maintain the road. Where we were hesitant with private streets on -- from a city's perspective is the cost and maintenance of those over time. But, again, staff was willing to open the door -- crack the door open a little bit and allow some more flexibility to use private streets, particularly if it's in-fill or a planned unit development, because that's really where, again, if you are going to -- in-fill as you know can be very tricky. There may be enclaves in the city where there is no street stub to it or it may -- may not necessitate a public street or the cross-section of a public street's too wide and it doesn't make it feasible to do an in-fill project, because you have taken up the property with a roadway similar to the discussion we had earlier this evening. So, we have got to be able to have some flexibility in the code to allow certain -- these in certain instances. So, currently the way the code is written is you can do -- it's discouraged to do private streets, unless it's a MEW or gated development. That's how it's written. Doesn't say you can't do it. It just says if you are going to do it and if we are going to entertain it, we may be supportive if it's -- you have those two options. If it's commercial or multi-family, we -- we typically would require private street for addressing purposes, because of the size of the development we want to make sure it's for emergency services. A lot of those provisions are staying in place with this code change. It -- but we realize there are some -- some holes or some gaps that we need to fill or leap at least make it a little bit more flexible. So, this code doesn't say you can't do a MEW or gate it, we just took it out that it's not that. That's not the only purpose for it. And, then, again, it's one of those where we looked at other code sections like we typically do, we don't reinvent code, we look and see what other communities are doing in the area and so some of this wordsmith was from those code sections and, then, going back and forth with the UDC focus group. So, again, I can see this tool being used more for in-fill, gated communities still and possibly commercial developments where maybe Ada county or the fire department or emergency services need something named for addressing purposes to get -- for public safety. That's really how this tool is meant to use and I think that will continue to be the case. The other portion of this is trying to have standards that what applies to a residential development versus a commercial

development and trying to separate those two things out as well. So, currently the way the standards are drafted, again, residential you are going to have your own design standards that you have to meet and, then, in commercial it can happen a couple different ways. One we can get the private streets with the multi-family development or commercial development and it could be just a commercial drive aisle or in some cases I have been part of where someone may not have access to a street, but they want to name their -- an existing drive aisle with -- name it a private street and, then, convert that to a private street, so that they can get a physical address for their business, because they are off the beaten path and they can't -- they are not seen from the street, so they want to make sure there is a street sign where people can get to them and so this code does that. It allows the process to get it with a gated community and in-fill a PUD or with a multi-family development, commercial development and, then, also rename existing or convert existing drive aisles to private streets or basically name them for emergency services purposes. Other than that it's pretty straightforward. I know Council had some reservations with opening the crack a little bit wider just because of, again, cost of maintenance to those doing that. I don't -- I don't see that being much of a burden for multi-family development and commercial, because, again, it's probably these smaller in-fills and how do they tackle that, but, again, that's CC&Rs and dues and we haven't seen a lot of it, to be honest with you. Most of the time people just do common driveways and do the four lots and they move on. But, again, we will shape -- we will see how this shapes -- shakes out, see what Council wants to do with it, but certainly happy to answer any questions about this topic.

Lorcher: I know this Commission has not been a fan of the private streets in subdivisions, because of just the congestion of utilities where you -- you allow four houses on this little spur and the last guy, you know, has to walk -- or, you know, emergency services or utility services, you know, can't get in there without having to back up for garbage or any other kind of types of things. So, it looks like that that -- or allowed use will continue, but, you know, it seems to me when you are dealing with a blank slate and creating a subdivision and you are allowed to have these private streets or these, you know, off -- offsets, it's like you don't -- you shouldn't have to, because you have got a blank slate to be able to do it. But I'm not sure -- you know, we don't see how the neighbors all react years later to those types of things. But we will see what City Council has to say. What -- any other comments from Commission in regard to private streets? Okay. Was that our last subject?

Parsons: That's the last item that I wanted to touch on. So, if you want to open it up to public testimony you certainly can.

Lorcher: Okay. Commissioners, do we have any questions from Bill or Caleb before we open public testimony? Okay. Do -- Madam Clerk, do we have anybody scheduled to testify?

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. We have Will Goode.

