

Meridian Planning and Zoning Meeting

September 17, 2020.

Meeting of the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission of September 17, 2020, was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chairman Ryan Fitzgerald.

Members Present: Chairman Ryan Fitzgerald, Commissioner Bill Cassinelli, Commissioner Andrew Seal, Commissioner Rhonda McCarvel and Commissioner Nick Grove.

Members Absent: Commissioner Lisa Holland and Commissioner Steven Yearsley.

Others Present: Chris Johnson, Adrienne Weatherly, Andrea Pogue, Bill Parsons, Sonya Allen, Joe Dodson, Alan Tiefenbach, Joe Bongiorno and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

_____ Lisa Holland	___X___ Rhonda McCarvel
___X___ Andrew Seal	___X___ Nick Grove
_____ Steven Yearsley	___X___ Bill Cassinelli
_____X_____ Ryan Fitzgerald - Chairman	

Fitzgerald: Well, at this time I would like to call to order the regularly scheduled meeting of the Meridian Planning and Zoning meeting for the date of September 17th and let's start with roll call.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Fitzgerald: Thank you, Madam Clerk. Appreciate it. First item on the agenda is the adoption of the agenda. We do have several continuances and an application to be vacated. The applications requesting continuance are TM Center and Horse Meadows and the Ada County Coroner by Lombard Conrad and, then, we do have one application to be vacated, which is Compass Pointe. With the approval of the Commission I would like to move those items up on the agenda and we will take care of those first. So, if there is anyone who wants to testify or be a part of the continuation conversation we will have them be able to be bought -- taken care of at the beginning of the meeting and we will move on. Does that work for everyone?

Weatherly Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Yes, ma'am.

Weatherly: Item No. 8, Ada County Coroner will also require a continuance.

Fitzgerald: Yes, ma'am. I think I had that in my comments. So, with the adjustment of moving those to the top of the agenda, can I get a motion to adopt the agenda as amended?

Cassinelli: So moved.

McCarvel: So moved. Second.

Fitzgerald: I have a motion and a second to adopt the agenda as amended. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

- 1. Approve Minutes of the August 20, 2020 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting**
- 2. Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for Loose Screw Brewery (H-2020-0081) by Mary Murphy, Grand Peak, LLC, Located at 1511 W. McMillan Rd., Ste. 100**

Fitzgerald: Okay. The next item on the agenda is the Consent Agenda. We have two items on the agenda -- or the Consent Agenda. One is the approval of minutes for the August 20th Planning and Zoning Commission meeting and the second is the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for Loose Screw Brewery, H-2020-0081. Does anything need to be pulled out or are we good to move forward with the Consent Agenda? Can I get a motion to approve the Consent Agenda?

Seal: So moved.

McCarvel: Second.

Fitzgerald: I have a motion and a second to approve the Consent Agenda -- Agenda as presented. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Fitzgerald: Real quickly, since we have -- our congratulations to Lisa Holland -- Commissioner Holland, she is going to be out for a few weeks. We are not sure -- give her some time to get used to her new growing family and, then, in talking to the staff, we were hoping that the former chair Commissioner McCarvel will step up and be our vice-chair for a temporary stead -- temporary post as vice-chair, so we know that if I get hit by a bus that somebody will take over and be able to lead us. Commissioner McCarvel, do you have any concerns with that request from the team?

McCarvel: I do not.

Fitzgerald: Any concerns or questions from the Commissioners? Okay. Perfect. Thanks, Commissioner McCarvel. We appreciate it.

ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

ACTION ITEMS

3. Public Hearing for TM Center (H-2020-0074) by SCS Brighton, et al., Located East of S. Ten Mile Rd. and South of W. Franklin Rd.

- A. Request: A Preliminary Plat consisting of 83 buildable lots and 2 common lots on 132.42 acres of land in the R-40, TN-C, C-C and C-G zoning districts.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Moving on to our first item -- action item on the agenda is the request for a continuance for the public hearing for TM Center, file number H-2020-0074, and, Bill, do you want to touch base on this or -- I think -- there is some applications that are moving around that need to catch up with each other. Do you want to touch base on that?

Parsons: Absolutely, Mr. Chair. So, yeah, the applicant, as you can see on your hearing outline, we don't have really a date certain for that hearing item, but the applicant is trying to get some additional applications to catch up with the plat and don't know for sure when that's going to be scheduled for a hearing, but I know we had talked about a date sometime either the second hearing in November or the first one in December for this body to take action on that. So, if that's something -- if you guys need to include a date in your motion this evening, then, that's where I would look at the calendar and either pick the 19th of November or possibly the first hearing in December. Allow the applicant and staff to get that -- get those applications caught up for you.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, Bill. Madam Clerk, do we have anything on the agenda for either one of those dates yet?

Weatherly: Mr. Chair, we do not.

Fitzgerald: Okay. So -- I'm good either way. If we want to move it to -- I'm sure that they would like to get it done sooner rather than later, but there is a lot of moving components about applications. So, either the November 19th date or the December 3rd date. I'm good either way.

McCarvel: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: Do we know -- does staff have any comfort level either way on whether the -- whether those other projects would catch up? Shall we just do December 3rd to be safe or -- I would hate to have to continue it again.

Fitzgerald: I think you are leaning in the direction I was thinking, too, Commissioner McCarvel. Just give it a little bit of -- I think it's a -- it's a big project, a lot of moving pieces, and there is a lot of stuff that needs to go into it. So, with all of the things we have got going on I have no problem moving it to December.

McCarvel: Okay.

Seal: That was the 3rd?

Fitzgerald: If you can follow that with a motion, Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: Sure. I guess that would be appropriate; right? Mr. Chair, I move that we continue TM Center, H-2020-0074, to the hearing date of December 3rd.

Grove: Second.

Fitzgerald: I have a motion and a second to continue the hearing on file number H-2020-0074, TM Center, to the date of December 3rd. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

- 4. Public Hearing for Compass Pointe (H-2020-0062) by A-Team Land Consultants, Located at the Southwest Corner of E. Victory Rd. and S. Locust Grove Rd.**
 - A. Request: Annexation and Zoning of 7.69 acres of land with the R-15 zoning district.
 - B. Request: A Preliminary Plat consisting of 50 single-family attached building lots and 8 common lots on approximately 7.6 acres of land in the R-15 zoning district.
 - C. A Planned Unit Development for the purpose of reducing the rear setback of the R-15 zoning district.

Fitzgerald: Very good. The next item is a public hearing for Compass Pointe, file number H-2020-0062. This application is being requested to be vacated by the city and I will let Bill chime in here, but my understanding is the public -- or the neighborhood meeting that was supposed to be held on this application was almost a year since it was done, so when the application came in it was not properly put forward. It was not legal, because there was not a neighborhood -- proper neighborhood meeting when it came in. So, we need

to start over. Start the process over so everything is done according to code and legal and so the city is going to request we vacate this application, let the applicant resubmit and get rolling again. Bill, is there any -- or, Andrea, either one, do you -- is there any additional we need to add?

Dodson: Mr. Chair, this is Joe.

Fitzgerald: Joe, go ahead.

Dodson: You hit the nail on the head there. That was the exact process that happened, so thank you for clarifying.

Fitzgerald: Thank you for the extra input. So, with that can I get a motion to vacate file H-2020-0062, Compass Pointe, and let them restart their process?

Seal: So moved.

Cassinelli: So moved.

McCarvel: So moved. Second. Third and fourth.

Fitzgerald: I have a motion and a second to vacate the application for H-2020-006, Compass Pointe. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed. Motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

7. Public Hearing Continued from August 20, 2020 for Horse Meadows Subdivision (H-2020-0060) by Riley Planning Services, Located at 710 N. Black Cat Rd.

- A. Request: Rezone of 4.71 acres of land from the R-4 zoning district (Medium-Low Density Residential) to the R-8 zoning district (Medium-Density Residential).
- B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 27 single-family residential lots and 3 common lots on 4.71 acres of land in the R-4 zoning district.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Next item for continuance is the file for Horse Meadows, file number H-2020-0060. Joe, do you want to touch base on this one?

Dodson: Yes, sir, Mr. Chair. So, this application -- I got a request this morning for a continuance. They are going to offer me a revised plat in response to my staff report. The applicant is here if you would like to hear from her -- or the applicant representative, but you do not have to if you would not like to. They are requesting the October 22nd P&Z hearing.

Cassinelli: What date was that?

Dodson: October 22nd, sir.

Cassinelli: Thank you.

Fitzgerald: And I think they are -- Joe's been working closely with them to get their plat to fit into what the city is looking for. So, I have no problem continuing this without additional input.

Seal: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: I move to Continue file number H-2020-0060 for Horse Meadows Subdivision until the date of October 22nd.

McCarvel: Second.

Fitzgerald: I have a motion and a second to continue H-2020-0060. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

8. Public Hearing for Ada County Coroner (H-2020-0085) by Lombard Conrad Architects, Located at 173 N. Touchmark Way

- A. Request: Rezone of 1.77 acres of land from the I-L to the C-G zoning district.

Fitzgerald: The last continuance we have on the docket is the public hearing for Ada County Coroner, H-2020-0085. Joe or Bill, do you want to touch on this one?

Parsons: Absolutely, Mr. Chair. So, yes, Ada County Coroner just did not post the site in accord with the UDC standards, so they have to be continued this evening and staff's recommending that that be continued to the October 15th hearing.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, Bill.

Seal: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: I move to continue file number H-2020-0085 for Ada County Coroner to the date of October 15th, 2020.

McCarvel: Second.

Fitzgerald: Motion and a second to continue the hearing on H-2020-0085, until the hearing date of October 15th. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Fitzgerald: Thank you all very much for that. So, going back, I think to go to our Action Items and as we -- I will kind of go back and I will explain the public hearing process for this evening. We kind of have Commissioners in both places, so the public is probably in both places as well and we appreciate you guys working with us during pandemic craziness, allowing us to continue doing this business, both remotely and in person. Commissioner Seal, we really appreciate you being there in person tonight again, sir. You are taking one for the team all the time. So, in our process tonight we will open each item individually and, then, start with the staff report. The staff will report their findings of how the project adheres to our Comprehensive Plan, Uniform Development Code, with a staff recommendation. After the staff has made their presentation the applicant will either come forward in person at the chambers or they will be with us on Zoom and they will have a chance -- 15 minutes to present their project to the Commission. After the applicant has finished we will open the floor to public testimony. Please make sure you have signed up if you are in chambers or if you are in Zoom let the clerk know by raising your hand that you would like to testify. There is also an online signup. Please make sure you have signed up online to testify on a certain application. If there is any individual that's speaking on behalf of an HOA or a larger group and they represent to others that they won't be speaking, we will give you a little bit more time to speak on the project. After all public testimony is taken we will allow the applicant to close the hearing -- or provide closing comments and answer any questions the public may have brought up and after that we will close the public hearing and the Commission will have a chance to deliberate and try to make a recommendation to City Council. Once you have given your three minutes of time as the public we don't allow a second option to come back up. So, please, make sure your comments are succinct and you get -- and you take advantage of that three minutes and give your -- your comments to us, so we can use that in our deliberation. But there is not another opportunity to come back up. We have had a couple of issues with that being a problem, so just letting you know that's how the process will work this evening.

5. Public Hearing Rescheduled from September 3, 2020 for Tara's Landing (H-2020-0048) by Mike Homan, Located at 5025 W. Larry Ln.

- A. Request: Annexation of 6.34 acres of land with an R-8 zoning district; and,
- B. Request: A Preliminary Plat consisting of 29 buildable lots and 2 common lots on 6.14 acres of land in the R-8 zoning district.

Fitzgerald: So, we will move on to our first action item, which is the public hearing rescheduled from September 3rd, 2020, for Tara's Landing, file number H-2020-0048, and we will kind of stay succinct to the issues we brought up on this application initially. So, Al, I will let you kick this thing off and talk through this project and the changes that were proposed.

Tiefenbach: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Alan Tiefenbach, Associate Planner with the City of Meridian. I'm just going to give a very quick overview, because I gave the full presentation, just to catch everybody up to speed. So, this is an annexation and zoning, bringing it in from RUT in the county to R-8 zoning and it's a preliminary plat consisting of 29 buildable lots. If you look at the future land use map it recommends this for medium density residential. You can see the zoning map in the middle on the planned development. I'm just going to basically quickly run through, again, what we are talking about here. This is the plat that was presented at the July 7th hearing. Larry Lane up here is presently a cul-de-sac and Larry Lane would be extended and connect into the Willow side. If you recall there is the Westbridge Subdivision that has been developed down here and it stubs to the north. There is the Prescott Ridge, which is developing over to the west and, then, there is a possible one that hasn't gotten to the public hearing phase yet for -- to be developing at the north. At the -- at the last hearing staff had really two concerns that were conditions of approval. The first one is that this common area here was originally provided and there is a -- a trail connection that was here and our concern was that this trail connection was running along the sides of the houses, so we recommended that the applicant turn these houses -- or, excuse me, turn these lots so that the backyards are looking out into the trail network. It's a little more obvious when you are in the backyard and you're along side of the house, so we want them to rotate these lots to match up with eight, nine and ten. We have seen recent versions of a landscape plan, which I will show you in a second, which does that. The other thing we had a condition about is that there wasn't a lot of -- there wasn't a lot of detail given about what the amenity was. At the -- the last hearing on July 7th the applicant showed up to the public hearing and presented this landscape plan here and with this particular landscape plan, although he didn't rotate the lots, he did show that he's proposing to put like a picnic shelter with some benches there. The big issue with here was that at the last hearing several of the neighbors brought in some covenants and these covenants restrict all of the lots in a particular subdivision to one acre in size. So, there is a civil matter that's playing out between the applicant and the neighbors. The neighbors say that the covenants pertain to the sizes of these lots and the applicant is saying that when this is annexed and zoned into the city that doesn't pertain. This civil matter was enough of an issue that the Planning Commission was uncomfortable with hearing this and continued that until this date. The other thing I think I might want to mention -- it's been a discussion item is whether or not Larry Lane should be extended. My understanding is that there is several neighbors that have not been happy about the fact that -- that Larry Lane is being extended and they would like to keep it a cul-de-sac. Staff, obviously, doesn't support that. The reason why is that we have requirements about how long a cul-de-sac can be, 550 feet or 750 -- up to 750 with City Council approval. Larry Lane, as it already exists, is more than 950 feet. So, City Council can't even approve a cul-de-sac of that length. They absolutely would have to punch it in and I believe Fire also does not support that.

With that staff is not aware that there has been any resolution that has occurred between the property owner and the neighbors and from what I understand they are still somewhat deadlocked. Staff has also not seen any new plans or any updates since the July 7th hearing. So, we are, basically, at the same place that we were -- at least as far as our staff we are at the same place that we were July 7th as we are today. Any questions?

Fitzgerald: Thank you very much.

Tiefenbach: You're muted, sir. I think. Sorry, I can't hear you.

Weatherly: One moment.

Fitzgerald: You're fine.

Weatherly: Okay, Ryan. Go ahead.

Fitzgerald: Thank you. Are there any questions for Alan? Seeing none, would the applicant like to join us or come forward or find us on Zoom.

Homan: Mike Homan. Developer. Elder, LLC. 6820 West Randolph Drive, Boise, Idaho. We met with the neighbors and tried to come up with a solution for them. We agree that we don't think that that road should go through, but it's not our decision, you know, there is ACHD involved and originally I went down and talked to Mike Alexander the other day and he said that don't need to go through and, then, the planner that was on it, Austin, came back and said, yes, it does and to change our plan to reflect it going through. The other concession we were going to make is if we shift that road over -- shift it all to our property and not on the neighbor's property -- we have shifted that over. We lost a lot, but we were willing to do that. Then we are going to put a solid fence all the way down in front of their home and down the side and, let's see, what else. And I have that on the plans. We just got that drawn, because ACHD -- we thought they were going one way and went the other. I think that was about it. Oh. We were willing to give them some compensation, too.

Fitzgerald: Mike, I have a question in regards to -- so, are you still planning to punch the road through? Is that the plan?

Homan: We are considering of even going private road and not putting it through. But if staff wanted us to make it a private, we would be willing to do that.

Fitzgerald: Okay. But you are still planning to make it connect to Larry Lane?

Homan: Well, if you guys allow private roads we will make it private and it won't go through.

Fitzgerald: Well, then, I guess I'm confused, because if it's a private road it still connects to something. So, where would that connect to?

Homan: We are going to put a cul -- excuse me. We are going to put a cul-de-sac and turn it around. Right in here put a cul-de-sac.

Fitzgerald: And, then, the question I -- did we make adjustments to the lot -- I believe it's five, six that are in the central part, was that conversation you have had or is there a revised plat that we can take a look or where do we stand there?

Homan: Yeah. I have got the revised plat switching those the other way. I need to give that to Alan here.

McCarvel: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: So, has staff not seen these changes then?

Homan: My civil engineer probably e-mailed them over to them, but --

Tiefenbach: Staff has not seen any updated plans since the July 7th Planning Commission meeting.

Cassinelli: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Cassinelli.

Cassinelli: Do we need to -- do we need to continue this?

Fitzgerald: Yes.

McCarvel: Yes.

Fitzgerald: We are -- everything -- and I think we -- we did it in a text plan amendment two weeks ago I think. Everything's got to be into the city within a reasonable time, so we can have -- they can write conditions about it first and, second, we can get it in our packets and the public sees it. So, at this point I'm with you guys, we don't need to go very much further than either -- I mean, yeah, because I think if we send it forward with whatever recommendation we do, I -- you know, I talked to Andrea about this today really briefly, but the City Council is going to remand it back and say, okay, work through whatever changes were made before we see it, which I think is a great point. So, I don't think we have a choice.

Homan: I got a question. Do you guys allow private roads?

Fitzgerald: Well, I think -- Mike, I think the challenge is that -- this is not the venue to have that conversation. That's a conversation you need to have with staff before the meeting --

Homan: Okay.

Fitzgerald: -- and so everybody's on the same page of where we are -- where we are going. Either you guys agree or you don't. We can't negotiate it inside of a meeting.

Homan: Yeah.

Fitzgerald: That just doesn't -- that doesn't work.

Homan: Okay.

Fitzgerald: So, I want to give -- be cognizant of the public environment. There is people who want to testify, but this -- we kind of need to have everybody on the same page and know where we are headed before we go there, so I think we need to move this thing to a continuance as well.

McCarvel: Yeah. Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: I would like to ask staff how far out they need to have this continued before we make a motion.

Tiefenbach: We are discussing. Hang on a second.

Seal: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Go ahead.

Seal: But just the -- the legality issue of the whole thing. How long is that going to take to resolve? I mean we have got a couple statements as far as what they are willing to do, but no resolution to that at all. So, I mean if -- again, I feel like the city is kind of getting put in between, you know, a rock and a hard place here, so -- so, I'm hopeful that, you know, there is something -- hopefully we can put some verbiage into here that requires some kind of legal counsel to reconcile the differences between the -- the landowners here.

Fitzgerald: Well, I -- and I feel like I'm with you. I think the challenge becomes is, you know, we have kind of got to take the project as it is and they -- before they go figure it out they are going to have to take what -- somebody is going to take legal action and we can't -- the city is not going to get in the middle of it. So, it's a -- it's a new subdivision asking for annexation. We have got to deal with the project as it is, as I have been advised, and then -- and whether it's good, bad, or indifferent I agree with you, but I think that the project is what it is. We have got to either approve it or deny it, but we need all the information first and so I think we got to deal with a continuance, so that the staff and the applicant can get on the same page, because I don't think we are helping City Council

out if we don't. But I think they are going to have to battle it out in court if that's where it goes and it's going to be outside of the city. So, that's -- it comes down to a civil situation that they are going to have to deal with.

Seal: Understand.

Tiefenbach: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Yes, sir.

Tiefenbach: This is Alan Tiefenbach. Just a follow up on your question. If -- if the applicant -- if the applicant has plans that have been crafted now, they are ready to go and they can e-mail them to us within the next couple of days, I think it's reasonable that we can -- we can continue this until the next one, which will be on the 15th. We just want to make sure that, again, we are not getting the plans several days before the hearing, we would need them in enough time to talk about what the traffic impacts are, what the impacts of the road improvements would be. That would give us enough time. We need to have this week and next week to talk about them and get an updated staff report out to you.

Fitzgerald: So, is that the 8th we are shooting for? Is that --

Tiefenbach: It would be the 15th, sir.

Fitzgerald: Oh, the 15th. I'm sorry. Okay. Commissioner McCarvel, if you want to make that motion go ahead.

McCarvel: Yeah. I move that we continue H-2020-0048, Tara's Landing, to the hearing date of October 15th to allow staff to evaluate plans offered by the applicant.

Seal: Second.

Grove: Second.

Fitzgerald: I have a motion and a second to continue file number H-2020-0048, Tara's Landing, to October 15th. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

6. Public Hearing Rescheduled from September 3, 2020 for Gateway at 10 Mile (H-2020-0046) by GFI - Meridian Investments III, LLC, Located at the Northeast Corner of N. Ten Mile Rd. and W. Franklin Rd.

- A. Request: Annexation and Zoning of approximately 41.28 acres of land from RUT in Ada County to the C-G (26.54 acres) and R-40

(14.74) zoning districts to accommodate the future construction of a mixed-use commercial and high density residential development.

Fitzgerald: We look forward to having all of our ducks in a row on that project going forward, guys. And, Alan, thank you for your assistance. Okay. Moving to the next item on our agenda is the rescheduled hearing for the -- from September 3rd, 2020, for Gateway at Ten Mile, file number H-2020-0046, and let's start with the staff report.

Dodson: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just cleaning up the area real quick, since we are doing a little people swap.

Fitzgerald: Yep. Thanks, Joe. Go ahead whenever you are ready.

Dodson: Okay. I think I'm ready. So, as Mr. Chair stated, this is -- was originally heard on June 18th. In response to my staff report the applicant requested continuance. We were working together and we requested another continuance and continued to work together. They were scheduled for the 3rd, there was no quorum on the 3rd of this month, so here we are today. So, the application before you is for annexation alone with a -- with the DA tied to the submitted concept plan. The site consists of 41.28 acres of land, currently zoned RUT, and is located at the northeast corner a Ten Mile and Franklin. Directly to the east is the new FedEx distribution center that is currently being built, zoned I-L, as you can see in the zoning map here in the center. There is commercial to the south, zoned C-G in the Ten Mile Crossing Subdivision. To the -- directly to the west is a church use and is zoned C-C. Directly north of that would be C-G and it is self storage. Directly north of the site is the railroad tracks and north of that would be C-C zoning with some commercial uses. The Comprehensive Plan in this area is for mixed use commercial within the Ten Mile interchange specific area plan. Again, the request before you is for annexation and zoning of approximately 41.28 acres of land from RUT to C-G and R-40 zoning districts to accommodate the future construction of a mixed use commercial and high density residential development. There is no plat or specific development proposed with this application. This application is only for annexation and the applicable development agreement that is tied to the submitted concept plan. Future development will be based upon the approved DA and concept plan. The subject site lies within the Ten Mile interchange specific area plan and has a future land use designation of mixed use commercial. There are some very specific goals and policies within the Ten Mile plan that should be met. The purpose of the mixed use commercial designation is to encourage the development of a mixture of office, retail, recreational, employment and other miscellaneous uses with supporting multi-family or single family attached residential uses. Enforcement of these standards will be largely done through the executed development agreement required with annexation of this property. Since there are no other concurrent applications associated with this project staff anticipates further refinement of this concept plan as end users are identified and a traffic impact study is completed in the future. With this site residing within the Ten Mile plan, as many goals and policies of the plan as possible should be met. Some of the policies that staff has outlined in the report are as follows: Traditional neighborhood design concepts with a strong pedestrian oriented focus are essential. Street oriented design is critical in urban

environments and especially at a gateway to the Ten Mile area such as this. Buildings should be at or close to the property line creating consistent edge to the public space and making streets more friendly and walkable. Also known as placemaking. Corporate plazas between compatible uses to provide shared outdoor seating and enhance pedestrian circulation between uses. Another goal in these areas is to achieve a floor area ratio, FAR, of one to 1.25 or more. Staff notes that this FAR is, indeed, a goal and not a prescribed standard, as achieving this will be difficult for almost any development. Staff and the applicant and I have had discussions regarding this goal and the Ten Mile -- the plan -- the goal within the overall Ten Mile plan of two story, more structures, and how it applies to the overall concept. To help meet the intent of this goal staff is recommending a provision that all commercial structures along the main thoroughfare, which would be the main road here is what I'm calling the main thoroughfare. The only road shown with on-street parking -- will have a ceiling height of at least 12 to 15 feet for the ground level commercial. That would be, again, only for the commercial on the west side of this road, not for the residential abutting it. This includes those buildings shown as single story with two story facades. This provision is consistent with languages in the Ten Mile plan. Staff will review each building site as future applications are submitted for compliance with the proposed provisions, but is not inclined to hold the applicant to any specific FAR requirement. There is a small area in the very northeast of the corner -- or, sorry, northeast corner of the site adjacent to the railroad tracks that shows a civic future land use with a transit station icon nearby. This area is labeled as civic to serve as a placeholder for future multi-modal transportation options should they arise. The applicant plans to incorporate that area into their proposed R-40 zoning district. The applicant shows this area as an open space area to act as a placeholder, as it may be decades before it develops as a public transportation hub. It should be noted that the city and outside agencies like that of COMPASS and VRT do not currently have specific plans for how mass transit within the valley will work within the rail corridor or specifically at this location. Because of this it is currently difficult for staff to recommend other uses not be allowed or limit certain uses on this site for the area shown as civic on the future land use map. It should also be noted that COMPASS is currently doing a study to determine the corridor and the mode for the I-84 alternative analysis. There will be additional public involvement and study necessary before any real regional decision is made on how the rail corridor is used for public transportation in the future. The Commission and Council should be aware that this applicant is choosing to work with staff on preserving this area for the benefit of the city and not necessarily for themselves, which is very appreciated. Nevertheless, staff is concerned that the revert -- the reserve area shown on the concept plan as open space may not be enough area for future transit needs like a transit station and associated infrastructure. Parking area directly to its west and potentially even the adjacent multi-story building may need to be redeveloped in the future depending on the type of public transportation developed in the future. The applicant is aware of this, that more area maybe need -- may need to be redeveloped in the future to accommodate future needs and also understands that a multi-modal transportation stop on this property would be beneficial to this development. And, again, I would like to note that the applicant has been very open to working with staff on the current and future use for this area of the site. The subject site currently has multiple curb cuts onto Ten Mile and Franklin. The applicant desires to keep the majority of these, but not all of them. According to ACHD,

