

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

McCarvel: And I'm guessing by looking at the clock my fellow Commissioners would like a five minute break before we continue. Okay. See you in five.

(Recess: 7:59 p.m. to 8:06 p.m.)

7. Public Hearing for Hatch Industrial (H-2021-0026) by Hatch Design Architecture, Located on the East Side of N. Linder Rd. and the North Side of W. Franklin Rd., South of the Railroad Tracks, and at 160 N. Linder Rd.

- A. Request: Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map to change the future land use designation on 42 +/- acres of land from Mixed Use – Community to Industrial.
- B. Request: Annexation of 1.59 acres of land with an I-L (Light Industrial) zoning district.

McCarvel: All right. We will resume the meeting here tonight with H-2021-0026, Hatch Industrial, and we will begin with the staff report.

Parsons: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. Next item on the agenda is Hatch Industrial. The application before you this evening includes a Comprehensive Plan map amendment and annexation. You can see here that there are several properties that are currently annexed and zoned within the city. As part of the application with the Comprehensive Plan map amendment that encompasses approximately 42 acres and is -- and the annexation request itself is approximately 1.59 acres in total. Current zoning in this area consists of C-C, R-1 in Ada county, L-O and I-L or -- yes. Moving on here you can see here the exhibit on the left-hand side shows you which area is currently part mixed use community and the applicant is here tonight to, again, change that designation from mixed use community to light industrial. So, going from a light beige to a gray, if you will. Back in 2019 this body actually did approve a Comprehensive Plan map amendment and a rezone for these two lots that fronted on Franklin Road and that was in -- as we were -- prior to the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan I should say -- or the new Comprehensive Plan and so the city always envisioned that this larger mixed use area may change at some time in the future. If you look at the aerial for this particular site, if I step back here, you can see that a lot of it is already slated or developed as industrial uses. So, in our -- in our opinion it makes some sense to change the future land use map to mimic what's actually occurring in the surrounding area. A couple of the projects, like along the north boundary just south of the railroad tracks, is an existing daycare center that is currently L-O and there is also a birthing center that's zoned C-C right in the middle of the proposed development as well -- or at least the comp plan change. I would let this body know that just because we are changing the color of the map does not affect the zoning or the current operations of those businesses. Any of the county residents that are currently zoned R-1 will have the ability to annex at

some point with an I-L zoning designation. The other reason why staff supports the Comprehensive Plan map amendment is if you look at -- again because a lot of the area is already developed and the -- the properties that are currently in the county are R-1 and long narrow strips of property, it doesn't seem feasible -- feasible from staff's standpoint that there will be a true mix of uses in the area. If you recall, a mixed use community designation likes to have a minimum of three land use types and no less than 20 percent residential. Again, we don't see that this will be a viable use -- or at least a valuable mixed use project in the future and that's why we are supporting the Comprehensive Plan map amendment. The exhibit on the right-hand side -- you can see is the portion that the applicant is proposing to annex in and it's that -- essentially two lots within the county, zoned R-1, and, then, the exhibit below shows you the existing zoning that's surrounding this property. As you know as part of annexation request the applicants do provide us a concept plan to show you what they envision to develop on the property. The applicant is here tonight to discuss with you developing approximately an 20,000 square foot multi-tenant industrial building. Don't have any uses proposed at this time, but they envision contractors yards, flex space, potentially some warehousing here. You can see here that the main access is off of Linder Road and the applicant is also providing cross-access to the property owner to the north and on the south, which is consistent with UDC standards. I would mention to you that the uses that the applicant is proposing only requires a certificate of zoning compliance and design review in the future. So, this is pretty -- again, if -- if the Comprehensive Plan map amendment gets approved, the request for I-L is consistent with that request. The applicant -- because the applicant does have county residents on either side along the north and the south, they are required to provide a 25 foot landscape buffer on those boundaries. The applicant has gone to both of those property owners and gotten consent, so to speak, agreeing to allowing a reduced buffer if and when they decided to develop this property. The Council, as part of the annexation request, will take -- will take that reduction under consideration as part of their approval. But I did just want to let you know that it does take Council waiver to allow the reduction in that buffer, but the applicant does have written agreements from both property owners that they are in agreement with that. The landscape buffers that you see on the concept plan here. I looked at the public record before the hearing for -- the property owners that are part of the Comprehensive Plan map amendment have provided written testimony in support of this application. I believe the applicant is also in agreement with the staff report. So, again, staff is recommending approval of the Comprehensive Plan map amendment and the annexation request with the requirement of a development agreement and those provisions are contained in the staff report. With that I will conclude my presentation and stand for any questions you may have.