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

Goode: Yes. Will Goode with Adler Industrial, 8665 West Emerald Street in Boise, Idaho. Madam Chair, Commissioners, Council Woman Perreault, congrats. I didn't know you were on Council, but that's been a whole bunch of times tonight people have called you Council Woman, so -- thank you guys for staying so late. Thank you for -- to staff for being open to feedback from the development community on -- on these code updates. For the most part I'm supportive of everything. There is just one item and -- with flex use that -- that I wanted to touch on and where this really matters is in mixed employment and the edge of C-G zones where you are up against other industrial and appreciate, Caleb, your definition -- the definition you gave of -- of what flex use is. I guess how we view it -- and Adler Industrial, we are the largest industrial developer in the valley. We own 20 plus buildings in Meridian and we have got five more under construction right now. How we view flex industrial is -- is exactly like you described it, Madam Chair. It is -- it is -- tends to be small industrial users, often with a -- some sort of a public facing retail component that they want to be able to -- they make cabinets and they want to be able to sell their cabinets in the front and, then, actually distribute out of the back or stone -- we find a lot of the demand is around building materials or construction supply type uses, where they want a public facing component, but they also need some warehouse and distribution in the back. So, to give you our perspective on this I wanted to compare two developments. We recently -- or just about to finish two flex concrete tilt buildings on the north side of Ten Mile Crossing. They are just south of the Tesla building and these two 36,000 square foot buildings are designed to demise down to six to 12 thousand square foot spaces, which is a small industrial user. That's like, you know, you have grown out of your garage in your house and you want 6,000 square feet, you are going next level. Those buildings are just about complete and we have zero leases signed. We have tons of interest. I will tell you why we have no leases signed in a little while. Comparing that with a building we have in Boise, similar building, designed for six to 12 thousand square foot users, we just finished the shell there and it's 60 percent leased and those last two spaces are probably going to be leased in the next -- next 60 days. We have agreed otherwise on both of them. The difference is we get more inquiries on the Meridian buildings and, then, we tell them that to be able to -- to go on this -- in this location you have to do 30 percent office and that drives up their lease rate to a point where they can't afford it anymore and they say, oh, I love the location, I can't go here, but what else do you have? And you either have to do 30 percent lease rate or apply for a conditional use permit to be able to qualify as warehouse. So, that's why this is near and dear to our hearts. Because I understand that we are -- we don't want warehouse in the mixed employment or the C-G zones. Their house is three to seven percent office. So, we are -- we are well above warehouse, but I do think that -- I don't think anyone here just wants vacant buildings that can't be leased, because they are not actually meeting a need in the market and that's right now kind of what we have. This flex use is overly strict. It's moving in the right direction and I appreciate that. In the letter we sent -- I'm sorry I'm taking too much time here. The letter we sent we proposed 15 percent office and showroom in the mixed employment zone and, then, 20 percent in the C-G zone as you step from, you

know, commercial to mixed employment to industrial, which is what really that mixed employment zone is designed for and I got a little -- little bit overly excited with data and graphs in my -- in what I presented just based on our portfolio, but that would at least allow us to appeal to, you know, half -- 50 percent plus of flex tenants that are out there and, hopefully, get these buildings leased up. So, thank you. Sorry I took too much time.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, no one else has signed up.

Lorcher: Anybody else in Chambers?

Wardle: Madam Chair, Commission Members, Mike Wardle, Brighton Corporation. 2929 West Navigator, Meridian. 83642. Our particular interest really is on the private street standards and as Bill noted it wasn't on the staff's radar particularly, but we found through our age qualified projects and some in-fill that we have been doing that there has been some challenges with the way that the -- the code -- sometimes it's interpretation, but still there were some issues that we brought forward to staff and, then, over the course of many months there has been a lot of participation with the staff, as well as other community members on these, standards along with the others that they brought forward. So, through that participation we are pleased with the outcome that is before you and we encourage your recommendation for the plan -- of the planning commission to recommend approval to the City Council and I would just note one item. We are talking private streets, not common driveways, which was your concern, Madam Chair. But I would also note -- and it's been a standard before, but it's reiterated in the proposed new standards that staff has recommended. It's three -- 3F-4A-8, says comply with the ACHD structural standards for streets as shown on design and construction documents prepared and certified by a registered professional engineer and in all of our projects that we have done -- and you are probably acquainted with our Cadence product. We have three communities in place and another that will be in front of you soon. We have always designed those and constructed those to ACHD standards as though it was going to be their street period. We have never done anything less than that. So, we support what staff has brought forth and presented to you and encourage you to pass on that affirmative recommendation.

Lorcher: All right. Thank you very much.

Wardle: Thank you.

Lorcher: Anybody else in Chambers? Hi. If you could state your name and address for the record that be great.

LeClaire: My name is Tom LeClaire. I live at 1923 East Pratt in Meridian and I'm a member of the Meridian Transportation Commission.

Lorcher: Okay.

LeClaire: We -- we received a transmission from ACHD in May and it was a drive-through business. You probably saw it, too. But they -- the ACHD required them to attach a queuing analysis with engineering stamp and -- and they asked our group if -- if the city was planning to set standards for drive-through businesses and we were told the UDC group is working on it. So, as I read through these, though, I don't -- and I don't know if it needs to say that, but it might be something to think about. Is if our standard is not met should there be some kind of language referring to a queuing analysis may be required by ACHD, where the -- it just -- there is -- there is a -- they want us to have a standard and yet they are really the ones that would implement such a standard and so I guess that's the concern I have about this is is there a gap in there between what the city is going to require and what ACHD may do based on what we require and so that's just some feedback to this process and I didn't want to -- I don't know how I would vote if I was in your shoes, honestly, but it gives me some pause to wonder does the city need these standards? Is this something ACHD is going to do on a case-by-case basis anyway? And so those are some thoughts and maybe staff can -- can provide thoughts to those questions. So, that's all I had and I just wanted to share those concerns with your group and wish you well in considering this ordinance.

Lorcher: All right. Thank you very much.

Parsons: Madam Chair, Members of the Commission --

Lorcher: Madam Clerk, is that it for public testimony including online?

Lomeli: Yes, Madam Chair, that is it.

Lorcher: Okay. We have some comments from you?