a traffic impact study will be required for future development of this site. Because of this staff is not conditioning the accesses until such time that future development applications and a TIS are submitted. Along the eastern boundary the master street map and the Ten Mile plan show a future collector roadway along almost the entire eastern property line. Sorry. Moving a box on my screen. Sorry. It shows a future collector roadway along almost the entire eastern property line and that, then, connects down to Franklin and into the Ten Mile Crossing Subdivision to the south. This intersection is intended to be signalized in the future. However, this collector roadway cannot be built as it is proposed in the master street map and cannot be proposed -- cannot be built as proposed to the connection point to Franklin because this applicant does not own the property directly abutting Franklin, which is this one, very southeast corner. The applicant is agreeing to construct half plus 12 public right of way on the area of the site they do own and control in the southeast corner of their site. In addition, directly to the east of this site is, again, the FedEx distribution center. Since the FedEx distribution center was approved without constructing the north-south collector roadway as shown on the master street map, it is not a feasible option to require this applicant to construct their portion at this time. Instead, staff believes adequate access to any future transportation use along the north boundary of the site can be obtained via the east-west street connection to Ten Mile as depicted on the revised concept plan, which would be this one. Limiting access points to Ten Mile and Franklin, the road networks will be the backbone of connectivity for this development and is, therefore, incredibly important to the future development of this site. These areas appear to be shown on the submitted concept plan as a combination of public streets, private streets, and drive aisles. Staff believes creating a public thoroughfare would help traffic flow and create a grand drive, so to speak, through the development lined with street trees and pedestrian walkways. In line with this, staff previously recommended changing the requested zoning from C-G and R-40 to traditional neighborhood zoning districts. This recommendation was made with the intent to ensure pedestrian oriented design and ensure some multi-story buildings on the subject site in order to comply better with the Comprehensive Plan and the Ten Mile plan. Since the original publication of the staff report, the applicant and staff have worked to create a more refined concept plan that includes an overall stepping and building height from the arterials towards the interior of the site and street sections that mirror those within the specific area plan. You can see on the site plan they did a very good job of it labeling it. You have one story along the arterials, then, it steps up to two story or multi-story, then, three story and, then, four story as you get closer to the back of the property. The proposed street sections show on-street parking, bike lanes, parkways with a tree canopy and detached sidewalks. These type of street designs are largely what a complete street should be and offers walkable and inviting neighborhoods for both the residential and commercial component of projects. An additional change from the original bubble plan is the applicant's addition of three story townhomes along the main thoroughfare of the site and one of the roads proposed as a complete street. These three story townhomes are a welcomed additional housing type on site and should help create placemakings in the transition between the high density apartments and commercial uses on the subject site. Because of these changes staff is now more comfortable with the requested zoning designations of C-G and R-40, with both staff and the applicant understanding that provisions will be included to ensure the site is constructed in the future with a pedestrian oriented focus as now

proposed with this concept plan and the submitted street sections. These revisions make the development more consistent with the policies outlined to the mixed use commercial designation, specifically those that promote different housing types and integration of commercial and residential uses. The applicant has also proposed plazas within the commercial nodes and has provided an exhibit of these plaza as seen in the left of this. The exhibit shows what appear to be some raised crossings for vehicles, which would be these areas here, which would offer traffic calming and added pedestrian safety. Benches with trees within tree grates and sails providing shade for tables between the commercial buildings. Staff finds that these details within the submitted exhibit show integration of pedestrian elements and better access to the proposed commercial and retail buildings for those who will live and work on site or nearby. Future development of these plazas should minimally contain these elements to ensure compliance to the Ten Mile plan and the general comp plan. Staff is recommending provisions in line with these elements. This does offer at least two constraints. One, the civic use previously discussed and, two, the very southwest corner of the site that is constrained by the Ten Mile Creek, as you can see here. This creek and its location will severely limit any use in this section of the site, as there will likely be no vehicular access allowed to this, since it's so close to the main intersection of Franklin and Ten Mile. The revised concept plan has a note on it stating possible ACHD pond relocation in this area of the site. There is no guarantee that ACHD will agree to relocating their pond, which is this parcel right here, to this site. Therefore, the applicant should be open to a number of possible options on this constrained part of the property. This corner property is approximately one and a half acres, which includes the easement area. It is highly visible from the public roadways. This area should be treated with great care and consideration of its intended use. The Ten Mile Creek should be integrated with the future uses proposed in this area similar to the design concepts implemented within the approval of the Ten Mile Creek project to the south. Staff also recommends that the applicant work with any appropriate agencies and city departments to find the best use for this corner. There could be an opportunity to provide a public use on this side of the creek if the applicant and Parks Department work together. Again, there is no guarantee of this, but staff wants to note that it is, obviously, a very visible and an important corner of the site. There was no written testimony in support or against this project and staff does recommend approval of the annexation with the requirement of a DA and the recommended provisions within the staff report. And after that I will stand for questions. Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, Joe. Are there any questions for staff?

Seal: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: A quick question on the -- the road layouts. The two roads that are coming out to Ten Mile, is that something that would be there -- and I know this is an early concept, but I mean is that -- are the two roads -- would they be something that would be included and supported by staff or would that really need to fold down to one road as far as access out to Ten Mile?

Dodson: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Seal, it -- it's a little early just because we don't know any end users, but generally speaking if it is in this layout staff is generally, you know, approved -- or I have approved -- I will give approval of these. It -- it is difficult to say to not know without a TIS and what those could be. For example, if they have -- they end up finding a bigger -- a larger end user that requires more of this frontage, then, likely it will go down to one. You know, maybe it would be a collector kind of access, rather than a local street. But, again, this TIS -- and once we get more into the development of the property we will know more.

Seal: Okay. Thank you.

Cassinelli: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Cassinelli.

Cassinelli: Joe, what's the -- whose requirement is it for that -- as the placeholder for the -- for the transit center?

Dodson: Yes. Mr. -- Commissioner Cassinelli, it -- it's kind of twofold. One, staff -- because this is one of the last areas along the rail corridor within the city that we could develop for multi-modal transportation, the other two locations -- one would be here at the City Hall, which is a potential, and the other one is further down and already developed. That leads to the second point, which is it's shown as a civic use on the comp plan, so it is already reserved in that sense and so in order to remove that would be a comp plan map amendment. Part of the flexibility with the comp plan does allow them to move that here or there, you know, within the site, which, again, the comp plan does show it specifically in the corner and shared with the parcel to the east, but, obviously, the FedEx distribution center was approved, because the -- they already had I-L zoning and there will not be a civic use on there, so they decided to shift their civic use from the comp plan a little further west into the site.

Cassinelli: And did you say that there is flexibility on where that can be or there is not --

Dodson: Commissioner Cassinelli --

Cassinelli: -- with that site?

Dodson: Yeah. No. There is flexibility on where that could be. Again, this is a concept plan and not a subdivision or a plat. So, this has not been platted. They could end up moving it further to the east, further to the west. I know from conversations with them they hesitate to push it further to the west, only because of thinking of any -- if there is commuter rail and how that could queue up and not wanting to block traffic, you know, with some forethought to some multi-modal transportation there. But other than that, yes, there is flexibility on where that could be on site and what could actually go there.

Cassinelli: Okay. So, from -- kind of from the position -- the preliminary position of that, the applicant and the staff are -- are both in agreement with that location as a possible location?

Dodson: Yes, Commissioner Cassinelli, we are. We have gone through a few iterations of this and have agreed upon this -- including the size. I just wanted to note that in my staff report, you know, and they -- the applicant understands as well, the size of this area might change. I mean, for example, if this is never a multi-modal and it's just a bus stop, they may not even need this entire civic area for that and that could change the location. So, again, staff and the applicant are aware that -- that there is some flexibility in this and as we develop this further with some subdivisions there will be some more concrete decisions made on them.

Cassinelli: Okay. And, Mr. Chair, if I may, another question on a different topic.

Fitzgerald: Go ahead.

Cassinelli: Joe, can you elaborate on the -- on the collector, where it's restricted in -- in that -- like I said, it would be the southeast corner because of the FedEx site.

Dodson: Yes. Commissioner Cassinelli, Members of the Commission, there is sort of two constraints. One in the -- where the -- where it would line up with the road in the Ten Mile Crossing, the applicant does not own the property that directly abuts Franklin. So, they, unfortunately, cannot construct this small segment. However, they own this portion and everything north. So, they are going to construct their half plus 12 to here and here to continue what the FedEx building is going to construct on their collector. Also with that the master street map shows the collector running all the way up here to about this way. While FedEx was not -- again, FedEx -- the property to the east already had zoning, so they didn't need to go through a hearing process, they decided to do a certificate of zoning compliance and design review. So, they were not required to build that collector roadway. We had no teeth to really do that. So, because of that they did not construct it there, but, instead, we will have cross-access and access to multiple industrial parcels to the east through this east-west collector roadway. So, that's why they -- I don't think it would make sense and -- to build the collector roadway here, when we can use this as that to funnel traffic and everything else out back to Ten Mile and even to Franklin, especially once this gets signalized and built out.

Cassinelli: And will that parcel that they don't own on the southeast corner, obviously, when -- if and when that comes up for development that will be a requirement to complete that collector out to Franklin; is that correct?

Dodson: Yes, sir. That is correct. They will be required to construct their parcel that -- directly to the east of this parcel is another parcel that is holding out on the development for right now and they, too, would be required to construct their half of that. So, there is a few things specifically limiting it right now as to being signalized and constructed right now.

Cassinelli: And, then, one final thing if I may. Apologize for hogging all the time. Is there -- will there be limitation on the development in there until that collector can be built out?

Dodson: Commissioner Cassinelli, in this current DA, no, there is no limitations as to when or how much could be developed. That is mostly because -- or wholly because in order to develop any part of this site they are going to have to subdivide it to put the public roads in and that when we have a plat and we have actual lots, then, we -- and a TIS, for that matter, then, we will be able to determine whether or not it needs to be phased and work with the applicant on that.

Cassinelli: Okay. Thank you. That -- that's it.

Fitzgerald: Are you sure?

Cassinelli: For now. For now.

Fitzgerald: Any additional questions for Joe? Okay. Thanks, Joe. Would the applicant like to join us or come forward? Thanks for joining us. Please state your name and your address for the record and the floor is yours.

Leonard: Good evening, Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission. Stephanie Leonard with KM Engineering. 9233 West State in Boise. 83714. Thanks for having us here this evening. As Joe mentioned, this is the Gateway at Ten Mile. We are really excited to go through this project with you. We have been working on this with staff and several consultants and a design team for the past several months and feel really confident in the development plan that we are going to show you tonight. So, this property is located, as Joe mentioned, at the northeast corner of Franklin and Ten Mile. It's within the Ten Mile interchange specific area plan on the future land use map and it's one of the few properties that's not been annexed or zoned into the City of Meridian yet. So, as you can see here we are surrounded by commercial, industrial to the east, and, then, we have got some rural urban transition zone to the southwest. We -- let's see. We are requesting to annex into the city with the R-40 and C-G zoning districts. This is a great location. We foresee this being a premier and notable part of Meridian where visitors and residents alike are going to be gathering to grab a bite to eat, go shopping, recreate, and live in the same area. So, this is an aerial photo that was taken in the winter. As you can see, a lot of the area around us is either in the process of being developed or has been developed to the north. The FedEx distribution center that was mentioned earlier is directly to the east and it's not quite -- it shown in this photo, but it is under construct and close to completion, I believe, so the -- this site is located on a couple of large transportation corridors. We are really close to the interstate. We are about -- I think it's like less than a mile to the north of I-84, which makes it a great location for getting into and out of relatively easily and we are close to the center of Meridian as well. So, as Joe mentioned -- and we are in the mixed use commercial area within the Ten Mile interchange specific area plan, we do have a small area of civic that's shown and we are indicating that on the development plan in the north part of the site. The primary -- let's see. Areas adjacent to us, as well have a mixed use commercial designation, as you can see to the south and

the property that's undeveloped to the southwest. To the east it's high density residential in the comp plan and, then, we have got some civic and commercial to the west as well. So, we really feel that the development that we have come up with -- or the plan that we have come up with is consistent with what the -- the future land use map and the comp plan call for. And so as Joe mentioned, we -- we have been working with staff for a long time on this project. We initially came to the city -- I believe it was in January and we met with a couple of the planners and just kind of conceptually talked about what this property was and just vetted out exactly what we were thinking and conceptually what we were envisioning for the area. We didn't have anything solidified or anything that was defined, but in those discussions the -- it was recommended to us that we develop a conceptual bubble plan just to kind of guide development in -- with the understanding that we would be tied to the provisions within the development agreement that would make sure that the Ten Mile interchange specific area plan design elements were pulled into the development and that uses were consistent with what the comp plan calls for. So, as a result we have developed this bubble plan. This is what was submitted with the application for annexation. As Joe mentioned, we -- initially with the staff report it was clear that there was a little bit more detail that was needed. So, we have requested continuance a couple times to be able to work with staff and determine exactly the direction they wanted to see with this plan. So, this is the development plan that we have developed. As you can see it's no longer conceptual. It's definitely well defined. We have called out general locations of buildings, the stories of buildings, and we are incorporating a mix of uses on purpose with pedestrian circulation and vehicular circulation in mind. We have even called out where plazas may be included. As Joe mentioned, the access points that we are showing here are -- they are the access points we would like to go with, but with future development ACHD and a traffic impact study will define exactly where those -- and if they will exist in this configuration. So, this revised plan contains elements that were specifically requested by staff and I think, you know, in those discussions we really came to a conclusion that it was important to include a lot of those Ten Mile interchange specific design elements, such as parkways, detached sidewalks, with an integration between the multi-family and townhome units and the commercial that envision being, you know, a large area for employment and kind of a central area for folks to either gather to eat, dine, shop or to work, so -- and this plan has also been designed to take existing development into account. The FedEx center is, you know, to the east, so we did make sure to provide a little bit more buffering there as far as the residents that are planned and, then, to the north we have got the railroad that provides a natural buffer that's fairly large to the commercial development just to the north. We situated all of our commercial buildings along the arterial roadways just to make sure that folks could easily get to and access those -- those buildings and, then, we transitioned naturally to the residential section that will complement, obviously, the commercial section, but also be kind of secluded and protected from larger, more heavily trafficked roadways, so -- okay. So -- and we are requesting an R-40 zoning district as mentioned. It's changed a little bit from the initial application. We are now requesting 16.3 acres. We foresee a four story executive style apartment building, which would potentially be housing for folks that would work over in the commercial section. Same story for the townhome buildings that we are envisioning. These -- both of these have been configured and thought of in a way that would comply with the Ten Mile plan and per the direction

that staff provided us and we really, you know, want to make sure that it's going to be a high quality development that people will be proud to live in and it will be also reflective of what the city sees in this area. We do have a variation in the type of units that we are proposing, too, which is really important to the Ten Mile plan and something that, you know, staff really emphasized in our -- in our discussions with them. Of course, any future development of any of the multi-family elements and any of the attached units are going to have to go through subsequent approvals. So, anything that's left to question from this concept plan will be further defined with those applications and they will be required to uphold to specific design elements. The thought behind the R-40 district on the east side was to support the commercial components on the west side and, really, provide a place where people can live and, then, easily get to work by walking or biking or -- so, the C-G zoning district is approximately 22.67 acres. We envision the C-G area providing employment opportunities, as well as a mix of commercial opportunities and retail space and office space. We have -- we have designed this part of the development to allow a mixture of the office and employment uses and foresee this area also supporting an R-40 section. So, we are excited about the potential for folks to be able to live and work and play in the same area and really think that this is what the Ten Mile plan is looking for as far as the mixed use commercial designation. So, these are the site circulation exhibits that we created to really show how this site will function. So, it will provide vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle transportation shown with the blue and those are -- those have been designed specifically to coordinate with the Ten Mile plan. The section -- I will show you on the next slide -- are actually basically taken exactly from the Ten Mile plan. And, then, most recently -- so, we had actually -- as mentioned we have made several changes and iterations to this plan. Most recently the blue line at the far north of the site was changed from a private street to a public street, just on -- to make sure that it's maintained and easily accessible to folks in the area. Okay. And as mentioned, we specifically created these three sections to coordinate with the Ten Mile plan and the -- and we envision this really collaborating well with the property that's to the south as well that has the same -- similar street sections. As you can see they -- they provide a nice buffer area for pedestrians. The section -- section one provides a nice buffer area for pedestrians that are walking along and, then, it also has bike lanes, as well as travel lanes for vehicles. The one on the -- the bottom, section two, has both the seclusion for the pedestrians, as well as bike lanes and, then, it has parallel parking that's going to be available as well. Let's just zoom into those two. And, then, one thing that we have really discussed pretty heavily was the pedestrian oriented design that the Ten Mile plan calls for and we tried to focus on creating something that would be really enjoyable for folks that are either eating at the restaurants or working nearby to be able to gather and just communally join with one another in a space that would be friendly to pedestrians and vehicles. As Joe mentioned, these plazas that are actually intended for vehicles to drive over as well, so the design incorporates a little bit of a raise to the pathway to make sure that folks know that they are not necessarily supposed to drive further over to the side, but recognize that they should slow down because there are pedestrians and folks that are hanging out in that area. So, the intent here, of course, is to allow for people that are dining and shopping to be able to relax and hang out in the same space. So, overall we are in agreement with the staff's report and recommended conditions of approval. There is one thing that we would like to discuss a little bit further and that's the requirement to modify the

development agreement with any future development. We feel that we have worked, you know, diligently with staff to make the changes that were requested and they have really molded our plan to be consistent with the Ten Mile plan and with city code and think that this is a pretty -- a pretty defined development plan that is no longer conceptual, but something that can really be held in a DA and required for future development. Of course if someone were to come in or if we found an end user that required something that was much different than what was shown on this development plan, we would be more than happy to modify the development agreement. But we have, you know, people that are interest in this area and we really want to facilitate a responsive way to be able to let people develop, rather than needing to come back in for a development agreement modification. In addition -- and I guess in that same vein we would like to request that two building permits be obtained prior to the recordation of the plat. This will really help to jumpstart the commercial development in the area and will facilitate this project and its success. So, as mentioned earlier, if we end up having, you know, a traffic impact study or work with ACHD and they determine that the accesses are inappropriate, we would work with staff to make sure that that meets their requirements as well. So, I think with that I am happy to stand for any questions. We have our development team here, too, that have worked hard on this -- on this -- on this development plan and overall we are excited for this project. We think it's going to be a great addition to the City of Meridian and we are excited to work with staff. So, I will stand for any questions.

Fitzgerald: Thank you, Stephanie.

Seal: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Yeah. Go right ahead, Commissioner Seal.

Seal: The first question I have is on the townhomes. Are those to own or to rent?

Leonard: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Seal, those are going to be to rent.

Seal: Okay. And, then, on the modification to the staff report, I guess I'm a little confused and staff might be able to help jump in here if -- if need be, but it seems like you are asking that basically somebody can come in and build before we have all the information. So, am I understanding that incorrectly or --

Leonard: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Seal, no, that's not what our -- our ask is in this case. In this case we would like to just -- so, as part of the annexation we are agreeing to enter into a development agreement. We are more than happy to do that. With that we are going to be connected to this development plan and the -- all the conditions that are included in the staff report and our request is to basically be able to pull two building permits without a subdivision and also be able to do -- complete -- or, I'm sorry, submit for development without amending the development agreement prior to that.

Seal: Okay. Understood. Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Additional questions for the applicant? So, I have one for Andrea before Stephanie runs away. As we talked about materially deviating from an approved development plan, do you feel comfortable with that language, Andrea? I -- I understand what they are going for and what the goal is, but how do we find that in regards to -- attorney guidance I guess is what I'm looking for.

Pogue: Mr. Chair, I'm going to refer you to staff to see what he meant by it and, then, we will go from there.

Fitzgerald: Okay.

Dodson: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Joe -- yeah. Go right ahead, Joe.

Dodson: Yes. So, when it comes to development agreement modification, generally speaking it -- the discretion is within code and my hope is that because we have nailed down a pretty specific development plan that we will not have to modify this numerous, numerous times and that is not staff's intention. However, when we do subdivide the property in the future that we will -- and -- and a TIS is submitted and approved by ACHD, there is a very high chance that there will be some modifications required and so staff wants to reserve that right and for City Council and -- and for you guys to see any kind of development agreement modification if it is deemed necessary. So, the -- that portion of their request is not very different from what we have, in my opinion. The part that is different is the two building permit portion. Staff is not supportive of that simply because of what's already been stated. If any building were to be built on this property they are going to need infrastructure, including streets and public streets at that. So, if they are going to put a public street in there needs to be a subdivision and, therefore, we would need a plat and, then, probably a development agreement modification, so -- and, again, a TIS. That's going to be their next step. So, staff does not want to get to that point of issuing this without having the infrastructure built and I should say entitled at that point.

Fitzgerald: Thank you, Joe. That was -- that helps a ton. Stephanie, what's the goal of the two building permits, because I -- I'm kind of with where Joe is going. Having all the pieces, parts -- this is a pretty important corner and we want to make sure we have everything dialed in. So, what would be the purpose of not having everything dialed in before we get building permits?

Leonard: Mr. Chair, my understanding is that we have got folks that are interested in developing on this piece of land and the whole point of getting the two building permits before recordation of the plat would be to kind of jumpstart the development. Recordation of plats can take several months and, you know, we do plan to submit a preliminary plat very soon and we have got a traffic impact study that we are going to start very soon as well. So, I mean I don't foresee that being far in the future, but it would really be integral to this project to be able to have two building permits prior to the recordation of our plat. It is done -- it has been done on several other projects. I don't know that I can think of

any off the top of my head, but I think our development plan has some that they -- they can reference that may -- may provide an example of -- of how that could work and be successful.

Fitzgerald: So, Joe it's not splitting hairs, but asking a question. Can you do it after approval of a preliminary plat and not having to record a final plat? Or approval of the final plat, but not recordation? Like where is the -- the balance point? Because I know we have done it before.

Dodson: Mr. Chair, for -- that is correct, Mr. Chair. Yes, this has occurred in the -- in the past. The biggest difference with this case is that this -- there are no end users known at this time and there is going to be a required TIS. If -- if the TIS had already been submitted and approved by ACHD staff would be a lot more likely to approve this, because, then, we would minimally know where the access points are. Guaranteed. We don't yet know that. So, I think the next true step for the applicant should be the TIS and once we get to that point, then, we can get to the subdivision and -- and at that point with -- that could be their first DA mod and that could be to modify this condition and, then, prior to the recordation of that plat we might be able to say, okay, yeah, now let's change it to have two building permits allowed. So, I'm not against developing this parcel quickly, it's just I think we are a little ahead of the game right now to get to this point of modifying that condition.

Nelson: Mr. Chairman, may I jump in and respond to that as well?

Fitzgerald: Yeah. Yeah. Go right ahead.

Nelson: And for the record this is Deborah Nelson. My address is 601 West Bannock Street and I'm here with the applicant team also and I think Stephanie covered it well and, actually, I agree with a lot of what Joe just said, too. I just want to add a little bit of additional flavor on the -- on the building permit question. The city has done it multiple times and it is frequently -- it -- the connection -- the trigger is to try to get it done before final plat, so that you don't have to go through all of the development details before you are allowed to jumpstart your -- your commercial area. It really -- I mean it really can be a catalyst to getting a commercial area going if you are able to take advantage of a great commercial project that comes along and just because we don't know that yet, that's exactly why we are asking for it. We need the opportunity to go out and market the property and to be able to work with a commercial developer and give them certainty that they could move forward quickly and, then, you asked about other examples. There is -- there is one just -- I mean this has happened in multiple places throughout the city, but there is one just down the street, Brighton's project within the Ten Mile area specific plan, they were allowed to get up to three buildings permits in phase one. I guess one additional point to keep in mind as you consider this particular request that we already are entitled to a building permit on this location and so at least one is appropriate based on the current parcel size and so at least one is appropriate now. Anything that gets pulled is -- has to satisfy all of the conditions of approval that are currently associated with this rezone, annexation, and development agreement and so we couldn't just go pull a

building permit for something that isn't consistent with everything that's laid out here and the development plan and all of the very specific conditions of approval that are identified now in these conditions.

Fitzgerald: I appreciate the additional feedback and I -- and I understand what you are saying. I think the TIS is important to understand the end user still. I think that's my one challenge there. But I appreciate the input and the additional guidance. Additional questions for Stephanie or for Deborah? Okay. Thank you, ladies, very much. We really much appreciate it and we will have you close, Stephanie, after we are done. Madam Clerk, anyone signed up to testify on this application?