McCarvel: Thank you. Would the applicant like to come forward?

Hatch: Good evening. Jeff Hatch with Hatch Design Architecture. Our address is 200 West 36th Street, Boise, Idaho. 83714. Good evening, Chairman McCarvel and Commissioners. Thank you for your consideration of our annexation application this evening. As Bill did a great job recapping, basically, we are wanting to clean up the future land use map zoning in this area based on the existing uses that are already there. We have some tilt up industrial buildings to the east. We have industrial to the west. We got

railroad tracks to the north, which complements industrial. We got a canal to the south. So, most of the property that's being annexed -- or being rezoned, not annexed -- being zoned is already in use in the industrial nature. To do this type of application it's not something that you can do in a couple months. We have been working on this for about a year now, because we have to go meet with each of these property owners. We got to discuss the intent of this future land use map amendment and what that does to them. Educate them on the nature of what a land use map amendment does versus annexation and how they aren't the same thing and you are not annexing their property for them into the city and all that takes time to educate people. In addition, looking at the -- at the property, even -- to the east we have the two highlighted parcels in the middle in the blue color are the ones that are actually being proposed -- my applicant's -- or property owners to be annexed to the city. You can see a little bit better here photos of the industrial nature to the east and to the west as well. Recapping our proposed site plan, we had to spend several months discussing with the property owner to the north and more particularly the property owner to the south to obtain written approval for the buffer reduction. Really what -- what they concluded was, well, you know, eventually we are going to be industrial in nature like properties to the east of us and so we are in favor and in support of this. We were able to put in our presentation -- the written approval from the applicant to the north. The applicant to the south is actually building a house in a remote area. We caught him at Cabela's this afternoon and he mailed that letter signed to Bill about ten minutes before this hearing started. So, just under the wire, but we did get all the clear documentation and really had been trying to get that for about six months. So, it's not -- not a short order task to get those reductions and communicate that to the public in a way that they understand and are comfortable signing their name to. A lot of legwork, a lot of effort in getting what's proposed. A couple other things on the site plan. We have a utility easement of 30 feet on the east, which in discussions with -- with Idaho Power may be something that's abandoned in the future and may be an opportunity for some kind of industrial use to the east as well in talking with that property owner. So, there is some -- some collective collaboration that may transpire there for potential connectivity. But for now we are proposing connectivity to the future use in the south, future use to the north to reduce congestion on Linder and really kind of set the precedence for that kind of business use and reducing traffic on -- on Linder Road with this application. As -- as Bill had described, we have a concept for industrial businesses to be able to utilize this, but it's set up so you have a bathroom core, potential for an office, potential for warehousing. You have a range of flexibility of uses or the space that are complementary to the industrial nature of the area, but we would like to think it -- since you have some street frontage, wanted to raise the caliber of that up, the expectation for the neighborhood along Linder, and so have a -- more of a retail frontage on the west. So, a little bit more store front, a little bit more glazing, something that's got some curb appeal, looks a little bit more retail in nature. We have varied the proposed roof heights, again, to add some distinct character and not keep the typical kind of gabled roof that just runs and has a bunch of metal. So, we wanted to make sure that we set a nice proposed structure there as well and I will stand for any questions.