Parsons: Yeah. I'm happy to address the public testimony that we got, because it -- it was a topic of discussion with the UDC focus group and we did the same thing. We went -- I'm sure you had ACHD staff come and say, yep, we require it, but it's not all the time or it's only in certain circumstances. So, they couldn't tell you when it was required or when it wasn't and so my experience in working with the UDC focus group and the industry experts that does drive-throughs throughout the country, we landed on saying provide a queuing exhibit like you see in number seven. Certainly I am not a queuing analysis expert or transportation expert, but I know that I have seen a few queuing analyses -- wow, that's a mouthful -- and the reason why it was required by ACHD was because they were concerned it was going -- the vehicles were going to stack on the adjacent roadways -- the public right of way. So, they use their professional judgment and, then, say, yeah, we need you to provide this to make sure it shows how it works, just like a traffic study. So, we couldn't really come up with a standard to say when a queuing analysis would be required and when it wouldn't be and so the gentleman and I that crafted this language we agreed that that queuing exhibit made a lot more sense, because, then, you can see the number of vehicles that can fit in those stacking lanes

and determine whether or not it can meet the requirements and you can -- then I took it one step further and said, well, we are not going to allow you to count Toyota Priuses as your length, we are going to require minimum vehicle length and that's where I came up with 20 feet. So, if you go up above it says for tier -- for stacking lanes we are looking at tier two or number six there, it says six vehicles for tier two. So, you are looking at a minimum of two drive-through stacking lanes at 240 feet. Again, that won't address the In-N-Outs of the world or the Chick-fil-As at busy times, but it will allow a lot of stacking to occur on the property more than what you would see at a -- and that's why we put some thought into breaking them out into the tier one, tier two, tier three, because we know not all of them are alike. So, again, this -- this took some of what I learned from my experiences looking at other code and, then, making it work for Meridian and so this does go above and beyond some of the codes that I have seen out there as well. So, I -- I don't -- I won't profess that it's perfect. I think ACHD will still have that right to ask for that queuing analysis on a case by case basis and, again, the city does transmit its applications to them, so, whether it's in front of you or us transmitting it to them through our certificate and zoning compliance process, they get a copy of the application and have access to the plans and if they want those -- ask for that information the applicant will work with ACHD and provide that information as part of the application.

Lorcher: Well, I also like the fact that if they don't fit into tier one, tier two or tier three and if it is, you know, a completely different animal compared to what fits in those three categories, they still have the ability to come to Council to have a conditional use permit and variances. So, you are right, it may not check all the boxes, but at least there is three standard mechanisms and also a flexible mechanism in place to be able to accommodate whatever kind of growth might come next and I would imagine with any kind of UDC text amendment if it's not working for the city we could also amend again as our city continues to change and grow so -- okay. Any other comments in regard to -- well, Mr. Wardle complimented the private streets. So, I think we have kind of hit the -- hit the mark on that one. Any other comments in regard to flex use?

Garrett: Yeah. I'm a big believer in having more flexibility in that area, now the definition, as opposed to less. Hearing from the industry I think that that gives us a handle on some of that, as opposed to -- I have no idea what, who and why somebody would occupy a building like that, but, obviously, the builders know far better than we do. So, having a little more flexibility in the definition I think would help.

Lorcher: So, would you support less than 30 percent showroom space and -- as far as what -- what the city is asking for right now as far as the percentages of use?

Garrett: Yes.

Lorcher: Okay.

Garrett: Just because I think that gives -- gives the developer a little more opportunity and, of course, the more buildings get occupied the more tax base for the city.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: I guess where I stand on that it's -- it's a question of, you know, we heard about, you know, warehouse space -- office space is maybe up to seven percent. I guess my question, then, is what about that gap of seven to -- seven to 20 percent -- seven to 25, something to -- yeah. Twenty-nine. Under the existing code. I think -- I think in the letter the request was for ten percent. I don't know that it was necessarily even for that -- for that small of a gap, but I'm curious of say here at 12 percent office space where does that land you? Does that still keep you in warehouse? And is there at least a space for that?

Hood: So, Madam Chair, I'm not -- I'm not sure that I can totally answer that question without having like a specific plan in front of me. I will just try to answer it a little bit, but on the fringes. Just back to my comment about -- we want -- we want flexibility, too. We are not trying to be so rigid and strict in some of these things. But, again, in the commercial districts -- even the C-G zones that are on the fringe and may be bought up, trying to protect some of those jobs even, it's not -- it's not just even about the tax base, it's about the jobs that we may be losing out on if the square footage -- the proportion of jobs to, you know, in a retailer square foot versus a warehouse square foot is less and so there is -- there is some of those components that even play into this. But I guess my comment was going to be to somewhat answer your question. Flexibility -- even things like the lavatories and hallways and things like that, like we are usually pretty generous in counting those towards your non-warehouse square footages. Building Code comes into play at some point, too, and what type of occupancy you need as well. So, it's -- it's a little more complex than seven or 12 percent. It kind of depends on how things are demised and separated and the type of occupancy you need in some -- some areas. So, this is pretty high level planning code. Building Code comes into play at some point, too. And, yeah, I'm sorry, I just -- I can't fully answer that.