Weatherly: Mr. Chair, we had one person sign in, but not indicating a wish to testify.

Fitzgerald: Is there anyone in the audience, in chambers or online, who would like to testify on this application? If so raise your hand, either online via Zoom or in person. Did we have one online, Madam Clerk.

Weatherly: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I will transfer them over. One moment.

Fitzgerald: Thank you, ma'am.

Weatherly: A slight technical difficulty, Mr. Chair. I'm getting an error. One moment.

Fitzgerald: Okay.

Weatherly: V. Stack, if you could try to unmute yourself.

Stack: So, this is Val Stack and I was just commenting that throughout this entire process and --

Fitzgerald: Ms. Stack, one second. Can you introduce yourself and give us your address for the record, ma'am, and, then, you can go ahead.

Stack: Okay. This is Val Stack at 6072 North Serenity Lane in Meridian and my comment was from myself and my neighbors that we have been having extreme problems hearing your audio. It's -- we are all on max here and I know that Patrick Connor has contacted your audio team and has tried to improve that, but we have extreme problems hearing what any -- almost any of you are saying. There are a couple of you that are coming through clearly and all the rest are mumble. We can hear Ryan and we can hear Rhonda and that's pretty much it.

Fitzgerald: Ms. Stack, are you on the YouTube Channel?

Stack: Yes, I am.

Fitzgerald: Okay. We will try to get that cleared up here shortly. I know we have had some -- a little bit of technical difficulties tonight, but did you have any specific comments on this application?

Stack: Not this one. We are here for the next process.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Well, I very much appreciate that heads up and we will try to get it cleaned up in -- in the midstream in between the two.

Stack: Thank you very much.

Fitzgerald: Thank you, ma'am. Is there anyone else in the audience or online that would like to testify on this application? Please raise your hand via Zoom or in the audience. Going once. Going twice. Stephanie, would you like to come and close? Is there anything else you would like to add to -- or the other representatives. That's fine.

Leonard: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Commissioners. Yes, I would like to say something, but Walt Gosser, one of our clients and the developer on this project, would like to say some stuff, too. So, I'm going to let him go ahead.

Fitzgerald: Thank you for being here, sir.

Gosser: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Commission, appreciate your time and just have some comments after listening to some of the discussions I would like to mention. First of all --

Fitzgerald: Sir, can you state your name and your address for the record.

Gosser: -- we drafted a bubble plan -- excuse me. It's Walt Gosser at 74 East 500 South, Suite 200, Bountiful, Utah. 84010. We have really had a joint effort with the staff. We have appreciated comments that we have received. We didn't ever realize it was going to be a seven and a half month process to come in for annexation and zoning, but as it's turned out this has just sort of evolved and staff asked for a bubble plan and more detail and after we provided the bubble plan we still ended up having requests for more detail and so we went to the concept plan and, really, with every meeting we have had with staff -- and we have had quite a few -- there has been progress made with comments that staff has made to us that we have tried to take under consideration and come back and make those changes, so that staff could feel comfortable and that we also could feel comfortable and -- and we feel like we have made a lot of progress in that area. Comments that were made on the civic center specifically. I would just mention to you -- we noted that the civic center was not requested by the -- or required for the FedEx developer to do that and we have looked at trying to comply with the request of staff and because it is on the -- a long term plan that there is a civic center there. We think what we are showing is very adequate in size. I have lived in Basel, Switzerland, and in Freiburg, Germany, a year each and in both of those cities they have high rail -- a high transportation requirements for the public and this amount of property that we are showing here would handle a large

four story parking complex if it came to that. Where it's so futuristic, you know, we are trying to keep that a placeholder out, but we would appreciate being able to keep it really where it is. We are trying to keep it in the middle of the project, because those trains sometimes get sort of long. There is right of way easement that the -- that comes with the railroad track. As you will look on the drawing there is quite a -- I think there is a hundred feet there. Usually you just get off and cross and maybe it's 15 or 20 feet at the most. So, there is adequate area to develop that properly, I believe, with what's shown. With regards to the road system, we also in one of our meetings with staff had an un -- unsigned draft letter from ACHD and ACHD attended that meeting. In that letter they gave us some distances that they thought were critical that we needed to be aware of. There are four accesses on Ten Mile Street -- or Ten Mile Road and we had -- we are not using any of the four, but we have -- we have agreed, as we have visited with staff and with ACHD, that two would work for us and so there -- we are using half of what they currently show and those four are actually installed right in the sidewalk as drives. The other thing I would mention with regards to the history that's happened on this project is -- is we have -- we have really tried hard to be cooperative and to be responsive to what staff has asked us to do and we feel like that we have had a good relationship in accomplishing that and so most recently staff asked if we could make one additional road a public road and extend that public road over to the northeast access of the civic area and we agreed to do that. We have made those changes. But each time as we do these we have looked at this and -- and very honestly I have been in development for 45 years now, this is about as detailed a plan as I have ever given, even when we have a -- seeking a final approval and so we changed it recently from a concept plan and said this is really a development plan. As we have gone through this we have had Cornel Larson Associates Architects assisting us with KM Engineering. We have done soil studies. We have done environmental reports. We have done drainage studies. We have looked at the street systems. We know that we are lacking the TIS and we are going to start on that immediately after we get an approval and so we -- we just want you to know that the reason we requested part of this change with regards to the development plan is because we really think this development plan is a complete development plan now. It's evolved from this bubble plan idea to something that we have worked on hard doing many different drafts to get to where we have building sizes, we have building heights, we have parking ratios that we are trying to meet and based upon other developments that we have done we think we are really pretty complete and that's why we have requested this one small change that we have talked about. With regards to -- the last thing I would like to mention here, because my writing is not as good as I would like it to be when I'm in a hurry. I have to put my glasses on to read what I wrote. With regards to the building permit issue, as Deborah mentioned, there is one that does come with the size of property that we are doing, but we are not trying to avoid any meetings, any requirements of staff, any -- we have got a complete building design, submit those, realize that there are going to be comments on those and resubmit them before we can ever pull a building permit to build anything and so we are just trying to make that possible, so that as we have someone come forward it gives us that opportunity, because most of these major clients that we would work with in the commercial retail area, they really require about a year or two in advance to know when they are going to build. We have built for a lot of them. Commercial has been one of our expertises and they look at it and they take it to

advisement and they take it to their board of directors and they put it on their schedule and sometimes those schedules go out a year or two years and so that's why it could be important to us to be able to accommodate something that came up sooner. That's the end of the comments I had. I just, again, appreciate your help. If there is anything that you would like me to address, any questions you would like to ask, I would be happy to answer them.

Fitzgerald: Thank you, sir, very much. Any additional questions for the applicant? Commissioner Cassinelli, you have your -- you came off mute. Do you have a question, sir?

Cassinelli: No. I have a question for staff when we get there, but, no, not right now.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Perfect. Any additional questions for the applicant?

Grove: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Grove, go right ahead.

Grove: Just for -- kind of looking at that southwest corner where the possible pond relocation -- have you given thought to what else you would be able to do if the -- if that doesn't come to fruition?

Gosser: Yes. But, again, it's been very preliminary, because there is -- as Mr. Dodson indicated in his presentation, there is no access to that piece of property and so there are -- there is access that is being used by the Ten Mile Creek ditch company that -- that controls that, but that's really only for their access or not for public access. So, it makes it very difficult to develop. We have tried to show two single story buildings immediately to the northeast of that, so that we can have glass extending down from those -- excuse me -- two single story buildings, but we could have glass looking out at that and we also believe that that would be a good area to introduce the site that we have got where if the ACHD idea doesn't work we are prepared to talk to parks administration and others in the city to try and determine how we could jointly develop something that would be an asset to our development and also for the city.

Grove: Thank you.

Fitzgerald: We very much appreciate you being here tonight and thank you for the clarification. Any additional comments or questions? If not, can I get a motion to close public hearing.

Gosser: Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, sir. Bill, did you want to be -- ask your question before we go to close the public hearing?

Cassinelli: It's either/or. I can -- we can close it up and I can ask it.

Fitzgerald: Can I get a motion?

Cassinelli: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Cassinelli.

Cassinelli: I move we close the public hearing on file number H-2020-046, Gateway at Ten Mile.

McCarvel: Second.

Seal: Second.

Fitzgerald: I have a motion and a second to close public hearing on H-2020-0046. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Fitzgerald: Bill, do you want to lead off?

Cassinelli: Sure. I will -- for staff, what's the -- and -- Chairman Fitzgerald mentioned that this is an important corner and I have kind of been -- I missed out on -- on some things of late. What -- Joe, what is -- where are we at on south -- I think it's the southwest corner that's currently zoned RUT? Are there any -- is there anything that you can publicly say about that property?

Dodson: Commissioner Cassinelli, Members of the Commission, actually, this week we have been contacted about that parcel. So, we are in discussions with that. We plan to pre-app with them soon. So, hopefully, we will have another wonderful application in front of you guys. So, that -- that -- the southwest corner of Ten Mile and Franklin is also working its way towards development.

Cassinelli: Okay. But that hasn't been brought up that I -- that I missed over the last couple of weeks or so?

Dodson: No.

Cassinelli: And, then, what is the size of that parcel?

Dodson: Directly to the southwest is approximately 40 acres, just like this one. Forty acres as well.

Cassinelli: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Go right ahead. Commissioner, go right ahead.

Cassinelli: No. I'm sorry. I was -- I was going to -- if -- if there were no other questions for staff, I guess I could start off on just some thoughts.

Fitzgerald: Go right ahead.

Cassinelli: Okay. On that note -- I mean I appreciate -- first of all, I want to say I appreciate the applicant's work on this and they have definitely gone a step beyond by doing a fairly detailed design there, not just the bubble design. So, that is -- that's definitely appreciated. A couple of things. Number one, when we get to the building permits, even though it may have been done previously, my -- my thought is to -- especially where we are at, I think with -- with development in the city, doing things the right way is -- is more critical than ever. You know, as land gets developed and developed and we have got fewer parcels left, we need to be -- we need to do it the proper way and I -- so, I would not be in favor of -- of allowing the building permit ahead of the -- the platting and, rather, run it through the regular channel. Overall comments. My thoughts on this are there is a lot of -- there is -- there is multiple different options within the Ten Mile interchange. One of those -- and I'm not here to -- to, you know, tell them they need to -- you know, what -- what to do on that land, but what I see is -- is, you know, kind of a -- a mirror image of what's directly to the south on that corner. So, I don't see anything unique and as you indicated, Mr. Chair, that we have got -- you know, this is a very critical corner. We have got one left after this and, then, you know, that -- those corners are gone. They are developed. One of the things that's allowable within -- you know, within the Ten Mile interchange is a -- is a lifestyle center. I like a lot of the aspects on this. I like the walkability, the pedestrian friendly aspect of it, but in my mind with -- with how critical this corner is -- and maybe that happens on the opposite corner, but I want to see -- you know, to me the bar is high and I want to see -- I don't want to just see, you know, a nice version of the same old thing. I want to see -- I would prefer something unique going in down there. And, then, a final point I will make is that while I appreciate the time that the applicant has spent and they indicated like seven months to get -- to get where they are today and, granted, with all the things that we are all going through, that's actually probably pretty quick, but something this important, this large, we need to take time and have it done to the benefit of -- of the City of Meridian. So, those are my -- those are my thoughts and comments on it and I will -- I will be done.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, Commissioner Cassinelli. Appreciate it. And I -- I understand exactly what you are saying and I agree. I think -- because it's only annexation and we are seeing a rather detailed kind of concept plan, I do love lifestyle centers and I think this area needs one definitely. So, I agree with you in that regard. Not that they couldn't do that here, because it is just concept. So, I -- this is just the initial steps and I think there is more to go along the way. I do think that you got to step through the process and I -- the end user has to be somewhat identified before I think I'm willing to start handing out building permits and that TIS is important. I think that's a big step. So, I -- I'm with you on stepping through the process and I know it's -- everyone wants to run -- they get an end user, so they can start developing, but we got to make sure we understand what's happening there before

we go further. At least in my thoughts. Commissioner McCarvel, you came off mute. Are you -- do you have comments, ma'am?

McCarvel: Well -- yeah. And I -- I would be in support of the annexation in this with the conditions in the staff report and I agree -- that I think with the pace of everything moving we need to probably stick with the staff's side on obtaining those building permits after the TIS. Definitely.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Seal or Commissioner Grove, do you have thoughts, gentlemen?

Grove: Sure. I will jump in real quick.

Fitzgerald: Go ahead, Commissioner Grove.

Grove: I will just echo what's been said. Concept looks good. One thing that I appreciate is that, you know, just in concept at least they are doing a good job of addressing the mixed use nature that is desired here and not just kind of doing half measures to get there, which would be concerning, you know, if -- if we don't have all aspects of the mixed use going in. So, I appreciate the concept and the direction that they have gone with that and, you know, looking at where the street was supposed to be versus what they -- they have, actually, like the -- how that came about. So, kudos to the development team and staff for able to get that in place the way they do -- the way they have it and making those not private streets, how they had on the documentation previously. So, I like -- like how that panned out and I'm in favor of, you know, going with whatever staff recommends on the -- the building permit piece.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Seal, go right ahead.

Seal: Just a question for staff on the -- the other applications that were submitted where building permits were allowed. Do you know if TIS's were completed on those? I hate to put you on the spot, but I mean right now it's -- it's an important distinction to me that -- I mean I guess in -- in the name of fair play it would be good have that information.

Dodson: Thank you, Commissioner Seal. That is a good question. I will default to my compatriot over here, who has more institutional knowledge at this point.

Parsons: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, certainly -- I want to say yes. I mean if you look -- I can give you a recent example with Costco. It's built there on Chinden, you can see that Ten Mile is being widened -- Ten Mile is being widened. They did a traffic study for that. Eagle View Landing where they are building the ITCU. I know I have worked with ACHD on getting a traffic study for that development at Eagle and Overland. So, that's always the intent. But certainly when those developments came through they had a user. You knew what was coming, so we wanted to get -- and we knew there was a time frame that we had to hit. Here in this particular case I can tell we have two users that are going to come online to the east of this development and the

transportation network is going to be critical and that is why staff is taking a hard position on this particular application, because they have not -- when I worked on the FedEx property they did not submit a TIS and they submitted for a building permit ahead of time and it became a disaster. It slowed the project down. It created a lot of hiccups for not only staff, but ACHD staff and so, therefore, we only got a small segment of that road and now we have another large user just to the east of them coming in that's going to generate a lot of trips, a lot of traffic, and they are going to also -- we met with them and we informed them that they need to get a TIS in and build all of this road network with your development. So, to me if -- if the -- not that staff is not against a building permit, it's just what infrastructure are you committed to doing with the first phase, so that we can make sure that those assurances can take place or those things are going to happen ahead of time. That's really where our position is. We know what's going to happen. We have met with the folks. I have been -- it's been my understanding that this particular applicant may be meeting with them as well to try to discuss some of those road extensions. So, again, we can't go into all those details for you this evening, but I just know there is a lot coming down the pipe and so without having -- yes, this is a concept plan, but we still need to know what are they willing to commit to as far as connectivity, roadways. I look at their concept plan and I see conflicts with ACHD policies in the fact that ACHD has been silent on this application and they don't want to commit to anything until a TIS. That gives me concern that we probably should slow this down and wait until we have a TIS and understand how that access is going to work, not only for this property, but also for the properties to the east. We want that interface to be smooth and we need lights to go in and all of those things that happen based on those traffic studies. So, it's critical. It's -- everyone has to work together on this and, again, staff is not comfortable letting this go with -- to building permit without having those details in place.

Seal: Okay. Thank you. I appreciate the information on that. It makes this quite a bit easier to swallow for sure. And for the applicant I really like the level of detail that they have provided on this plan. It's going to make it easier to go to the next step I think, especially when a TIS is completed. I do agree that it is critical that the traffic patterns are determined in here, especially knowing that that's a shipping center next door to you. You know, if -- hopefully there is not a lot of conflict in there where they are going to allow, you know, trucks to travel through this, even though it's, you know, partially commercial in there, I can just see there is, you know, going to be a lot of, you know, large residential units in here and a lot of kids playing and there it is -- it is, you know, very walkable, very rideable and all that, so I can see where having the traffic study done and making sure that that's all nailed down is going to be vital to making sure that this is, you know, safe and livable for not only the businesses that are there, but the people that have to live there, as well as the neighbors that kind of jumped the gun on things a little bit. So, again, I do appreciate the layout of it. I actually really like it. So, I think what we have going on south of this is a good mix of residential and commercial building properties. It's bringing in more places to eat, more places to have, you know, hobby locations and things like that. So, I generally like the idea. I like the fact that it puts that high density residential where it needs to be, which is, you know, close access to the freeway, things like that. So, there is a lot of really good things about this application. I'm very hopeful that that corner on -- on Ten Mile there -- hopefully we can -- you know, if -- if the pond relocation doesn't work

out with ACHD and even if it does, hopefully that corner can be turned into something that's highly visible and marks it as, you know, something very specific, you know, something very Meridian, you know, is done -- as done in the -- you know, Meridian Road interchange that's already there and you can see there is quite a bit of artwork and some visibility there to, you know, what Meridian is trying to be. Other than that, I really like the application and will definitely support staff.

McCarvel: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: For motion purposes, I think we all agree that we are going to be in support of not to include the applicant's request for two building permits prior to recording of the plat, but I know they had a little bit different wording earlier -- just a few lines up in that same area that might need to be addressed or are we good with that?

Fitzgerald: I think they say basically the same thing. We call out very specific things and -- or Joe calls out very specific things and I'm okay with, you know, significant deviations and fixes. So, I -- I'm good either way and I -- yeah, I think major deviations and changes or -- and I think Joe just listed out all the things that could change. I think either way I'm good. I don't have a problem with changing it to the applicant's request -- requested language. I think it's the same.

McCarvel: Okay.

Fitzgerald: I definitely appreciate the effort that they have put forward in regards to the civic area. If you can get some multi-modal in that -- in that area I would love to see something and so I really appreciate the applicant's efforts to work with staff on that. I know that peeled over from the FedEx location into your property. So, thank you for your patience in dealing with that and I know, Commissioner Seal, one of the other things I think that we have got in play -- we may not have seen it yet, but I think there is an Amazon location going in further east from the FedEx location, so I think we -- we definitely want to make sure that trucks are a big thing in my mind as well and so I think you are spot on in regards to your comments. So, additional comments before -- or motions are always in order. So, anyone take a stab?

McCarvel: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move we recommend approval to the City Council of file number H-2020-0046 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of September 17th, 2020, with the following modifications: To include the applicant's request and verbiage on Section 8A-1B, but not to include the last statement of up to two building permits may be obtained prior to the recordation of the plat.

Seal: Second.

McCarvel: Does that --

Fitzgerald: Does everybody understand what that -- what that is? Are we good? I have a motion and a second to recommend approval of file number H -- I'm losing my mind -- 2020-0046 with modifications. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed?

Cassinelli: Aye.

Fitzgerald: Okay. So, three-one, if I counted that. Making sure I'm -- correct? Okay. Motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. ONE NAY. TWO ABSENT.

Fitzgerald: Thank you very much, Stephanie. We appreciate it. I'm sure we will see you again soon. Okay. Moving on to the next -- oh, Adrienne, go right ahead, ma'am.

Weatherly: Mr. Chair, I just wanted to make a note. Ms. Stack, I see that your hand is raised again. If it is an audio issue if you could, please, try calling in. We are not receiving any feedback that other people are having audio issues. You can find the phone number to call the same place where you found the link to login into the Zoom meeting. If you need any help with that, please, e-mail cityclerk@meridiantcity.org and we would be happy to help you right now.

Fitzgerald: On the top of the agenda, if you look at the agenda, Ms. Stack, the join by phone number is on there and the web ID is on there as well. If there is questions there, please, join us there and --

Cassinelli: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Cassinelli.

Cassinelli: If I may comment. I think some of it what I'm getting -- I'm getting cutting in and out at the podium. So, if we can encourage those that are -- if there -- if -- if the applicant and -- on this next one is at the podium that they really concentrate on being at that microphone.

McCarvel: Yeah. Sure. I think it's the mask and any -- any movement away from that microphone it just gets muffled.

9. Public Hearing Rescheduled from September 3, 2020 for Pura Vida Ridge Ranch (H-2020-0064) by Jay Gibbons, South Beck & Baird, Located 3727 E. Lake Hazel Rd.

- A. Request: Annexation of 26.34 acres of land with R-8 (6.64 acres) and R-15 (19.69 acres) zoning districts.
- B. Request: A Preliminary Plat consisting of 157 buildable lots and 35 common lots on 26.34 acres of land in the R-8 and R-15 zoning districts.
- C. Request: A Planned Unit Development with a request for a deviation from the dimensional standards listed in UDC Table 11-2A-7 to allow reduced building setbacks in the R-15 zoning district.

Fitzgerald: Perfect. Thank you. Okay. And we will move on to the next item on our agenda, which is the file -- the application for -- it was rescheduled from September 3rd for Pura Vida Ridge Ranch, file number H-2020-0064 and let's kick it off with the staff report. Sonya, are you with us?

Allen: Yes, I am. Thank you, Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission. The next item before you is a request for annexation and zoning, a preliminary plat, and a planned unit development. This site consists of 26.34 acres of land, it's zoned RUT in Ada county, and is located at 3727 East Lake Hazel Road. Adjacent land use and zoning. To the north are single family residential properties in the development process zoned R-15. Excuse me just a moment.

Fitzgerald: Making sure our -- we can see the screen. If you are speaking to the PowerPoint slides we don't see them.

Seal: Mr. Chair, they are working on that right now.

Fitzgerald: Awesome.

Allen: Alrighty. Sorry about that. Back with you. Adjacent land use and zoning. To the north are single family residential properties in the development process, zoned R-15. To the west is single family rural residential agricultural land, zoned RUT in Ada county. To the south is the same and to the east is recently approved for the development of a church and single family residential attached and townhome units with R-15 zoning. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation for this site is medium high density residential, which calls for eight to 12 units per acre. Annexation of 26.34 acres of land with R-8 zoning, which consists of 6.64 acres, and R-15 zoning, which consists of 19.69 acres, is requested for the development of 157 single family residential homes, consisting of a mix of detached units, which is 30, and attached units, which are six, and townhome units, which are 121, at a gross density of 8.23 units per acre, which excludes the undevelopable areas of the site, consistent with the medium high density residential future land use map designation for the property. The area proposed to be rezoned -- or, excuse me, zoned R-8 consists of the upper rim area at the southwest corner of the site and that is this area right here where my pointer is. That is proposed to develop with single family residential detached homes, which will provide a transition to future medium density

residential development to the south. The area proposed to be zoned R-15 consists of the slope and the lower value -- valley area on the remainder of the site proposed to develop primarily with townhomes and a few single family residential attached units, which should be consistent with the future medium high density residential development to the east and west. A development agreement is recommended as a provision of annexation. A preliminary plat is proposed as shown to subdivide the property consisting of 157 buildable lots, 35 common lots, on 26.34 acres of land in the R-8 and R-15 zoning districts. The plat is proposed to develop in four phases as shown on the phasing plan on the right. The first phase is nearest Lake Hazel Road, with subsequent phases progressing to the south, with the last phase at the southwest corner of the site, which requires a public street access to be provided from the south. There is no vehicular connectivity between the upper rim and the lower valley lots. The Fire Department is requiring secondary access to be provided from the east or south or other means as agreeable by the Fire Department prior to development of phases two or three. Access is proposed via one public street and one emergency only access via East Lake Hazel Road. One stub street is proposed to the west and two stub streets are proposed to the south for future extension and one stub street is planned to the east boundary of the site from Poiema Subdivision for interconnectivity. A bridge is required to be constructed across the Ten Mile Creek to the east on the subject property in this location. The Ten Mile Creek does lie along the eastern boundary of this site right here. Alleys and common driveways are proposed off internal public streets for access to the proposed attached and townhome units. Traffic calming is proposed on road three, which is over 700 feet in length and that is this road right here by narrowing the street down to 24 feet between road six and seven and roads six and seven are these loops right here. A planned unit development is proposed to enable the development of a mix of single family residential detached, attached and townhome units on the site at a gross density of 8.23 units per acre, excluding the undevelopable areas of the slope, the hillside, while preserving the natural topography of the property and the Ten Mile Creek. This property has significant topography, which prevents development of over 25 percent of the property for buildable lots. The applicant states there is a 28 foot height difference between the valley floor and the rim with an average slope of approximately 40 percent. As part of the planned unit development the applicant requests deviations from UDC standards pertaining to building setbacks as shown on the preliminary plat and in the table there at the upper right of the screen. They are also asking for deviations from code requirements pertaining to sidewalks, landscaping along pathways, and cul-de-sac and block face lengths. The details and justification for such is included in the staff report. A 35 foot wide street buffer is proposed along Lake Hazel containing a berm and landscaping is proposed within common areas, except for the portion of the site that's on the hillside. No landscaping or sprinklers are proposed as the area is proposed to be left natural and unimproved. The applicant states low growing vegetation currently exists in this area that doesn't require supplemental moisture. Installing an irrigation system would cause unnecessary damage to the hillside. The HOA is proposed to be responsible for reducing fuels on an annual basis at a minimum. Staff and the Fire Department is very concerned about the potential danger of wildfires -- wildfires in this area. Therefore, the Fire Department is requiring defensible space to be provided. A minimum of 30 feet and possibly more for steep topography from all structures to the undeveloped natural open space. Plantings within

this area should be fire resistant. A wildfire safety plan is required to be approved by the Fire Department prior to approval of the first final plan and a copy of the approved plans should be included in the CC&Rs for the subdivision. Qualified open space in excess of the minimum standards. A minimum of 2.63 acres or ten percent is required. A total of 4.9 acres or 18.6 percent is proposed, consisting of half of the street buffer along Lake Hazel, linear open space, MEWs, and open grassy areas of at least 50 feet by 100 feet in area. This does not include the unimproved hillside area. Site amenities in excess of UDC standards are proposed. A minimum of one site amenity is required. Proposed amenities consist of a ten foot wide 1,631 foot long segment of the city's regional multi-use pathway system along the east boundary the site adjacent to the creek. A 16 foot by 16 foot shelter with a picnic table. Two eight foot by 12 foot arbors with benches and separate common areas. And a dirt trail and paved five foot wide pathway on the hillside. A pedestrian -- pedestrian connectivity plan was submitted as shown that depicts sidewalks along streets, pathways through internal common open space areas leading to amenities, micro pathways through MEWs providing connections to the ten foot multi-use pathway along the creek and pathways and trails in the unimproved slope area providing pedestrian connections between the upper ridge and lower valley lots. A parking plan was submitted as shown on the right that demonstrates compliance with the off-street parking standards for residential uses. A total of 71 additional off-street spaces are proposed for guests in many parking lots dispersed throughout the development and an additional 88 spaces can be accommodated on street for a total of 157 extra spaces. As noted, the Ten Mile Creek is a natural waterway that runs along the eastern boundary of the site. As such the UDC states that fencing should not prevent access to the waterway. However, in limited circumstances and in the interest of public safety, larger open water systems may require fencing as determined by the City Council, director, and -- and/or Public Works director. Fencing is not proposed or desired by the applicant. The applicant states water flows year round in the creek. It's shallow and slow flowing at an approximate depth of 18 to 24 inches and is overgrown with cattails as shown in the pictures. The depth of the waterway is -- in relation to the surrounding land is approximately six feet from the top of bank to the bottom of the channel and the width is approximately 15 to 20 feet wide. Fencing the creek would likely impede the irrigation district's ability -- ability to maintain the drain. Because this is not a large open water system with deep fast flowing current, staff is not overly concerned. However, any waterway may present a hazard to young children. For this reason and because staff has not received a determination from the director or the Public Works director on this matter, staff is recommending fencing is installed along the creek to restrict access unless otherwise waived by City Council. Respective elevations and views of the development were submitted as shown. Conceptual building elevations were submitted for the single family residential detached and attached townhomes, consisting of a variety of vertical and horizontal siding, stucco, brick and stone veneer accents, with wood and timber design elements, with gable style shingled roofs, with metal accent roofing on some elevations. No elevations were submitted for the two attached units, but they will consist of the two end units of the three plus unit townhomes put together back to back. The end units have a kick out on the front corner. To ensure quality of development within the PUD in accord with the UDC, staff recommends design guidelines are submitted for the overall development to be included in the development agreement that promote innovative design that creates

visually pleasing and cohesive patterns of development. To ensure compliance with these guidelines and the design standards in the architectural standards manual, staff recommends all structures, including single family detached, are subject to design review for compliance with these standards and guidelines. Written testimony was received from Jennifer Loveday. She is not in support of this project due to the opinion that the existing roadways in this area cannot support additional traffic and the schools can't support the influx of children this, along with other developments in this area, will bring. She is not in favor of the density proposed. She feels it's too high. And she would like to see more open space areas. Staff is recommending approval of the project with the requirement of a development agreement for the provisions in the staff report. Staff will stand for any questions.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, Sonya. I appreciate it. Are there questions for staff? Hearing none, would the applicant like to come forward.