McCarvel: Okay. Thank you. Any questions for staff or the applicant? Okay. Thank you. Madam Clerk, do we have anybody signed up to testify on this application?

Weatherly: Madam Chair, we do not.

McCarvel: Okay. That being said, is there anybody in the room or online who wishes to testify? I'm assuming, then, the applicant has no further remarks. Great.

Hatch: The only remark I have is that Meridian just recently went through a very substantial Comprehensive Plan revisioning about a year or so ago where a lot of this type of zoning was identified. At that time we presented to the Mayor a separate industrial zone off of Fairview at that time without application. They agreed upon that. Talking with staff about a year ago, they said, you know, we didn't -- we didn't get to a point where we could really explain this properly and we think this is the opportunity to clean up much needed industrial land in Meridian and so as a -- as an advocate for that use in Meridian as a need for the city, we just wanted to -- to express our -- our support for this application.

McCarvel: Thank you. Would we like to -- do I have a motion to close public hearing on H-2021-0026?

Seal: So moved.

Yearsley: Second.

McCarvel: It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing on H-2021-0026. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Lorcher: Madam Chair, I will start.

McCarvel: Commissioner Lorcher.

Lorcher: So, right down the street at Pine and Linder is Meridian Storage and in front of there there is several businesses, including the one that I can think of off the top of my head is Ace Auto Body and since we are in transportation we use that business quite frequently and my -- when he presented this, this is kind of the vision of more of that along this corridor. I also know that the City of Meridian is -- is trying to promote Linder to continue on across the freeway and this would be the last busy access point at that point in time. So, if it's going to be light industrial anyway and it seems to have gone that route, this seems to be a good fit.

McCarvel: Any other comments? Motions?

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: I will -- I will just throw a motion out there. I think this is kind of a slam dunk --

McCarvel: Yeah.

Seal: -- in a lot of ways. After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to City Council a file number H-2021-0026 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of September 16th, 2021, with no modifications.

Grove: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to approve H-2021-0026 -- or I'm sorry. Recommend approval of Hatch Industrial with no modifications. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

8. Public Hearing for Fields Sub-Area Plan (H-2021-0047) by City of Meridian, the Location Consisting of Approximately Four (4) Square Miles and Bounded by Chinden Blvd. on the North, McDermott Rd. on the East, McMillan Rd. on the South and Can-Ada Rd. on the West

- A. Request: Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment to incorporate the Fields Sub-Area Plan.

McCarvel: Last on our agenda is H-2021-0047, The Fields Sub -- Sub Area Plan and we will begin with the staff report. All right. Or just presentation. Sorry.

McClure: Good evening, Members of the Planning and Zoning Commission. I'm here tonight to discuss The Field Sub Area Plan with you. My name is Brian McClure and for those who don't know me I'm a long range planner. Caleb Hood is also here and Megan Moore with Logan Simpson, our lead project consultant, is on Zoom. Briefly this is the presentation outline. We will do an intro, cover the background, briefly describe the process, the plan and go over the request and, then, take questions. The Fields Sub Area Plan is a direct continuation of the 2019 Comprehensive Plan. This is a sub area plan with a high priority for Council, which continued funding the work. The application before you tonight is a Comprehensive Plan text amendment. The proposal would be to add this new sub area plan to the list of adopted plans and studies by reference. This is like the Parks and Recreation Master Plan, pathway master plan, Destination Downtown Ten Mile plan, various utility plans and many others. There are no future land use map revisions. As I said, this is a direct continuation of the work and the analysis from the Comprehensive Plan. There are also no proposed annexations or development. Any proposed development with annexations would have their own public hearing process and the city does not engage in forced annexation. This area is unique and so some background and additional context is probably useful. Planning work has been ongoing for more than a decade now. In 2008 that area was formally added to the city's area of impact for Ada county. Land uses assigned at this time were generally considered interim. As a result, there have been multiple studies and white papers, multiple local and regional working groups to look at potential economic activity and patterns of