Smith: That's fine. I guess my question is is there -- you know, regardless of the specific use or specific plan or what the -- what is constituted -- as non-warehouse use, if I am in that gap, you know, I guess what is -- what is the -- the plan? It sounds like from some of the public testimony that really the answer is CUP. But is -- is that, basically, the only output if you are in that gap between that seven for warehouse and -- and 30 for -- for flex, that seems like a big space and so I guess I'm just curious what is the -- what is the way that they can have some non-super burdensome --

Hood: A CUP may be the way -- and I will just say it, a CUP is not super burdensome. It is -- it is a process and it does take some time and some money and some expense. I'm not trying to totally downplay that. But in a situation like that that may be appropriate. I mean having to go through a public hearing for something that's marginal at best, in my opinion, may be the best way forward. At least you get your day in court; right? You can make a case for it at least. Again, I think there is a lot that goes into that. So, depending on what the -- these -- these gap projects or gap scenarios or



whatever you want to call them, I would really like to see if we can get there. So, again, what does the building even look like? You know, how can we -- how can we work with developers on some of these things to make it fit? That's really what it is about, about fit here. It's not even -- to me -- it's not so much about the percentage of the floor space, it's what are you doing in the building? The example I mentioned before -- they have corporate offices, but it's not as big as their retail or their -- we could call them whatever -- they had options; right? We could call them offices. We could call them retail. We could call them flex. What's in their best interest? What's in the city's best interest? How does the building fit on the property in that specific situation? Yes, there is some code. The flex space is really meant to have a caveat to say, okay, to differentiate you from a warehouse you need to have some of this or else you are just a warehouse. If you are seven percent, sorry, you're a warehouse. You know, that's kind of where I'm at. Like even eight percent I'm like that's a pretty small percentage. If there is another number -- I mean, again, I'm open to some of that, but that's what we are trying to protect against again. So, I do appreciate -- I will just say -- well, that, you know, everyone stayed this late and for the comments and the letters and the feedback. So, do appreciate that. But I -- it could be tough. We will work with them at the end of the day it may be a CUP. It may be no. It may be, yeah, you got to go to another community, quite honestly. Again, we are trying to protect some jobs, the integrity of the future buildings potentially.

Lorcher: Previous to this revision in regard to flex space with the percentages of 30 percent being front of the house and the rest being back of the house, is that always been the consistent number or was it higher before in flex space?

Hood: Bill might be able to -- I'm not aware of us changing it ever. I think this has been the standard.

Lorcher: So, 30 percent has been our standard in our city for quite a while. So, there is really no change there.

Hood: Again, we thought -- I thought I was being helpful in opening it up a little bit more to say, okay, yeah, let's have a lesser percent in some of these other zones. It's just been 30 percent in all zones to qualify as flex.

Lorcher: Got you.

Hood: We are like okay.

Lorcher: And so there is really is no -- no change in that language at all. But the develop -- I mean I understand from a developer standpoint or owner like Adler, who wants to be able to create more marketing opportunities to be able to sell their space by saying you don't have to have 30 percent, maybe it's 20 percent front of the house and, then, you know, whatever else is -- and you still can be in that flex space. But what you are telling me is that 30 percent has been the standard for quite a while. That part hasn't changed.

Hood: Absolutely. For quite a while. I don't know -- I'm not going to say 20 years, but as far as I know it's been --

Lorcher: Quite a while.

Hood: -- years. I don't remember us changing it.

Lorcher: Okay.

Parsons: Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, it's funny you bring that up, because Adler -- although it wasn't Adler at the time was at the table when we came up with the flex space standards. We worked with Brad Miller. He sat on there and I know even at that time he thought 30 was high. But, again, as Caleb mentioned, the -- it really is a quasi-industrial use. So, you are -- we are skirting that -- that line between a commercial versus industrial and it's -- that's why we call it flex space. I don't think Boise even has a flex space definition in their code if I'm not -- so they just like, yeah, if it's allowed in the district you kind of go in there and you are this use. So, although I think we -- we are trying to create flexibility here, it's -- sometimes it does confuse our applicants as to what that really means and that's -- I think Caleb is trying to do his best -- or staff is trying to do our best to say we -- we want to be flexible. We hear you, but at the same time we don't want to go so far that now we have created an industrial use in a -- in a C-G zone or a commercial district. It really -- for staff -- or at least my experience in planning -- current planning is everything -- everything we do is about compatibility. The context. What is developed around it. The example Will gave with the Ten Mile Crossing property, he is part of a large mixed use commercial development. His buildings blend in. So, to me in that situation if code were different I would say I am good with something more industrial in nature, because it was part of -- it's store -- it's around storage. It blends in. It's part of that. It's -- it could fit in that situation. But, like you said, if this was a flex space next to a residential district or an in-fill piece maybe it didn't. It doesn't work. So, to me I think what we can do -- at least if -- if you guys want to change the standards or recommend a change that's certainly within your purview tonight to have Council take that into consideration. But I would like the opportunity to maybe work as we transition to City Council on getting with these industry experts and maybe coming up -- not necessarily a CUP, but maybe coming up with a standard that allows the director to deviate a certain percentage when somebody can demonstrate that it fits in with the character -- or I don't know what that threshold is. I'm just talking, spitballing ideas. But some codes out there do give the director latitude to make those determinations to say, hey, we are willing to let you do 20 percent in the C-G zone if you can demonstrate these things or the 15 percent in the I-L. Give you that five percent deviation in the office if you can show us how you maintain the jobs or whatever -- whatever the threshold may be through how the business operates, because to me that's -- that's -- like Caleb said, there is so many variables to this --

Lorcher: Right.