Cassinelli: Mr. Chair, I'm getting a lot of audio feedback.

Fitzgerald: Madam Clerk, I know I'm loud in the chamber. Is that -- can you manage that for me?

Weatherly: Mr. Chair, I continue to try to adjust the speakers, as we have found best appropriate to try to manage the meeting inside chambers. I can try to be more discerning with it.

Fitzgerald: Okay.

Weatherly: If you could continue to provide reports on how the sound is I would appreciate it.

Fitzgerald: Is the applicant online or -- or in the chambers?

Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, I'm -- the applicant's here. The staff is getting my -- my PowerPoint up at the moment.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Thanks, sir. Madam Clerk, if we can also turn the video camera for the podium.

Weatherly: Sorry, Mr. Chair. We are just getting the presentation -- the applicant's presentation up and we are just working through the technical situation here. It will be just another second.

Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, my name is Jay Gibbons. I am with South Beck & Baird in Boise, Idaho. I am the applicant-owner-representative for Pura Vida Ridge Ranch Subdivision. As staff stated, it's -- it's located off of -- just south of Lake Hazel Road and Ten Mile Creek runs entirely -- our property runs to the east side of Ten Mile drain -- Creek drain. So, there are -- there are two pieces -- there are two parcels included

in the 26.34 acres. You can see there is an existing house. There is a -- there is a dirt road that goes to the top of the hill where that house is. The house will go away as part of the development. I will clarify and note the information that I provided to staff when -- in my narrative apparently I didn't update or I transposed a number or what have you. There is actually 58 feet of elevation difference from the toe of the slope to the -- to the top of the slope. It's -- it's a significant hill. It's a challenging piece of property and we have -- we have worked with the neighbors to the -- to the east, the church property, Poiema Subdivision. We have -- we have worked with the two owners in different development applications that neither has come forward yet to the south that we are -- we are going to rely on for access to the R-8 in phase four. So, our development plan is -- I want to -- I want to make sure that it's understood that this is single family attached housing product in the R-15 district is not apartments, they are not for rent. We will build a building -- you know, the -- you have got to build -- you can't -- they are attached, so you build one building at a time -- in pairs, anyways, because of the common driveways. We have worked closely with the Fire Department -- the Meridian Fire and basically city has nothing on the books at the moment with regard to wildland -- or wildland urban interface fire issues, but because we are a unique property and we have that slope and it's a native slope, in my conversation with Joe Bongiorno we -- we have no issue with -- we believe and I agree with the city that we will address that, we will create a fire and firewise plan for that common area for the hillside slope and it will be part of our CC&Rs and the homeowners association will -- will be required to, you know, keep the vegetation down and -- and the fuel load for future fire issues per se. So, we don't -- we don't want fires and anything we can do naturally. Irrigation is -- is not necessary. There are, you know, native plants. There is a whole table and database of -- of appropriate plants for different -- different levels of protection from the, you know, 30 foot buffer to, you know, a hundred feet. It actually goes from five to 30 to 100. So, we will address all that as -- as it comes going forward. So, the waterway -- you saw pictures that staff showed I provided to staff of the waterway and Ten Mile drain. It's not very deep. There is not -- it is very shallow, though, as evidenced by the cattails. The cattails -- this -- this picture shows a nice -- nice blue stream. Well, at the moment, until the irrigation district or the border -- the Boise Project Board of Control come in and -- and do something inside, you know, to maintain the ditch, it is all cattails from Ten Mile Road way beyond our property. I will note that we will have a pressurized irrigation system for the common areas within this project. We -- the little red dot in the southeast corner. We -- we do have water rights -- irrigation water rights from Ten Mile Creek, which I didn't believe the first time I heard it either, but it actually -- it is a creek and drain, but -- but we have verification from the New York Irrigation District that -- who -- who oversees it. It's not Nampa-Meridian. The New York Irrigation District -- we do have water rights within that. So, we will create a pump system and we have discussed cooperation with -- actually with the Poiema development that is to the east that will share water, pressurized irrigation with that development as well. So, as staff noted there are a number of -- because we -- we are kind of the middle property and because of the topography we needed to provide street stubs access to -- for future development. Hence, we are -- and needed -- in order to go beyond the first phase of our project we need to build a bridge so we have a secondary access from a fire perspective and we -- so, that's why that actually ties up with -- with -- with the plan -- the development plan. The preliminary showed -- we sat down and coordinated that that

bridge would be an appropriate location for both developments. That said, the property to the south -- you see white lines. There is -- that connect to -- a local street that connects to our R-8 street. That R-8 will tag -- take access from Eagle Road as part of that development to the south when it comes and we will continue to coordinate with -- with whoever the property owner is down there. At the same time they have a similar low valley triangle on their property, the same elevation as our R-15 area that they will need a -- want a connection. They will have a cul-de-sac, because that road basically can't go anywhere beyond that. You get to the end of the -- their corner of the property at Ten Mile Creek and it becomes Boise Ranch Golf Course and in the city of Boise jurisdiction at that point, so we are kind on the edge of things, but we -- we have coordinated the best we could and we have good relationships with -- with the neighbors in order to accomplish that. We did -- since we have the public comment about the future traffic issues on Lake Hazel and the lack of -- of improvement at the moment, we did submit a traffic study. We did -- we accomplished one. We submitted it to Ada County Highway District. They approved that. They had to go through some revisions. They have -- they have a plan for Lake Hazel Road potentially to be widened from Eagle Road past this development in 2023 or '24. So, that's coming up pretty quick. Our -- our road improvements will -- will be tied to that and if we -- if we start down the road of our first final plat and there will be a new bridge that crosses for Ten Mile Creek if that's not all in by the time we can move to the final plat and we will be contributing to that -- that bridge trust with ACHD as well. As I say, we are -- we comply with the Comprehensive Plan and we worked extensively with staff. I think our first pre-app was last November. We have been through a lot of -- a lot of iterations and really worked closely with staff to get to this point and we are really appreciative of their efforts. We spoke to open space. The bridge connection. It is a PUD and it's an attached product, that's why we are doing the difference in setbacks will be zero setback -- zero lot lines on interiors. You will have three to five feet -- it is a -- it is an alley loaded -- our rear-loaded garages are in the rear. The hundred -- the hundred and -- all 127 townhomes and other attached are all rear loaded. The smaller ones on the common -- on 24 foot roads, which I should probably -- there you go. So, everything that's kind of a tan color is either the 24 foot road or it's on a common driveway. Those are alley loaded. You have three and five foot setbacks from the property line to the face of the buildings. We want to modulate the building so you have some -- some differentiation, it's just not a solid, flat wall and, then, the yellowish are the alley loaded. They are larger. They will have four bedrooms potentially. You have got a two car garage, plus two cars on -- on the parking -- a driveway parking pad 20 by 20 and we do have parking guest, additional cars, what have you. I think it's important that between the street parking and what have you and in a tight, dense development like that you got -- you got to have room for -- for folks to come in and out. So, as I spoke to -- and staff, we do have four access points to adjacent properties, one to the west, two to the south and -- and one, of course, across Ten Mile Creek to the east. A little larger parking plan. You can see we have a ton of parking and it's a good thing. We have no issue with that. We would like to provide that. This is a very pedestrian oriented development. The orange is the multi-use pathway that runs the entire length of Ten Mile Creek. It also -- the very northeast end of that looks wider. It is. That's our emergency access for the time being through phase one until we -- until we build a bridge and have a secondary access for -- for fire in phase two. The green -- the green lines are -- we are trying to provide a -- more

of a trail. It's not paved. Those are, you know, three or four foot compacted native soil -- it will be soil or -- or, you know, gravel improved. Definitely built into the slope. I want to clarify that with the five foot pathway sidewalk that goes up the hill to the -- and ties into the roadway and the R-8 -- part of the reason that that pathway is where it is and where it is -- is -- there is a waterline that will be -- that runs in alignment and we will -- we will provide part of the loop for the city in that regard and it will tie to the -- to the property to the south and as it develops. Hopefully not in the too distant future you will see that one as well. So, these are our -- our elevations for our R-15 units. You can see there is modulation. There is a lot of different -- different materials, a lot of different colors. It's a very colorful development. I can say this -- these are actually -- we were in -- my firm was involved in -- in this project. It's in Eagle. It's in the River District and it's in -- you know, our building layout as far as how they fit on individual lots and the buildings themselves and the spaces in the buildings are very similar to this and I can say it's extremely popular through the course of development and finalizing the landscape. I did the -- all the certificate of completion on each set of two buildings. They had ten buildings built over about 18 months. But as soon as -- as soon as I did the -- provided the certificate of completion for the landscape and they got their certificate of occupancy, they got full fast. That similarly to our project they are on individual lots as well. I think initially these ones in -- in Eagle are -- are rentals currently, but they -- they are set up to be sold at some point in the future and similarly the R-8 elevations will be up on the bluff. Fit on lots that are about 55 feet wide or so. They share similar building materials and styles to the -- to the R-15 that we propose. This is actually part of the same. This is the first phase of Lonesome Dove in Eagle. That was totally single family. It's closer to the river and, then, Lonesome Dove Two was out closer to the bypass itself. But it really ties well together, it's really well landscaped, and it has access to a greenbelt as well. Other than that, you know, I think -- I will work with -- with the city to get to this point and the staff report of conditions that are set forth in the staff report, we agree with those. We have worked closely to get to that point and we are not asking for any changes. We are happy the way they are. And with that I will stand for questions. Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, Jay. We appreciate it. Any questions for the applicant?

Seal: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: Just -- do you have timing or, you know, estimated timing on when you will start or complete the four phases that are shown on this?

Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Seal, we want to -- we want to push forward when we get -- the first phase, of course, is contingent on getting entitlements through the city. We have -- in the course of getting to this point we have potential financing for construction of the final plat and the first phase. As soon as we can get construction draws. So, I would say the first phase will start next year sometime and, then, the second phase will follow on that and the third phase will follow after that. The fourth phase is contingent on what happens south of us. We really -- we can't build that -- that could sit

for a while until -- until the property to the south comes up with a development plan and goes through process, gets their entitlements and actually gets to a phase that hits us and is contiguous, so -- but we would like to build the -- the lower part, the R-15 sections as quickly as possible within the next five years to have that complete.

Seal: Okay. Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Cassinelli, go right ahead.

Cassinelli: Thank you. Yes, this is Commissioner Cassinelli. Question on the -- I'm getting a lot of feedback. Hopefully you can hear me. The gross density application that you -- or calculations I should say that you have in the application, what is the lower -- do you have a size of that lower portion that's buildable?

Gibbons: Let's see. Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Cassinelli --

Cassinelli: Cassinelli. Thank you.

Gibbons: I did all those calculations last week and I didn't bring that worksheet with per se. I mean there is -- so, 15 acres -- the rezone itself was for -- okay. So, the R-15 is 19.69 acres. The hillside itself is between four and five, if I remember correctly, and Ten Mile Creek itself was about an acre and a half. We deducted -- it was -- there is 19 minus 7.26 acres. It must be pretty close to 12 acres on the -- on the south side -- or, you know, on the lower end. Twelve or thirteen probably.

Cassinelli: So -- so, 13 acres is that buildable portion on the -- of what the townhomes are occupying; is that -- am I hearing that correct?

Gibbons: Correct.

Cassinelli: Okay.

Gibbons: Correct.

Cassinelli: All right. Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Grove, did you have some comments, sir?

Grove: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Question with the R-15 portion where are residents meant to congregate, I guess, is my best way of putting that. I see that there is a lot of open space, but it doesn't feel like there is a cohesive -- like usable space from an open space perspective with that many units.

Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Grove, we have actually spread the -- we do have -- so, being a -- being a rear loaded product the front door actually faces the MEWs, which common areas with the sidewalks in between them. There are areas -- there is a -- there

is a shelter up where we have the light yellow. If you remember back to our overall colored rendered plan, the -- the alley loaded with the parking driveways themselves, there is a good sized space in there that has a shelter and benches. There is -- so, there is also a mailbox kiosk. It's right at the base of the hill where the -- the westernmost trail takes off that -- it's red as well. There is -- there is some gathering area and benches around there. We have spread benches along the walkways that that walk -- that follow the toe of the slope and, then, there is also some area on the very south end where our -- our road ends. There is some area there and, basically, it's -- you know, it just kind of all ties together. There is -- there is not like a big park area per se, but there is lots of little spots with things in them and -- and, you know, this is -- this is -- this is meant to -- you know, for people -- they live close and they have open space out their front door and that's usable. Each house has an 80 foot square foot stoop on it as well, so -- does that answer your question? I kind of rambled there. I apologize.

Grove: It answers the question. I -- I just --

Fitzgerald: Additional question for the applicant? Mr. Gibbons, we will have you close here after public testimony and we appreciate your presentation.

Gibbons: Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Madam Clerk, do we have anyone who would like to testify on this application?

Weatherly: Mr. Chair, we had several people sign in and one person indicating a wish to testify. That's Annette Alonso and she marked she is an HOA representative as well. Annette, I'm trying to transfer you, but we are having some technical difficulties, so if you will bear with me for just a minute. I'm going to give you the ability to talk.

Fitzgerald: And I have -- I will just -- if anybody else wants to testify -- I know Annette knows this because she has testified before, but, please, state your name and your address for the record as we get started. Annette, the floor is yours, ma'am, if you are ready to go.

Alonso: All right. Can you all hear me?

Fitzgerald: Yes, ma'am.

Alonso: Okay. This is Annette Alonso. I live at 2204 East Hyperdrive in Meridian. 83642. I live -- I live fairly close to this development. Thank you, Commissioners, for allowing me to speak tonight. First of all, in regards to this development, it appears that we are kind of putting the cart before the horse here, as a portion of this development, the 30 homes on the hill, will only be accessible from a development to the southwest and that has not yet been heard in a single public hearing process. No roads will access this portion of Pura Vida and there will be no connectivity. The 30 proposed homes would be located within a private gated area of the other development, which I believe is coming on sometime to P&Z in October. We don't believe the private streets were presented in this

application, nor do we understand the necessity or the desire of the city to have such streets. So, moving on to site characteristics. This is a very unique piece of property with high groundwater and a location where migratory birds nest with cattails in the marshy meadows. The D-shaped portion of the parcel that sits at the bottom of the hill will need to be filled and a loma required to be built upon according to the applicant's initial information. This will change the groundwater dynamics for all the surrounding area. Section 4.05.00 of the Comprehensive Plan states that we need to preserve, protect, and enhance and wisely use natural resources and natural features. This aspect of Pura Vida application is an assault against the spirit of -- and the intent of the newly adopted comp plan in that aspect. The applicant's lack of planning for the steep hillside will introduce risks and create a permanent unacceptable, undesirable eyesore for the area residents. As you all are aware, the city has long needed to address the slopes and related erosion drainage and fire hazards through the UDC and yet we still don't have an appropriate UDC in place for this. The southern rim has many hillsides in various developments, of which I live in one, that either the HOA or the individual residents maintain. That is in quotes. Maintain. In most instances, as our code enforcement officers will tell you, they are not maintained at all. This is a cause of chronic fire, along with rodents, snakes, and as this year severe tick infestation. This developer is proposing not to have the area watered or planted, which based on precedence in our scenic southern rim district causes hills to become risk hazards, eyesores, and certainly not any sort of usable amenity for the enjoyment of residents. And walking up a pathway in that area is going to be hazardous to dogs, to children, et cetera. As far as the dimensional deviations that they are asking for, the developer is requesting a deviation in set -- setback for the R-15 zoning to allow attached structures with -- sorry, guys. Hold on just a second. Sorry. My dog was barking and she was bothering me. Okay. The justification is that the front doors open onto a MEW providing pedestrian access in front of the residents. R-15 zoning has an appropriate setback currently per the UDC, allowing us to merely provide the developer the ability to add more homes and get more sales. This is not the equivalent -- this is the equivalent of a step up in our understanding, which City Council has clearly stated will not be allowed under the new comp plan. Further, the amount of money the developer will or will not make on a development is irrelevant. So, this could be denied as a step up are not allowed. Moving on to the streets. Road improvements in the area are not scheduled until '23 or '24. There is an average of one accident per month in the area at the intersection of Eagle and Lake Hazel. It's very dangerous with only a fourway stop, steep inclines and declines in all directions. Pura Vida would add another 1,204 vehicle trips per day to this intersection. Section 6.01.02F of the comp plan. Consider incomplete and underserved roadways and timing of the necessary road improvements in all land use decisions. Within the development the developer is proposing no curb and sidewalks on the 20 foot wide street ways. These are all along the southwest toe of the slope where it would be natural to access -- an actual access point for pedestrians to reach the hillside pathway. Asking the city for private streets to avoid sidewalks is not acceptable. This was mentioned in one ACHD report in the information on the file. There is no reasonable rationale for the city to lower its bar when some of the most important stakeholder values were connectivity, pathways, and amenities. If the developer does not want to install sidewalks on the 20 foot wide streets, we would suggest they place a pedestrian pathway all along the toe of the hill from the north to south. This would allow

pedestrian and bicycle connectivity throughout the site on the southwest side of the lower portion. Driveways -- shared driveways -- we all know it's a major bone of contention within the P&Z and the City Council. Currently the UDC committee is looking at an amendment to lower the number of homes on a common driveway to fewer than six due to the problems they create amongst homeowners and with parking. Each of these shared drives that's proposed has six residents. This is the maximum allowed per UDC. As far as transition is concerned, Idaho land use strongly protects agricultural practices. The southern rim stakeholders seriously desire to protect our existing rural properties and practices. The neighbor to the west has put quite a bit of money into developing a prosperous horse farm where they breed and raise horses. Their large birthing barn is located just over the property line. Allowing this development will overtax the young foals and the mares. There has been no acceptable buffer plan for this homeowner's property. This is shockingly inadequate and insensitive to our community and Idaho's values, as well as to the equine property owner's rights, essentially, as to be pushing them out of their position that they live in at this point. Going on to open space. 2.02.08. Plan safe, attractive, and well maintained neighborhoods that have ample open space and generous amenities. 2.02.01A. With new plats require design and construction of class laid connections, easy pedestrian and bicycle access to parks, safe routes to school, and the incorporation of usable open space. This is being marketed as a first time homebuyer development, according to the applicant's information. Statistically this style of development has many children. MEWs, pedestrian pathways along a waterway, and an 80 foot square foot stoop on the front -- or porch on the front of each of those MEW areas does not allow for a child to play freely. These proposed open spaces are irregularly shaped, disconnected, or isolated and do not meet Meridian's high standards for usable open space. The majority of the open space should not be comprised of unusable laterals, remnant spaces, and linear parkways. Open space and all amenities should be intentional, well designed, and high quality, designed to promote the well being of the residents. A large aggregate area for children, with play equipment, room to run, kick a ball and benches with shade are desired. These should be centrally located with the development. I'm going to move on to schools. I know you all have heard it, but you need to hear it again. According to the Comprehensive Plan 3.02.01A, to evaluate the comprehensive impacts of growth and consider the city master plan and strategic plans in all land use decisions, i.e., traffic, school enrollment, and parks. 3.02.01G. Establish and maintain levels of service for public facilities and services, including water, sewer, police, transportation, schools, fire and parks. At this time in our city development schools must be a main focus. Our schools are severely overcrowded and I have listed some information. This is count of -- within a mile and a half radius of this property we have Sky Mesa Highland, The Keep, Turf Farm, Century Farm, East Ridge, Lavender Heights, McKay Farm, Poiema, Sky Break, which is coming, Pinnacle and Pura Vida. We have 1,410 possible students. I spoke to the school district today and the 1,410 students, if you divide that the way they do, I was told that the -- that the group that would be in the elementary school would fill an entire elementary school. We don't even have an elementary school available. So, this is seriously going to tax our school system. If this is first time homebuyers, these people do not have the capacity financially to put their children in a private school or other situations like that. So, we have to seriously look at this. Where -- where will these children go to school? Would you like your children to be

in a situation with up to 37 students in their classes? So, in conclusion, the city has made it very clear that annexation is to be held at a higher standard. This application does not represent or come within reach of that higher standard. It lacks continuity of open space, no connectivity within the development itself, and bases part of the development access on another developer that hasn't been seen or presented to P&Z yet. Road improvement is not scheduled for another three to four years. Schools are severely overcrowded and redrawing school boundaries will not solve this. No new school is planned to have bonds or have bonds pending. A development very similar in housing style has been approved adjacent to this property by City Council in the past month. Comp Plan clearly states that there needs to be a good cross-section of housing and they should guard against an abundance of subdivisions in similar and repetitive density, appearance, and price ranges. This is a beautiful piece of property and should be developed to protect its natural features. This is not that development. Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Ma'am, we appreciate your comments tonight. Madam Clerk, is there additional folks who would like to testify?

Weatherly: Mr. Chair, I don't see anyone with their hand raised and I don't see anyone with their hand raised in chambers either.

Fitzgerald: If there is anyone who would like to testify on this application, please, raise your hand via Zoom or in chambers and we will call on you. Give you a few seconds. Commissioner Seal, do you see anybody? Okay. Seeing no hands -- Mr. Gibbons, would you like to come up and close, sir, and respond to comments?

Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners. I think, you know, we all share similar concerns as far as schools are concerned, traffic, and the way that -- you know, the way that the traffic improvements are funded and the timing never seems to work just right. I can say that -- so, this -- this piece of property is -- you know, it was pasture land on the flat at some point, had -- had horses or cattle on it. If you -- if you see the -- the hillside itself at the moment there is -- there are, you know, wheel tracks from -- somebody's been up there fourwheeling and what have you and there is -- somebody did a slippy slide at some -- some point, so there is visqueen down the side. There are -- there are a lot -- that hillside can't be left exactly the way it is at the moment. It's got to be improved and that's -- that's part of our plan as well with the firewise plantings and -- and -- and part of -- part of our development plan, you know, so we -- we have preserved the native vegetation that's along Ten Mile Creek. The multi-use pathway will invite the public in, which is -- I was the Pathways Project Manager at the City of Meridian for seven years until I went back to private practice about three years ago. So, as far as, you know, fences along -- along ditches or drains, that is really something I will have to -- I need to discuss with the irrigation district, because I'm always concerned -- I have seen it both ways. Sometimes the irrigation district doesn't want a fence, maybe it's a different height of fence or what have you. We are not against building a fence if -- if the city sees that that needs to happen in the end, we will -- you know, we will work through the -- the possibilities to do that. But at least -- as far as traffic is concerned, it's been studied, it's a -- it's on the way. Improvements are on the way. When it comes to density and

questions about density and being too dense, our property falls within the medium high density residential designation under the comp plan. It speaks to that much density and we did everything we could to -- I mean if you -- if you look at 26 acres and you got a maximum -- you know, the high end of that medium high residential is 12 units per acre, that's a -- that's almost -- it's right at 300 units per acre. We don't have 300 units overall in 26.34 acres. We don't have the ability to build that many. We are not building multi-family. We are not building apartments. So, we have -- we have done our best to comply with what the city foresaw and the vision that they had for this property and the adjacent property. So, you know, we have -- we have -- we have worked diligently to get on board with -- with what the city needs to find. So, hopefully, I have addressed questions and addressed the issues that the public has brought up and I will stand for questions. Thanks.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Gibbons, one quick second. I'm going to have you maybe sit down for a second. I'm going to have Chief Bongiorno chime in here, because I see him raising his hand and we wanted to have him chime in on the wild land urban fire interface and kind of the effort, because I know that the issue has been brought up, we want to make sure that the chief has a chance to comment on that hillside and what's being done. Chief, are you available?

Bongiorno: I am. I am not sure if I'm in the call or not.

Fitzgerald: I think you are, sir. So, if you --

Bongiorno: Oh.

Fitzgerald: -- could give us your thoughts we would really appreciate your perspective.

Bongiorno: Awesome. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Sorry, I just came in, so I'm -- I'm going to go off what I assume you guys were talking about and when I talked to Mr. Gibbons in the past last -- earlier last week we had talked about, you know, just concerns about the hillside and making sure that we don't have another Idaho Power, you know, Boise fire incident where they, you know, lost 12 houses and one person up on the hillside up above where the fire caught. So, the fire department's main concern was just making sure that it's maintained, the hillside, and that we -- for those houses that do back up to that hillside that we maintain the 30 feet of clear space, so we don't have, you know, flames impinging on fences and houses and, you know, to where we can have a wildfire. So, basically, we -- I borrowed Boise's wildland urban -- urban interface documents, toned it down a little bit and sent them to Jay and -- and he had mentioned that, yeah, we are -- we are familiar with it. So, again, our goal is just to make sure that we don't lose that hillside and any houses around it. So, the goal was just to come up with a way that the HOA is going to maintain it and, then, anything that does get disturbed that it's planted with fire resistant plantings, which is part of the firewise documentation that I think I sent that to them as well.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, chief. Are there questions from the Commission for Chief Bongiorno? Commissioner Cassinelli, go right ahead.

Cassinelli: Deputy Chief, as long as they comply with everything and the HOA, you are satisfied with that plan then? The plan that they have?

Bongiorno: We haven't -- Commissioner. Sorry. Chairman and Commissioners, I have not seen the plan yet. We just spoke this week about it. But, yes, as soon as we get that plan together, Sonya and I were talking about, you know, when -- once we get the plan approved to make sure that she's aware of it and so we can move forward with the -- with the subdivision. So, I don't have any issues at this point. The conversation I had with Mr. Gibbons was it -- it's not going to be a problem, we will -- we will take care of it.

Cassinelli: Okay. Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Any additional questions -- or I mean comments or questions for the chief?

Allen: Mr. Chair, if I could --

Fitzgerald: Go right ahead, Sonya.

Allen: -- add something. Thank you. I just wanted to clarify the record. When Mrs. Alonso spoke she referenced private streets within the development several times. There are no private streets in this development. They are all public. So, just wanted to clarify. Thank you.

Fitzgerald: That was a question I was going to ask you to clarify. So, thank you very much for doing it. Well, Chief, thank you for being here. Hopefully you can stick around for a minute if there is additional questions, but we really appreciate your perspective and you guys taking that step forward.

Bongiorno: I will -- I will -- Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, I will be here.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, sir. Mr. Gibbons, do you have any final comments, sir? I kind of cut you off a little bit. Or -- and then I will -- we will open it up for questions.

Gibbons; Mr. Chairman, thanks for the opportunity. No, I would -- I had it written down to clarify that -- that there are no -- no private streets in the -- in the development. I appreciate staff making that comment for me. With that I will -- I will stand for questions. I'm here as a resource, so thank you.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Seal, go right ahead, sir.

Seal: Just one question on the -- the property that's up on top of the hill that's going to turn into the R-8. That's going to come out as part of phase one or in phase one or is that

-- when -- when will that come out and when will the access -- that access road be cut off is my main question?

Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Seal, you're talking the R-8 up on the hill?

Seal: Correct.

Gibbons: That is our last phase and that has to wait until -- until the development -- when there is a development. I mean we have talked to -- we have worked with both potential developers to this -- to this point. They were actually ahead of us last winter and, then, they fell behind and I assume they will catch up, but our access -- the thing is is they need additional access from -- from their -- and we -- we need our access to come through them. It will go to Eagle Road. So, we can't build until -- until they get to that point.

Seal: Right. But when will the -- the existing property that's there, when will that be taken? This kind of relates to the fire danger and --

Gibbons: Oh. Okay. I understand.

Seal: -- things like that where if that's going to come out who is going to maintain it, how is that going to fit into the -- you know, the fire plan and everything. If that sits empty for two, three years, then, obviously, the fire danger extends into that property as well.

Gibbons: Exactly. Commissioner Seal, so the problem with -- with -- so, the staff report -- there is a condition that it goes away, that the house is removed -- or it will be removed when that -- that phase hits. However, like you say, if it were to sit -- sit vacant it's an issue, because the access to the house currently comes from -- it's that dirt road that comes to the south off of Lake Hazel where it has such a great -- it's been cut, so there is -- it's in a valley and all of that was pushed out to -- to level it up to get it into -- you know, the grade of the road would meet city requirements, it wouldn't be too steep for fire protection, what have you. Well, the way that road sits I have to cut the bottom of that road off with the first phase, because it becomes part of our -- our loop there. So, that -- that house really has to go away right away. It can't -- it doesn't have access otherwise, so --

Seal: Right. Understood. Thank you.

Gibbons: Uh-huh.

Fitzgerald: Additional questions for Mr. Gibbons? Commissioner Grove, go right ahead, sir.

Grove: Thank you, Mr. Chair. With this development is -- I know that there is no physical connection to the R-8 and R-15, but is there an overall development connection between the two in terms of like HOA or is it, basically, two separate developments happening with this project?

Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Grove, no, it is -- it is a part of the same development, it's just that their access is -- is coming from another development. It will be under the same HOA. It will be maintained in the same fashion. It has common areas that are part of the -- of the rest of the R-15 development as well. The pathway connection and water connection -- that pathway, if need be, could be turned into -- I mean it's -- the reason that that -- that five foot pathway that goes up the hill is in the configuration it is with water underneath, per se, is it could be an access road. It just requires a lot more grading. I mean it's our fallback plan if the other development never comes forth we can flip that and -- and, you know, we would have to work with the city in that regard, too, after the fact, but it could provide access up to the north. But we still need that -- that access to the south for a secondary emergency access for our work with the fire department.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel, do you have questions?

McCarvel: No, not at the time.

Fitzgerald: Any additional questions for Mr. Gibbons? Thank you very much, sir.

Gibbons: Thank you.

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

McCarvel: Mr. Chair --

Seal: So moved.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: Second.

Fitzgerald: I have a motion and a second to close the public hearing. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Fitzgerald: Somebody want to lead off. Commissioner Seal, I will go to you first. Commissioner Grove, you can --

Seal; I will start off. There is -- I know there is a need for this type of housing in Meridian. That -- that said I -- I agree with a lot of what Mrs. Alonso had to say as far as kind of where this is at and how it's situated and the predicament we are in as far as, you know, the roads and the schools and everything else. Again, I'm pretty passionate about the schools. Not only the -- I mean there is a great school available, but the nearest grade school is already capped. The grade school that these kids will end up going to is near being capped and everything else is already overcrowded. So, you know, the fact of the matter is these kids are probably going to be bused somewhere else to get to school. So,

that may or may not be a reality, but if they are not bused somewhere else, then, the only other alternative is class size will increase. To me neither one of those are anything I can in good conscience support and that would go for, you know, anybody developing in this area, unless they bring something in that's going to help eliminate some of that along the way. Some of the design that's in this -- and I understand it's a very unique piece of property, so it's not going to be laid out nice and neat like other things. That said, I think there is more opportunity to lay this out in a fashion that's going to provide for it to be 14 more unique and more fitting for the area that it's in. We have had several applications come in with townhome style homes that provide for, you know, no shared driveways or less shared driveways, as well as, you know, more of a -- kind of north end style entrance to them, so I think something like that would probably work much better in this area and it gives Meridian something not only -- not only that's needed, but something that's unique for that area. So, there are some things that I like about it. I do like some of the alley load houses, the way that the -- the configuration is done on that. Some of the parking that's in there -- I do agree that more parking is generally better, but it eats up quite a bit of area that could be common. It was marked as unqualified common space and a lot of that has parking in it, so I think some of the parking that's in there -- some of the parking and some of the open space could probably be reconfigured as well in order to provide for, you know, open space that is more communal, especially when you are going to have a huge disconnect between the R-8 and the R-15s down below. So, that's my thoughts at this point. You are muted.

Fitzgerald: All right. Sorry. My computer -- Commissioner Grove, go ahead.

Grove: Thanks, Mr. Chair. I will echo some of the same things, but the biggest concern for me right off the bat is the -- the school and just looking at the distance that was listed for like the elementary school. There is two schools that are within like a mile of this development, but the -- the school that was listed was 4.6 miles or something like that for the elementary school, which is just a major red flag for me on this. In -- in that aspect this might be a timing piece more than anything else, but my other concern is -- and I kind of brought it up earlier -- is with the -- the open space configuration and I like the product. I'm not a huge fan of shared driveways typically, but I'm okay with this -- like general product and layout even, but it's missing a cohesive open space for this development as a whole. I don't see it -- the use of the open space that is presented now does not feel like it will meet the needs of the people who will be moving into this product. You know, having lived in places like this and having small children, this doesn't feel like there is a place for families and young children to really congregate and hang out safely with -- and actually have a sense of place where they live. So, I have some major concerns with that. With the -- the Ten Mile Creek I was already a little concerned and, then, seeing the pictures with all the cattails made me even more concerned just from a safety standpoint, because it doesn't feel like you can really see where that embankment is necessarily at. Maybe that was just the photo, but it was concerning to me, so I don't know, you know, if -- if we could look at fencing that might solve it. I'm just a little concerned with the visibility of that water feature. And, then, I don't know exactly how it's addressed, but the southwest -- sorry. Southeast corner of the project, I don't know -- if it doesn't connect how that would be reshaped, because it doesn't look like there would be adequate

turnaround space. So, that might be something that could be explained to me, but I don't -- looking at it -- and I'm just kind of confused by how that would work. And, then, I don't know, it -- I see how they are connected, the -- the two pieces, the southwest corner and, then, the R-15 are connected by the pathway, but it doesn't feel like there is anything else that really connects them, since there is no roadway structure that connects the two product types. So, I mean I don't know if that's a huge concern, but it's going to stand out to me just looking through this. But those are the -- the concerns that kind of are on my radar right now.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Grove, I will point out one thing -- and Chief Bongiorno can clarify for us if we need to. The circle to the northwest, that racetrack looking thing, it has -- it has two accesses off of that. The orange connection back to Lake Hazel is an emergency exit, a bollarded emergency access and, then, it has a main access coming in. The only way they can build paths of the circular kind of slot car racing track is to connect that secondary access down in the southeast corner and that -- I'm not sure that helps you with the -- with your thoughts, but they do have to have another connection point going south.

Grove: If I read it, it was the connection point that leads over to -- across the creek.

Fitzgerald: Or across the -- yeah. One of them has to be put in place.

Grove: I guess it was just going down all the way to the end of that development that I was concerned with.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Commissioner Cassinelli or Commissioner McCarvel, do you want to hop in? I think you remuted yourself, Bill.

Cassinelli: Wrong way. I thought I was muted. I share -- I share many of the concerns that have been expressed so far. A big one is the open space and, first of all, this is -- let me backup. It's a difficult piece of property. In-fills are -- are always a pain. They are -- they are difficult to deal with and part of this one -- it's got four acres that are unbuildable, unusable, it's -- I believe it's counting as qualified open space, but it's a hillside that would be difficult to play on. So, there isn't a whole lot -- for -- for a hundred and -- I believe it's 26 units are in the -- are in the R-15 category, there is going to be -- there is going to be a lot of kids in there. If it's -- if this is designed for first time homebuyers, we are looking at probably young small families, that's who -- what's going to be able to afford this type of product. I like the product. I just don't -- there is -- there is some cool design elements to it and I think it would be a great fit in a lot of areas. I just don't know if it's the right fit here. I do also have another concern. I didn't initially about the fencing, but when -- when Commissioner Grove was talking and the fact that you can't see in there -- you know, this community just lost a two year old a couple of weeks ago to -- in a pond and -- which was tragic and -- and it wouldn't take much for -- without any fencing. So, I think -- I didn't think that was critical, now I do. If we are going to -- you know, if this does move forward I do think that's critical. But the big thing for me is that on a density aspect -- and it's something that -- that I'm always going to look at and I don't -- this -- it appears as though

-- and, you know, it's kind of a question here to staff. It appears as though this was looked at as the entire parcel and the density was configured for the entire parcel, but, really, this is -- it almost -- this is two and you have got 81 percent of -- according to my quick calculations -- 81 percent of the -- of the units are on less than half of the -- the property there and so it really -- if -- I was trying to do it, but I couldn't come up with calculations. I think if we took the density of just those -- of the townhomes by themselves on that -- on that lower level, I think we would exceed the density here, but because we are looking at -- it is one -- one big parcel it fits. But I think that's a little -- I don't want to say it's misleading, it just throws it off and it -- what happens is what we are seeing is -- is, honestly, a higher density here that's -- that's going in between R-8s and I just -- maybe if we could pull some of that density out of there, but, then, I know it throws numbers off, but I just don't -- I like it, I just don't think it fits in there is my issue. And you are going to -- and don't ask me what -- what fits, because I don't know.

Allen: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Oh, yeah, Sonya, go ahead.

Allen: It's staff. Thank you. If I could just clarify a couple of items. First of all, the qualified open space calculations do not include the undeveloped, unimproved hillside area. They exclude that area and the -- the density calcs also exclude that area as it's undevelopable area. So, the density proposed is actually consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and what we want to see in the medium high density residential designated areas like this, especially next to a major transportation mobility corridor such as Lake Hazel. Thank you.

Cassinelli: Mr. Chair, if I may.

Fitzgerald: Yes. Go ahead, Bill.

Cassinelli: Sonya, on that -- on the -- in that regard, did -- did you look at -- did you calculate a separate density for that lower parcel or were you looking at the entire 26 acres minus the four unbuildable acres and, then, the number of units?

Allen: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Cassinelli, I believe it was the overall area minus the undevelopable hillside area. It's in the -- it's the -- the calculations are in the staff report.

Cassinelli: Yeah. And I -- I was -- I was looking through those and trying to figure them out and I think that's where -- that's one of the hang ups I have, I think, because when you -- again, it's -- it's -- it's -- it's being proposed as one single development, but we are almost looking at two separate things and when I look at the -- at that high density -- or higher density, medium high density component to it, I think if we looked at that and took the numbers off that, we would -- we would exceed the R-15. Again, that's not how it's calculated I know, but I think when you -- when you break this apart -- and there is a definite break in here, because they are not even connected by -- by roadways. You can't even get from -- from A to B without -- without going out onto the major arterials, so --

McCarvel: Mr. Chair? I was just going to ask Sonya to clarify, because I think -- I'm hearing that she already -- that in the calculations they already took out the un -- the unusable space.

Fitzgerald: Yes. That's correct.

Allen: That's correct, Commissioner McCarvel. Thank you.

McCarvel: Yeah. Yeah. So, they -- they have already taken that out.

Cassinelli: Correct. And I -- that's what I understand. I'm just looking at -- and I guess the way I'm looking at it is -- to me in my mind is that this -- you know, I'm looking at it as two separate -- I'm looking at it as an R-8 development -- and I know it's all one and where -- we got to look at it as all one, but what I'm saying is the density in that one section, if that were looked at in and of itself it would -- I'm guessing that would exceed the R-15 and so that's all -- but I -- but I know, it's -- it's -- it's one full development and that's -- that's how it's being measured. But that's my hang up.

Fitzgerald: Understood. Commissioner McCarvel, did you have thoughts, ma'am?

McCarvel: I guess I would really like to see -- at least before it goes to Council -- and I'm not sure that -- I mean maybe we want to see it, but I would like to see what the plan is for that hill, because I'm hearing them -- and I'm thinking they are not going to leave it untouched, that they are going to go in and put, you know, decent mark -- not marked trails, but make the trails known and replant, but with native plants. I'm -- I'm not thinking they are just leaving it undone. But I guess I would like to see what that plan -- they should have a definite landscape plan that shows what the Fire Department wants to see down below as that preventable space and, then, the actual plants, because I look at, you know, some places along the greenbelt, you have definite places where it's been less natural and, then, you have places where developments have gone in and replanted and making it look beautiful, but planted it with native plants for the area. So, I'm just wondering -- I mean if that would change things if we saw what the actual plan was for that and I'm thinking -- was the proposal we saw a couple of months ago, was that Lake Hazel and Locust Grove where the two new schools are going in?

Fitzgerald: I know there are schools -- there is a new school going in nearby here. I just don't know when.

McCarvel: Yeah. And when is the closest -- it's the high school that seems to be the most there, I know there is elementary schools that they are busing them, that's not good either, but I think we have got two new ones coming right out there within a mile.

Fitzgerald: Sonya, can you speak to that?

Allen: I didn't hear the last comment. The earlier comment at Lake Hazel and Locust Grove, yes, there are two schools planned with Apex development area there. Would you repeat the last question, if there was one.

McCarvel: Yeah. So, I wasn't sure if there is -- where the next new high school is in the area, but I think those ones over at Apex were elementary and one of them was even up to grade eight I thought.

Allen: I believe there was a high school planned. I'm not sure if it still is. On the north side of Amity east of Eagle.

McCarvel: Okay.

Allen: But I can't confirm that for sure. Mr. Chair, when Commissioner McCarvel is finished with her thought I -- I would like to add something.

Fitzgerald: Yeah.

McCarvel: Oh. Go ahead.

Allen: In regard to the Commissioner's comment about the density on the lower area in the R-15 area, I did count that real quick and without the hillside area figured in in the R-15 area, it comes out to 12.43 acres. A hundred and twenty-seven units it comes out to 10.2 units per acre gross. So, that does fall right in the middle of the medium high density residential desired target range of eight to 12 units per acre. So, just wanted to clarify. Thanks.

Cassinelli: Thanks, Sonya.

McCarvel: Yeah. Yeah. I agree. I think it could be tweaked a little bit on the open area, but, then, we have that church going in on the east side where they have got some -- quite a bit of open space over there. Yeah.

Grove: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Grove.

Grove: Just to comment on Commissioner McCarvel. I -- with the parcel to the east, we -- we wrestled with that one as well, because the open space was a challenge there as well, because it wasn't -- it didn't feel like it was part of that community that was -- of that residential component there. So, it wasn't as big as we were hoping, because of the shape of the parcel there as well, so --

McCarvel: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Go right ahead.

McCarvel: Yeah. I think we could -- I could be in support of it if we had just a little bit -- I guess a little more community space, but, you know, they have got the golf course right over there. I think there is a feel of openness around here and I think that hill, you know, provides that barrier and as long as that is not left untouched, but it's maintainable space, I think that's kind of an interesting amenity and I think -- I think, you know, the schools are coming.

Fitzgerald: And I tend to agree with you, I -- I like the product. I have the same concerns as Commissioner Grove is that there -- I appreciate that we have got parking and guest parking for the high density project. There wasn't a lot of green space -- like condensed green space. I liked the MEWs. I like -- I like this product and I heard Commissioner Cassinelli's comments. This is a difficult project space to build on, especially with the hill in the middle. So, I -- I do appreciate what they have done. But I kind of wanted to see a central gathering area or central play area for kids, with a tot lot, you know, a park -- go kick a soccer ball around or something. I think the challenge we are going to face going forward, guys, is we have a brand new comp plan and the comp plan says medium high density residential and they are trying to get there and -- and in that way -- and I understand there is the concern about schools. I will reiterate -- I heard from our good Mayor last couple of weeks when we -- we had commissioners -- or we had discussions about the new Commissioner -- now Commissioner Yearsley has come back to see us. But one of the things that Planning and Zoning is about -- we are about how this meets our Comprehensive Plan and our code. You know, the -- the people who get paid the big bucks and put their names on -- on ballots get to call -- make the call on schools. I know it's something we have to take into account, but we got to be really careful that we are not shirking our duties to what meets our code, what meets the Comprehensive Plan and, then, we have to let the elected officials make the judgment call on if the schools are coming or not. And I know that's not the easiest thing and not the easiest thing for you guys to take on, but that is something that we have got to -- our charge is -- and we talk about it every time we enter a meeting is does it meet our code, doesn't it meet the Comprehensive Plan and that's what the staff tries to get -- tries to get us to. It doesn't say does it meets the school requirements, because we don't know the timing always and -- and we don't know if it's going to fit in with this next class or when a new school is getting built and you have to have house -- houses to build the schools and roads and so I -- we got to be careful about how far we go on using that one issue to stop development or to slow down development and that's not our charge. That's the elected officials. That's City Council's job. And we are here to help them understand the project, ask the tough questions and I know that's not an easy thing for us always. So, I just got reminded about it when I was talking to the Mayor. So, I'm just bringing it back for you all to consider as -- as another point to take into account, because I -- I think the open space piece is definitely something we need to take into account. Amenities. Just got to be very careful about how far we go with schools and roads, because that's not part of Comprehensive Plan or code. So, just something to think about as you take in these projects and how we look at things. But I think your comments -- both -- all of you guys your comments are all well taken and I agree with lots of them, especially on the condensed open space and how we are using that hillside. So, I do think it's great that we have WUFI or Wild Urban Fire Interface coming into the city. They have been due for

a while. I appreciate the -- the good deputy chief being here tonight to talk about that. But any thoughts or comments or feedback, because I -- I just -- it was a reminder for me and I -- I want to make sure we are all on the same page, so -- Commissioner Cassinelli.

Cassinelli: I was just going to say, Commissioner, thank you for -- for clarifying that, for clarifying our -- our role and, you know, the -- the purview that we operate under. I appreciate that. It's helpful to know and to hear probably on a regular basis. Thank you for that. At least for me.

Fitzgerald: Well, it's funny, because I -- I -- we get wrapped around these issues and it's important, because we care about the city and so we just got to be careful about how far we go in that one judgment call, so -- because I have gone there, too. Any additional comments or thoughts?

McCarvel: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: I would be happy to take a stab at a motion.

Fitzgerald: Okay.

McCarvel: Make sure I'm on the correct one here. I lost my -- after considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council of file number H-2020-0064 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of September 17th, 2020, with the following modifications: That the applicant work with staff on presentation of landscape, communal open space, and fire preventative illustrations prior to City Council.

Fitzgerald: Motion fails for a second. Commissioner Seal or Commissioner Cassinelli, do you have -- come off of mute. Or Commissioner -- do either one of you have any thoughts? Thanks, Commissioner Seal, you are always off mute, so I -- go right ahead, sir.

Seal: Yeah. I mean kind of on the lines of Commissioner Cassinelli. Some -- it just doesn't seem to fit and I understand it's in-fill. That with all the shared driveways, with kind of the craziness that's going on in there and the uniqueness of this property, I think we are -- we are failing to meet -- you know -- and, again, there are things in the Comprehensive Plan that do speak to some of the concerns that we have. How far we drive those concerns that's within our own purview.

Fitzgerald: Yeah.

Seal: So, again, I'm always going to be passionate about the education thing. So, you know, I will always drive that. That said, I think there is something missing and I don't know what the something is. But, again, you have a hillside, you have the opportunity for

a biking, hiking, community, you have some integration that could happen here that -- that I'm just not seeing. I mean I understand there is some trails, but they are -- they are kind of -- they are being put in more as an afterthought. There is just a lot of things in here that seem to be that way, where instead of integrating the open space and the element of the hillside, as well as, you know, the townhome type community, I think -- I think things could be done differently. You know, I'm not an architect or a builder, but I just think that we are missing an opportunity to do something with a very unique piece of property and still provide for the density that is, you know, called for in the Comprehensive Plan. That's my hang up with it. Because I just don't -- I don't think it's ready at this point in time to go forward and I don't think it's -- it meets, you know, the standards that we are trying to put in for Meridian at this point in time, knowing that we are a landlocked city. Once the -- I mean we are not going to expand ever. Once this land is taken up it's taken up. We can't expand. We can't go somewhere else. So, we should take every opportunity to make sure that we are putting something in and steering people to put things in that are above and beyond or premier as we have been calling it lately.