Parsons: -- I can't sit here and say -- give you the perfect scenario. It's just -- it's impossible, because everything we do it comes down to definitions and how we interpret the code and what that end use can be. Like Caleb says, we have a lot of flexibility, we just have to find where you best fit.

Lorcher: Yeah. One of the things I appreciate about this Commission and this process with the city -- with Planning and Zoning being the first step and, then, City Council being the second step is that each application is addressed on its own merit by itself and that the city -- like what you have told us when we were trained, we want this Commission to say yes, because the planners have done everything that we can to be able to make that box fit into that space, but as our city grows and there is pockets, there is going to be, you know, always certain circumstances and what you are suggesting here for this UDC text amendment is the beginning of the discussion, the baseline of the conversation; right? And, then, like you said, maybe having the director or even through the CUP process, having that flexibility. It's like, you know, it does fit, but, you know, this is -- this is our goal, but in your case, because you are right next to FedEx, you know, maybe this warehousing does comply with only 15 percent front and, then, you know, the rest of the back, because we treat each application individually. But I also understand that as a city we have to have a code and a standard and a place to start, a minimum, and that's where the variances come in. So, as we go through this process with the City Council and it would be interesting to see what they say as far as flex space, maybe there is some language in there saying 30 percent is the standard and, you know, with a little asterisk on occasion open for, you know, discussion type of thing. But the standard needs to be written, so --

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: I just -- I want to -- first off I want to thank you. I think we are asking a lot of questions tonight, which the answer is it depends. I think it's probably -- in lawyer -- for lawyers and city staff as far as I understand are probably the most common words. But I think that's kind of where my head's at. I guess I don't know how this comports with the rest of code, but I wonder if there is some way to also -- yeah. In this -- the same way that there is the drive-throughs, there is kind of here is the standard and if not it specifies in the code it's a CUP and I think maybe some of the question marks that -- that I have and maybe some applicants have is that the -- the alternative or the -- the alternative way to gain compliance is unclear. So, I think having that kind of direct -- you know, director level decision maybe in the code or even a CUP as an outlet in the code can be helpful, because I also look at that and I think, well, is there something that maybe I need to go to Council instead of -- of CUP and kind of outlining those a little more quickly. Again, a lot of it depends, but maybe having some more specificity there, so, then, when an applicant like -- like Adler, you know, instead of, hey, there is kind of this extra stuff you got to do and, then, there is -- these -- the other question it's -- instead it's, hey, here is a very clear thing that might take. Here is the expected timeline. Here is the expected cost and you can factor that in, rather than it being kind

of the scary unknown for a potential new tenant. So, less of a question and more I guess I think that's the right path and I think that's worth going -- the path worth going down.

Lorcher: We are still in public testimony; correct? Am I allowed to bring a -- am I allowed to bring a person back up?

Hood: You certainly can. Yeah.

Breshears: Madam Chair, if they are coming up to rebut new information, then, they can come back up. In your discretion.

Goode: Thank you. I wouldn't call it rebut.

Lorcher: Need to call it rebut.

Goode: Okay. Wait, I am rebutting new information. I was responding to new information.

Lorcher: Okay. There you go.

Goode: Will Goode. 8665 West Emerald Street, Boise, Idaho.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Goode: The CUPs -- so, when a tenant is faced with should I lease here or should I lease here and one option requires a CUP, which adds time, money and uncertainty, because CUPs are discretionary, they almost all the time will just choose the other option and to your question, earlier the option for 12 percent is to go into an I-L zone. The -- in Boise you have commercial and you have industrial butting up to each other. Meridian tried to create a mixed employment zone to ease the transition between commercial and industrial and what we are trying to do is thread the needle of what does that transition look like? If you will notice right now, if you look at your land use map, there is hardly any mixed employment land that's developed, because it's not developable. The -- because warehouse isn't allowed -- most things aren't allowed. Building materials isn't allowed. So, flex is allowed, but of our four million square feet, one and a half percent of it has greater than 30 percent office and showroom. We can't build a building to appeal to one and a half percent of the market. I can't convince investors. I can't -- I can't convince anyone to get behind that. So, the CUP usually will just scare away a tenant unfortunately. I wish it didn't. And, yeah, 12 percent means you just go to an I-L zone basically, so -- thank you for the --

Lorcher: Thank you. Okay. Did you have any other comments before we close the public hearing? No? Commissioners, any other questions before we close the public hearing? Can I get a motion to close the public hearing?

Smith: So moved.