McCarvel: Yeah. Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Just one thing. Commissioner Seal, don't -- don't take my earlier comments to think that I don't want you to show your passion, because I do. I think it's important that we have those balances and I think -- and it's just something I want to make sure as we talk through this stuff we take that into account as one factor, but not the only factor. As we -- we take -- we definitely need to take it into account as we do the roads and, you know, traffic impact studies are imperative to everything we do I think in a lot of cases. So, please, don't take my comments -- I was just -- just making sure we are -- we are on the same page as regard to -- the only factor can't be that -- it can't be one thing -- it can be growth and it can be schools only, it's got to be other pieces of the comp and code. So, please, don't -- I appreciate your passion. I think it's an awesome thing that we take into account always. So, thank you for your comments. Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: Yeah. Yeah. I guess that's maybe where I was headed with the motion is that I think we had made a lot of our thoughts pretty clear with the applicant and even -- I know Council, you know, reads our minutes and sometimes watches these meetings and so I was just thinking that potentially the applicant could work with staff to have those illustrations of something more along that hillside, but maybe we just -- yeah, do we just want to see it again I guess?

Fitzgerald: And, personally, I --

McCarvel: To have some of that open space can -- you know, more -- some communal space and the hillside -- what the plan is for that.

Fitzgerald: I love the trail going down the hillside. I think that, you know, actually improved trails with, you know, the non-fire -- or fire resistant plants, which would be really cool and make that a natural space would be cool. But I also think something in the middle -- and I know that nobody likes to lose lots, but I think there has got to be some kind of a, you

know, gathering place. So, if it's a continuance, I'm up for whatever you guys are up -- or think is best. But I think there has got to be some kind of additional open space somewhere in the middle.

McCarvel: Okay.

Grove: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Seal. Commissioner Grove, go right ahead, sir. Sorry about that.

Grove: I don't know if we move forward or continue, but it does -- it -- it's severely lacking that open space. So, if we could do -- I don't know what -- what's the best way to do that, but it's -- that's -- I like the product, like everyone has kind of -- or a lot of people have said I like the product. I don't mind like the fit location wise with it and whatnot, it's just -- it doesn't have that community feel without a centralized space, so --

Cassinelli: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Cassinelli.

Cassinelli: Do we want to open it back up and hear from the applicant and see if they want to continue or do we -- I mean a motion to approve -- I mean we -- I think -- if that's going to be the case we got to have a real clear guideline as to what we want that communal space to look like, because without it that -- you know, they could come up -- they could pick out two -- you know, two units, make a little -- you know, a little tiny -- a mini pocket park and call it good and that may not be what -- enough for what we are looking for. So, do we want to open it back up to hear from them if they want to -- you know, if they want to continue or if they would just rather deny and take their chances or -- or how they want to handle it.

Fitzgerald: If that's the consensus of the Commission I'm good with that. Would you like to hear from the applicant again?

Cassinelli: I think I would really quickly on that.

McCarvel: Yeah. Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Yeah, Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: I move we reopen the public testimony for H-2020-0064 in order to hear from the applicant on a continuance.

Cassinelli: Second.

Fitzgerald: I have a motion and a second to reopen the public hearing for file number H-2020-0064. All those in favor say aye. Motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Gibbons, please, join us, again, please, sir.

Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, pleasure to be back. You know, I took some really good notes about all the concerns that the -- that the Commission has brought forth and, you know, that's part of coming up with -- with a better product and I would just as soon work with staff and -- and present -- I would like your approval -- a recommendation of approval, as opposed to just pushing this through and taking our chances later. I think that's counterproductive to what we are trying to do, so --

Fitzgerald: So, a motion is to continue this to a date will be better than a recommendation of denial? Just making sure I'm clear. Perfect. Anybody else have any questions? Any Commissioners have questions for Mr. Gibbons before we move back to a public hearing discussion?

Cassinelli: Mr. -- Mr. Chair, real quickly.

Fitzgerald: Go right ahead.

Cassinelli: It sounded like -- it sounds like the applicant was clear. He said he took some copious notes there. But I just want to make sure on the -- on the communal open space that he -- that he is clear of what we are looking to see.

Gibbon: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Cassinelli, I do. I think that, you know, we can probably -- I mean we are excessively parked in some and -- and we can certainly make some adjustments to come up with a -- you know, a more usable larger open space. If we lose some parking, if we -- you know, we lose a unit or -- or two or what have you, it's what it takes to -- to get the best product possible, let's do it.

Cassinelli: Perfect. Thank you.

Gibbons: And I will bring it back to you.

McCarvel: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: Question for staff. Are they more comfortable -- the 15th or the 22nd?

Allen: Of October?

McCarvel: October. Yes.

Weatherly: Mr. Chair, Commissioner McCarvel, just to let you know currently you have six hearings on October 15th and --

McCarvel: 22nd it is.

Cassinelli: I didn't have that on my calendar. I didn't know we were meeting on the 22nd.

Fitzgerald: We shifted from the first week to the 15th.

Cassinelli: Oh, we did?

Fitzgerald: Yeah. The chambers are being worked on while we are -- or something.

Cassinelli: So -- so, we are losing -- we are not on the 1st, we are on the 22nd?

Fitzgerald: Yeah.

McCarvel: We are on the 15th and the 22nd; right?

Fitzgerald: Yeah.

Cassinelli: Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Yeah.

Cassinelli: Get my calendar here.

Fitzgerald: That was actually going to be my last thing on the docket today, so we did take care of it already, so that's awesome.

McCarvel: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: I was going to move to close the public hearing, so he's got more --

Fitzgerald: We need to leave it open, because it's going to continue before, so --

McCarvel: Oh, that's right. Yeah.

Fitzgerald: If you want to make a motion to continue it, I think we are ready to go.

McCarvel: I move to continue file number H-2020-0046 to the hearing date of October 22nd to allow time for staff and the applicant to work together on landscape suggestions on the hillside, open space changes, and illustrations of the fire preventative measures.

Grove: Second.

Fitzgerald: I have a motion and a second to continue the public hearing for Pura Vida, file number H-2020-0064. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Gibbons, we will see you on the 22nd. Okay. I'm going to call a five minute bio break, so everybody can run to the restroom, and I can get more water or something. Back in the -- be back at about 9:35 and we will go again on the final docket item.

(Recess: 9:28 p.m. to 9:36 p.m.)

10. Public Hearing Continued from August 20, 2020 for Prescott Ridge (H-2020-0047) by Providence Properties, LLC, Located on the South Side of W. Chinden Blvd. and on the East Side of N. McDermott Rd.

- A. Request: Annexation of 126.53 acres of land with R-8 (99.53 acres), R-15 (8.82 acres) and C-G (18.17 acres), zoning districts.
- B. Request: A Preliminary Plat consisting of 395 buildable lots [316 single family residential (94 attached & 222 detached), 63 townhomes, 14 multifamily residential, 1 commercial and 1 school], 32 common lots and 6 other (shared driveway) lots on 123.26 acres of land in the R-8, R-15 and C-G zoning districts.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Moving on to the next and last item on our agenda for the evening, I would like to open the public hearing for the continued public hearing on -- for Prescott Ridge, file number H-2020-0047, and let's kick it off with the staff report. Sonya, it's all you, ma'am.

Allen: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission. The next and last application before you tonight is a request for annexation and zoning and a preliminary plat. This site consists of 122.8 acres of land. It's zoned RUT in Ada county and is located on the south side of West Chinden Boulevard and State Highway 20-26 and on the east side of North McDermott Road. It was just there.

Weatherly: Ryan, we are having some technical difficulties. One moment.

Cassinelli: I thought that was me. I turn everything off and on.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Cassinelli, do you have anymore bad dad jokes or dad jokes?

Cassinelli: No. I'm good for one. Somebody else's turn.

Fitzgerald: Oh, man.

Weatherly: Ryan, question for you. Can you see Sonya's screen right now?

Fitzgerald: Yeah.

Weatherly: Okay.

Fitzgerald: We are good in that regard.

Weatherly: Commissioner, we are ready now. Thank you for your patience.

Fitzgerald: Thank you, ma'am. Sonya, go right ahead and --

Allen: Alrighty.

Fitzgerald: Whenever you want to go, ma'am.

Allen: Alrighty. So, adjacent land use and zoning. To the north is Chinden Boulevard and State Highway 20-26 and a future mixed use medical and professional and retail and commercial and residential project, zoned C-G and R-8. To the west is McDermott Road and future State Highway 16 and vacant undeveloped agricultural land, zoned RUT in Ada county and there are also some rural residential properties there in Peregrine Heights as well. To the south are single family residential development in the development process. The Oaks North, zoned R-4 and R-8 and to the east is single family residential development in process, again, Oaks North, zoned R-4, and rural residential and agriculture land, zoned RUT in Ada county. A portion of this site consists of Lot 18, Block 2, Peregrine Heights Subdivision, which was formerly deed restricted agricultural lot for open space, nonfarm -- nonfarm that has since expired. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation for the northern portion of this property, which is approximately nine acres, is mixed use regional along Chinden and medium density residential to the south, which calls for three to eight dwelling units per acre and that consists of 113 and a half acres of land. Annexation of a total of 126.53 acres of land with R-8 zoning, which consists of 99.53 acres, R-15 zoning, which consists of 8.82 acres, and C-G zoning, which consists of 18.17 acres is requested for the development of a mix of residential and medical office uses, including a hospital with emergency care. West Ada School District plans to develop a school on the eastern portion of the annexation area separate from this development. A master plan for the residential portion and concept plan for the medical campus portion of the site was submitted. The residential portion is shown as proposed to consist of a mix of single family residential attached and detached homes, townhomes, and multi-family residential apartments. I will just point those out real quick here. If you see my pointer here, that is the multi-family section. This is the townhome section. And the rest of the development -- this is the single family. And, again, the commercial portion is -- is right here. The commercial portion will include two four story structures, a 100 -- or, excuse me, 220,000 square foot hospital, with 90 in-patient beds and 90,000 square foot medical office building that will provide medical services geared

toward women's health and pediatrics and that is the concept plan for that portion of the site. To achieve a mix of uses as desired in the Comprehensive Plan for mixed use and specifically mixed use regional designated areas, staff is recommending a commercial component, i.e., retail or restaurant, et cetera, is included in the plan to serve the employment area and adjacent neighborhood. With this addition and other recommended provisions, staff believes the requested zoning and development plan will be generally consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The single family residential uses are permitted in the R-8 and R-15 districts. The school, the multi-family residential development, and hospital will require conditional use approval of the uses prior to development and are subject to specific use standards. One of the standards for hospitals that provide emergency care is that the location has a direct access on an arterial street. However, because the UDC prohibits new approaches directly accessing a state highway, no other access is available, except for North Rustic Oak Way, a collector street along the east boundary of the site, which connects to the highway and this intersection is eventually planned to be signalized. The City Council should determine if this meets the intent of the requirement. If so, it should be memorialized in the development agreement. If not, Council may consider a modification to the standard prohibiting new approaches directly accessing state highways upon specific recommendation of ITD, if strict adherence is not feasible as determined by Council. Alternatively, Council may deny the emergency care component of the hospital use. A preliminary plat is proposed as shown consisting of 395 building lots, which consists of 316 single family, 94 attached and 222 detached, 63 townhomes, 14 multi-family residential, one commercial and one school lot, 32 common lots and six other shared driveway lots on 123.26 acres of land in the proposed R-8, R-15 and C-G zoning districts. The minimum lot size proposed in the single family portion of the development is 4,000 square feet, with an average lot size of 6,060 square feet. The average townhome lot size is 2,037 square feet. The overall gross density is 3.63 units per acre, with a net density of 7.86 units per acre. The gross density of the R-8 portion is 4.87 units per acre, with a net density of 7.19 units per acre and the gross density of the R-15 portion is 12.87 units per acre, with a net density of 21.39 units per acre, consistent with the density desired in the associated medium density residential and mixed use regional designated areas. The residential portion is proposed to develop in nine phases as depicted on the phasing plan over a time period of four to five years. The north-south collector street will be constructed from Chinden Boulevard in alignment with Pollard Lane across Chinden to the north and extend to the southern boundary with the first phase of development. The single family residential portion of the site will develop first, followed by the townhomes and, then, the multi-family apartments. The commercial portion of the development and the school property are not included in the phasing plan, as they are under separate ownership and will develop separately from the residential portion. Access is proposed in the residential portion of the development via one collector street, which is Rustic Oak Way, from Chinden, which extends through the site to the south boundary and will eventually extend the McMillan Road. Access via McMillan is proposed as the -- excuse me -- McDermott is proposed at the west boundary. A collector street is proposed from Rustic Oak to the east for access to the school site. Stub streets are proposed to adjacent properties for future extension. A additional stub street is recommended by staff to be provided to the outparcel at the southwest corner of the site and that is this area right here. Access is proposed to the commercial portion of the

development from Rustic Oak with a frontage road running through the site parallel to Chinden, connecting to Serenity Lane, and that is that pink line right here. Serenity Lane to the west for access to Chinden and that is the -- this road right here that goes into the Peregrine Heights Subdivision. This is proposed instead of a backage road for consideration by Council, since a public street really isn't desirable in this area. The applicant is requesting approval of private streets in the townhome portion of the development. I will just go to that again real quick here. This is this area we are talking about right there. Per the UDC private streets are not intended for townhome developments, unless a MEW or limited gated development is proposed, of which neither is proposed with the original plan. The applicant is requesting alternative compliance to this requirement, but has not proposed an alternative. Staff is not supportive of the design of this portion of the development, because staff and Fire Department is of the opinion there are too many units accessed off a private street and not enough parking available for guests and feels approving such could be detrimental to public -- excuse me -- detrimental to the public safety if emergency services were not able to access homes due to parking issues on the private street. Therefore, staff is not supportive of the private street and alternative compliance application. The applicant, however, did submit a revised concept plan and that's the one shown on the right. The one on the left is the original layout -- late this afternoon that depicts six fewer units and the same basic design with additional parking. It should be noted that private streets and common areas are proposed to be in use easements on buildable lots, rather than on common lots, which further condenses the site layout and, essentially, results in reduced setbacks and lot sizes because much of the lot area is encompassed by driveways and common area. Lot lines also are not depicted clearly or accurately on the plan. Staff is not in favor of the revised plan for these reasons and along with the Fire Department does not approve of the private streets in the design proposed. A parking plan was submitted for the overall development that includes a total of 505 on-street parking spaces available for guest parking in the single family residential portion of the development. Parking in the multi-family portion will be evaluated with the conditional use permit. An updated parking exhibit was submitted for the townhome portion of the development that depicts a couple of parking areas off the private streets and that was the one we were just talking about here. They have a couple parking areas here, which does help with their parking situation. Qualified open space is proposed in excess of UDC standards. A minimum of 10.51 acres or ten percent is required. A total of 11.56 acres or 11 percent is proposed consisting of the street buffer along the collector streets, McDermott and Rustic Oak, open space areas at least 50 feet by 100 feet in area and linear open space. Because the multi-family residential portion of the development is proposed to be subdivided with each four-plex on its own lot for the option of separate ownership, staff is recommending a provision in the development agreement that requires one management company to handle the leasing and maintenance of the entire project to ensure better overall consistent management of the development. Site amenities are proposed in excess of UDC standards. A minimum of five qualified amenities are required. A 3,750 foot -- approximate square foot clubhouse with restrooms and exercise area, office, and meeting room, with an outdoor patio and a swimming pool. One large tot lot and two smaller tot lots with play equipment in separate areas. An enclosed dog park. Although this area may be just a pocket park with no dog facilities, depending on what is desired for future

residents. Segments of the city's multi-use pathway system and additional qualified open space exceeding 20,000 square feet. So, the city's multi-use pathway system is proposed along the east side of the collector street up to the commercial portion and, then, it goes through the common area and the commercial portion and, then, along Chinden Boulevard and, then, also along the collector street to the school property. Sample photo elevations and renderings were submitted for the different home types planned in this development as shown. Homes depicted are a mix of one and two and -- one and two story units of varying sizes for the variety of lot sizes proposed. Building materials consist of a mix of finished materials, with stone and brick veneer accents. Staff is recommending articulation and other architectural elements are provided on elevations facing collector streets for two story homes. And this is a concept elevation of the proposed medical center. Written testimony has been received from Josh Femreite, chief of new schools for Gem Innovation Schools. He is in strong support of the project, as their future campus is located about 300 yards south of this development and it will bring much needed housing options in this area and the school will be able to provide kindergarten through 12th grade public education choice for future families in this area. Staff is recommending approval of the project, except for the -- the layout proposed in the townhome portion of the development. Staff will stand for any questions.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, Sonya. One question regarding the buffering in the -- the subdivision and this hospital location. Are there -- what's it's like -- what kind of a landscape buffer -- I know it's significant, but are you concerned about any additional buffering needed there or berming? Thoughts there?

Allen: Chairman, Commissioners, the applicant is proposing a 30 foot wide landscaped buffer along the south and west boundaries of the site. Staff is requiring it to be very densely landscaped, with a combination of bushes and trees and shrubbery that result in a barrier that allows trees to touch at maturity and they are also proposing an eight foot tall CMU wall as an additional buffer in this area.

Fitzgerald: I did not catch that when I was reading through the staff report, so thanks. Additional questions for Sonya?

Grove: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Seal. Sorry. Commissioner Grove, go right ahead. You can start, sir. Mr. Seal, I will get to you next.

Grove: I just had a quick question. Sonya, does this project connect to the future school? It didn't -- like I know it's not part -- the school is not part of it, necessarily, but is there access to the school from this development?

Allen: Yes, Chairman, Commissioner Grove, Commissioners. There is a collector street proposed from Rustic Oak, the north-south collector street, to the school site.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Grove, did you have a follow up or are you good? Commissioner Seal, go right ahead, sir.

Seal: Can you bring up the phasing plan again? I just had a question on what I think I'm seeing. It looks like -- well, if I'm looking at this right, phase one and phase two are going to develop and there is only one access to them; is that correct? And I kind of went back through and looked at the Fire Department report, but to me it looks like there is only one access in and out until they get at least to phase three, which is going to connect up and over through the existing stub that's there.

Allen: Chairman and Commissioner Seal, there are two stub streets to the south in phase one that will connect to the Oaks North development and, then, there is also an access out to McDermott here on the west boundary that's part of phase one.

Seal: So, to the south is already developed, is that what I --

Allen: No. There is -- it's not developed. It's a future phase of the Oaks North Subdivision. It is not -- this project, I failed to mention, is not serviceable by water and sewer service until extensions of those services are made available to this property from the south. But, no, as it sits right now there is -- there is not access available either.

Seal: Okay. Is that a concern?

Allen: They can't develop until they have access to services.

Seal: Okay. That makes sense then. Got you.

Allen: Yeah.

Seal: Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Cassinelli, do you have questions?

Cassinelli: Yes. Sonya, would -- the issue with the -- I think those are the townhomes there that -- that you were pulling up. Phase eight there on the map. What did you discuss -- what was -- did staff have a recommendation that you liked? Because that's the one thing in here that -- that staff has not -- staff doesn't want to see in there the way it is. What -- what was your -- what was staff's feedback? What was staff's proposal to the applicant?

Allen: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Cassinelli, Commissioners, staff discussed a couple different options in the staff report and with the applicant. One was if they are wanting this high of a density possibly going for a multi-family development in this area. Possibly four-plexes or townhome style, like they have, but multi-family. For instance, either one four-plex townhome style building on a lot -- on each lot or the entire multi-family development on one lot. I believe their purpose is to sell off individual units, so they --

they didn't want to do that. Other options we discussed with them is dropping some units and making all of them front on the private streets and doing a MEW on a common lot -- or a couple of MEWs that the units would front on. Public streets within the development. A loop. Again, that would be a reduction in the number of units. We just really felt it was too compact and asking for too many variances from code. And as I mentioned before, the current plan that we got this afternoon does not show the private streets or the common areas on common lots. When -- when a property is subdivided, the UDC -- the UDC's preference is to have the private street on a common lot. Same thing with common areas. They should be on common lots. When they are platted as an easement over buildable lots it decreases the area that's usable for each individual lot and it does affect the building setbacks as well.

Fitzgerald: So, Sonya, can you bring up the -- can you bring up the phase eight, so we can look at it, because -- and correct me if I'm wrong, but the individual lots they are looking to sell -- part of those lots include -- include the road. Is that not -- is that correct?

Allen: Yes. Part of the buildable lots as proposed would include a private street easement over the top of them, as well as an easement for the common areas, the greenspace you see around them. There are no common lots proposed on this -- on this plan. They are all buildable lots. And before we have the applicant come up, I would like to ask the deputy chief to step in and -- he has some comments to make from the Fire Department. Chief Bongiorno, are you there, sir?

Bongiorno: I am. Can you guys hear me?

Fitzgerald: Yes, sir. Go right ahead.

Bongiorno: Okay. Great. Thank you. So, Mr. Chairman and Members, Sonya and I talked about this earlier and -- and just the fact that the people are going to be owning a chunk of the road is very concerning for us, because you could have a whole bunch of people that decide, you know what, I don't want to pay to maintain this property and so for the Fire Department it could be an access issue in the -- in the future and, then, if we have issues with parking, like we had talked about, where somebody blocks the private street, it's going to make it very difficult for us to access this whole thing. So, I'm -- I'm in total agreement with Sonya and also in the code it says all private streets have to be approved by the fire marshal and I am back -- I am with Sonya also, I cannot approve this as it sits. So, that's the comment there. And to answer one of the other commissioner's questions, it was hard to tell on that phasing map, but phase one basically stretches from Chinden Boulevard all the way to McDermott. They do -- they do put that main road all the way through, so that there is two -- two points of access through this whole -- their whole phasing. So, I did not have an issue with their phasing plan at all, because they went ahead and connected Levi Lane and, then, it curves around and goes all the way out to McDermott. So, there is two points of access with phase one.

Fitzgerald: Thank you, chief. Appreciate the guidance there. Any additional questions -- Commissioner Cassinelli, did you have a question for staff or for the chief?

Cassinelli: No. Huh-uh. No. Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Seeing no additional questions at this time, would the applicant like to come forward and present? And, chief, thanks again for being here.

Bongiorno: My pleasure. Thank you.

Conner: Thank you. Good evening, Mr. Chair and Commissioners. My name is Patrick Conner, I'm with Providence Properties. Address 701 South Allen Street, Meridian, Idaho.

Leonard: Good evening, Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission. Stephanie Leonard with KM Engineering. 9233 West State, Boise. 83714. Thank you for having us here this evening. We are excited to talk about Prescott Ridge with you. We have been waiting a little bit to get to the hearing level with this and so this project is -- we are proposing annexation into the City of Meridian, zoning approval -- or we are asking for zoning approval for R-8, R-15, and the C-G zoning district and approval of our proposed preliminary plat. Sonya did a really great job of explaining -- explaining the logistics of this project. So, I will be brief with the basics. We are located -- we are about 123 acres proposed to be annexed into the city, located just west of McDermott. I'm sorry. East of McDermott and south of Chinden Boulevard. We are close to a recently approved high school and a charter school that's just the south as well. This graphic that we created is actually meant to show you where -- everything that's being built or is either through the entitlement process or platted. So, as you can see we are surrounded by properties that are being developed or contemplated to be developed. We are close to existing subdivisions, recently approved projects, and we are adjacent to Chinden and McDermott, both of which are major transportation corridors. We are surrounded on three sides of the property that have been annexed and zoned to the city, a future commercial and residential subdivision to the north, and future -- or constructed single family residential subdivisions to the south and east. We have been working on this project for the past couple of years and in preparing for this application we have met with staff several times. We have had conversations and have coordinated over the layout of everything that you see today and we have coordinated with the Fire Department regarding access and phasing. We have also shared this plan with neighbors via an in-person and virtual neighborhood meeting and discussed their comments and thoughts on the project. We have also provided additional information to anyone that wanted it and have adjusted our plan based on staff's comments and ACHD comments. Most recently, as Sonya indicated, we did make some changes to the townhome portion of the site. We actually -- our client modeled what they perceived for the townhomes portion of the site on a project that they -- they own, the Hensley Townhomes, which were recently approved and they actually are very similarly configured. They are townhomes that front on a private street that's actually easements over buildable lots. So, it was interesting to kind of compare the two products and -- and, honestly, they are very similar. So, I think we could have done a better job with displaying that with our application to make it very clear and we look forward to working with staff further as we can kind of clarify how those will function and how it will work with a private street and an open space that acts as a MEW, although not on a common lot. So, as she mentioned we -- we actually are proposing

nine fewer lots and we are providing close to 30 more parking spaces. So, we will go into more detail with that later, but here is the future land use map. We are located in the medium density area, mixed use regional, which is where the -- the hospital and the proposed medical boutique center is going to be -- is located here as well. We are consistent with both the zoning that we are requesting. As you can see we are surrounded by C-G. We have got R-8, R-4, and believe that our requested zoning districts will be a good transition to Chinden, which is a highly trafficked road. This is our requested zoning boundaries. C-G is comprised of roughly 15 acres and, then, the R-15 districts are shown here as well and they will be comprised of the townhomes, which is the central one right below the C-G district and the multi-family residential, which will be four-plexes to the east. The R-8 part -- or the R-8 school parcel is included within our plat, just because it was improperly subdivided in the county and was not eligible for building permits. So, in order to become eligible for a building permit they needed to be a part of our application. As Sonya mentioned, they will develop at a later date and will really be a part of this project. So, the mixed use regional area we are envisioning it to act as an employment and economic anchor for the area, with the -- the medical campus, and believe that adding the R-15 section for the multi-family is going to just add to that mixed use regional component, which requires some -- at least ten percent of a residential component to it. Our preliminary plat -- we are proposing 395 buildable lots, 32 common lots, and six other lots. The R-8 district is comprised of 316 single family residential lots to accommodate detached and attached single family homes, as Sonya mentioned. The school is included as well in the R-8 district and the R-15 district is comprised of 54 townhome units. So, we lost nine units. We were previously at 63. We have 14 lots for multi-family four-plex, which is on the east part of the site, and the lots range in the R-8 district from 4,000 to 11,200 square feet. Townhome lots are 2,000 square feet roughly. And we were -- in working with staff we were asked to do larger lots on the west part of our site just below the C-G district adjacent to the Peregrine Heights Subdivision to kind of add a little bit of a transition from the lots that we are planning. So, overall I guess the main takeaway is that we have got a variety of lot sizes and product styles that we are planning for this area. Oh. One -- one note. So, the stub street that's been requested from Smokejumper in the central area to the property to the west, we weren't aware of that require -- or that request, but -- and I don't believe it was mentioned before, but we are happy to accommodate that if required. We do have one that's to the north, so if that would suffice, so --

Fitzgerald: Stephanie, can you make sure you are clearly speaking in the mic. You're breaking up a little bit.