Perreault: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing on Item No. ZOA-2025-0001. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Lorcher: Well, this is a stacked deck, isn't it? I think all the changes that -- for this particular text amendment are in the best interest of the city. It defines things a little bit differently and I'm talking about all of them, not anything in specific. For -- for me personally. You know, I wrote down that the drive-throughs -- if they don't fit the -- the categories they have the CUP. The ADUs for -- for safety, for the primary structure, for addressing, all makes sense. The flex space, the 30 percent is a -- is a good start, but it's sounding like the market is saying that they need less. So, that's maybe a conversation that, you know, when it gets to the City Council they -- they can look at, but we need a standard and it sounds like that's been the standard. Home occupation with the -- the swimming I think is a lovely idea. Consistency in fencing and the private streets, you know, all seem to make sense without a lot of controversy. I think as we continue with the industry and City Council working with the flex space, I'm sure we can come up with some language that would be able to bridge developers in the city and what's in the best interest of both to be able to move our city forward. So, I'm in favor of the things that are -- the way they are written right now.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: I think I tend to agree with you. I -- I -- it seems to me a lot of the flex space issues also kind of more targeted around that, you know, I-L I mean kind of area where it might be 20 percent -- maybe it's not the 30 percent areas, the CCUs, that it's -- it's the huge issue, but it's those -- those more border -- borderline cases and maybe there is a case for rolling that 20 percent down to 15, but leaving everything else the same. I think there is maybe some discussion that, you know, staff can have before this gets to Council and some discussion at Council about that. But I think -- I think, really, the question is is the City of Meridian going to be seriously hurting if we get this wrong in the sense of, yeah, what will hurt more if we get it wrong in what direction. If we have the ratios too low and, then, the anticipated kind of uses of the zoning kind of aren't aligned with what the plan is, I think that's more harmful than, you know, maybe we take a more temperamental -- more of a slow and steady reduction to kind of try to thread the needle and find the right percentages there. So, I think -- yeah, I see the argument for a lower percent and very well may get there at some point, but I don't know that it's an urgent enough case to do it right now and that we need to jump at lowering the numbers. Maybe -- maybe in six months, a year, two years that ends up with -- that's what it ends up at, but I think -- I think I'm okay with where staff is at now, especially

with some sort of mechanism, especially at the director level to help maybe limit some of the CUP concerns and some of the City Council concerns, but even, then, you know, having a more clear path for variance I think will be helpful.

Garrett: I have a comment. I'm on the other side of that, because I think the minute you time -- you add time or variable people are reticent to invest their money and add time to it, because time is money for them and especially if they are having to borrow money or if he is looking for investors. Any developer is looking for that investor or that bank and the longer things go the more it costs and so they are going to say I'm going to go somewhere else. So, I think if we are serious as a city to encouraging these types of businesses and having this flex zone somehow we have to communicate that we are flexible. You know, you -- you can't go down to five percent, but, you know, if you are at 15 or 20, yeah, we are happy to look at it. So, somehow in that way I think we have to communicate that out and, obviously, you know, if we are competing against other municipalities they are going to go elsewhere and, then, we end up with raw land unused.

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: I'm going to somewhat land in the middle here. I really like Bill's idea about taking that time to sit down with our stakeholders and our commercial developers and fleshing that out more, seeing if we can come to a little bit more detail on that and figuring out if there are some criteria that would allow those percentages to change up or down. Maybe we start talking minimums instead of maximums and I feel like that -- I think that it would be better for us to have more information to -- before the decision is made and I would like to see that happen before Council, if possible. I don't know what the time frame is, but I will leave that to you all. But I think that would be really wise on our part, so that -- not that staff doesn't already have a really good grasp on what's going on with -- with commercial development, but just as that -- you know, just the opportunity for the community to have a little bit more voice in it and see if there is some way that we can -- as far as -- I understand what Commissioner Smith is saying. I -- as far as like director level decisions and there still has to be kind of a criteria that the director follows. So, one way or the other you are still developing some additional criteria that says, hey, we are going to agree to this or we are not going to agree to that. Whoever the decision maker is.

Lorcher: Right.

Perreault: So --

Lorcher: So, are you suggesting a continuance, so that they come back with the flex space or do we make a -- vote a motion with a condition that -- that conversation happens before Council?

Perreault: If the Commission wants to -- wants staff to do that and come back before us and have another discussion, then, yes, we would continue it.

Lorcher: Right.

Perreault: If --

Lorcher: Is that what you are suggesting?

Perreault: No. No. No. I'm suggesting that staff have those conversations hopefully before Council. Yeah. If it's possible. I don't know what your time frame is.

Hood: Well, Madam Chair, I mean I certainly am happy to talk to Will more about it. We have talked about and I understand where they are coming from. I mean we can talk and if you want to change percentages that's up to you. I'm trying to keep an open mind, but I don't see -- this is already going that direction. If you want to make it 20, then, that's a motion and you can make it 20. I don't know that me talking to Will anymore is going to be -- again, I enjoy our conversations, but I don't know that either one of us are going to be convinced. So, it's fine, I get his perspective. I think I understand everything and I -- if I'm in his shoes I under -- I'm writing the same letter. I have a different -- I wear different shoes, though, and I have a different perspective and you do as well. So, if you want to change it, then, you can make that motion, a continuance to talk about it some more I'm afraid is not going to change staff's recommendation at this point. What I will commit to, irregardless of what you do and ultimately what the Council does, we will continue to monitor it and be back in six months, a year, two, three -- I don't know how long, but we will monitor it still. I'm not too worried about vacant land just sitting there. That hasn't been a problem for the last 20 years. I'm not saying we are trying to be, you know, a -- you know, obstinate to development, but we want the right type of development. That's what this is really all about. If you want just development we could -- why have zoning? Just -- we get rid of all the zoning codes and people -- let people go crazy. Okay. If that's what you want to do make that part of your motion. And, again, I can meet with Will and I will before we go to Council. I don't know what that's going to gain anyone necessarily; right?