Weatherly: Can you repeat yourself, chair?

Fitzgerald: Yeah. Stephanie, you were breaking up a little bit. Can you make sure you are speaking right into the mic. We are losing you in a couple spots.

Leonard: Okay.

Fitzgerald: Thank you, ma'am.

Conner: So, our goal for the open space and amenities is to have ample open space and generous amenities. We have 11 percent qualified open space. We have one centrally located park with a pool, clubhouse, and a large playground. We have other pocket parks and two tot lots scattered around the community for closer accessibility. We have learned that having safe parks, playgrounds, pathways is highly desirable to residents of all ages and backgrounds. In addition to parks, we have a host of pathways throughout the community through the green spaces and we have a ten foot parks and rec pathway that meanders from the north parcel of the medical -- proposed medical office campus and down south and connects to the middle school parcel on the far east side. The purpose of our -- of pedestrian connectivity is a link to residential to commercial as it's a major component to the comprehensive plan. Here is some photos and renderings of the parks and amenities. So, the phasing plan for the residential portion, we will have seven phases. The first phase, as previously stated, will be on the south side of the property and will extend all the way north to Chinden, providing two points of access, one to McDermott and one to Chinden and, then, two points of access down to Oaks North. From there we will progress our phasing to the north and west and east and, then, move to north again finishing out the multi-family parcel on the north side. We typically build two phases per year, so with the seven phases of residential we expect this will be about a four to five year project. Utilities as previously stated will come from the south and we are actively negotiating with the property owners on the extension of utilities to our boundary. Serviceability. As previously stated, our first phase will go all the way to Chinden and to McDermott. This is a -- a priority of ours. Fire emergency services are very important to us and we want to ensure that fire and police departments are best able to serve our project as well as they can and projects adjacent to us. Because of this we are committing to extend those two existing roads. The Fire Department has stated that our project is within their -- their limits of service. On a regional level outside of just our project, we understand the important position we have in the region in connecting the collector all the way to Oaks North as well. We actually got confirmation from the Fire Department and the Police Department that this full extension will help to merge the response times to our adjoining parcels to the south and the north. Also opening the collector road all the way to the north opens the development opportunity for properties between Rustic Oak and Black Cat. Lastly, Serenity Lane currently has one access point on Chinden. Once that street light comes in at the corner of Levi and Chinden, ITD has expressed that their access point will actually change to right-in, right-out access. At the south end of their property at the cul-de-sac we have been charged to install a stub street and the Fire Department has stated that once the right-in, right-out access isn't -- is in place for the Serenity Lane street, that their primary access point to their parcel -- or into their 15 homes will be through Prescott Ridge. So, talking more about the housing types, part of the map -- part of the Comprehensive Plan is having a diverse selection of housing types that meets the needs, preferences, and financial capabilities of future and current residents of Meridian. So, we have five main housing types. First, our largest estate lots, which will surround the existing Peregrine Heights community between 70 and 100 feet in width. Next the largest portion is our 45, 50 and 60 foot single family lots. The blue that you see are our cluster 40 foot lots and the option there is for single family attached and detached homes, similar to what we have built and was well received in Whites Acres here in Meridian. Also will have attached single family townhomes and the multi-family

four-plex. So, we have five options there for housing types. Here is some typical home elevations for single family -- single family attached. Typical home elevations for our medium density. Here is a little bit more detail -- a larger picture on that townhome exhibit. So, as Stephanie had mentioned, we did do some major modifications to this plan. We eliminated a whole building in the southeast corner of three units. In addition, we eliminated another six units from the buildings on the east and west side to add additional parking and also create more green space. As Stephanie mentioned, we don't have an official MEW, because it's not in a common space, but all the green space that you see on this map will be maintained by the HOA. So, in addition there are -- the single family lots do go into the cross-access easement for driving, but there are some common lots outside of those -- of those single family lots. I believe we also added 30 additional parking spaces with the elimination of the units and moving the buildings around and spaced those parking lots on the southeast and the north central part. Again, this is a rear load product, so the homes will open up to the central common area -- or the central commonly maintained area, with the parking in the rear. We are really excited about this kind of product. It's something that we think would be a great asset to Meridian. It appeals to many different buyers and homeowners. For example, my parents just recently moved into a unit like this in north Texas and they absolutely love it. My dad especially loves not having to take care of the yard. But also the community that the shared space provides. Here is some elevations of that townhome concept. Next is the multi-family four-plex. This will be -- because it's a multi-family project and the zoning, it would be CUP eligible, but those are some of the concepts of that product. Again, it's going to be a four-plex building on a single lot for each one and there is 14 total buildings. For all of our buildings we commit to a hundred percent energy efficiency, along with Brighton, they are also a hundred percent energy efficiency through HERS rated and Energy Star certified and last year we actually led the valley -- valley in homes that were Energy Star certified. Here is some photos of our interiors. And the last item I want to talk about is the medical campus. As previously stated, Central Valley Plaza north of Chinden and this medical campus are -- create a regional kind of medical hub here on the intersection of Chinden and Highway 16. We proposing to annex and zone approximately 15 acres to the C-G district. The campus will cater to women's health and pediatrics and related services. The development will require an additional conditional use permit for hospital use. The application is in works, but has not yet been submitted. The operator of this medical campus will be HCA Healthcare. They are proposing a four story medical office building, 90,000 square feet, and a four story medical hospital at 220,000 square feet. Given the level of surgeries that are provided, they have to have an emergency room and though this is not a trauma hospital -- so, St. Luke's and St. Al's will continue to receive those cases. The emergency room will be part of the first phase, followed by the medical office building and, then, the hospital. HCA is also in negotiations to purchase the two and a half acre parcel in the northeast corner. Staff has stated before -- asked for the placement of commercial services, whether it's a restaurant or retail, and the operator of the hospital is open to that option. In addition, there are ample development opportunities along Chinden on the east side of Levi Lane. We paid particular attention to balancing the mitigation and integration of this proposed commercial -- general commercial zoning adjacent to residential. As stated before, we are proposing a 30 foot landscape buffer along all the residential sides an eight foot masonry wall. The city pathway will meander

through that 30 foot buffer. We will abide by the city noise and light reduction requirements. We have had multiple neighborhood meetings with the residents of Peregrine Heights, many of which are on the call right now, to discuss this project and we have integrated some changes into this plan for their comments. As far as integration, it's important for us to have the commercial and the regional zoning work together as a masterminded community. We want residents be able to access the services within the zoning -- commercial general zoning. We are doing this by providing two sidewalk pathway connections to the commercial general zoning through the townhome and large lots, as well as a pathway along Levi Lane and a 30 foot buffer. In addition there will be a crosswalk connecting the pathway to the hospital building, serving as an outdoor plaza. It's still to be determined and it will be determined with the CUP, but it will be open for hospital employees and guests. We want to be part of creating a place here -- placemaking within the mixed use designation. So, just to kind of close about the medical campus, I believe we really have an opportunity with the Central Valley across the street and this medical campus to create a premier regional medical destination that can offer a wide variety of services and selection of medical providers. Cities across our area in the country had fostered these medical centers where multiple operators of hospitals and physicians work out of one central region. From a -- from a -- there can be a lot of efficiencies possible when you have two medical campuses in close proximity from a healthcare standpoint. There is -- the greater number of providers the better options, competition, and, hopefully, the better service. It's also a magnet for high earning jobs and multiplying effect of employment, retail sales, and importantly tax revenue for those property sales and use tax. HCA Healthcare is a very large private hospital -- hospital operator. They pay a lot in tax and it would be a great benefit for the city. They are an anchor for economic development as well. Here is just an example of a hospital community here in Meridian. This is St. Luke's on South Eagle Road. When it first was under construction in 1998 there wasn't much around it and, then, just probably eight years just across Eagle Road a lot of medical offices came up next to it -- next to it and within about another three or four years a huge swath of land north of the site became restaurants, office, commercial. And so it really kind of fostered a whole growth in this area and we think that could be possible with this center. So, just to conclude, thank you for having us tonight. I think we are a bit over our time. But we are happy and proud to present Prescott Ridge tonight. We think we have submitted a premier project that's going to be something that Meridian is -- is -- is proud of and it will be a future anchor for economic development, but also future homes for all the residents of Meridian future and current. We think we provided a broad selection of housing options and the mixed use connection with our residential project. So, thank you, staff, for working with us. As mentioned before, we are completely on board with continuing to work with staff to ensure that -- that townhome layout works with code. We want to make sure that safety is the number one priority and that we are within compliance. I think, like Stephanie said, we could have done a little bit better job by labeling where the lot lines are and how it all fits together. Like she also said before, we used our -- the Hensley Subdivision as a model for how we were trying to do this one to make it work and, hopefully, will continue working through that project prior to City Council. I think that concludes our presentation.

Fitzgerald: Thank you very much. Are there questions for the applicant? Or applicant representative. Commissioner Grove.

Grove: Yes, Mr. Chair. What is the little triangle in the northern portion of the development off of Chinden that's kind of to the west of the medical facility?

Leonard: Mr. Chair, Commissioner -- was it Grove? I can't see anything. Okay. That -- that portion is actually just a part of the original parcel that was split off from the -- that was part of an original subdivision, Peregrine Heights neighborhood, is in. So, it's just a remnant parcel and the remainder of the -- it is part of what was split off, if that makes sense.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Grove, do you have follow up? Commissioner Seal, do you have a comment or a question? Okay. Any additional questions or comments for the applicant at this time?

Cassinelli: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Cassinelli.

Cassinelli: What -- can you explain where the additional commercial is going to be?

Leonard: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Cassinelli, I don't know if I understand. Are you asking where the additional commercial, being the retail that staff has conditioned --

Cassinelli: Correct.

Leonard: -- in the staff report is going to be located? So, the -- the exhibit that's up on the screen now has a parcel that's not a part of our preliminary plat as it stands now. It's a single family residence at this point and we have been in communication with them to try to acquire that parcel. So, I believe the hospital has been working with them and trying to come to an agreement to be able to include that within our project.

Cassinelli: So, that would be the planned area for that?

Conner: Correct.

Cassinelli: Okay. Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Any additional questions at this time? Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: I will just get this question now, so we don't have to discuss it and reopen later. I can see where we are probably going to want the applicant to continue to work with staff and if as the Commission in our discussions decides that we want to see this again before it goes to Council, what's the timing on this as far as looking at bringing it

back to look at the -- a townhome layout? Are we open to November? I mean because services aren't even to this yet, so is there any rush to get this on the October agendas?

Conner: So, I believe in the staff report there is a condition about prior than ten days before Council meeting, narrowing down a final plan on the townhome layout. Is that accurate?

Allen: It is. If I could just butt in for a second here, Mr. Chair, Commissioners. One clarification I need to -- the applicant did clarify. I just wanted to also clarify. When you asked me about the access to the first phase of development I totally spaced the access from Chinden from Rustic Way. So, they do have that access available also and the applicant said that. I just wanted to clarify my comment so it was correct on the record. And, then, I was also asked about the options that staff would like to see for the development options for the townhome portion of the development. There is a condition in Section 9-A-2F of the report and that is on page 49 and there are several options outlined in there for a redesign of that area and I will -- I will just go ahead and read it to you real quick, so that we are all on the same page. Redesign the townhome portion of the development, the public streets, alleys and/or common driveways may be incorporated or if private streets are proposed each unit should front on and be accessed via the private street. Alternatively, a multi-family development, which is one structure on one property with three or more dwelling units, with townhome style units might be a development option -- option for this area. I did ask for a revised concept plan to be presented tonight for review and, then, the revised plat, if that met everyone's approval, to be submitted -- submitted prior to a Council meeting ten days prior. If private streets are proposed with townhome development, a MEW or gated private street should be provided in accord with UDC requirements. So, the plan that we have before us tonight staff is not in support of. So, the options we have at this point is to go forward with the conditions and the applicant revise it -- the plan to comply and submit a revised plan prior to Council. That is one of those options. Or for the Commission to continue this project until we do have a plan that meets staff and Fire Department approval for access primarily, as well as layout. Unless the Commission prefers the applicant's proposed design, in which they could move forward with that. Another option that I don't have in the staff condition is that they could plat this as one large lot and come back and revisit it later and replat it if they wished. Or develop a multi-family development on one lot. So, anyway, just wanted to clarify that and this all came together kind of last minute this week. It's been one of those weeks, so bear with us, please. Thank you.

McCarvel: Thank you, Sonya.

Bongiorno: Mr. Commissioner -- or -- yeah. Mr. Chairman and Commission, if I may.

Fitzgerald: Go ahead, chief.

Bongiorno: Sorry. I got mixed up there. I also want to make sure that Stephanie and everybody -- we talked about it a direct -- in an e-mail last night I believe, Stephanie. If and when you guys do look at this property -- as it sits right now up on the screen, if they

are built as true townhomes with two hour rated walls in between them, this doesn't meet fire code because of the access points being too close together. If they were built under the building code and they are fire sprinklered, then, the access would be fine. So, something else to think about as well on how the construction is going to be if you are -- if you are dead set on townhomes, the construction type makes a difference and that's going to make a difference on access and it's going to make a difference on sprinklers or not.

Leonard: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission and Mr. Bongiorno -- Chief Bongiorno. Excuse me. Yes, we agree to sprinkler the units, if that's what fire code requires. I would like to say, too, just on a -- a side note from what Sonya had mentioned about potentially leaving this lot as just a lot within our plat and revisiting later, I believe we are open to that option. So, that would be something that we would -- if -- if the need comes and we don't feel that the conditions that she supplied with the staff report are sufficient, that we would really like to explore that option. So, thank you.

Fitzgerald: Thank you for the clarification, Stephanie. Appreciate it. Commissioner Cassinelli, go right ahead, sir.

Cassinelli: Yeah. Is there a lot and block -- lot and block map we can pull up? Because I have something that -- it may come up that I want to reference and it's -- I can't -- I can't --

Leonard: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Cassinelli, this is a very -- a pretty large project, so it was really difficult to have everything on one sheet, so this is --

Cassinelli: Sure.

Leonard: -- it might be difficult to reference it based off of --

Cassinelli: I will kind of describe what I'm looking at. Some of the lots that are -- that are up against the homes on Serenity Lane -- in particular the southern -- the southeastern most property, you have five lots abutting -- it happens to be the corner lot there, but you have five lots abutting a corner lot and as far as transition, that just -- to me that doesn't make sense. Did you look at some common lots down in that area?

Conner: Mr. Commissioner, we did actually explore -- because that was something that the neighbors did bring up is having common lots behind -- in between their lots and the lots we were proposing. One, we thought that may be a safety and a maintenance problem, given the access there, and it would be -- it would be hard to see from the street. I know that fire and police want to be sure that they know what's going on in the parks from the street. So, that was the main point and not putting any sort of greenspace immediately behind. We can commit to adding additional plantings in the rear of those houses -- the rear of those -- of those backyards. Again, those houses are significantly bigger than -- than the other lots. They are between 70 and 100 feet in width. So, there is going to be definitely less of a massing impact from their -- from their backyard view.

Cassinelli: Thank you. And another question if I might, Mr. Chair.

Fitzgerald: Go right ahead.

Cassinelli: On -- on some of those -- well, you -- you said that they could perhaps be attached single family residences on the more compact area three over to the -- to the west. Are those -- are you -- are those specifically going to be single story or -- or not necessarily?

Conner: I believe that we do have attached single and two story. The ones that I showed you tonight are single story. I think that's primarily what we have done in Whites Acres. That's -- that's mainly what I have seen, but I do think that we do have an option for a two story. I would have to check. We are constantly working on providing new plans and options and, again, the point of the attached zero lot line single family, advised by staff, was for -- to kind of break up any sort of monotonous block and to provide some sort of different look in the streetscape, try to create some sort of diversity in the product that is -- is -- is on -- on the lots.

Cassinelli: Would you be open to specifically maybe doing -- in certain areas that -- that abut some of the other adjacent properties, would you be open to looking at perhaps single story on -- on some of the boundary on the edges there?

Conner: Yes.

Cassinelli: Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Any additional questions for the applicant? Okay. Thank you all. We appreciate it. We will have you come up and close after the public testimony. Madam Clerk, we have a group of people -- I see at least one hand being raised. Do we have a sign up list of people who would like to testify?

Weatherly: I did have several people, Mr. Chair, that signed up, but Ms. Stack is the only one with her hand raised and that indicated a wish to testify so far.

Fitzgerald: Okay. And we have got one more. We will bring Ms. Stack over, hopefully, and she can --

Stack: Great. This is Val Stack. So, I live at 6072 North Serenity Lane and, Mr. Cassinelli, we certainly appreciate the comments that you just brought up. So, I guess I will start there about having -- just a second. So, behind the houses -- I'm the fifth house on the right down Serenity Lane and one of the comments that I really wanted to make is one of the biggest components of the value of our homes there -- our acre -- one acre homes all along the whole Serenity lane, each -- each lot -- is the view shed. So, our home view of Shafer Butte and the Boise foothills to us is worth a million bucks. It's the reason we bought the lot. It's beautiful. And we invite you to come out and take a look at it, take a drive down Serenity Lane, and although we certainly have known for many years that, of

course, there is going to be a subdivision back here eventually, what we hadn't counted on was this massive, massive high density, right up abutting our back fences and the houses -- the townhouses that are multiple stories and we certainly never anticipated having -- looking straight up at a four story hospital building directly behind those -- our homes. So, it's -- our views are completely toast. Those are all going to be gone. And so although there is a 30 foot buffer from the corner of Chinden behind the parking lot of the hospital, it only goes to the edge of their parking lot and we have requested that they extend that 30 foot wide buffer all the way down Serenity Lane, both to the end and past the cul-de-sac, all the way to the western lots where they meet up with that dog park and have requested a 30 foot buffer and, then, the estate lots there, that they all be single level in -- in that whole cul-de-sac area. So, that was one thing that is -- we think would be helpful. It's not going to cure anything, but it certainly would be a big help for us. And another very critical piece that hasn't been talked about at all, we would like to give you just a two second history lesson here about ITD's plan, because it's critical access for Serenity Lane to be able to get in and get out and have medical emergency vehicles for us. So, their plan of ITD that we have worked with for many years in dealing, you know, with the whole Highway 16 configuration, they have told us that at some point we would have right-in, right-out access only and that that is now determined to be as soon as they turn on the light at Levi Lane. What you may not be aware of is in the 2030 plan, which is just ten years down the road at the latest, when they have fully built out Chinden to seven lanes from the five they just completed, is that they will completely block off Serenity Lane, we will not have any right-in, right-out, we will have no access whatsoever and so what we are saying is this plan does not give us robust access -- certainly doesn't give us -- any good plan for us to be able to get in and get out in case of emergency or for emergency vehicles to access us if we have to wind them around and around through a tight, highly dense subdivision and what is on the plan by Prescott Ridge that has not been discussed -- and maybe they can go to the -- the -- show -- show the plan where they have a frontage road as part of the major plan for -- for access for us, what they are trying to do is say we will give you access by going through the parking lot of the hospital down through the very tight, tight, tight corner. Now, remember, we have got a really -- we are a private road, so we have a narrow lane to start with, which is 19 feet wide, and there is -- so one of the other gentlemen had asked about what is that -- that -- that little slice, that triangle at the top on Chinden there. Well, that's considered a noneconomic remnant. There is not really much of anything you could do, except plant grass there, and what they are talking about is having a -- a -- an access road -- it would be a little skinny frontage road where emergency vehicles would come into the entrance at Serenity Lane, go down next to this first house -- excuse me -- and so you're talking about ambulances, fire engines, all the employees that are going to work at this hospital -- you're going to have to talk. Excuse me.

Hoyer: Hi. This is Paul Hoyer, Val's husband. We are concerned about this frontage road they want to put into Serenity and they are bringing a public road into a private road off of 20-26 and it is about 30 feet from that frontage to Chinden as it now exists. So, we are kind of worried about this public-private interface here. I'm not sure that is a workable situation and it's really tight. I don't see much in the way of fire or emergency getting in

that narrow of a lane. So, we are concerned about that and I guess like Val said, the access to our lane, after this 20-26 expansion is done -- the light beyond Levi is done.

Stack: And I believe the -- Chief Bongiorno, I hope you are still on, I believe he made the comment that having that -- that -- that little access road will actually handicap the fire response into Serenity Lane. Pardon me. The smoke got to my throat and I'm just choking here. So, this is a really critical issue for us and the highway -- or ITD has not been part of this whole plan. We don't think that the -- the frontage road is proper access for Serenity and also it cuts off the -- where they are planning on driving in is part of private property or at least part of that meets up with the private property, because of -- we have the private Serenity Lane access. The other thing about that is is that -- that pink line actually extends, as I understand it, across Serenity Lane to the west and is intended to be the access road for the large parcel of land that is going to be the cloverleaf, essentially, for the Highway 16 intersection and a commercial piece of property on the west side behind Serenity Lane. So, we think this is ill-conceived. It's not been thought out. We think that there is a whole lot more to that plan that needs to be looked at and that we need to have a really solid plan before anything is built over in this subdivision for us to be able to get in and get out safely from our neighborhood. So, that's -- those are the big issues that we have. The other thing, of course, is looking up straight at a four story hospital building that is, you know, right up against the houses and so I think there are some other people who want to talk about that, like to Sue Ropski, probably.

Fitzgerald: I appreciate it, ma'am. Thank you so much. Madam Clerk, I think Sue Ropski has got her hand up. I think she is the next one that would like to testify. Ms. Ropski --

Weatherly: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Oh, go ahead, Adrienne.

Weatherly: No. Go ahead.

Fitzgerald: Ms. Ropski, if you are with us, please, state your name and address for the record and the floor is yours, ma'am.

Ropski: Mr. Chair and Commissioners, my name is Sue Ropski. I live at 6262 North Serenity Lane, Meridian. 83646. Looking at this map I'm the second house on the east side. I second everything Val and Paul commented on and I would like to add a few more comments. We know that a hospital of this size will employ a lot of staff and the south parking is right up against the back of my home, so I anticipate many staff will cut in that little Serenity Lane to shoot over and get in and park. The other thing I don't know if you can see are those two little squares right behind the second house. That's the garbage. That's where the medical waste will be and that's where the trash will be. Right behind my home. Most people on our road have lived here for over 20 years and we are not only invested in our community, but we are invested in the City of Meridian and we understand expansion is coming, but that being said, the thought of 24 hour traffic next to my home and a waste -- of medical waste right behind my home currently, as Val described, my

view is a million dollar view and I'm looking at -- now when I look out my bedroom window probably being able to waive at patients that hopefully will be getting better in the hospital. It is really severely impacting what the future will hold. I'm very concerned about noise reduction. Sonya talked about buffering the south and the west. She didn't talk about any buffering on the north side with the five lanes that will go to seven, addition -- the small road that will be expanded -- that's eight lanes of traffic and we have no noise buffering to the north. I -- I think along with that we will have the ambulances coming through and all the people that are just coming and going from the hospital. So, we are looking at going to 24 hour traffic. I think the others thing that I'm concerned about is -- I understand they are going to give us a 30 foot piece of property, but if they could push that hospital as far east as they can -- I don't know if they could push their hospital towards the front and move their garbage over where their outdoor yard is -- I brought this up before and they said the architect was going to look at it and make some changes to where the garbage is and I haven't seen any changes there. So, I won't reiterate everything Val says. I am concerned that we won't have any westbound access readily available and I guess noise pollution, light pollution and I understand our way of life is going to change and I -- I can accept that, but I can't accept that my way of life is going to be eroded and -- and the thought of my beautiful home backing up to a parking lot and garbage is -- is really tough. So, I know you guys won't fail me and thank you for listening to my comments.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, Ms. Ropski. We appreciate it. Thank you for being with us tonight. Madam Clerk, I think Cory Coltrin is the next person to testify.

Weatherly: That's correct, Mr. Chair.

Fitzgerald: Cory, if you are with us, please, state your name and your address for the record and the floor is yours.

Coltrin: Hello. I'm Cory Coltrin. I'm at 6178 North Serenity Lane and I am Sue Ropski's neighbor and along with everything that's been said I totally agree. You know, when the hospital was originally proposed it was supposed to be way over on the west side -- or the east side. Excuse me. Away from the homes. And it seems like every revision we see that hospital is getting closer and closer until now it's practically in our backyard. So, I'm really disappointed with that. Maybe we could -- when they could get that parcel over on the east side, that hospital can be flipped over and moved away from -- from the resident -- residential area. And also do we -- so my question is also -- we also -- there is a hospital -- I believe that is proposed right across the street, north side of Chinden. How many hospitals do we need here? Do we need to put one right next to a neighborhood that's been -- been here for, what, 25 years now? The other concern I have is our road becoming a major thoroughfare from all -- the new neighborhood. Is that -- is that going to happen? Is it going to be a way to get from -- out to Chinden from -- from the new neighborhood or is that going to be barricaded off? Yeah. That is a concern that I have. So, it just -- yeah, it just breaks our hearts to see this happening behind us and -- and our quality of life is just going to go down and that -- that hospital is just getting

taller and taller and closer and closer and I would really appreciate it if they can move it over to -- closer to Levi Lane. Thank you very much.

Fitzgerald: Thank you, Mr. Coltrin. We appreciate it. Thank you for your comments. Is there additional individuals who would like to testify, either in chambers or online? Please raise your hand, either via Zoom or in person. Hearing none -- or seeing none at this time, Stephanie, would you like to come back up -- would your team like to come back up and -- and close the comments and answer some of the questions that have been proposed. I do have one while you are walking up. Much like Mr. Coltrin said, is there a reason we are not trying to do our best to move the hospital or flip it, so that it's moving towards the east? That -- it just seems like that would be a more appropriate buffer for neighbors that have been there for a number of years.

Leonard: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission. We will do our best to answer all the questions that were asked. I think I guess in relation to your first question I might let Patrick field that.

Conner: Yeah. I just wanted to quickly show the future land use map that just kind of shows a broader area and kind of what the city decided -- how this area is going to redevelop in the future. I think it kind of gives some indication on why we were asked to put in that frontage-backage road and we will talk about it. Everything you see kind of in dark brown is mentioned -- it's regional. I believe -- do you remember the name of this hatched --

Leonard: Yeah. So, the -- the area that's hatched is a mixed use interchange area as well. So, as Patrick is saying, they -- they envision this area to really develop into an area that has a fair amount of employment, commercial, and other regional draws. In addition, city code does require that you provide frontage roads when adjacent -- or parallel to a state highway. So, in this case we are parallel to Chinden, so city code actually requires that we provide some kind of frontage road to alleviate some of the traffic that's seen there.

Conner: We can try to start answering some -- some questions. I think there -- there is similar -- hopefully we can -- oops. Let me go back. There we go.

Leonard: Okay. So, I think in relation to the -- the density of the homes in question, the -- this area is in a medium density residential area. The density range for that, I believe, is three to eight units an acre. We are right in the middle. We are at 4.87. Trying to pull up this lower part so you can kind of see. I'm speaking in reference to the size of the lots adjacent to Serenity Lane. We did our best to comply with city code and the -- the future land use map in getting to that density range and the homes here are significantly more wider than some of the other lots that are in this plat and we really tried to transition up to the Serenity Lane homes to kind of add a nice buffer, but also comply with what the -- the city is seeing for this area. As far as -- I think Val brought up the fact that Serenity Lane will be closing and that it will eventually be completely blocked off in about ten years. As far as the -- the access point that she is requesting, this is a fairly direct access point and

I think it actually helps to -- the design of it actually helps to alleviate what might be considered cut-through traffic or just a heavily trafficked area if it weren't a little bit off the beaten path. We certainly wouldn't want to -- we wouldn't want to, you know, put you right on a collector, but I think that this provides a nice access point that will get you to Levi Lane and, then, eventually Chinden fairly quickly when that access to Chinden from Serenity closes. I think Val also brought up the buffer that she would like to the west. I'm not sure that I understand --

Conner: I can chime in on that. So, the -- the very southeast parcel there, that homeowner is actually Raymond Rourke's house and we are purchasing a majority of the property from him and he is fine with the three units abutting his property and so from his standpoint -- and we brought this plan to him and he was -- he was fine the way that it's currently laid out.

Leonard: So, Val also discussed the frontage road, which we just addressed a little bit. It was also in discussions with staff in pre-app and -- and in speaking with the hospital specifically we determined that it would be best to try to bring a frontage road through the campus and, then, over to Levi Lane. That's -- Levi Lane is actually where emergency vehicles and the majority of the traffic is going to enter. It's going to be the main entrance and that's where we envision that folks will actually use -- or get to the site. The area is -- I believe it's a little -- oh. Sorry. Sorry, we got our presentation -- okay. I'm not -- I'm not sure what the actual dimension is of that section that was referenced. If it is tight it will be -- it will have to come into compliance with whatever ACHD requires and whatever city code requires for the road frontage. In addition, with this conditional -- there will be a conditional use permit required for the site in the medical campus. So, the design will be further detailed for that application and all reviewing agencies, including the city and the fire department, will have a chance to chime in on that application and condition requirements as needed.

Fitzgerald: While you are looking --

Conner: I want to invite --

Fitzgerald: Sorry, Patrick. Go ahead.

Leonard: So, we actually have a person from the hospital with us that we would like to bring up to kind of address the hours of operation and some of the logistical details of the medical campus.

Hunsicker: Hi. My name is Betsy Hunsicker. Do I need to give you my address? 1717 Arlington Street, Caldwell, Idaho. I'm with HCA Healthcare. So, a couple of things I wanted to address that came up as questions. The majority of the -- although hospitals are open 24 hours a day, that's the nature of our business, the bulk of the traffic really happens between 6:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. That's when the majority of people are coming in for morning appointments and getting ready and feeding. Shift change is typically seven A and seven P, so we don't have a lot of traffic outside of those hours coming and

going. So, just to speak to hours of operation. Ambulances. We -- in many cases -- HCA has 186 hospitals across the country and so we have a lot of experience doing -- doing projects like this and we frequently work with our ambulance partners to -- to turn off lights, to not use lights and sirens once you get close to a facility. That's very normal that we work with the ambulance companies to -- to go silent when they come into the facility to not bother neighbors. So, that's certainly something we would -- we would work with them to do. Also I want to kind of highlight the height concerns and, you know, I think we can -- we can definitely work to move the trash area and kind of move -- try to make that a different access and have the trucks -- I think we are very open to doing that and very sensitive, you know, appreciate that concern. I also would point out that most of this -- most of what you are seeing here is not four stories. The four story tower area is -- there is a -- right. So, I don't know how to -- if there is a pointer or something like that. So, it is kind of in the center. It's kind out in the center of the property. So, it's not right up against that western edge there, it's more -- it's more central. We did kind of -- kind of try to figure out other layouts and other orientations and based on this footprint this was the orientation that we were able to make work in the space given the access points and everything else. That doesn't mean that we are not open to trying to push that a little bit further east, but I think between pushing it further east and orienting it around the trash, you know, that's -- that's just something we have to work through and I'm -- I'm not sure how much better we can get to be all the way over on the -- on the north -- the northeast side of the property, but it certainly -- you know, I don't think -- I don't think we are opposed to that, it's just a matter of the access --

Grove: Mr. Chair, could you have them speak in the microphone.

Fitzgerald: Can we make sure you guys are really centered on that microphone.

Hunsicker: I feel like it's in my mouth, but -- but how is that? All right. So -- and then -- and, then, I will just bring up -- so, HCA was actually working with the Pollard Subdivision on the north side of Chinden and we were the hospital partner with that project.

Cassinelli: Mr. Chair, I'm still missing 90 percent of what's being said. Is this one better?

Hunsicker: Okay. All right. I was just saying that -- someone brought up -- now I don't feel like it's working at all. Okay. When we were working with -- HCA Healthcare was the hospital partner working with the developers on the north side of Chinden in the Pollard Subdivision, so we were the hospital partner on that project and they have -- that -- they have changed their focus and although they have the zoning for that, that -- we are not working with them on that project just because of the timing and the way things played out there, so -- so I don't know -- I'm not aware of a hospital partner they have for that project versus the hospital that we are proposing on this spot. So, just to speak to not having two hospitals right across the street from each other.

Conner: I just want to reiterate -- as Betsy said, that the CUP process is a process that we have yet to apply for. We have -- we have had one neighborhood meeting where we have shown this concept plan to the neighbors. Like Betsy said, we are completely open

to working and moving the building as it -- as it works well for access and being cognizant of their needs. We have made one adjustment of moving the medical office building north, but we can look again at moving the larger building further east. Also as this parcel on the northeast side, as it comes into play, there is potential that there is more flexibility for a redesign. So, it's something that is a work in progress -- progress and I appreciate the testimony from -- from the neighbors of Serenity Lane.

Leonard: So, I guess -- I think I will just add that, you know, we are -- we think this will be a really fantastic addition to this part of Meridian. It's super close to what will eventually be the extension of State Highway 16 and Chinden, which is wisely just recently expanded roadway and this will really be a regional draw for not only high quality paying jobs, but a place that people could potentially work and, then, walk home to where they live nearby with residences that we are providing -- or proposing. I think with that -- I think we addressed all the questions and I guess with that we will stand for any further questions or discussion.

Fitzgerald: Stephanie, one quick question and, then, I will open up to my fellow Commissioners. In the road connection from Serenity Lane currently it kind of had -- on the -- on your plat it looks like it's going in kind of a roundabout type setup or something, but is it -- is that going to connect currently or is that emergency access now and will be opened up later when that right-in, right-out comes into play?

Leonard: Mr. Chair, were you referring to the pink line that was on that medical campus site plan?

Fitzgerald: No. The Serenity Lane at the end of it going into the -- into the main neighborhood. Is that a main access so people will be cutting through Serenity Lane onto Chinden or is that being bollarded -- bollarded if that's a word -- until such time as the right-in, right-out is established?

Leonard: Thank you, Mr. Chair, for the clarification on that. No, this -- that access point will be blocked off until Serenity Lane is completely closed. The intent and what we were asked to do was connect to the end of Serenity Lane knowing that ITD could very well and will close Serenity Lane to Chinden in the future. I believe their plan as of now and the letter that we received indicates that they are planning on limiting it to a right-in, right-out with the installation of that light at Levi Lane.

Fitzgerald: So, it will be a little while before the -- when their address is completely cut off that's when that will open up, just to clarify?

Leonard: Yes. Mr. Chair, I think Val said that it was 2030 plan. So, somewhere around then.

Bongiorno: Mr. Chairman?

Fitzgerald: Yes, chief, go right ahead.

Bongiorno: I guess -- I guess I will take concern with that, because with right-in and right-out we can't get in there. So, if they make it a right-in, right-out at Serenity Lane and Chinden, I cannot get a fire engine in there.

Leonard: Mr. Chair, Chief Bongiorno, I believe that we could put bollards -- we would put bollards there. Obviously, we would need to make sure that the -- that neighborhood is serviceable by the Fire Department, that they are able to -- to, you know, meet access for you and your requirements.

Bongiorno: Okay. Yeah. I guess that's -- this is the first I have heard of that, because with right-in, right-out we -- we have to have that lane open so we can get through.

Conner: So, the way that we have done it previously with emergency access only is it -- it really functions as a chain, so it restricts private car access, but if an emergency vehicle needs to go through there it's something they can either disassemble the chain or go through the chain or -- there is a way for them to get through there, but it restricts through traffic from -- from anyone trying to drive through there. But it is an emergency only access.

Fitzgerald: As long as we are taking care of the fire requests there and any kind of I guess requirements going forward --

Bongiorno: Yeah. I think --

Fitzgerald: -- I think we are clear.

Bongiorno: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think that we should look at that. Definitely. Because that's the first I heard that that was not going to be open.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Thanks, chief. I appreciate it. Commissioner Cassinelli, did you have a question, sir?

Cassinelli: I did. Stephanie, I believe you mentioned something about that southeast property. Was that the one on Serenity Lane talking about the -- the number of homes that are abutting that? Did you mention that prior to the hospital discussion there?

Leonard: Sure. I think -- Mr. Chair, Commissioner Cassinelli, I believe Patrick mentioned that that was the homeowner -- or the property owner for the property we are acquiring for this project. So -- and he's not concerned with the number of homes that are abutting his -- the back of his property.

Cassinelli: So, which property is that that you are talking about?

Leonard: That's the property at the corner of -- the five lots that you had mentioned before. So, it's at the -- the southeast corner of the Serenity Lane properties.

Cassinelli: Okay.

Leonard: Right next to the cul-de-sac.

Cassinelli: Okay. And, then, another question and I don't know if you know the answer to this, but where are you in discussions on that property there on the east side of the medical campus along Levi Lane, if you are trying to -- you are trying to acquire that piece. Do you know -- is that -- is it looking good? Is it not looking good? What -- I mean are we --

Conner: Yes. Yeah. Actually it is. It's looking good. This is Patrick, Mr. Chairman. I believe they are -- they are -- they are negotiating -- negotiating the PSA. They are negotiating the PSA. So, they are coming to a purchase and sale agreement. They are in the final works of that. Once that -- once the conditions and all the details and the terms of the contract are decided, then, they can enter a formal -- a formal contract. So, they are currently negotiating the purchase and sale agreement. So, it's looking very good.

Cassinelli: Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Additional questions for the applicant? And I know we have someone -- Ms. Ropski and Ms. Stack, we -- we are allowing only you guys to speak for your time. So, I apologize, we are not going to open it back up to additional second round. But we appreciate your input and I think we got the gist of your guys' comments. Any additional thoughts or comments before we close the public hearing? Can I get a motion to close public hearing?

Cassinelli: Mr. Chair, I move we close the public hearing on Prescott Ridge, H-2020-0047.

McCarvel: Second.

Fitzgerald: I have a motion and a second to close the public hearing --

Allen: Mr. Chair, excuse me.

Fitzgerald: Please, go ahead.

Allen: You have someone -- we had someone walk in the door right before you made the motion to close the public hearing.

Fitzgerald: Okay.

Allen: Would he be able to testify?

Fitzgerald: Someone new?

Allen: Yes, I believe so.

Fitzgerald: Yeah. And I will let -- Stephanie, I will let you close after that person gets done if you have any additional comments. Thank you for joining us, sir. Please state your name and your address for the record and the floor is yours.

Peterman: Okay. My name is Randall A. Peterman. I control an LLC called Peterman Boise, LLC, that owns nine and a half acres on -- at 5215 Chinden Boulevard on the south side. The best way to think about that is it's directly north of where this school site is and so it's directly impacted by what's going on in this Planning and Zoning Commission hearing. First, thank you for fitting me in. I'm here to speak in favor of the application for Prescott Bridge -- I'm sorry -- Prescott Ridge. Basically because it's necessary for area property owners like me to get sewer and water connected to their property. It will doubtless increase the value of my property and I know there are hospital areas -- at least one hospital on a 30 acre parcel that would benefit as well. I have kept up with what's going on here before the P&Z. Almost seems like this issue has been politicized as between two developers. I'm not sure I understand that. But I don't see that it's really necessary. This is the public sewer and water. It will benefit all the area homeowners and I stand in support of it.

Fitzgerald: Perfect. Any questions? Sir, thank you so much for joining us tonight and we appreciate your comments and we will take that into account as we wrap up and start deliberating. Thanks for being with us.

Peterman: Thank you. Thanks again.

Fitzgerald: Absolutely. Stephanie, do you any additional comments you need to make?

Leonard: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission. I guess if given the opportunity to speak more I will. We appreciate staff working with us on the townhomes portion specifically and we look forward to keeping -- or to continue our work with them to make sure that that fits their needs, as well as ours, and it's compliant with city code and the Comprehensive Plan. In addition, like we have already said, I think this medical campus is going to be a great addition to this area of town. It's a great location, accessible to major transportation corridors and will really set this part of Meridian in -- in a great place. So, I think overall we are excited about this project and think it will be -- it will provide a lot of additional housing units, lots of variety and is meeting a lot of the Comprehensive Plan goals and intents and it has been designed to really be a great place to live in addition, as well as a great place to work for folks that want to do both. So, with that I guess I will conclude and stand for any questions if there is any further ones.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, ma'am.

Leonard: Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Any additional questions for the applicant? If not, I can entertain a motion.

McCarvel: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Mr. Chairman?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel, go right ahead.

McCarvel: I move we close the public hearing on H-2020-0047.

Grove: Second.

Cassinelli: Second.

Fitzgerald: I have a motion and a second to close public hearing on H-2020-0047. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Fitzgerald: Anyone want to lead off?

Cassinelli: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Cassinelli, go right ahead, sir.

Cassinelli: I actually had a question for Sonya. Sonya, are we -- we are only looking at the residential portion of this tonight; is that correct? What --

Allen: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Cassinelli, Commissioners, no, you are also looking at zoning for the commercial portion and a concept development plan for the commercial portion. Detailed approval will come with a conditional use permit for the hospital. The medical office would be allowed, though, with the C-G zoning.

Cassinelli: But that will -- the conditional use -- the hospital will come back to us?

Allen: For conditional use, yes, but -- but what is under your purview tonight is the concept development plan for that site. So, that will be included as part of the development agreement. So, if you have any changes with that, it is important to state that on the record and include it in the development agreement or for changes to be made prior to Council, actually, preferably. Staff does have other changes that are requested prior to Council as well. And, Mr. Chair, if I may also clarify something on the record that was stated earlier from Ms. Ropski. She did make a reference to the lack of noise abatement provided along the state highway. I did not mention it in my presentation, but it is a requirement in the development agreement that the developer provide a berm and/or wall combination that's a minimum of ten feet higher than the centerline of the state highway. So, that is a requirement in the development agreement for the commercial portion, so it could be in the buffer out there along the highway. So, just wanted to clarify that. Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Thank you for clarifying that upgrade. Additional comments or questions for staff or just to kick off the comment?

McCarvel: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: First I would like to say I love the variety of housing. I think they have done a great job with the transition on the house size lots from the one acre, you know, other than that corner, which has got two and two or two and a half and two and a half. They have kind of matched up one to two. So, I appreciate that and the variety of housing in there. I think, you know, we just need to decide tonight -- and I think there is a lot going on here. I think we are going to have to take -- in my opinion probably another stab at it for the medical campus and the townhomes. It sounds like they have got a lot to work out with our Fire Department before we move forward with a lot of this. So, I'm not sure how detailed -- you know, when I think through the discussion we have had so far and to understand, you know, that there is a lot less to talk about that we would like to see, I think, before it goes forward.

Fitzgerald: Additional comments? Commissioner Cassinelli.

Cassinelli: Yeah. I'm -- I will second Commissioner McCarvel's thoughts there and I think that if they are about to get under contract on that one parcel, I would -- you know, a project of this size takes -- you know, in my mind it -- it takes a few passes and things and I think, you know, if they are about to get that parcel under contract, it would be best to bring it back with that -- with a -- with a full -- with a full plan that includes that, that does something else with that frontage road to maybe ease -- they can -- at that point in time they can -- they can probably move the hospital, get the emergency access, so I think -- and, then, they would also have time to work with Fire, they would have time to look at the townhomes and my personal preference was -- I mean even though -- and we didn't hear from that lot owner on the southeast corner over there, but we got five lots on one and, granted, at the corner, but I don't buy that explanation of the visibility, because if you take one of those lots and make that a common lot, you know, you -- the way I'm looking at it you are -- you can see that there is a road right there. So, you will see that. So, I don't necessarily agree with that. So, those are -- those are my comments on that. But I feel strongly that one lot there are up along Levi Lane in the front is -- is just about under contract. I think it would be best to see it all together. Complete.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Cassinelli -- I'm sorry. Commissioner Grove or Commissioner Seal, do you have comments or thoughts? I -- I mean I tend to agree with what both of you had said, that typically about the -- that's a linchpin piece of that. If we can take access off of Levi Lane and not off of Serenity Lane for some of the -- especially for emergency vehicles, that's a big deal. I do -- I do think -- the townhomes don't work at all right now for me. I think that -- it doesn't make sense and having some kind of a -- of a weird quasi-private road that someone owns doesn't work for me either. So, that -- that whole thing needs to be worked out and I know that the chief had brought up some really

good points that we need to make sure fire is clear and concise on -- that they feel comfortable with where they are going, especially if they are sprinkling things or not and there needs to be conditions in there about that, if they are going to agree to sprinkler any kind of attached product or I guess in that one section. That needs to be clearly outlined in our conditions. So, I'm -- I understand where Commissioner Cassinelli is going and that makes sense.

Grove: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Grove.

Grove: I'm okay either -- with whatever the consensus of the group is on this one, but I feel that, you know, there is a whole bunch of things that we have kind of talked about that need to be kind of just touched on or updated with new information, but if it were to be decided to go forward I wouldn't -- wouldn't feel as bad as I would on some other projects that have this many. It seems like they are most -- they are fairly easy -- or not easy, but they are easily understood what the changes are, even if the changes might not be that hard. So, the only thing that I would want to make sure that they keep is if they do -- you know, when they do the townhome making sure that those stay -- I like the concept of those being owner occupied units versus rental units or like separate -- or multi-family units, just because we don't have a ton of those it doesn't seem like. So, that's an opinion piece, not necessarily something that would stop me from, you know, liking the project overall. But one thing I just want to point out -- two things. I want to thank the residents that commented. Their -- their feedback was -- was very well appreciated just in terms of how constructive it was in providing the feedback and, then, for the developers I like the -- the open space that they have shown in this project, so --

Fitzgerald: I agree with all those comments.

Seal: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Seal, go right ahead, sir.

Seal: I think we are rapidly approaching a continuance here. So, if -- if October 22nd is the date that we are looking at, I can take a stab at a motion.

Cassinelli: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Cassinelli.

Cassinelli: If I can jump in. Sorry, Commissioner Seal, but if -- if we want to see that parcel under contract it may take longer than 30 days. I don't know.

Fitzgerald: Can I get a head nod or a pen in the air or something. And I know that services are not there yet, so we have got some time. This thing is not going to well up tomorrow. They have got to go through the Oaks to get services. So -- Andrea, it looks like she's

scrambling for something. I don't like to see our attorneys running around. That makes me nervous.

Pogue: Mr. Chair, I was going to -- I was going to just whisper into Commissioner Seal's ear. We -- if you are leaning on continuing you need to reopen the public hearing.

Fitzgerald: Yes, ma'am. Thank you very much for the clarification. If -- we are going to do that and, then, look for continuance. You want to -- we can probably ask Stephanie how much time that they need, if that's the direction we are headed.

McCarvel: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: I move we reopen the public hearing on H-2020-0047 to discuss a continuance date with the applicant.

Grove: Second.

Cassinelli: Second.

Fitzgerald: I have a motion and a second to reopen the public hearing on H-2020-0047. All those in favor say --

Allen: Mr. Chair? I'm not sure if it's necessary to open the public hearing. I'm sorry I'm butting in. This is staff. The applicant has mouthed to us that they would be good with October 22 hearing date, so --

Fitzgerald: We still have to reopen it. So, that's fine. So, I have a motion and a second to reopen the public hearing. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed?

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Fitzgerald: Okay. So, we have got the high sign that the October 22nd date works. Bring a cot and some popcorn. We may be there for a while.

Cassinelli: Are they confident that that parcel will be under contract by then?

Armuth: My name is Mitch Armuth. I'm with Providence Properties. Our address is 701 South Allen. We are currently -- the property is listed. We are in negotiations on the property where the HCA Hospital is. So, the seller is either going to accept the conditions that the buyer is offering or keep it listed on -- on the market. We are -- Providence Properties is not involved with that transaction. It's a hundred percent between HCA and the existing landowner. I did see transactions go across yesterday from the seller's representative and the buyer's representative and they seem to be very close in -- in that acquisition.

Seal: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: Just to reiterate -- the question is October 22nd going to be enough time, do you think, in order to include that piece of property into the overall plan as it will be submitted back to Planning and Zoning.

Armuth: Mr. Commissioner, yes, I do believe that is time for the seller and buyer to reach an agreement or not. To terminate. He has a price. They have a price that they are willing to offer and they are in that process and it's either going to happen here in the next couple of days or not.

Seal: Understood. Okay. Thank you.

Armuth: Thank you.

Bongiorno: Mr. Chairman?

Fitzgerald: Yes, sir. Go ahead, chief.

Bongiorno: Since you opened it back up again, I just wanted to make one last comment before you do your thing. So -- so, Commission, one of the things that I have had discussions with City Council about is access and -- and development is well aware of -- of Fire Department's concerns when it comes to access and having Serenity Lane be bollarded off or chained off or whatever takes time. It takes time for us to get through bollards. It takes time for us to get through chains. And as we all know when you are dealing with fire or an EMS issue or a police issue, time is of the essence and so for Fire, Police and EMS, our hopes and wishes is that roads will be open without bollards and chains, even with the right-in, right-out, because time is of the essence and so we have had very similar projects to this where they have -- they have decided just to put bollards up and -- and, again, our main goal is get there quickly and save lives and help people in their time of need and so just a half step up onto my soapbox and -- and just -- the thoughts and wants of Fire, Police and in EMS is direct routes that are unhindered.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, chief. We appreciate your additional input. That's helpful.

Bongiorno: Thank you.

Fitzgerald: With that do we have any additional comments or thoughts or are we ready to make a motion?

McCarvel: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: I move we continue file number H-2020-0047 to the hearing date of October 22nd to allow the applicant and the Fire Department and staff to come to agreements on access and -- to all portions of the project and to provide illustrations of items discussed with medical campus and the townhomes.

Fitzgerald: I hope we worked in that second -- that last piece. Does that include that, just for clarification?

McCarvel: The last piece of the Fire Department?

Fitzgerald: The last piece of that --

McCarvel: Oh, yeah. Yeah. To show us a complete proposed medical campus.

Grove: Second.

Fitzgerald: I have a motion and a second to continue the public hearing on H-2020-0047 to the hearing date of October 22nd. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Fitzgerald: Stephanie, we will see you on October 22nd. And, Patrick, you guys have a good night.

Cassinelli: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Cassinelli.

Cassinelli: One more motion. I move we adjourn. Go to bed.

Seal: Second.

Fitzgerald: I have a motion and a second to close the meeting and go to bed. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed to not going to bed? Please don't talk.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, team. Appreciate all the comments and all the work. Commissioner Seal, thanks for being there in person again. We appreciate you.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 11:34 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS.)

APPROVED

RYAN FITZGERALD - CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK

DATE APPROVED