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: I apologize, I got the impression that you hadn't had those conversations. You had mentioned something along the lines of maybe not having had as many conversations and I -- with stakeholders and I didn't know if it was about this specific issue or other issues in -- in -- in the code changes that are recommended.

Hood: So, Madam Chair, maybe just a little bit of what's happened over the last couple of years. Will has not been part of our tighter UDC focus group, but for the last meeting, maybe two. We have talked about it on and off, though, through other interactions we have with developer stakeholder groups and other things. So, we have had conversations over the time -- over the last six months or more even going back. So, again, I'm -- I'm trying to be open minded and listen, I just can't take everything and just

make those changes in good confidence with what I feel is in the best interest of the community. But that -- that is my just professional opinion. I mean I will -- again I will talk -- I will talk to him. We will talk maybe even right after this meeting. I know it's getting late, but I will definitely connect with him between now and Council. I just don't know that's going to equate to any real change, because I feel like we have -- we have been having some of those conversations and this is where we have landed for now.

Lorcher: Right.

Hood: It's a change in the right direction. Is it all the way to there? Maybe, maybe not. We will keep tracking it and can come back again if we need to change it more.

Smith: Madam Chair, I think -- I think that's -- to clarify, I think where I'm at that's kind of my position. I'm thinking of this as, you know, lowering the limit is like adding salt to a dish, or you can always add a little bit more, you can always reduce a little bit more, but it's really hard to -- when you add too much salt -- when you lower the limit too much --

Lorcher: Right.

Smith: -- there is -- there is -- there is that risk there and so -- yeah, I do think, you know, those numbers maybe matter to the applicants and they matter to the developer. I think it's more of a question of how hard pressed the city is right now at this very second to get that -- those -- that ME zone or those specific zones developed. We want to see them used -- developed and use, but I think it's a question of are we -- are we under the gun really trying to get them developed now and that's a different conversation. I don't think that's where we are at and so I think this is an opportunity for, you know, if we still land high we can -- we can come back around I think to Caleb's point and, you know, try -- try getting a little lower if that's still a need. I think, you know, I think there is a risk here of mistaking a step in the right direction or a step in the wrong one, just because it's not a big enough step and so I think -- I think this is -- I think this is good. I think this is really good. And, again, I really do like -- to -- Commissioner Perreault, to your point about having some standard, I do like kind of -- Bill, maybe -- maybe an offhand idea, but I think a good one of having that, again, specifically a five percent discretion, you know, I think that might help cover a lot of the ground. I know some of the letters asked for five percent lower and so if we can say, hey, it is five percent lower if you can do these things and there is -- there is that director discretion, I think there is -- that is helpful there. I don't know if that's something that gets workshopped a little bit and brought before Council, I don't know if we make a motion tonight to leave that up to rest of the Commission. I don't know if that's baked enough for that. But I think that's the direction that makes more sense to go, rather than dropping it and trying to drop it now or make a big drastic change to it.

Lorcher: Well, knowing that City Council is going to be very aware of our conversation about flex space and it's probably going to be presented again at Council as well, I -- you know, I don't see us being the governing body to make that change here. The 30 percent, you know, can stay and in the meantime stakeholders and the city can



continue to talk and, then, when it goes to Council it will -- it will come up again and if the city feels at this point in time that it is in the best interest of the city to change that standard, then, that's when it will come up. So, with that in mind -- after considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I recommend to approve of File No. ZOA-2025-0001 as presented the staff report of the hearing date June 26, 2025, to City Council.

Smith: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to approve the UDC text amendment. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed?

Garrett: Opposed.

Lorcher: City Clerk -- Madam Clerk, you can note the denial and it is still three to one. So, motion passes.

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Lorcher: Do we need to do anything with the other document reports that were listed on the agenda? Then I will take one more motion. Yes? We do want to talk about the document report. Okay. Or department, not documents. I can't even read my own handwriting. Department Reports. Thank you for coming.

## **DEPARTMENT REPORTS**

### **11. Proposed Updates to Meridian City Code Title 8 Regarding Addressing**

McClure: Members of the Commission, this is -- as previously noted an information item only. P&Z makes formal recommendations to City Council on Title 11. This is Title 8. However, P&Z does make on occasion decisions regarding Title 8 addressing and we still would like to have your input if you have any on it to share with City Council.

Lorcher: Okay.

McClure: I will keep this brief, but since I don't get to talk about addressing to you very often, it's usually the comp plan or something else, I thought I would just give you a little recap of what it is, especially for the newer commissioners. So, our addressing technicians do code compliance, participate in interagency reviews and there is a great deal of technical workflows, not just within the city, but multiple agencies. We have an interagency data sharing system called ACX, for which Ada County leads and Boise and Meridian are part of. Sorry. Wrong slide. This is just a simple infographic sort of showing where addressing data goes, sort of what I just mentioned, and, then, you will note it goes to Esri, Google Maps, a whole lot of different services and systems. It's using a lot of things. Basically every permit through the city. Finance uses it for billing addressing. There is a lot of behind the scene work there. It's also much more complex

than this. Ada county has an extensive number of workflows that are far more advanced than this. On the city side we have our own workflows. It's also multiple database systems talking to each other and working back and forth, not trying to oversell it, it's just very complex and there is a lot of review that goes into it. Back to the purpose of the update tonight. You all have a detailed memo in your packet. I'm not going to go over those in great depth, but I will sort of cover high level what those topics are and, then, if you have any specific areas you want to discuss I would love to do that with you. This first topic area, as Caleb mentioned earlier, relates to Title 11 UDC changes and specifically accessory dwelling units. Both changes in Title 8 and Title 11 are intended to align with building code as a sort of the cornerstone or anchor. High level. We are adding in some very broad definitions for single, multi and accessory dwellings. A few cleanup changes as a result of those definitions and, then, sort of defining -- and this is the important part -- when an ADU gets addressed. This is a little complex for me, so I'm just going to sort of explain it the way I was told and understood it. I apologize for that. Lots of things by definition. You know, even in Title 11 are an ADU. Then there is the standards in Title 11 or Title 10 building code, the standards. So, you can be an ADU, but you can be an illegal ADU just like you can be an ADU that meets all of our standards the big change here is in order to get an address and you -- if you meet those standards you will get an address, whether you decide to use it or not. And if you do not meet those standards, if you are, quote, an illegal ADU, you will not get an address. The reason for that is some direction basically the city was told to go after -- I'm going get it right. We were basically told to go that way. So, there is -- there was a judge involved and there were some comments earlier about -- about some news -- news a couple years ago. The second round of changes are consistency and clean up for the most part. They generally involve multi-unit residential or suites. So, apartments or suites. The first big change is to basically decide that we are not going to follow a system previously where buildings were addressed based off whether they were under single or common ownership in an apartment complex. The Postal Service does not like doing that anymore. They have asked us not to do that. What that means is we are not going to give buildings letter identifiers anymore. So, you have not Building A, not Building B, with their own apartment -- apartments and, then, it's now each one of those buildings has their own address. This is actually helpful for the city as well, because we don't determine when a property might be subdivided later -- later on and if it is subdivided, then, each one of those buildings has to, then, be readdressed, which is a nightmare. So, it's -- we have already been doing this, but it reflects sort of direction from USPS. The second one. There are four suites. This area is one where we have a lot of direction from a number of different systems, including NENA or the 9-1-1 Association, fire and building code. Again, USPS. Others. They don't provide a lot of direction on how we should address suites or apartments for that matter, except that we want to be consistent in how we do it. We haven't always been super consistent in a few areas. We have lost institutional -- institutional knowledge. Things have changed. But some of the things that we have been consistent on we are now codifying, so that there is some less -- there is less external pressure of telling us, you know, what someone wants to do, rather than what we need to do for 9-1-1 or emergency purposes and, then, there is some other ones where we recognize we haven't been doing them great apartment -- apartment numbers, for example, and what

I call pinwheel, so external access single floor sort of units, not walk-up garden style or mid-rise internal hallway sort of apartments. Standardizing how we do those and making it more consistent with everything else we are doing. That's really high level. I'm happy to dive into any of the specific code changes if you want, if you -- something you just want us to share with Council I'm happy to do that. I will note we also added some diagrams just help people understand some of the common things we see and are asked about. Yeah. I will stand for any questions.

Lorcher: The only question I have is that everything is moving -- going forward or are you going to -- are you going to retro any of this stuff? Like -- well, specifically with like the ADUs, you know, is it only new applications that come through or have you identified if somebody changed their -- you know, put a unit in the backyard and it was illegal and now it's going to be legal, because code enforcement asked them to go through the process, you know, are you searching them out or are you just waiting for them to come to you as they are identified as we go forward?

McClure: Commission President, that's -- that's a great question. This is primarily intended for moving forward. However, we will be working to go back through our Enterprise system and find previously approved ADUs that meet those standards and add them to the system and add addresses if they don't already have them and, then, we will modify it as we become aware of issues, but we are not going to do a complete overhaul and trying to figure out where all the legal ones are or whether they approve or could be approved or --

Lorcher: Right. And same with apartment buildings, so no more letters, but the ones that already have them will still be identify them as --

McClure: Correct. We are not going to up -- upend everyone's lives. Yeah.

Lorcher: Okay. Okay. That was all. Any comments from you? There is nothing to really approve, but thank you for sharing. So, I think it seems very straightforward and cleaning up changes and making life easier for the post office and the city seems to make a lot of sense. So, thank you very much.

McClure: Thank you.

Lorcher: All right. I will take one more motion.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Move to adjourn.

Perreault: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to adjourn. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 10:13 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS. )

APPROVED

\_\_\_\_\_  
MARIA LORCHER - CHAIRMAN

\_\_\_\_\_|\_\_\_\_\_|\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK