

Meeting of the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission of September 16, 2021, was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chairman Rhonda McCarvel.

Members Present: Chairman Rhonda McCarvel, Commissioner Andrew Seal, Commissioner Nick Grove, Commissioner Steven Yearsley, Commissioner Maria Lorcher and Commissioner Nate Wheeler.

Members Absent: Commissioner Bill Cassinelli.

Others Present: Adrienne Weatherly, Kurt Starman, Caleb Hood, Bill Parsons, Joe Dodson, Alan Tiefenbach, Brian McClure and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nate Wheeler | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Maria Lorcher |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Andrew Seal | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nick Grove |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Steven Yearsley | <input type="checkbox"/> Bill Cassinelli |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rhonda McCarvel - Chairman | |

McCarvel: Okay. Good evening and welcome to Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission meeting for September 16th, 2021. The Commissioners and staff who are present for this evening's meeting are at City Hall and on Zoom. If you are joining us on Zoom this evening we can see that you are here. You may be able to observe the meeting. However, your ability to be seen on screen and talk will be muted. During the public testimony portion of the meeting you will be unmuted and, then, be able to comment. Please note that we cannot take questions until the public testimony portion. If you have a process question during the meeting, please, e-mail cityclerk@meridiacity.org and they will reply as quickly as possible. And we will begin with roll call.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

McCarvel: Thank you. First item on the agenda is the adoption of the agenda. Burger King Drive-Through, H-2021-0051, will be open for the sole purpose of continuing this item to the regularly scheduled date of -- what do we have? October -- October 7th. Yeah. So, if there is anybody here tonight to testify on that particular application, we will be not -- we will not be taking testimony this evening. And we also have a scrivener's error on Item 5, I believe it was, and I'm going to let Kurt Starman tell us about that.

Starman: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just for the record, the applicant in this instance originally applied for C-G zoning designation and so the original notice was published that way. Since that time the applicant is requesting a C-C zoning district, which is a less

intense zoning district and so the notice was proper and we are fine to proceed tonight, because the zoning being discussed by the Commission later this evening is a less intense zoning district than what was noticed for the public.

McCarvel: Thank you. So, with that could I get a motion to adopt the agenda as amended?

Seal: So moved.

Yearsley: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to adopt the agenda. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

1. Approve Minutes of the August 19, 2021 Planning and Zoning Commission Special Meeting

McCarvel: Next item on the agenda is the Consent Agenda and we have just the approval of minutes for the August 19th, 2021, meeting. Could I get a motion to approve the Consent Agenda?

Wheeler: So moved.

Seal: Second.

McCarvel: It's been moved and seconded to adopt the -- to adopt the Consent Agenda. All those in favor say aye.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

McCarvel: All right. So, at this time I would like to briefly explain the public hearing process. We will open each item individually and begin with the staff report. The staff will report their findings on how each item adheres to our Comprehensive Plan and Unified Development Code. After the staff has made their presentation, the applicant will come forward to present their case and respond to staff comments. They will have 15 minutes to do so. After the applicant has finished we will open the floor to public testimony. Each person will be called on only once during the public testimony. The Clerk will call the names individually of those who signed up on our website in advance to testify. You will, then, be unmuted. Please state your name and address for the record and you will have three minutes to address the Commission. If you have previously sent pictures or a

presentation for the meeting, it will be displayed on the screen and our Clerk will run the presentation. After all those who have signed up in advance have spoken we will invite others who may wish to testify. If you wish to speak on a topic you may press the raise hand button on the Zoom app or if you are only listening on the phone, please, press star nine and wait for your name to be called. When you are finished, if the Commission does not have questions for you, your time -- your time is up and we will not call on you a second time. After all testimony has been heard, the applicant will be given another ten minutes to come back and respond. When the applicant has finished responding to questions and concerns, we will close the public hearing and the Commissioners will have the opportunity to discuss and hopefully be able to make final decisions or recommendations to City Council as needed.

DEPARTMENT REPORTS

2. COMPASS Development Review Checklist and Fiscal Impact Tool Presentation

McCarvel: So, at this time we will start with Item 2 on the agenda, Department Report from COMPASS.

Miller: Good evening. My name is Carl Miller. I'm with COMPASS. I assume you can hear me all right.

McCarvel: Yes.

Miller: Great. Thank you. Appreciate you hosting me. Thank you for hosting me remotely. I'm going to share a short presentation that will talk a little bit about COMPASS's new tool, our fiscal impact tool, that we think will be really helpful -- and I did the wrong one. Hold on just a second. We think this will be a really helpful tool for providing another data set and other information for planning and zoning commissioners, city council members, and others to really look at the financial impact of new development and growth. Okay. Are you able to see my presentation now? Is that working right? Okay. You would think after a year and a half of doing this I had got this down, but we are still -- every once in a while it gives me fits. So, thanks. Before I get started I just wanted to kind of start with a few rhetorical questions for you to think about in the background as I'm sharing this new tool with you. First, if a new subdivision is approved in Meridian, could you afford the new services that would be required of it? How would you know if your Comprehensive Plan is financially viable? What's the financial impact of new House Bill 389? And can you answer any of these questions right now? COMPASS would like to -- well, I would like to share a little bit more about COMPASS, why we did this new fiscal impact tool, what it does, how we are going to report this and make this tool available to you, as well as your staff. And, then, answer any questions that you have at the end of the presentation. Obviously, if you have any questions throughout, though, please feel free to interrupt me. I would rather address those questions as they are fresh in your mind. COMPASS, if you are not familiar, is the Community Planning Association of Southwest Idaho, we are the metropolitan planning

organization for Ada and Canyon county and in that role we bring in federal dollars through Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration to do long range transportation planning. Really working with your staff to identify what is the most important transportation infrastructure and services that we can provide and, then, getting dollars either through FHWA and FTA or searching out for grants to make sure that we can get the most dollars here in the Treasure Valley and -- and work towards transportation planning. We also have a -- maybe a secondary role as a council of governments, which means that we are really enabled to do whatever our -- our board of directors asks us to do and our board is made up of mayors, city council members, board of county commissioners and others and who has been growing increasingly concerned about the -- the rate and pace of growth and trying to answer the question is growth paying for itself and that's something that collectively as a region we are all struggling with, obviously, as we grow so quickly and making sure that we are not burdening future generations with the -- the things that we approve today and so we were tasked with -- we are hiring a consultant. We hired TischlerBice out of D.C., who actually now has moved an -- an office to the Boise area because of the work that they are seeing in the intermountain west because of the new growth we are seeing in this -- in this region. But to also work with our -- our community partners, City of Meridian, Ada County Highway District, Idaho Transportation Department and others to really build this fiscal impact tool. The fiscal impact tool really, at its simplest, it really is just a calculation of the expected revenues that we are going to see and the expected expenditures for new subdivisions, rezones, land use plans, changes and those kinds of things. So, we are really looking at the impact fees, property taxes, those things that will generate revenue for communities, and, then, the expenditures, the -- the amount of new infrastructure, the capital, the operating and all those things that we are obligated to provide when new growth comes to an area. So, we have looked at, really, everything under the public service purview from transportation to new public schools, safety and emergency services, parks and recreation, administration of all those things and so forth. In fact, we have over a hundred different public sector service categories built into this fiscal impact tool, so really from A to Z we can understand what is the impact of new growth. Just quickly, what this tool is not. It's not an economic impact tool. So, it's not going to be able to tell us, you know, if a new business, new firm comes into the Treasure Valley, what's the spillover effect, what is the new doctors and dentists and drycleaners and restaurants that will be generated by that and how many new jobs or how much new income is generated by new businesses. Really this is focused on public sector finances and is not meant to be an economic impact tool and it's not meant to be more than a tool. It really relies on good information in and good information coming out and so the assumptions that went into this were developed through a lot of lengthy conversations with your staff, your public works, your planning, your finances, and others to make sure that we understand your public budgets, your capital improvement plans, your long range planning and everything else that would go into this and it's also not meant to be anything more than a tool. It's one data set, amongst others, that are important to you in your Comprehensive Plan and in your city goals. But we definitely think public finances is one of them. As many communities develop these fiscal impact tools, it somewhat becomes the end all, be all, and that any decision by planning and zoning sometimes comes down to what is the fiscal impact tool say and -- and while that's important, we want to make sure it's -- it's one

perspective, one lens to view on long range planning and there may be many good reasons to, you know, approve development, even if it doesn't pencil. Affordable housing, that could be one. I know that with our consultant they talked about it in Boulder, Colorado, when they generated results, restaurants wouldn't often pencil and yet to Boulder, Colorado, that meant tourism, that meant nightlife, that meant so many other things that they were trying to generate that -- that was one consideration, but not necessarily the end all, be all. So, as we receive development reviews we will provide this fiscal impact analysis to you and to your staff. Just to give you a little bit of maybe behind the scenes to the tool, this is one of the maps that we include in the fiscal impact tool and as you can see there is a lot of granularity built into this. A lot of times when communities build fiscal impact tools, they say, you know, what is the average cost of a new student, you know, when a new home comes in how many average new students, what does that mean? We really wanted to drill down and be very specific with this, because in different parts of the community there could be different impacts and different ability for communities to serve that. You will notice, especially on the Canyon side of things, we have several highway districts, several school districts, and we split that out by who the service provider is, and is the ability for our public sector services to serve those different areas and so you will see that Meridian, for example, has I think eight or nine different geographic areas that we developed through feedback with your staff to reflect how well the city can serve certain areas versus others. And, then, we have the ability to do very -- look at different types of growth and different ways that growth would impact us. Three different single family residential types, five different multi-family, over a dozen different employment types and, then, we can mix and match for any mixed use development that we see in the city. We like to think that this covers about 95 percent of all development types. Almost -- most of what we see is going to fit nicely into one of these categories with new proposals that are seen before the Planning and Zoning Commission. There is every once in a while, you know, a new baseball stadium, a new Expo Idaho, that doesn't really fit nicely into any of these categories and we would have to do some specific modeling for that. It can be done, but just so you know that this is intended to cover maybe 95 percent of all the -- the things that you will see. And, then, finally, based on those geographic areas and based on those land use types that we have identified, we can say what is the impact on the -- the different service providers. So, how many new people are going to be generated by an average new single family unit? How many new students? How many vehicle miles traveled or law enforcement calls or fire and EMS calls are going to be generated both at that land use type in this location, but also at different price points? Well, one thing that we found is that at -- at higher price points, as for single family attached detached homes -- and this is here in Meridian. I think this is northwest Meridian -- there is less students per household. So, that's, obviously, going to be a different impact on the West Ada School District, than those at a lower price point or those detached housing or multi-family housing. So, we can vary -- look to see what is the -- what is the impact based on these different locations and land use types. COMPASS will be using this tool as we work with your -- your staff to identify opportunities for this where you will want to know the impact of new growth. We can provide this information both at the city level, county impact, school district, highway district and Valley Regional Transit, include -- including when does that break even, you know, maybe there is a couple of years of capital improvements that need to take place

and, then, later on the property taxes that see that, so we break even at -- at, you know, year five for the highway district or sometimes they break even right away. This is from a hypothetical grocery store and 50 multi-family units in Kuna, but, obviously, this could be generated for -- for the City of Meridian. We can also chart that out, so you can see how the revenues exceed expenditures, if that's the case, over time. COMPASS has been providing our development review checklist to you for larger scale developments, anything over 50 residential units, or more equivalent amount of commercial space. We provide this to really help bridge that local planning that you need to do with the regional goals that we have agreed on as a region to say how well is a particular development doing and are there things that we can look for or change to make sure that we are meeting the goals that we all collectively have. We have changed the format a little bit to better reflect our upcoming long range transportation plan Communities In Motion 2050 and that's the -- the screen on the left and, then, the one on the right will basically -- we will include this as the fiscal impact analysis that we do with that development review checklist. So, I will indicate with -- with green checkmarks where we are -- where there is a net positive fiscal impact, red will be net negative, and yellow will be somewhere in between where maybe there is a positive, but it takes several years to get there. So, very quickly you will be able to see what is the financial impact of this development proposal through these icons and what's the breakeven point. This is the example that we will use for the development review checklist that I know you have seen in the past. We also have the ability to review this or use this tool as you look at, you know, a new Comprehensive Plan or sub area plan or any scenarios that you want to test, so that way we can also look at what does this mean at the end of the day. You know, as we develop comprehensive plans this will help us to be able to say does this comprehensive plan pencil, does this make financial sense to us. So, we are also going to be running these at COMPASS. We are working with our consultant right now on making a web-based tool available to your staff, so that at pre-application meetings or if your staff is considering different policies or densities or any types of changes, you will have the abilities at your fingertips to -- to also run the evaluation and know what the different scenarios would -- would generate as far as public sector finances. So, anyway, I think I have given you a lot to chew on. There is a lot more detail I could get into, but I think that's pretty good overview for now, but this is also an image to help me remember that this tool will take care and feeding. We will need to come back and meet with your staff again to keep this tool up to date and current with current budgets, current capital improvement plans, any -- any planning that's changed the ability for the city to serve different areas and so this will probably be the first of maybe several times you will see me down the road as we update this plan -- update this tool and keep it current and fresh. So, that way it can be a really useful tool to -- to -- to help us all with the decisions that we have to make. But, in conclusion, this will help us to start using the tool, better evaluate the financial ramifications of land use decisions and be a tool at your fingertips. Any questions for me?

McCarvel: Any questions for Carl?

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: Just a quick question on the -- will the financial analysis be included in the -- essentially is your agency -- what am I trying to say? Is it going to be included in our planning and zoning reports I guess is what I'm trying to say.

Miller: Commissioner Seal, it sounds like a question for your staff; is that right? Or was that intended for me?

Seal: Well, generally COMPASS submits something as -- as far as each plan that comes through, so I just want to know if this fiscal impact analysis would also be submitted.

Miller: I see. Thank you, Commissioner. You will see a report similar to what you see on the screen right now. Hopefully you are seeing this on your screen. But, basically, we will include some of those regional goals that we have in those four boxes, safety, economic vitality, quality of life and convenience and, then, a supplementary page is included on your right that you will be able to see how well does the development proposal made city, highway district, county or school district finances with those little icons there. So, that's the way that we will be reporting this to you.

Seal: Okay. Thank you.

McCarvel: Thank you. Any other questions for Carl? Okay. Thank you. Look forward to seeing this.

Miller: Thank you for your time. Appreciate it.

ACTION ITEMS

3. Public Hearing for Burger King Drive-Through (H-2021-0051) by Legend Engineering, Located at 6211 N. Ten Mile Rd.

- A. Request: Conditional Use Permit for a dual-ordering drive-through establishment within 300 feet of another approved drive-through establishment and within 300 feet of a residential district for a 2,910 square foot Burger King with 37 parking spaces on 0.877 acres of land in the C-G zoning district.

McCarvel: So, at this time we will open H-2021-0051, Burger King Drive-Through and, as mentioned before, they are requesting continuance to October 7th due to failure to post the site with public hearing notice sign with the required time frame prior to the meeting. Could I get a motion to continue H-2021-0051?

Seal: Madam Chair, I move to continue file number H-2021-0051 to the date of October 7th, 2021.

Yearsley: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to continue H-2021-0051. All those -- to October 7th. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

4. Public Hearing Continued from July 15, 2021 for Heron Village Expansion (H-2021-0027) by Tamara Thompson of The Land Group, Inc., Located at 51, 125 and 185 E. Blue Heron Ln.

- A. Request: Annexation of 1.36 acres of land with a R-40 zoning district.
- B. Request: Rezone of 4.18 acres of land from C-G and R-8 to R-40.
- C. Request: Conditional Use Permit to allow expansion of an existing 108-unit, 5-building multifamily complex to allow an additional 36 units in two **new buildings**.

McCarvel: Now we will continue from July 15th, H-2021-0027, the Heron Village Expansion and we will begin with the staff report.

Tiefenbach: Good evening, Planning Commissioners. Alan Tiefenbach remotely. Associate planner with the City of Meridian. This is a proposal for an annexation, a rezoning, and a conditional use. The property is located at the southeast intersection of North Meridian Road and East Blue Heron Drive. It consists of -- let me go here -- consists of six properties. So, if you can see it -- well, one, two, three, four, five, six. Five of these properties are already in the city. They have different zonings. R-8, C-G and R-40. There is one property that is to be annexed and that's what you see here that's about 20 acres. It's located roughly a quarter mile north of the East Fairview-North Meridian intersection. A little history on this. The existing Heron Village Apartments consists of 108 units and five buildings. That's what's there now. That's what you can see here. Conditional use was approved for this in 2013. In 2014 there was a modification in regard to changing the amenities. Certificate of zoning compliance was approved in April 2013. In September of 2020 the applicant requested a pre-application meeting to discuss annexation of an additional 1.36 acres. That's, again, what you see here. That's to the east and also to include this to expand by constructing 36 more units in two buildings. Because the existing Heron Village Apartments were on several properties with different zoning districts, again, it would be the C-G here and, then, they are looking at doing this as well -- staff recommended to clean it up and to zone the entire thing to R-40. The Comprehensive Plan recommends this for mixed use neighborhood. This is a copy of what is being proposed. So, there is two buildings. There is one here. There is one here. This is what they are proposing for open space and their parking is here. There is one existing access right now. That's what you see here from Blue Heron Road. They are proposing an additional access here. Meridian Fire has commented that although this site does provide two points of access, both of these accesses are from East Blue Heron Drive with only one way -- one way in and one way out. Not good emergency access. They have talked to the applicant and the discussion involves this east of Blue Heron

Lane there is an existing pathway that's there. The applicant has agreed to widen this pathway to 15 feet wide. If you look in the staff report originally it said 20. So, that's a correction to the staff report. They would be widening -- widening this to 15 feet wide. This would not be primary access, this would only be emergency secondary access. So, there would be bollards there. But that would provide the emergency access that they need. This is a condition of approval of the annexation and the rezoning. Phase one was required to provide 204 parking spaces, with 102 of them -- so, roughly half of them being covered. Two hundred and seven parking spaces are provided, with about 195 of them actually being covered. Phase two is -- this one is required to provide 69 parking spaces. Roughly half of those are covered. In this case 87 parking spaces are required, with 71 of them being covered. Six total bicycle spaces and new bicycle covered parking is required with this development. Basically the -- the parking that's now being proposed would exceed the total requirements of this development by 21 spaces. However, I want to mention Meridian Fire, Police, and the surrounding residents have all commented that parking and traffic is a continuous issue for this development. Residents and guests often park on both sides of East Blue Heron Drive, which makes it very difficult for access. One cause of this -- and probably a primary cause for this is that many of the garages that were required to be covered and were intended to be used to satisfy the parking requirements are now being used as storage. It's very difficult to enforce whether or not they are using their garages as storage, so they are using the garage as the storage and, then, they are parking elsewhere. So, they are losing -- they are losing a lot of those parking spaces to the garage. As 71 of those parking spaces on phase two are required to be covered, staff and fire have talked and we think the best solution to that would be to require only carports for the next phase and not garages, since carports would not really be able to be used for storage, they would be used for parking. So, that would certainly help with the parking situation, as well as to the additional 21 parking spaces that they are providing. Forty-one thousand -- roughly a little less than an acre of open space was required with phase one. That's what you see in blue. That's qualified open space. Fifty-three thousand square foot was provided. With this phase 10,200 square feet is required and 15,330 square feet is proposed. So, a little more than 5,000 square feet of additional office space is provided. It does exceed what's required -- the minimum requirement. Per our code four amenities meets categories required for a multi-family development of more than 75 units. But if there is more than a hundred, it says that the decision making body shall require additional amenities. So, again, 75 or less would be four, but what they have provided thus far is a half basketball court, a plaza containing benches and a trellis, a 1,600 square foot clubhouse with an exercise room, a playground, a horseshoe pit, barbecues and picnic tables and with this proposed expansion they would be looking at 50 times a hundred square foot open space, that's what you see on the northeast corner, and 52 additional enclosed bike storage facilities. Again, though, the Planning Commission should decide if the amenities are sufficient. There are elevations that have been provided. These are basically consistent with the existing complex. As I noted, staff has received comments. We have gotten seven letters and voicemails from adjacent property owners. The issues are almost primarily centered around traffic and access, particularly along East Blue Heron Road and the amount of parking that happens along on that road. As this proposal, though, does meet all the UDC requirements -- in fact, it exceeds them -- staff recommends approval with

conditions. The conditions are in your staff report, but to summarize, one of the conditions is that phase one and two would share access parking, amenities, and open space. There is a requirement that the applicant should widen and improve the pathway between East Blue Heron Road to 15 feet wide as a secondary access. The denser units on the north side, we think that they should be screened better. They show fences and they should have landscaping as well to soften it down and, most importantly, staff is recommending that the -- the requirement for covered parking only be provided by carports and not garages, so that the garages can't be used by storage and that -- that concludes my presentation, unless you have comments or questions.

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

Thompson: Good evening. This is Tamara Thompson with The Land Group.

McCarvel: Good evening, Tamara.

Thompson: Great. I never know if you guys can hear me or not, it takes so long to get in. Thank you. I have a PowerPoint, if it's okay if I share my screen.

McCarvel: Go ahead.

Thompson: Let's see here. All right. Are you able to see that?

McCarvel: Yes.

Thompson: Okay. Perfect. All right. So, we will go over quickly -- Alan covered much of it. This is an in-fill project and it is an expansion of an existing multi-family community located at the southeast corner of North Meridian Road and East Blue Heron Lane and this existing facility, multi-family community, was approved in 2013. As Alan showed you, it is a patchwork quilt of zones currently and so these two are the new property, but part of the development is C-G. So, we will be cleaning it all up. There is R-40 to the south and R-40 to the north as well. So, it will just make this whole area R-40. And, then, just to show you the -- the land use. So, this -- this little R-1 area is in the county still, so that's an annexation of 1.36 acres and, then, the rezone is that annexed area, plus the properties that are already in the city. So, the rezone is 5.54 acres, as highlighted here, and I put that here on this one. You can see this little -- those little shapes. So, this proposal is also for a conditional use permit to include 36 additional residential units in two buildings and it does have one additional access onto Blue Heron. ACHD has reviewed and has a staff report. They have approved this access point. The parking, as Alan said -- he went through all the numbers. We are -- we have 21 more parking spaces than required by code and those are all carports. We have -- Alan had that no -- no -- no more garages and we will comply with that and just have those in carports. Some of the areas that -- this is the landscape plan. There will be a sidewalk continuing on. This open space is actually 70 by 100 and a nice little -- kind of park amenity there and to give you some existing photos -- so, this is the -- the existing clubhouse. There is a fitness facility and a kitchen in the clubhouse. This is the outdoor space. There is already a tot lot.

These amenities will be shared. And, then, we have some new amenities coming in, too. Alan gave you an overview already of the elevations. This will go through design review and CZC. And just to give you an overview of the existing amenities, the half court basketball plaza with benches and trellis. Sixteen fifty square foot clubhouse with an exercise room. There is a playground, horseshoe pit, barbecues and picnic tables. And, then, the proposed for phase two, the expansion -- and, again, these are all shared. They will be the same management company. So, that open space park with the sidewalks is 8,600 square feet. Additional park benches, picnic tables and they are including 52 new enclosed bike storage spaces. The secondary access -- I just wanted to point that out to you. So, the -- this is the -- the end of where development is. So, it's definitely an off-site, but there is an existing path there currently. It's a paved path for pedestrians with bollards on each end that connects to North Eureka Drive and to Blue Heron and so this will just be widened along this area. It's already ACHD right of way, so there is nothing to -- to acquire or anything there and it's just widening out the existing pavement and so the -- the way that that current condition reads is a 20 foot -- 20 foot pathway -- or 20 foot emergency access within the right of way or as approved by the Meridian Fire Department and we are just asking for a small change there, that that will be 15 feet or as approved by the Fire Department and ACHD. I think ACHD should be included in there. And that's Condition 2-C. And, then, I will go over quickly with you on the -- on the parking and the parking on the street. The management company, when the Fire Department and Planning brought this up to us at our pre-app meeting, as far as the on-street parking, so the management company conducted a parking audit between February 24th and March 25th, so a full 30 days, and they did this between the hours of 8:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m. So, each evening for 30 days. And what they did is they took counts of the parking within the community, how many parking stalls were being used, how many were vacant, and, then, how many parking -- how many cars were on the street and what they learned is that on average there were 35.2 parking stalls within the community that were vacant and so roughly 81.8 percent of the -- of the stalls were being occupied, but there were 35 -- a little over the average -- it was a little over 35 parking stalls were vacant and this number increased on the weekends. So, there were four weekends in that audit and that number went up to 38.9 spaces during the weekends that were vacant within the community. On average on Blue Heron there were roughly 24.7 vehicles parked on Blue Heron and when the -- when the residents fill out their applications for -- to live here, they fill in what their -- what their license plate number is, so the management company could cross-reference those to determine who was parking on the street and they did find that on average 70 percent of those cars parked on the street were residents of the Blue Heron community and 30 percent were not. There are other residential -- there is townhouses to the north. Not sure if it's from there, but there are other residential areas. So, they -- so, they took this information and they started educating their -- their -- their residents and they put it in their monthly newsletter that they are encouraging people not to park on the street, but to use the community parking stalls and they are encouraging anyone that's not using their garage to use those. They don't believe that's an issue here, because there are so many extra parking stalls on site. So, in general, they have -- they learned that there is more than enough vacant parking spaces on the property within Heron Village community to park all the vehicles that are on East Blue Heron and so they are educating their tenants and encouraging them not to park on the street. So, we have read the staff report and

we want to thank staff for their thorough review. We agree with staff's analysis and the recommended conditions of approval with that small clarification of 2-C, which relates to that pathway -- the emergency access pathway and we respectfully request your approval tonight. Thank you.

McCarvel: Okay. Any questions for the applicant or staff? All right. Madam Clerk, do we have anyone signed up for public testimony?

Weatherly: Madam Chair, we have a couple people signed up. One is Misti Stelluto from Dave Evans Construction. She's online with us. Misti, go ahead. Sorry, Madam Chair. One technical difficulty here. It's not doing what I asked it to do. Hang on just a moment. Okay. Misti, if you can hear us you should be able to go ahead with your name and address now.

Stelluto: Yes. I was just going to comment with Tamara if there was any questions for both of us, so I'm good to go.

McCarvel: Okay. Thank you, Misti. Do we have anybody else?

Weatherly: No one else indicating a wish to testify, Madam Chair.

McCarvel: Okay. That being said, is there anyone in the room or online that wishes to testify on this application? No one in the room. Do we have anybody online? Oh, go ahead. Ma'am in the front row. Yes. You need -- if you wish to testify, please, come forward. One at a time is fine. And, please, state your name and address for the record.

Rogers: Okay. My name is Sandra --

McCarvel: And you need to pull that -- the microphone right down to you. Sorry.

Rogers: My name is Sandra Rogers and I live at 102 East Waterbury Lane.

McCarvel: Okay.

Rogers: That's a complex of 34 townhomes. Okay? Many of us in there feel the parking spaces that they made in the first complex is very inadequate and a lot of cars and trucks -- sometimes trucks with trailers are parked on East Blue Heron and it's very difficult -- we are a senior park and it's very difficult for people to -- we have to get halfway out into Blue Heron sometimes to see around these vehicles. There is only one way -- as she stated there is only one way in and out and that's to Meridian Road. We have a stop sign when we go out. They don't when they come out of the complex. Our other worry is about emergency vehicles coming in and out. Like I said, we are a senior complex. We frequently have emergency vehicles in there. So, that's a big concern. The other concern is the parking -- not adequate parking. And if you could see the way some of the people park it's just ridiculous. You are supposed to be so many feet back from a driveway. We also have overflow parking for our guests and they park there and unless we see them

actually walk across to the complex we can't do anything about it, because we don't know if they are a visitor or family member or whatever and it's just -- it's just a nightmare the way they park and the other issue we have is trash. Throwing trash out and, of course, not picking it up and so we -- we try to do that when we walk. There is a lot of us in there that walk and try to keep the trash picked up, but many of us are just against this, because it's just not adequate parking places.

McCarvel: Okay.

Rogers: Okay.

McCarvel: Thank you.

Rogers: Uh-huh.

McCarvel: Please state your name and address for the record.

Sorensen: Okay. I'm Belinda Sorensen. I live at 136 East Waterbury Lane. I live in the senior townhomes across the street and listening to the adequate number and that of parking places that are provided right now that are up to code, there are times that -- yesterday I counted 36 cars parked on the street. There are times when -- when they are full at capacity that both sides of the street, clear down past the meat packers on both sides of the streets, are full of cars. I have talked to some of the tenants there. Sometimes there is up to four people living in one unit. There are construction workers that -- that live there, so they have trucks with trailers parked on the street, so when you try to pull out you literally cannot see. Last night I tried to pull in and an emergency vehicle was trying to pull out and I could barely -- we could barely squeeze by each other. That's a big concern. That wasn't even a fire truck. One of the concerns I also have is from Richter, from their first entrance to the street to North Meridian Road, there are times when you -- when you are turning off of North Meridian Road it is so dangerous, because you can't see and there is -- there is -- if they are parked on both sides of the street it's really hard to pull in off of the road, especially when it's snowy and you have to be really careful to make your turn. Sometimes they will park almost to the corner. Perhaps if this goes through maybe you should -- they should consider making it a red zone from Richter from their first entrance to North Meridian Road, so that it's safe to pull in and out. Also the trash is -- it's just unbelievable their trash. They just opened up their car doors and just throw it on the ground everywhere. They -- it's -- it's -- it's just frustrating. The parking especially is frustrating. They park on the sidewalks. They leave abandoned vehicles. They have -- their company comes and parks in our overflow parking and we have had words with them and they have become very angry, used foul language. There has been some scary times. So, we just let them park, because we don't want to be hurt, you know, or -- by them.

McCarvel: Thank you.

Sorenson: Well, thank you.

McCarvel: Anyone else that wishes to testify in the room or online?

Weatherly: Madam Chair, we have one person online Gail Simpson. Excuse me. Gail Simpson. Gail, you should to be able to unmute.

Simpson: Yes. Thank you very much. Can you hear me?

McCarvel: Yes. And you have three minutes. Thank you. Go ahead.

Simpson: Thank you. I appreciate the time. I was going to attend, but I had a medical procedure done, so --

McCarvel: Gail, can you give your full name and address for the record, please?

Simpson: Okay. It's Gail L. Simpson. 93 East Waterbury Lane. I also live in the senior townhomes and I have written a letter about my -- my feedback and input and I thank you for allowing us to Zoom. That's really wonderful. My concern is not only the parking, which has been talked about a lot, which I double all the concerns. I'm one of the ones that live on the side of the road -- actual road. So, I hear a lot of cars coming in and out at night, which is understandable, because people have different work schedules. However, on the weekends in particular there is a lot of partying going on, a lot of thumping, a lot of people out standing by the cars on the road partying and drinking and it's kind of scary, because you just know we have so many people from out of state coming in or just -- safety is a concern for me and, then, when we talk about the number of cars per unit. Do they take into consideration that there is -- I think somebody mentioned two -- more than one person in a unit. Well, if there is four persons in a unit there is four cars and if a person has two cars that just adds up. So, I want to know if that's been taken into consideration and also -- also the visitors of these people. We have overflow parking for our visitors, but if there is a party going on and they are inviting a lot of visitors into their clubhouse, that's additional parking and those people are going to park on the side of the road. So, asking them not to park there where are those people supposed to park? The trash is an issue. A lot of us have pets and they zoom up and down inside our private parking area and I'm not just concerned about our pets, but like Sandy said, a lot of us walk. I, the other day, had to stop somebody and tell them to slow down. Well, they were selling their car and they were test driving it in our little private parking area and I said this is private and they were speeding. So, how are they going to address all those concerns? I think adding additional parking isn't going to solve those -- those issues at all and it is hard to come in and out of our units. I -- I don't think expanding 15 or 20 feet is going to solve the issue of the parking or the emergency services. Thank you.

McCarvel: Thank you, Gail. Anyone else, Madam Clerk?

Weatherly: Not that I -- not that I see, Madam Chair.

McCarvel: Pardon me?

Weatherly: No.

McCarvel: Okay. So, Tamara, would you like to come back -- if there is no more public testimony, so would you like to come back on?

Thompson: Yes, Madam Chair. Tamara Thompson with The Land Group again. The three items that I heard were parking, trash and emergency access. I addressed to two of the three. So, there the -- the emergency access is something that's been satisfied. The Fire has -- has approved that and so has ACHD. As far as the parking, we did submit that parking analysis that was done by the management company and they -- that study -- we submitted that to the city. That study concluded that there was adequate parking on site, that there are empty parking stalls and they are educating the tenants on where to -- where to park. The -- additionally what could happen -- because it is public street and so they can't control what happens on the public street -- is -- is that we could -- we could go back to ACHD and talk to them about some striping and signage there. If the -- if the road is too narrow for parking on two sides I would think that ACHD would -- would take care of that and looking at an aerial it looks like it accommodates parking on both sides, but perhaps that's something we can work with ACHD on and doing some additional signage and some striping. The -- the trash I don't -- I don't know anything about. I do know that this is professionally managed. They do have a management company on this and we can forward that information on to that management company that they need to take a closer look at those -- at those common areas. So, with that the -- the project meets or exceeds city requirements. We have 21 more parking stalls than required by code and we are requesting to add 36 more units to the existing development and we respectfully request your approval and thank you very much.

McCarvel: Okay. Can I get a motion to close the public hearing for item H-2021-0027, Heron Village Expansion?

Seal: I may have some questions for --

McCarvel: You have more questions for -- okay. All right. I thought we were going to get away with it when nobody asked questions before, but apparently I'm wrong. Commissioner Seal.

Seal: Just wanted to ask a couple questions that relate to the parking. I know there is a study done that shows that there is parking there, but if -- if there is adequate parking on one side and not the other that could be the -- why things are lopsided, people using the street instead. You know, if I had to park 30 feet away, instead of a quarter mile away or eighth of a mile away on the other side of the complex, I would choose to park closer for sure. On the CC&Rs that are written in for the folks that have to live here, is there any verbiage in there at all about using the garages for storage instead of parking?

Thompson: Madam Chair, Commissioner Seal, I don't know that that would be a CC&R, but that would be a lease, because these are leased premises and I believe they do have that and they have been talking to them -- they have been doing an audit on those also

to make sure that people are not using those for storage and they are using them for parking.

Seal: What's the enforcement on that?

Thompson: That -- I can't answer that. I'm not sure. I don't know if they -- I can find out for you, but I don't know that for sure.

Seal: Can the management company that's used for that, can -- can that information be given out to the folks that live across the street, so there is a more ready communication line open?

Thompson: Absolutely.

Seal: I guess what I'm driving towards is there -- I mean it's 80 percent full on parking -- again, if I pull into one side of it, I'm not going to drive around all day and try and find a spot, I'm going to go park on the street. So, that to me is the issue. I'm hoping that there is more of a solution to that, but if we are going to rely on the report, then, we can go ahead and close this up.

McCarvel: I did have another -- since you started the question train. Tamara, tell me about -- another concern seems to be the trash and I know that's not -- I mean as part of this new application in front of us is it possible to provide more trash cans throughout, you know, by the parking areas and such that makes it more convenient for people to not just throw their trash in the street?

Thompson: Madam Chair, yes, that would be acceptable and we are adding pet stations with those -- with those trash cans. So, we are -- we are planning on adding those.

McCarvel: Okay. And maybe just a few more throughout the complex in more convenient area -- additional convenient areas. Any other questions for the applicant, so I don't jump the gun again? All right. Could I get a motion to close the public hearing on H-2021-0027?

Seal: So moved.

Grove: Second.

McCarvel: Okay. It has been moved and seconded to close the public hearing on H-2021-0027. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

McCarvel: Thoughts? Concerns? Discussions?

Grove: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Yes. Commissioner.

Grove: Overall it doesn't look out of line. I think it's good to move forward in my opinion. I would put in here just some of the things that we talked about to encourage the group to go back and seek an ACHD request to limit parking on one side and to encourage the property management to do the parking enforcement a little bit better, as well as put in language to add trash receptacles.

McCarvel: Anyone else?

Yearsley: Madam Chair, I would agree. I think those are very appropriate conditions. However, I prefer the -- to keep that pathway at 20 feet, instead of 15 feet. I know fire code requires 20 feet, so I don't know if I agree with allowing -- or asking them to go down to 15 feet. I would prefer to keep it 20 feet.

McCarvel: Question maybe for staff. And correct me if I'm wrong. Is the request for that because of an easement confinement?

Tiefenbach: Alan Tiefenbach --

McCarvel: Yeah. There we go.

Tiefenbach: Yeah. Alan Tiefenbach, associate planner. Thank you, Madam Chair. My understanding and I would probably defer more to the applicant, but there is a couple of utility poles that are on either side of the pathway that prohibits them from getting it to a full 20 feet wide.

McCarvel: Commissioner Yearsley, does that answer -- do you want to keep it at 20 and have them move poles or --

Yearsley: I'm okay to move poles. You get one time to do it right --

McCarvel: Yeah.

Yearsley: -- and my opinion is let's do it right.

McCarvel: Okay.

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: On the 15 feet instead of 20, I think what they are asking for is 15 feet or what is approved by the Meridian Fire Department. So, if the Meridian Fire Department says, no, we need 20, is that acceptable verbiage in there? I agree we get one time to do it right and if they need to move power poles they need to move power poles. But if the Fire

Department says, yes, this will work, this gives us the access they want -- because they -- they are -- they want to have that access for sure.

Yearsley: Well -- and my guess is the 20 foot is because that's what the Fire Department wanted, so --

Tiefenbach: So, if I can --

Yearsley: I'm not going to just kill the deal based on my five feet. But I still would prefer the 20.

McCarvel: Prefer the 20. Go ahead, Alan.

Tiefenbach: My apologies. Not always easy to not interrupt when there is a Zoom meeting going. Yeah. So, originally we did talk about 20 feet. There was a lot of discussions, again, with Joe Bongiorno, who is with Fire, and Joe actually gave me in writing that 15 feet was acceptable. So, I think that they have -- would have to improve it to hold the weight and I think the number is an 8,000 pound fire truck. Bill will probably interrupt me if I'm wrong. But it would be designed for fire access.

McCarvel: Okay.

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: I mean overall the fact that this is in-fill, I'm -- I'm a little bit torn on this. So, I mean I like to see the in-fill come in. It makes sense to put -- to expand what's already there. It fits well. But I mean I have used that road -- I use Meridian Meat Packers and I have had difficulty getting in and getting down the road and dropping things off there myself. So, I completely understand what people are talking about in that. I would like to see that -- if -- if we try and move this forward for me to be on board -- I mean I would say we would have to have some kind of better enforcement. I don't know how we get better enforcement on them parking in their garages. That's the conundrum that I'm in right now is -- I mean you can educate people all you want, you can do what you want to, but I mean if somebody pulls in, they have a truck and a trailer, they are not going to park in a garage. They don't have anywhere to park, number one. Number two, if they don't want to -- if they want to use their garages for storage right now it seems like they just do it and there is no enforcement to that. So, I don't know how we get around that. It's definitely a problem and it is a safety issue for me. So, unless that can be resolved I just can't see moving forward with this.

Lorcher: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Lorcher.

Lorcher: One strategy that both communities can employ for free is if you work with a parking enforcement company through a tow truck company, they can patrol -- the management company can designate stickers on each of the cars, so that you know who belongs to where. The city -- they can also enforce the number of days a car might be parked on the street. What are you allowed three days, two days, to be -- be able to be on a public street; is that right? Is that -- so, there is several companies out there that can help patrol. They can -- the property management can institute a sticker where you know who the residents are and, then, for your community, if you have people that don't belong there, you can have them towed and that becomes a huge financial deterrent, because as soon as the tow truck hooks to a car it's 125 dollars and, then, it's five dollars a mile and if it's late at night it's 50 dollars to get in and if they have to use dollies because it's a four wheel drive that's another 50 bucks. So, you are looking at a 300 dollar fine just to kind of institute parking enforcements. It's a very good deterrent. Usually there is a lot of bad behavior at the beginning and, then, everybody gets it pretty quick. So, these types of services -- there is no cost to your community, there is no cost of the Blue Heron community, because the tow truck company makes up, you know, their costs by the -- by the towing part of it and so that might be one way to at least manage the parking within each of your communities without -- but the property management would be the company that would have to not only enforce it, but to implement it and, you know, keep it -- keep it on track.

McCarvel: Thank you.

Wheeler: Madam Chair. Thank you. No. I like this project and it's an in-fill, it's going to be the -- a better -- higher and better use than what it's currently being used as. When it comes down to the parking side, the fact that there is 21 more parking spaces in here than what was needed by code I think we will be able to help out with the parking issues that are there and hopefully mitigate some of the parking that we see in phase one. I also want to just encourage the applicant, as they have said that they have already wanted to do is talk with ACHD about maybe moving like a no parking area on at least one side of the street or within the distance within that side of the street and that might help out also with some of the visibility that's coming out from the Waterbury and Richter Lanes accessing Blue Heron, but I think this is good. It looks like they have taken care of a lot of the issues that could come up with this kind of a project and I'm with you, Commissioner Seal, I don't know how you would enforce on a -- you know, a private business here on how to -- what they put in their garages and everything like this. That's just a tough -- that's just a tough thing to do and so I think there is ways to maybe mitigate it with -- on the public way -- public right of ways of the streets and with the towing option, as the Commissioner said, so I think that that's -- I think that these are some of their points in the direction that they are going to go with it. I think it would be a good in-fill project for the City of Meridian.

McCarvel: Thank you. Yeah. I think there is analysis and, then, I think there is real life and real life -- you can count those license plates and everything, but the fact of the matter is there is probably people living there or long-term visitors that are parking around there. So, I think, you know, part of the answer is definitely getting ACHD involved in putting up

no parking signs on one side of the street, doing some additional, like we said, striping as far as getting no parking around the entrances and that kind of thing. But, you know, the other option, too, is with the conditional use permit requiring more parking or less units. Throwing that out there as an option.

Lorcher: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Lorcher.

Lorcher: I agree with the commissioner who said that this project is fine as long as the existing issues can be resolved before they add more. Right? Can we put in that talking with ACHD, maybe consulting with a private company for parking lot management, be part of their conditional use permit first before they add more on, because adding more is just going to add more of the same.

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: Honestly, I wouldn't -- I mean I would like to see this go forward, but at the same time I would like to see these issues resolved or at least a plan to resolve them that has some teeth in it. So, honestly, I wouldn't mind doing a continuance on this to give the applicant more time to put some teeth into it to show us how the lease has been rewritten, to show how they are going to have better enforcement, to show that they have went to ACHD, that they have contacted a parking enforcement company and things like that, then, I would feel much better about it.

Grove: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Grove. Sorry.

Grove: I would have similar thoughts, but I think maybe a different approach, so that we don't necessarily have to hear this again for something that's relatively straightforward. I think we can -- staff might be -- correct me, but put a condition on it for occupancy or something that they have to show that they have talked to ACHD or something to that effect. I don't know -- is that possible?

McCarvel: I don't know if just talking is going to be what we want to have in there for --

Grove: Or put more teeth --

McCarvel: -- to put teeth into it.

Grove: Put more teeth into it, but --

McCarvel: Yeah. Because this is a conditional use permit, it's not going on anywhere

else. This is it, so --

Grove: But they will need to get occupancy before residents can move in; right?

McCarvel: Right. Sure. I get you.

Yearsley: This does need to go to the City Council, because it's an annexation as well.

McCarvel: Oh, it's an annexation --

Yearsley: So, it will have to go to City Council. So, we could have them present that -- make that a condition before City Council.

McCarvel: Thank you.

Tiefenbach: That's what I was going to suggest, Madam Chair. Alan Tiefenbach. This does have to go to Council for approval, so you can make that a condition for them to discuss this with ACHD first.

McCarvel: Yeah. Thank you. It's been a long day. And a long week. Yeah. So, are we at the point of a motion, then, or more discussion?

Grove: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Grove.

Grove: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council of file number H-2021-0027, as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of September 16th, 2021, with the following modifications: That prior to City Council the applicant has a parking plan that has been addressed with ACHD to address the concerns from tonight. That they have an agreement in place with the property management on enforcement of the parking regulations and that they add additional trash receptacles and show that on the plan and that condition 2-C is amended from 20 feet to 15 feet.

Wheeler: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to approve H-2021-0027 with modifications. All those in favor say aye. Opposed?

Seal: Nay.

McCarvel: Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE NAY. ONE ABSENT.

5. Public Hearing for McFadden Property (H-2021-0048) by Doug Tamura, Located at 104 W. Cherry Ln.

- A. Request: Annexation and Zoning of 17.87 acres of land with the C-G zoning district.

McCarvel: Next on the agenda is H-2021-0048, McFadden Property, and we will begin with the staff report.

Tiefenbach: Okay. Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Can you see my screen? I'm assuming yes.

McCarvel: Yes.

Tiefenbach: Okay. This is a -- this next one is a request for an annexation and a rezoning. The property consists of about seven -- a little -- not quite 18 acres of land, zoned RUT in the county, located at the northwest corner of North Meridian Road and West Cherry Lane. Probably recognize this property. It often has horses on it. Large rural piece of property surrounded by city. So, the property is bordered by L-O and R-8 to the north, West Cherry Lane and OT to the south. There is commercial, which is the Albertson's across North Meridian Road to the east and R-8 to the west. The Comprehensive Plan recommends this property for MUC. So, a little history on this. What you can see on the left is basically showing the property. What you are seeing on the right is concept plan. The -- so, this annexation and zoning of 18 acres of land is proposed to annex it with the C-C zoning district. The reason why this is being done is that the north -- the Meridian Development Corporation is writing a new Northern Gateway Urban Renewal Plan. As they have been working on this plan they approached this property owner about annexing this property into the district, which is the reason why this is being moved forward. So, they don't have a very clear concept plan at this point, it's mostly conceptual, because, again, the purpose of this is just to get this into the urban renewal district. The future land use map designates this property for mixed use community, so that's allocating areas where community service uses and dwellings are seamlessly integrated into the project. What you see on the right is a conceptual plan that they submitted. The plan shows three buildings oriented along Cherry Lane. That's what you see here at this corner and, then, there is five more buildings to the north along North Meridian, with the parking to the back and to the side. Where you see that large box, according to this concept plan, is what is known as phase two. In their narrative the applicant suggested what they wanted to do is to develop the buildings right here at this intersection first, including possibly a gas station with a convenience store, maybe retail or office, and, then, as the second phase they would be doing multi-family uses. The applicant proposed -- this has been quite a bit of discussion with the applicant with Meridian Development Corporation and the city -- sort of a comprehensive effort between all three of us. The applicant knows that before any specific uses can be built after that they would have to do a development agreement modification. We do mostly support what the applicant wanted to do, but we weren't okay with all the commercial along North Meridian being built out without a further plan, just

because this is a large piece of property, a lot of work with Meridian Development Corporation, we want to make sure that it builds out with the -- the real mixed use type of concept that is required. However, we do think that those three buildings right there on the corner could probably be built initially and wouldn't have a huge impact on the rest of the project. That's why we do support a limited amount of commercial. Again, those three buildings, two along West Cherry Lane and the one right there just south. We are okay with that being built out. We are not okay with the rest of it along North Meridian Road being built out with the concept plan as it is. So, as I said, based on this we recommend allowing development of the first three commercial buildings, which would be along the West Cherry Lane frontage and south of that existing access. Our recommendation would be a development agreement with -- with plans that are consistent with the mixed use community designation of the Comprehensive Plan and the Northern Gateway District. We received one letter of support from the Meridian Development Corporation and they -- they were in support of this project, but they mentioned how important it was about the timing on this project, because they are working on a timeline that includes this project, but they have to get their North Gateway plan to the Council at a certain point during -- based on statutory requirements. So, if this -- if this particular approval stalls out, then, that could stall them out. We do recommend approval of this annexation and we have certain conditions. The first one is that with the first phase of development the applicant -- we would be okay with them building up to three commercial buildings along West Cherry Lane and south of the existing access, as indicated on the concept plan. The applicant after that will have to submit a plan -- or sorry. As part of that first phase the applicant would have to submit a plan illustrating how the pedestrian connections in the first phase would tie to the future development, because we do want to make sure the whole thing works together. Also we want to make sure that the applicant works with the city and the MDC on the design of an entry feature at the southeast corner. There is a lot of discussion in the plan about entry features and sense of place. So, we wanted to make sure there was a gateway or some kind of feature. We would want to make sure that those buildings, as it was built out, were oriented knowing that that feature was going to happen. With the first phase staff would recommend that the developer has to install the 25 foot landscape buffers. Beyond that -- after that in the other development we would recommend that the developer would have to submit a development agreement modification that would come through to you and the Council and that develop -- that development agreement would address things like concept plan, general layout and configuration of buildings, circulation plan, open space, conceptual building elevations. So, it would be the whole thing shown as it was going to develop comprehensively. Also we are recommending that whatever they do in the future it would comply with any future design concepts of the Northern Gateway Plan. There is some requirements on the size of building square footage. That's because the -- the Comprehensive Plan actually talks about how -- what the maximum size of building should be in a mixed use neighborhood. There is a requirement on how many -- at least three types of uses and there is a limitation on that -- that at least 20 percent of it has to be commercial at a density of six to 15 dwelling units. I know that's a lot, but in general basically what this would do is allow the first three buildings to get built, as long as they had a pedestrian plan showing how that would work and installing the landscape buffers. With that I would stand for any questions or if the applicants wants to say something.

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

Tamura: Madam -- can you hear me? Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, my name is Doug Tamura. I reside at 732 Santa Paula Place in Boise, Idaho, and I'm the owner of the McFadden property located at the northwest corner of Meridian Road and Cherry Lane. This spring I was pleasantly surprised when the City of Meridian reached out and requested that I become a part of the Northern Gateway Urban Renewal District. I'm here tonight to request both annexation and zoning. I concur with staff's findings of fact and conclusions and conditions of approval. I'm a small town developer, but my goal is to make this property the keystone of the Northern Gateway Renewal District. Appreciate your consideration.

McCarvel: Thanks.

Tamura: Any questions?

McCarvel: Yeah. Any questions for staff or the applicant?

Tamura: All right. Thank you.

McCarvel: All right. Thank you. Madam Clerk, do we have anybody signed up to testify on this application?

Weatherly: Madam Chair, we have a couple of people signed in, but nobody indicating a wish to testify.

McCarvel: Okay. With that being said, is there anyone in the room at this time that would like to testify or on Zoom? Sir, come forward.

Rice: My name is Earl Rice and I live in Marsing, but I am representing the Church of God Seventh-Day Meridian Church at 1808 West 3rd Street and also the General Council of Church of God at 1824. We own the property right to the west of this property right behind the U.S. Bank all the way back to the end of that property. Questions I have, obviously, is traffic coming along now our property. We have a park area. We are going to get more traffic onto our park area that we have been cultivating. I have -- we have a lot of concern for that. We -- our facilities get used every single day by multiple churches, not just by us. The safety of the children and the people there -- I was looking at the concept that shows the road going right alongside of our property and that just takes away from what we have been trying to develop and so that's a big concern and, then, putting the phase two is a real big concern for me as well for us, because it shows multiple things that could go in there, like hotels and offices and -- tall stuff. We -- that just detracts so much from the feel that we have created there and so that was were a big concern for us for that.

McCarvel: Okay. Thank you. Anyone else that wishes to testify? Okay. Would the applicant like to make any other comments?

Tamura: Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, Doug Tamura. In talking with staff in preliminary, it was requested that we provide some kind of access to our property to the church's property in that -- in that northern section. You know, we are a long ways from, you know, reaching what -- what that vision looks like, so -- but, you know, we could put that as a condition of approval if we need to. But I know that it's been addressed.

McCarvel: Okay.

Yearsley: Madam --

McCarvel: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: Madam Chair. I'm assuming as you develop your property that you would probably fence your boundary as well, is that not the case?

Tamura: You know, it's -- it's a large parcel and I want to make sure and do it right, so our intention is to move relatively slowly and -- and, you know, and -- and the other thing that we are concerned about is the buffering of the single family residential to the north and, again, I promised that neighborhood that we would be conscious of making sure that we do things right as far as your privacy and your buffering and stuff. So, when we get to that position, you know, with both the church and with the neighborhood to the north, we will -- we will get them involved and make sure that we, you know, design whatever is necessary to -- to be good neighbors. But, you know, it's -- it's an 18 acre development, so it's -- we have got a long ways to go. So, our main goal right now is just annexation and rezone. Thank you.

McCarvel: Thank you. Any other questions at this time?

Lorcher: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Lorcher.

Lorcher: I'm not sure if this is the right time to ask it. So, he would still -- the developer would still have to put together a developmental plan as far as where the streets and buildings are going to go, even -- even though there is a conceptual idea here. The concerns of the church and what he addressed was the concerns of the neighborhood can be directly addressed during the developmental planning stage; correct?

McCarvel: Yes.

Lorcher: So, we are just voting on, like he said, the annexation.

McCarvel: Okay. If there is no other questions, could I get a motion to close the public hearing on H-2021-0048?

Seal: So moved.

Grove: Second.

Yearsley: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to close the public hearing on H-2021-0048. All those in favor say aye. Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

McCarvel: Apparently I'm not the only one that had a long day. Thoughts? Concerns? Discussion?

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: I like the way that staff has gone about this where we can see some -- some, you know, things happening right away, but -- and it's refreshing to hear the -- the applicant say this as well, where they want to take their time and move into this. So, you know, we can see some development happening in there, some businesses coming in. I'm really happy to see that this is going to be very business oriented. We need more of that in our town. But there is also the phase two piece of it and there is concerns that have been raised from the neighbors. It sounds like they are going to be addressed and I hope that they honor that. They tried to build something in there that's going to keep that somewhat secluded back there, keep it more of a neighborhood kind of feel, instead of a commercial kind of feel, so -- and if that can't be accommodated, then, hopefully, some -- some type of noise mitigation is put in there or, you know, something along those lines in order to help out with that. But for the most part it looks -- it looks promising to me. I'm happy to see development like this come into Meridian.

McCarvel: Yeah. I agree. I think there is a lot of potential there and a lot of room for good transitions all around.

Grove: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Grove.

Grove: So, having been in downtown, both living and working, for a while now, I'm excited to see this move forward. I can walk out my door and see those horses. So, I'm ready to see what happens here. I know with working with urban renewal, there is additional tools that will be able to help this project develop, along with the other parts of that urban renewal district. So, I think, you know, getting this moving forward is -- is very important, so that those plans can be, you know, incorporated. It will be a lot more difficult for this property to develop without some of those tools and so I think that, you know, getting it moving forward so that those tools can be utilized is a very important aspect for this project overall. I'm less concerned with any of the phasing, so much as moving this

project forward, allowing those partners and those resources to be properly utilized.

Wheeler: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Wheeler.

Wheeler: I have a question concerning the zoning here. So, I'm seeing here that it was C-C; is that correct? Initially? But, then, it was -- it was actually asking for C-G; is that right?

McCarvel: Other way around.

Wheeler: Other way around. He's asking for C-C.

McCarvel: Yeah.

Wheeler: Okay. So, is there a height limit, then, or restriction on C-C on some of the buildings compared to C-G?

Tiefenbach: Would you like me to answer that, Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Go ahead, Alan.

Tiefenbach: Yeah. I believe it's 55 feet and my understanding he wants to go to 65 feet. This was actually probably the most contentious issue with -- that we had discussed, because the applicant really wants to go higher than that. He has the ability -- so, with the 55 feet that's required by C-C, he has the ability to do a conditional use to ask for a higher height, just depends on where the building is, what the building is. That would be something that would be coming in front of you. Originally he did want to do C-G and we were not supportive of that, because there are some very -- other intensive uses as well with the automatic entitlement for 65 feet. We recommended C-C. It was an object -- it was a -- it was a topic of quite -- quite a lot of debate. At the end of the day, again, he's okay with C-C, understanding that he's going to have to do the conditional use to go higher than that.

Wheeler: Okay.

McCarvel: It's in the future when -- there is some play on there.

Wheeler: My -- my only -- my only concern on the C-C with the 55 foot -- they can go up to 55 feet and, then, beyond that with -- with the CUP is that this butts up next to single family dwellings and that was also one of the concerns that the testimony from the church was about was the -- just kind of that density side. So, I'm wondering if -- can we -- can we allow for two different kinds of zoning on this, the one that's closer to the road and, then, something that's more interior might be of a less density?

McCarvel: I guess allow -- I mean have full discussion, but looking at that north end there and it looks like he's got two story residential -- office -- an office upon the end as a -- as transition. I think that's -- there is a lot of room there for a lot of different -- sort of transition to allow for proper transition.

Grove: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Grove.

Grove: On that north side also, once you step back past the -- the water, it drops in elevation quite a bit and so you are not going to be able to necessarily grade some of that out I don't think. So, I think some of the concerns of going large next -- on that northern portion will be limited in the -- just the topography of the parcel itself.

Tiefenbach: Madam Chair, can I, again, add some clarification on that?

McCarvel: Yeah. Go ahead, Alan.

Tiefenbach: Yeah. I guess -- I wanted to say this again. With the first phase you want -- the first phase all he wants to do are these three buildings. Based on what he wants to do and based on this concept plan, it's extremely unlikely that those are going to be more than one story. Anything other than that has to go through a DA modification and all of the height issues can be controlled under that DA mod. He would have to show an entire development plan of this whole thing. So, he wouldn't -- he's not -- he's not entirely entitled to do C-C, he's entitled to build this. But after this he has to do a DA mod, which would include the entire development plan. So, all that stuff could be controlled.

Wheeler: Okay. Very good. Thank you.

McCarvel: Thank you. Anymore discussion or a motion?

Yearsley: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to City Council of file number H-2021-0048 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of September 16th, 2021, with no modifications.

Seal: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to approve H-2021-0048. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

6. Public Hearing for Fairview Row Townhomes (H-2021-0049) by Riley Planning Services, Located at 2065 E. Fairview Ave.

- A. Request: Conditional Use Permit for a multi-family development consisting of 16 attached townhome units on 1.02 acres of land in the C-G zoning district.

McCarvel: Sorry, I had moved on to the next CUP already. Next item on our agenda is H-2021-0049 and we will begin with the Fairview Row Townhomes and we will begin with the staff report.

Dodson: Thank you, Madam Chair. Can you all hear me all right?

McCarvel: Yes.

Dodson: Perfect. Thank you. I'm presenting remotely just because of health concerns surrounding just being in and out of the office so much, just trying to be safe for my family. So, I appreciate the opportunity to present remotely and still do my job. As noted, this first item by me -- I guess not by me -- Fairview Row Townhomes, which is a conditional use permit on a site that consists of just over one acre of land currently zoned C-G, located at 2065 East Fairview, which is halfway between Locust Grove and Eagle on the south side of Fairview. It's directly across the street -- almost directly across the street from the Sonic that's on Fairview. It's right to the east of the Pizza Hut. There is the Pine 43 development directly to the east and to the south. This property was annexed in 1995 and since, then, it's had a myriad of different uses. Most recently it was a residential home that was used for some kind of commercial use, but it's all been vacated now. The existing structures are there, but it has been vacated. This image here to the right is north, just to let you guys know. It is a very skinny property relative. About 400 feet long or deep and only about a hundred feet wide. The application before you tonight, as noted, is a conditional use permit for a multi-family development, which consists of 16 attached townhome units. Two eight-plexes. All services are readily available. The product is within the Fire Department's five minute response time goal. It meets the Comprehensive Plan as outlined in the staff report. Specifically, due to the site constraints -- specifically its relative deepness versus its width, staff does believe that the multi-family development versus commercial promotes a thoughtful site design and should consequently exist in future commercial in the area. Existing will be to the west and Pine 43 commercial will be to the east. The proposed multi-family development as noted does consist of two eight-plex townhome buildings. This use is subject to conditional use permit approval by this commission, because it's being requested in the C-G zoning district. It is also subject to specific use standard as outlined in 11-4-3-27. It -- those standards are generally about open space amenities and overall site design standards. The applicant is proposing approximately 10,500 square feet of qualified common open space, which exceeds the minimum requirement of 5,600, which would be 350 square feet per unit due to each unit being over 1,200 square feet or approximately 2,000 square feet, each unit. I did not note as well, but each building is proposed as a three story building as well. In addition to the common open space each unit should provide a minimum amount of 80 square feet of

private usable open space. The applicant has proposed approximately 200 square feet of private open space for each unit in the form of private balconies. Obviously, this 200 exceeds the required 80. At least two amenities should also be provided from two different categories noted within the code. The applicant has proposed two from two different areas, a quasi-area with a water feature, which is this area here and a shade structure. These amenities meet the minimum code requirements for multi-family of 20 units or less. Based on number of bedrooms per unit, which all 16 are two bedroom units, a minimum of 32 parking spaces should be provided with at least half of them being covered or within a garage. The applicant has proposed a total of 35 parking spaces. Three surface parking spaces and each unit will have a tuck under garage -- tuck under two car garage. Therefore, the proposed parking exceeds the minimum required amount, especially after the covered or garage, as that is -- they are proposing there twice as much as would be required. Access to the development. This shows access a little bit better. So, this would be the existing zoning and a little bit of the area underneath the zoning. Pine 43 to the east. Existing commercial to the west. Fairview along the north. The access is proposed via East Wilson Lane, which is a collector street proposed to be extended along this property's southern boundary going west to east. The existing access to Fairview Avenue is proposed and is required to be closed. A new one will be added closer to the west boundary that is only an emergency only access. ACHD is not allowing any public access to Fairview Avenue. The drive aisles as proposed are 26 feet wide due to the proposed three story buildings and provides accesses to all the garage units. So, the garages are facing west. The entrances with sidewalks, as you can see on the site plan, are facing east. The drive aisle and garage. Pedestrian entrances to the units on the east. The Pine 43 development directly to the east is currently under construction and will further extend Wilson Lane from its property to North Webb. That's what this dotted line here is. They are already required to construct it, they just have not done that quite yet. The timing of this is not yet known explicitly, but it should coincide relatively with the construction timeline of this project if it were approved. The subject property is the last property of this Wilson Lane frontage to be entitled. So, in order for this to connect from Locust Grove to Webb, this property would need to construct this hundred foot segment, give or take, of Wilson Lane as well. In addition, staff has approved alternative compliance -- an alternative compliance request made by the applicant. That is an administrative review, but I did want to relay it to the Commission. They are requesting to reduce the landscape buffer on East Wilson Lane. This request was made because of the subject site and its site constraints being relatively deep, but thin. Again, approximately 400 feet deep and a hundred feet wide. It affects the building footprints when accounting for all their dimensional and access requirements. The applicant states in order to fit the proposed buildings, the required access, appropriate open space and other landscaping and buffers, the reduction to the buffer along Wilson Lane is needed only adjacent to the building, which is approximately 36 feet in width -- or length, however you want to measure that. Due to the relatively small impact of this short linear length and a belief that a reduction in any of the other project aspects, like landscaping and buffers and other areas, as well as building footprints, staff does believe that the alternative compliance request is amenable and has, therefore, approved it. The project meets or exceeds all other dimensional standards. These are some conceptual elevations proposed. Future -- they did not submit for design review with this conditional

use permit. So, a future application for zoning compliance and design review will be required as the next step after -- if this were to be approved. Initial review of these building elevations do show three story buildings that combine different fill materials, modulation and material coloring. The main materials shown are stucco, lap siding and some stone cladding. The elevations also show second and third story decks that offer recreation and a different architecture element to the elevations. Preliminary review of the elevations do show compliance with our architectural standards manual, but I will confirm this at the future -- when the future design review application is submitted. As of this afternoon around 4:00 o'clock there was no public testimony and staff has recommended approval of this conditional use permit for all the reasons noted in my presentation, as well as in my staff report for both the Comprehensive Plan and the Development Code. After that I will stand for any questions.

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

Constantikes: Thank you, Madam Chairman. For the record, Penelope Constantikes, representing Tradewinds General Contracting. My address is Post Office Box 405, Boise, Idaho. 83701. I'm very pleased to present this innovative project to you this evening for the Fairview Row Townhomes. The developer directed the project team to develop a residential use that would compliment the surrounding uses and provide an alternative to housing options that are available in the vicinity. We do believe that we have met this goal. The applicant project team have reviewed the staff report and concur, with one very minor adjustment to one of the conditions of approval that I will cover in a few minutes. As you know, this is a 16 unit residential development in two buildings. We have substantial personal private space and a generous common area that is 43 percent greater than what is required by the UDC. To maximize the benefit of the open space it was concentrated, as Joe talked about, on the east side of the property. To the west of us is a tall, blank wall that has no architectural or aesthetic character. So, we shifted everything to the east of us. With the completion of Pine 43, along with the variety of services that are east, north and west -- excuse me -- these residents will have a walkability and bikeability option for all kinds of services that are in the immediate vicinity. The applicant has visited with the property owner to the west, which is the L-shaped strip mall, and there are two points of pedestrian access that we are going to implement with that property owner, so people can easily get from the Row Townhomes westward into that strip mall to benefit from the services that are available there. As you know, each townhome has a two car garage and guest parking that is in compliance with the UDC. The alternative compliance application submitted addresses the treatment to the south end of the site adjacent to Wilson Lane. Staff has provided an excellent discussion regarding that item. I don't think I need to cover it anymore. I would like to confirm that the applicant is in agreement with the slight modification to this area with the expansion of a sidewalk attach 71 -- 75 -- excuse me -- seven foot wide sidewalk. Because on page eight of the staff report the Wilson Lane was brought up, I went out there today and wanted to verify parking along Wilson Lane. So, what I found was that there is no parking west of the rear entrance to D&B. Everything to the east of there has got parking on both sides of the street. It's constructed to commercial collector standard. So, that would make sense that it would be wide enough. The proposed parking with the development

application does meet the UDC standards and we are not dependent on Wilson Lane for any parking, but because the staff report brought it up I thought I should go do a little bit of reconnaissance. The proposed landscaping that is shown on the west property line will be updated prior to submittal for a certificate of zoning compliance. Idaho Power has requested that trees located in this area be lower and slower growing trees, so that they don't have problems with those above ground power lines that serve a variety of uses to the south of us. So, the overhead line is not going to go away. We would request that the conditions of approval be minimally modified and -- and that would just be for Item 8-3-A, which is the first one in that list. We would just ask that the condition reference Idaho Power's preferences regarding the kinds of trees that are planted there. A revised site plan will be provided that shows the pedestrian crossing both of the north and south boundary of the site that uses some kind of a treatment that differentiates the pedestrian crossing from driving surface and with that I would be happy to answer any questions you have.

McCarvel: Thank you. Any questions for staff or the applicant?

Yearsley: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: So, are you planning to allow parking in that drive aisle of the 26 feet?

Constantikes: No, sir.

Yearsley: Okay.

Constantikes: It will be not a parking area.

Yearsley: So, they have the garages there, so they have to park inside the garage? There is no stacking in front of the houses; is that correct?

Constantikes: Correct.

Yearsley: Okay.

Constantikes: And there was a question about solid waste and we are going to have a -- a recessed area in the garage that will be the right size to store those handcarts. So, we even took care of that.

Yearsley: Okay. And, then, with losing access to Fairview, do you have any concerns about trying -- people trying to -- if they get down to the end and can't -- find they have to turn around and come back, is there a concern about a turnaround down at that -- that end?

Constantikes: No. That's an interesting question. I think in 26 feet if somebody does

have that they can do a three point turnaround. We just -- the issue with Fairview Avenue being a primary or principal arterial and -- and an actual turnaround, a circular turnaround, would eat a substantial portion of that site. So, we were trying to thread the needle carefully and make sure that we had a wide enough drive aisle and still maximize the space for residential, because it's so walkable and bikeable. So, I don't see that that will be a problem. ACHD didn't indicate that that was an issue for them.

Yearsley: Okay. And just one last quick question. Are these going to be sold off as individual units or more of a rental type entity?

Constantikes: Madam Chairman. I apologize. I have been dropping my protocol. Madam Chair, Commissioner, no, these are going to be leased opportunities.

Yearsley: Okay.

Constantikes: The site will not be platted.

Yearsley: Okay. Thank you.

McCarvel: Any other questions for the applicant or staff?

Grove: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Grove.

Grove: Real quick question. You had mentioned the connection to the commercial to the west and providing the pedestrian access. Were you planning to do pedestrian access to that -- the break in between those two buildings or is it just the pedestrian access on the north and south of the property?

Constantikes: Madam Chair, Commissioner, actually, now that you mention it, there will be three points. So, there will be the -- the sidewalk along Fairview Avenue. There is a break between the buildings that's kind of a patio area, outside restaurant area. The third point would be on the north side of the parking lot that's along the back of that commercial development and there are more commercial uses that actually face south and Wilson Lane. So, there will be two interior and, then, the sidewalk along Fairview.

Lorcher: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Lorcher.

Lorcher: This is a message for staff and so this is a new guy on the commission question. If there is already an approach on Fairview currently, why wouldn't we continue to support that as an access point?

Dodson: Commissioner Lorcher, this is Planner Joe. The -- because the site is being

requested for development, because it had -- it's being intensified, ACHD basically has the run of the mill on what access they can and can't allow or will or will not. I -- there was some discussion at the beginning of all of this that if the applicant or the city really wanted to push to keep an access out to Fairview that we may allow it to be -- that ACHD may allow it to be right-in, right-out, but it would require a lot of additional steps from the applicant. Because Wilson Lane is going to be extended and that's a lesser classified street, ACHD policy kind of pushes everything to say, hey, take access from there. There is a lot of successive driveways along this segment of Fairview, so reducing one of those to be only emergency access is really prudent, to be honest, and I believe that's the applicant -- that's their intent as well, to help with some of the safety concerns. I, frankly, don't want to go down the rabbit hole with ACHD about trying to get an access out there to Fairview. I think that might be a big uphill battle for everybody, even if it was commercial, which is why they are -- part of why they are not proposing commercial here, ACHD was going to attempt to limit the access to Fairview, if not eliminate it, even though there is one currently. Just because you have it doesn't mean you are entitled to keep it. It depends on the use you are proposing and if you don't intensify it, then, you are allowed, but if you intensify it you are going to be subject to their policies.

Lorcher: All right. Thank you.

Dodson: You are welcome. Sorry I was long winded. I'm sorry.

Constantikes: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Yes.

Constantikes: If I might add one more thing. We are going to bollard that. So, it really will only be emergency access.

McCarvel: Okay.

Lorcher: I wouldn't want to be on -- have a fire on that last one if you have to go all the way around.

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: Question for staff and possibly the applicant. The Wilson Lane there, is that -- do you have a time frame on when that's going to be extended all the way through?

Constantikes: Madam Chair, Commissioner, no. It -- that final extension will be the purview of Pine 43, but they are out there moving dirt right now and -- and I think they are moving forward pretty quickly. Based on just preliminary review of application materials that were submitted to the city, it looks like they are going to also be putting in townhouses along this stretch that would be very similar to our section of Wilson and -- and they have

got their curb cut in already in their main road that runs through -- I can't remember the name of the -- the primary connection between Fairview and Pine. So, those -- the curb cut's in. They have cut in to start laying their base. So, it looks like they are moving forward pretty quickly.

Seal: Okay. Thank you.

McCarvel: Any other questions for staff or applicant? Okay. Thank you.

Constantikes: Thank you.

McCarvel: Madam Clerk, do we have anyone signed up to testify on this application?

Weatherly: Madam Chair, we do not.

McCarvel: Okay. With that being said, is there anyone in the room or on Zoom that would like to testify on this application? Okay. I assume the applicant has no further comment then. Could I get a motion to close the public hearing on H-2021-0049.

Wheeler: So moved.

Yearsley: Second.

McCarvel: It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing on H-2021-0049. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

McCarvel: I'm just going to say I love the look of these. Two story balcony and stuff. That's cool. I think they have done pretty good thought through this little skinny parcel.

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: I agree with what you are saying, however, I am concerned about the parking there. You know, I always mentioned if it's Super Bowl Sunday and everybody has folks over, where are they going to park. The folks here can, obviously, park in their garages and they will, essentially, be forced to, which I love, but if anybody else is going to come over and park they are probably going to park in the -- over in the commercial parking or along Wilson. So, that's a concern. A bigger concern of mine is, honestly, the cut-through through the commercial property, where if somebody's coming into this, if they are coming down Fairview they are not going to want to come clear around to Locust Grove, then, to Wilson. Turning from Locust Grove left onto Wilson is problematic at best. So, I have a concern that there is going to be a lot of cut-through traffic coming through that residential area until the road is completed all the way through. So, I almost want to throw a condition

in there of no occupancy until that road goes all the way through just to prevent that. I just don't see people going all the way down Wilson, contending with Locust Grove at that intersection, rather than going through the parking lot. Me being a normal human being I know I would just go through the parking lot, so -- but I do like the layout of it. I like the design of it. It's -- it's different. I mean considering it is a very small parcel of land, I think they have tried to incorporate a lot of livability into it. So, those pieces of it I like. It seems to fit in this area. There is going to be a lot of business and residential and this fits in that -- in that way. But I do have those concerns.

McCarvel: Thank you.

Yearsley: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: My initial take on this was kind of a little concerning, but looking at it more fully and remembering the -- what's going into the east of them, I think it actually fits very well and -- and, to be honest with you, I'm not too concerned about the Wilson Lane. My guess is Tradewinds is going to be very anxious to talk to the development to the east and have that included with their design to save money. So, my guess is they are going to want to have that be built prior to that. They are opening anyways. By the time they get their plans built, ready and go, my guess is the roads are going to be -- be completed through the entire site. So, I have -- I don't have as much concerns with that, just because knowing how long it takes to get something, you know, designed and put together and, then, finally built, I think it will be done prior to that work. So, I do like the fact that it's more of a leased type entity where they have a little bit better control on no parking and parking with the garages. That was one of my concerns. Given the narrow strip and all that -- that works out, so I like that ability. So, with that I'm in favor of this project.

Wheeler: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Wheeler.

Wheeler: I would like to make a motion.

McCarvel: Always an order.

Wheeler: Okay. After consideration -- after considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to approve file number H-2021-0049 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of September 16th, 2021, with the following modifications: That in the staff report 8-3-A, that the kinds of trees be slow growing.

Yearsley: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to approve H-2021-0049 with modifications. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

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

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

- 7. Public Hearing for Hatch Industrial (H-2021-0026) by Hatch Design Architecture, Located on the East Side of N. Linder Rd. and the North Side of W. Franklin Rd., South of the Railroad Tracks, and at 160 N. Linder Rd.**
 - A. Request: Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map to change the future land use designation on 42 +/- acres of land from Mixed Use – Community to Industrial.
 - B. Request: Annexation of 1.59 acres of land with an I-L (Light Industrial) zoning district.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Weatherly: Madam Chair, we do not.

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

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

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

Seal: So moved.

Yearsley: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Lorcher: Madam Chair, I will start.

McCarvel: Commissioner Lorcher.

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

McCarvel: Any other comments? Motions?

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

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

McCarvel: Yeah.

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

Grove: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

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

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

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

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

development and there have been quite a few design charrettes and visioning exercises. None of this really coalesced and, frankly, caused a lot of confusion. The city began to solidify plans in 2017 with amendment around the Intermountain Gas facility and the Williams Pipeline connection. The Williams Pipeline is a 24 inch, 30 mile long, natural gas pipeline that traverses much of Meridian and is a connection to Intermountain liquefied natural gas tank south of McMillan and just west of the Phyllis Canal. The city's separation requirements codified in the Unified Development Code for the pipeline. The seven million gallon Intermountain tank filled with natural gas has been chilled into a liquid state. For those that are curious, natural gas, it becomes liquid at negative 260 degrees Fahrenheit and is 600 times smaller than the gaseous form. It's either really cool science or magic. The photo here is at dusk earlier this year. There is a red combine for reference scale highlighted. The tank needs 1,000 foot nonresidential safety buffer, which falls a little outside of their property and there are some other off-site impact considerations, such as light, noise, conductivity and quality of place. Another obvious influence in the area are development pressures. The construction of Owyhee High School has brought a new level of that. This is a challenge as we don't currently have adequate fire service and our police officers have long travel times. Utility infrastructure is inadequate. We still need some major improvements to sewer, including a new lift station. There is also uncertainty with road improvements and the State Highway 16 extension west of McDermott. Finally, there is no neighborhood services and many that are likely to be of interest earlier are not necessarily in the best location or had the best community or long term value. And, finally, as previously noted, 2019 Comprehensive Plan was a huge basis for a lot of the background and context for this plan. It identified the future plans for the area and the need for more integrated development patterns and service planning. I realize this map is a little late, but it serves as a -- as a good transition here. The left shows the region and The Fields area and the right shows the adopted future land uses without the other noise. The liquid -- the liquefied natural gas tank is called out. The candy striped line near McDermott is State Highway 16, which will have crossings only at Ustick, Chinden, McMillan and Five Mile Creek. The Phyllis Canal and Five Mile Creek wrap around the industrial area and the Intermountain facility in the southwest corner. The background information here is all context and history for the Comprehensive Plan. We have had some questions on it, though, and it's casual -- and casual why not type comments. So, it may be useful for newer P&Z members not involved in this work previously. During the Comprehensive Plan build out and analysis consider neighboring cities, citywide allocation, corridor analysis and sub area planning. The Fields area was one of the several dedicated focus areas. Most of the adjacent regional land uses are mixed use in today's market and away from the highway that's largely -- likely to largely be residential with linear commercial along the frontages. In Meridian and of late the next best use from commercial that has reached saturation is multi-family. This vacant commercial -- chances are someone has thought about putting multi-family there and regardless of conductivity, access transportation, employment or supportive uses. Star is actually looking to pair their commercial uses back due to viability. You can see this in Meridian. People think Chinden, for example, should all be commercial, but most of it is, in fact, residential. Limited access requires nonresidential to be focused and there has been no reversal of the effect, except generally for those destination uses and spaces that really shine. Employment opportunities in The Fields area focus in the southwest,

northeast and neighborhood center. In the right context and conditions these each have an opportunity to specialize in different markets and uses. Parks and open space is also important for context. There is probably a little too -- too much information here. However, I want you to see a previous discussion point with City Council and one of the driving reasons for this work. Despite valiant best efforts by our Parks and Recreation Department, the city has not been gaining on its service goals. It's been going the other way, unfortunately. The Fields area in particular has no previously acquired land or dedicated land. The Borup on Cherry, Discovery on Lake Hazel, and to a lesser degree Aldape property along the river, all areas that the city has been proactive in planning for city park space prior to development coming. We don't have anything like that out here, though. The city didn't expect the high school and developments happening. State Highway 16 is coming and it just hasn't been a good opportunity previously. With some important background covered, we will step into a brief review of the process. This has focused on a recent engagement. As reiterated, this work has made use of further recent efforts. This has led to some challenges and opportunity. It's challenging because newer stakeholders and those that did not participate previously sometimes wanted to talk about previous steps. It's an opportunity, because it allowed us to focus on how much we really cared about. Usually, though, we just got asked about roadway questions. The consistent feedback through all this, however, was on pathways connectivity and a distinct community thematic. This was great as it's alignment with city's previous efforts and feedback received. For this project we began with small group interviews, in person and online. The focus of these meetings was concerns and opportunities and included partner agencies, city staff, development and financing professionals and key stakeholders, those near the community center. After initial direction and concept work the project team moved an online workshop. This used an interactive tool called Mural. The technology is still a little awkward, but worked well. All property owners in The Fields area were notified and invited to participate. The focus was still on the neighborhood center, but included broader visual preference, polling and discussion. Again, most of the questions were about the roads. Prior to submitting for public hearing, the city notified all previous participants and invited them to review and comment on a preview draft. This utilized a public comment tool equivalent to a market tool and PDF, Adobe Acrobat, but was available to all and made comments publicly visible. After submitting -- submitting for public hearing, we again notified all property owners of the public -- of the project and process and shared their project website with links to the final draft on the project folder on the record system. Staff has also continued to meet and engage with stakeholders throughout this process. Thankfully and despite the very large area and constant changing ownership, there are not a lot of unique property owners in the area. Unique being the number of property owners. This slide isn't going to do the platform justice, but here you can see a few screen captures from the Mural platform. This is a digital collaborative whiteboard that was used for the online workshop. The tool has been gaining in popularity and for good reason. You can engage with more people more easily, not just those who are close by and have more time. That was a long setup, so we will transition into the plan now. The Field Sub Area Plan includes four chapters, with an intro, overview of the public process, the plan or vision and implementation. The vision includes elements on transportation, parks and pathways, economic development, character and a focus on the neighborhood center. The graphics here will be discussed

and some late changes later, so, please, make a note of that. Implementation is focused on priorities, city participation, and action items. The heart and focus of the plan here is the Star-McMillan center. It is central to the area, accessible, but it's insulated from highways and yet distinctly Meridian. It's not Nampa or Star. It's intended to be iconic and to have a unique destination identity. It's designed and accessible for locals, but attracted to everyone else, too. Makes use of one of the city's pathways network and -- makes use of the city's pathway network and especially the Five Mile Creek pathway. This will have one of the few crossings on State Highway 16 with an underpass. It includes a main street style that provides more opportunities for destination uses and placemaking. This area is prime for partnerships and synergies, not just the pathway network and linear open space, but also to provide locational benefits from a future city park. A key characteristic here is the east-west alignment to make best use of access down McMillan. The access points nearest historic McMillan intersection may be limited or at least not as efficient. Market absorption may take some time here as contemplated, but to propose synergies and limited competing land uses in -- in the near vicinity provide a huge amount of opportunities long term. The mixed use nature allow some ebb and sway in trends with flexible and convertible space development. While a park or other destination uses may support a fully realized neighborhood center sooner, it has an opportunity to be self sufficient long term with the rooftops necessary to support the desired uses. The vision is that many of the services residents may normally drive to can be accessible without getting onto an arterial roadway or -- or crossing a congested state highway. A lot of thought went into how this can work. If you look at areas like Bown Crossing or this 36th Street Bistro and Hill, they have had problems. It's about combination shortcomings, including in lack of external access, local community access, visibility, essential use anchors, public amenities, programming, competing areas, and total rooftops were are all contributing factors. The project team looked at neighborhood center success stories and retail trends. Case study examples in the area and the region included Daybreak, Utah; Ferguson Farms in Bozeman, Montana; Montava in Fort Collins and others. There is going to be strong local demand in the future and with a river crossing at Star and overpass on McMillan, there will be visibility and traffic. The center itself will be a destination draw. This is an illustrated look and field sketch. This isn't prescriptive, but it does include many of the sense of place and focus elements that stakeholders have commented on. Here is a smattering of other images that have received positive feedback for look and feel elements. All these come from the plan. Next steps is crucial. The plan has limited usefulness of this self document. We didn't need to go to this level of effort for just development review. As mentioned, there is a lot of challenges and opportunities, including State Highway 16, and continued transportation impacts and existing infrastructure. A fully functioning high school, still largely in the middle of nowhere. A funded, but unconstructed fire station, changing land ownership and increasing development pressures. The coordination of partnerships can't be reinforced. In fact, it probably needs its own slide. Aligning city and partner agency services will be key. The high school shook things up and this plan is a good step to get service planning back in alignment. We can help that through public-public, public-private and private-private partnerships to reduce some of the risk with advanced timing and to address otherwise negative circumstances and barriers and, instead, create positive opportunities. I also want to be very straightforward. This plan has some of the usual

planning development guidelines, but it's also put a lot of responsibility for success on the city. It's not just evaluating consistency of broad planning elements with unique development proposals, but the city working with developers and owners and other stakeholders to ensure we have something special. The process to get here and the framework is important, but I would argue that next steps are even more important. That was a relatively quick summary. The project -- project team believes we have a balanced -- we have balanced a lot of perspective and interest with short and long term needs. The plan and staff report do touch on some other topics and there are, quite frankly, some other equally big ideas, such as funding, that fall on staff and City Council. I didn't go through the comp plan policies that support this work or the plan or the findings as illustrated in the staff report, but we feel this is not just consistent with the comp plan, but also finishing the work we already started. Quickly I will go through the request and some additional recommended changes. There is a lot of depth to discussion we could have on any number of topics, but it's difficult to do most of that outside of questions or several hours of debrief. The big request of Commission tonight, as previously noted, is to adopt The Field Sub Area Plan by reference. That amounts to one new row and table on page D of the Comprehensive Plan. We do have a few other proposed changes to the draft as well. The city has had some questions and feedback since the draft plan was submitted for public hearing. Most of these have been around understanding the purpose of text and some conservative prescriptive standards. A lot of this is very understandable and valid. The project team had proposed some adjustments to adjust -- to address some of these. More broadly, though, there are a few things to remember. The first is that this is a high level planning document. It's not all things to all projects. There is a narrative for data. There is narrative for data for records -- and reference. The plan is used for city priorities and projects and the plan is also used to review development in conjunction with the Comprehensive Plan, UDC, architecture standards and other approved documents. Another reminder is that not all development is the same. The location, size, and context is very important. This plan should not be blindly followed and -- with all -- with all elements required in all conditions. It's also difficult to strike up balance that makes everyone happy. The plan has to have language that is strong enough to be enforceable and provide confidence to both residents and development, but avoid blindly imposing an inappropriate condition or being so weak and broad as to lack any means to be implemented. This screen in the staff -- this screen and the next are both in the staff report as part of the staff recommendation. I won't linger here. This language is all intended to provide more context on why some of the information is there and why it's important. This page are just some simple clarification to other text and, again, these ones are included in the staff report as part of the staff recommendation. These changes are not in the staff report, so, please, consider these with any approval motion. COMPASS provided a few comments in their agency response. One set of comments -- comments were related to use as described on the illustrated framework map. That was the image referenced earlier. The quote uses described are not in the city's future land use designation portfolio. That was not fully evident apparently and so these changes are trying to make clear. Those were generalized uses, not future land uses. Those comments are to reference different regional planning documents. The wrong ones are cited in the document. That's the presentation. Lastly, doing the future amendment we would like to tweak a few sections of the Comprehensive Plan to better

accommodate all sub area planning types into one section. They are currently sort of all over. That is a little intensive and distracting from the actual work now, though, and so we are planning to do that with the next round of cleanup and update to the comp plan itself. I'm also hoping we can create a responsive website for this sub area plan, just like the Comprehensive Plan. We have the tools and ability, we just need some time. I just need some time. With that, myself, Megan and Caleb, are happy to answer any questions you may have.

McCarvel: Okay. Thank you. Any questions for staff?

Lorcher: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Lorcher.

Lorcher: I'm not sure if this is the right time to ask it, but the corner of Star and McMillan has some historic buildings on it. I assume that was the name of a town back in the wayback days. Does this Comprehensive Plan include saving what Meridian was?

McClure: Madam Chair, the -- the Comprehensive Plan has some historic elements in the -- in the main document. This specific -- or the sub area plan does not call out specific structures to save. It does, however, identify that church on the southwest corner of McMillan and Star as an historic structure. We did speak with the owners of that property. The church has acquired some other property on Star and they are interested in potentially relocating that -- moving that in the future. I can't say it will be a difficult balance in the future due to the proximity of the intersection with any future intersection widening. So, hopefully, they do relocate it, rather than tearing it down or having it removed for them.

Grove: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Grove.

Grove: Brian -- Brian, does the timeline on the highway extension change like how -- how important this is in terms of timing to get some of these things moving?

McClure: Commissioner, the timing for the State Highway 16 is ever evolving. It's changed from 20 years from now to sooner to an interim condition that could start really soon. I don't know how important it is to this plan's timing right now. I don't. But understanding how it will impact where development occurs is important. A lot of that is probably more for the broader Comprehensive Plan and not sort of focused on the neighborhood center, but certainly it's something that's very important and will have some huge impacts and we need to be aware of what they are.

Yearsley: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: You know, it's surprising to me how fast this has come about. I was on the Planning and Zoning Commission when we were looking at the subdivisions there off of McMillan -- off McDermott -- McDermott and how far out I thought that was and now we are planning all the way out to the city limits or impact area. It just amazes me how fast this is moving and -- and expanding. I applaud the city for getting ahead of this now and trying to plan for what this should look like and especially planning for services and parks out that way. So, I appreciate your efforts.

McCarvel: Okay. Any other questions for staff? Okay. And point of order to my legal counsel. We are taking public testimony on this this evening?

Starman: Yes.

McCarvel: Madam Clerk, do we have anybody signed up to testify on this application or this --

Weatherly: Madam Chair, we do. There are several people signed in. I will just call them as they signed up. First up is Jeff Hatch. I think he left. Mark Bottles.

Bottles: This mic or this mic? Both of them are live?

McCarvel: They are both -- both are live as long as you are close enough.

Bottles: Okay. Good evening, Chair and Commissioners. My name is Mark Bottles at 839 South Bridgeway Place, Eagle, Idaho. First I want to thank all the city staff, Brian and Caleb and the Mayor and everyone at the city that has contributed to get here tonight. We are extremely excited about the Field Sub Area, what we believe is really the last best area of Meridian and the planning that's gone into it. I'm here tonight with Jim Houk from Kimley-Horn; Deb Nelson and Emily Mueller, who is in my office, to discuss in greater detail some of our specific comments to the plan. Is there -- Brian, can you put up this -- do you have the slide for -- map just showing the parcels? Thank you. Together with several partners I -- or control approximately 630 acres in The Fields Sub Area. This represents almost a third of the developmental ground in the entire Fields district. We are invested in this area. Very excited about the plan and partnering with the city to make this a vibrant place to live, work and recreate. We are excited about the pathway system that's going to connect it all together in the park. After engaging with the city staff and Logan Simpson over the last year, we are left with only a few, but important comments to the plan prior to its adoption. These comments are primarily focused on the Star-McMillan center, which partner owns 62 acres of that. If we could go to that slide. If we have got the right one. Yeah. There we go. Thank you. The neighborhood center, which is adjacent to the current city limits, my partners are ready to bring this application in within the next six to 12 months. We are very excited about the center. We share the city's vision for the neighborhood, community center with walkable retail streets, with direct connection to adjacent neighborhoods and to the community pathway system, which it will be located on. While we -- while we cast vision for this area for the next five, you know, 20 and 50 years of the plan in the future, the plan should allow flexibility and

creativity in the mix uses and the design standards to respond to the market demand that will support and maintain the economic viability of the center. I'm very familiar with the successes and struggles of centers throughout the valley and -- and believe allowing the center's development to be driven both by the city and by the city's vision and the market demands, this will be key in allowing us to bring this center to life, so we are excited. I'm going to have -- introduced to you Jim Houk with Kimley-Horn, who I think should be on Zoom. I guess that's what we call it.

Weatherly: Yes, sir. I'm transferring him over now.

Bottlers: Okay. Thank you.

Weatherly: Jim, you should have the ability to unmute yourself and turn on your camera if you would like.

Houk: Thank you, Mark and Chairman and Council -- Commissioners I should say. We appreciate the opportunity to -- again to -- to share in this adventure with the city and the planning efforts that the city has put forth. As Mark had mentioned, you know, the -- the town center is an important part of the puzzle and even as Brian, excuse me, has outlined, you know, it becomes kind of a cornerstone for a lot of what's being envisioned for the community and we are excited to be part of that. I think what I would really just stop and say is we think, you know, from our planning efforts and as a team and working with the city, there is -- there is alignment. There is a great alignment that's going to make this very possible and it's exciting to know that Mark and his partners are in the position to really bring this plan forward in the near future. So, we are excited to be a part of that. We are excited to also share with you some -- some initial thoughts tonight. This bubble diagram was -- was provided as an additional version or concept of what's possible out here today and we are excited that city staff has allowed us to bring our own ideas to the table and show how maybe what one other version might look like for the town center as a -- as a -- as a whole. We understand that -- that through this alignment we are going to provide, you know, great pedestrian and auto connections east, north, south, west from the center, really encouraging the multi-modal options, but also eliminating some of the traffic concerns that we, you know, are all experiencing on the major corridors today. But what we are really talking about, too, here is about the principles of creating -- creating place. One of those buzzwords out there in the planning world. Sense of place doesn't always happen overnight, it takes time, it takes people living there, it takes, you know, time for places to get ownership and a sense of authenticity and we think moving the plan forward we need to make sure that the language continues to support those options, supports new ideas that we haven't even thought about yet moving forward and we appreciate Brian's efforts to talk about the limitations or changing the language a bit on prescriptive tones within the original draft that we were reviewing with them. Moving forward we want to recognize that -- again, that the plan should recognize the time that it will take to mold the community as we -- as we talk about the market forces, but also giving time for the neighborhoods to begin to develop and for the housing mix to kind of evolve and we are encouraging that the plan continue to reinforce that language, opening up the opportunity -- opportunities for a series of potential opportunities around the town

center as it relates to the mixed use and how that begins to take shape. So, we would continue to just -- and ensure that the document clearly states how that vision and the town center will move forward, but also that -- that there are options on the table, as Brian had mentioned, that really will embrace some of the things out there from the market standpoint, but also from the residential development perspective. I want to move on to the next slide real quickly. This slide was really just introduced as a way to give some perspective on -- on the Bown property and the development that's happened there, you know, that we -- when we talk about envisioning a plan and moving it forward, it really comes based on, you know, what our history has been, what we have experienced, success and failures, and as planners, you know, we -- we talk a lot about lessons learned and I think in this case, you know, we can see the -- the success, but -- but also the evolution of how the -- the project has gotten to where it is today and just for reference also the -- the spread that you see before you on the aerial, it's about two and a half acres, and that same two and a half acres -- and, then, that's reflected over here on the bubble diagram as a -- just I guess for reference and perspective on what the town center here potentially could be and how it will maybe evolve with the main street, the connections to the greenway, as well as the civics pieces there in blue. We even envision kind of celebrating the agricultural history of the place and encouraging civic space for commerce markets and things of that nature, but also recognizing that as we move forward we want to -- my screen is frozen. Sorry. The bubble concept we think in this case, as well as the one that's shown in the plan, really begins to celebrate those connections that are important to the overall vision for the plan. We believe it's important that the sub area plan continues to be flexible and nimble, enough to develop over time and that's where we really have been talking more with Brian and staff and team about just making sure that some of the language is -- will benefit options in the future, really support the benefits of new business and new housing opportunities that will be coming to The Field at some point. So, with that I think we are grateful for the opportunity to share this bubble concept with -- with you all and the opportunity to share and can be part of the development of this plan and we think it will be a great -- a great next steps for the City of Meridian. With that I will be open to any questions, but, if not, I could -- I could pass the mic on.

McCarvel: Any questions for this testimony? Okay. Madam Clerk?

Weatherly: Madam Chair, I believe it's Deb Nelson.

Nelson: Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, Deborah Nelson. My address is 601 West Bannock Street. It's a pleasure to be with you this evening. We are here to support the plan. I'm here on behalf of the team that's representing the current landowner and developer and we do -- we are very grateful for the process and opportunity to weigh in on this. We do have some relatively minor, but very important adjustments that we are asking you to address and my focus this evening is to talk about some of this prescriptive language. You know, Brian addressed that this is supposed to be a high level planning document. That's its purpose and we completely agree. There is just a few places in the plan where we would suggest some of the language doesn't accomplish that goal of being a high level planning document. Instead, it gets prescriptive to the point that it operates more like a zoning ordinance and could limit market opportunities, could limit innovation.

So, I want to highlight a couple of those areas. First on -- on page 315, addressing the center components, a particular language that we asked for some change on, if you look under on the right you can see where the plan language says under main street style -- and here is just a very prescriptive sentence of two to three story mixed use buildings fronting a curved street running east-west. You know, we would just ask that rather than prescribing the layout and the building types with this level of specificity, instead you address -- you address design qualities that are desired here and how to accomplish those. So, we suggested language more like -- that incorporates innovative design and uses based on market demand with on-street parking and pedestrian oriented streetscape. You know, requiring the two and three story buildings can not only stifle that innovation, but really limit market interest and you are trying to develop a successful commercial center here. Commercial uses are particular about building height and often do prefer a single story frontage opportunity and you can still achieve with that single story appearance the same main street feel that's part of the architectural theme here and that's really illustrated well by these types of examples. Single story retail. They activate the streetscape without overpowering it. They encourage walkability. They still have that great interface with the pedestrian and the street frontage and they really capture the theme of this plan as set forth of contemporary rural thematic that's really sought here for the commercial. So, you can accomplish that, whether it's one, two or three story buildings, we just asked that that not be so prescriptive. The second area that we wanted to focus on is on page 420 of the plan. Design standards. Here there are some -- within the recommended action items, which is, really, a place where the -- the plan is calling for the development of future architectural standards. We recognize that that's calling for a future action, but the direction that's given here about what should be in those standards is very prescriptive and we would just ask for some minor changes on the first two bullets to incorporate flexibility, so that when the people come together, the city is working with stakeholders and developing these architectural standards, which, of course, our developer is excited to be a part of, that they haven't started out of the gate with too many rules in place before they even get there. You can still incorporate these great concepts, but we ask that it includes some language such as, you know, incorporate material such as, but not limited to. So, you give the guidance for how they are going to develop these standards. The third bullet was probably the most concerning I guess to us, because it seemed like the most prescriptive, where it says to discourage or allow only a very limited use of -- and, then, it lists quite a few materials. These materials are commonly used in high quality, innovative developments and still are used in ways that can meet these -- these character goals. You know, we would ask you, instead, to make sure the design standards in the plan and the resulting architectural standards are flexible enough to achieve the development that can meet those character goals, create a successful commercial area without limiting important materials for that creative process. For some examples, these are all on the restricted list. As I said, this type of material, composite siding, metal siding, cement board, they are appropriate, they are attractive and can be used in innovative and quality ways and are. The plan doesn't need to restrict these materials to accomplish its goals. In fact, a good architectural standard, you know, can and should work for a variety of materials and particularly in today's market conditions where supply of materials is so limited. You know, let the architectural design come through without arbitrarily cutting out these basic materials used day in day out in

commercial developments. And so with that we thank you for your consideration of those changes. We are very supportive of the plan and the process. Appreciative of all the work that Brian and everybody on the city staff has put into this and their welcoming of our input and they have been very receptive to that. So, very appreciative. Just focusing on a few details that we ask you to consider. Thank you.

Weatherly: Madam Chair, Emily Mueller.

Mueller: Good evening, Madam Chair and Commissioners. Emily Mueller. 839 South Bridgeway Place, Eagle, Idaho. And I will just be wrapping up the last couple minor comments that we have to the plan from this ownership group. The two main requests that we ask to be addressed in the plan include Table 4-A, which is an overview -- overall development program table. Staff did address some of our concerns that we have had in the interim over the last several days with comments that Brian shared earlier. However, with those comments it is still unclear to us what the purpose of this table really is. Is it a target four square footage or is it just an estimate or a record of what's been done? And, additionally, it's unclear how the figures were reached to us and we have had additional follow up with Logan Simpson, which we really appreciate, but we would like that to be included in here and -- and it's hard for us to replicate those -- those estimates or those -- those figures and so while the plan -- so, yeah, the intended use of this table I think is the primary concern here, it not being clear, and -- and while some of the added language that staff included says that this is -- is to estimate -- this is to estimate a table, it still is used to consider the overall development of the area and while we agree that it's important to balance uses and consider the area, while paired -- while that language is paired with these really specific numbers, it's -- it can be confusing and problematic. So, we would request that this table either be removed or that it's revised to explain how these figures were reached and add a statement that the table reflects estimates and doesn't present standards for consideration of future development applications. Our final request is regarding some of the recommended action items on page 4-11 of the plan and the first bullet point here suggests that a specific action would be to limit single family developments per planned use designations and our concern with this clause is that it's somewhat of a blanket statement about -- about product type. Single family product is consistently being refined with denser product types. I live in a neighborhood where my single family home is smaller than the townhomes in my neighborhood and so we feel that this was more of a blanket statement on a product type, instead of the goal, which is to include density where we need density. The second bullet point recommends codifying standards -- stronger standards for a maximum percentage of land use dedicated for residential within mixed use areas and we would recommend not including this. It would really be the first time that there is maximum standards prescribed for residents in mixed use and we don't think that precluding residential will bring commercial. Market brings commercial. And so we don't think that that is an appropriate action item moving forward. I have included here a summary of our recommendations just for convenience. I also have a handout for you. The most important of them being the invitation we got to submit a concept of our desired development that is consistent with the -- the aesthetic of the plan to include and so that is our first and our primary recommendation, the plan that Mr. Houk went over and the rest of our recommendations are summarized here. So, if I can

give these to you. With that I or any member of our team, if you have a specific question for a member of our team, can stand for questions. Thank you.

McCarvel: Any questions at this point for the current testimony? Madam Clerk, do we have anybody else signed up?

Weatherly: Madam Chair, we do not.

McCarvel: Okay. I'm thinking just as we go forward on this discussion -- I don't know that we really opened -- point of order, sir. We haven't really opened a discussion, so we don't need to close the public hearing, because this presentation was not really an application.

Starman: Test. Test. I think it was advertised as a public hearing.

McCarvel: Okay.

Starman: Or staff can correct -- planning staff correct me. I think it was advertised as a public hearing. So, I would consider the testimony you received this evening as part of that public hearing. You can ask if there are additional members in the audience or on Zoom that want to speak, but after that I would -- I would say just close the public --

McCarvel: Go ahead and --

Starman: Or continue to where ever the Commission's desire might be.

McCarvel: Okay. Would the Commissioners like to leave the public testimony open to ask more questions or close the public hearing and move on with deliberations?

Seal: Madam Chair, I have a few questions.

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: Just for staff and Brian specifically, I mean we have got -- we have got a big list of things that we could make a motion out of, but, personally, I would like these discussions to happen between the folks who gave the presentation and staff and for us to not be an intermediary in that, unless staff basically says, yes, we agree to everything they say.

McClure: Commissioner, this is the city's application. Our consultants have delivered to you what they feel is in the best interest of the city. Public testimony is important and I would encourage you to consider and listen to that, but at the end of the day it's not really a negotiation at this point, it's whatever you think is best. So, staff's happy to talk to the -- some of the stakeholders in the area further, but I'm not in a position to necessarily negotiate the details of those. It's sort of we have given to you what our consultant feels -- feels is best and if you think some of this is valid or would like to have some discussion about it we could, but I'm not going to be in a position -- I'm not in the best position to go through those further. They have given most of this to us previously. We understand and

feel that a lot of them are valid and understand and recognize them, but there is usually reasons for why some of them were not made. Maybe I will have to defer to Caleb as to -- yeah.

Lorcher: Madam Chair? Oh, are we --

McCarvel: Yeah. Go ahead, Caleb.

Hood: I don't have much to add, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. As Brian mentioned, we have -- we have met with the folks that have testified thus far on this project. It's not that we don't agree with some of their -- their comments, we thoughtfully have considered them. Some of them we could make. I think at this point, though, it's good to hear back from the Commission on what you think is in the best interest of the city and what you have before you now is what we are proposing to move forward. But no hard feelings if there is additional changes. You have questions and want to talk about some of those we are certainly happy to do that.

McCarvel: Commissioner Lorcher.

Lorcher: So, are you -- are you willing to make any changes to the recommendations that have been made or are your design -- your presentation for the city final? These bullet points that they have brought forward to you. You have listened to them. Are any of them open for consideration or you have already considered them and made your designs --

McClure: We have made some -- some recommendations based off some of these already. They are in the list of staff recommended changes in the staff report. For example, to the table -- they have reviewed that and they -- it's still not where they like it to be and that's fine, but we have made the changes that we thought were appropriate. If you guys think more changes are appropriate that's certainly within your purview, happy to have specific discussions about them. But this table is more for you than it is for me at this point.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Grove: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Grove.

Grove: Brian and Caleb, is this document that we have been presented, what is its long term use in terms of being amended or modified as we go? Is it, you know, in line with like a comp plan where you don't want to go back in and make significant changes as, you know, things on the ground change or is it a recommending document more than anything else where changes are okayed a little bit more? I'm kind of thinking like the Ten Mile Specific Area Plan or whatever that -- it's not as rigid as some of the other documents that are out there. So, what are -- what's the long term use of this document?

McClure: Commissioner, I don't think we ever want to change the plan more than necessary. It is -- this plan would be a text amendment, because it's adopted by reference. Well, actually, I'm not sure -- we would generally consider it a text amendment to modify the plan. Text amendments aren't as difficult now as the map amendments, which have a restriction. Staff can change the text whenever we want, so if there is an appropriate time the staff can do it. Development interest, stakeholders, anyone can make a request to change the text of the plan. Long term reason for the plan is just like the Comprehensive Plan, it just has some additional areas of focus that sort of deal with the unique conditions of this area. So, this is not a future land use map plan. There is -- there is no element of that here. It would just be text to modify the plan. Does that help at all?

Grove: It does. Thank you.

Hood: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Caleb.

Hood: I would just note -- and maybe you are getting there. I just want to make sure we -- we have other folks in the audience. I imagine they are here for -- to testify, but this is a public hearing, so if you are willing to take additional public testimony we would certainly like to hear that, too.

McCarvel: Oh, absolutely. I thought we had gone down the road. Sorry. We had no more that were signed up; right? Okay. Anybody else in the room that would like to offer comments?

Wessel: Madam Chairperson, Commissioners, my name is Tim Wessel. I live at 5080 North Baylor Lane, directly in line with where all this is going to happen. We have been here for two years. This is the first notification whatsoever that we have ever received of any of this. So, not good with communication, I guess. I come from the service side. I'm a retired fire chief out of southern California. Thirty years in the fire department and I would have been strung up had we not communicated with people in the area better than this. There is talk of high density housing directly across McMillan from our street and, then, with the high density housing comes a lot of things that are not nice. Higher crime, trash and all kinds of other great problems. I just would hope that in the future going forward with this project that those of us that are living in the middle of it are going to be contacted and be talked to and asked what our opinions are, because so far we haven't been. I just really hope that in the future as this moves forward -- because I know that things can change and things will change as this whole process goes forward. But I really hope that there will be an effort to talk to those of us that are going to be directly impacted by this, because this is going to directly impact us. I live on a street with seven houses. There is a cornfield in front of us and a farm behind us. So, we are going to be impacted by this. I just really hope in the future that -- that you guys will take the time to make sure that we are talked to. Thank you.

McCarvel: Okay. Madam Clerk. Oh, you said we had nobody else. Is there anybody else in the room? Sorry.

Ross: Madam Chair, Commissioners, my name is David Ross. I live with my wife at 5595 North McDermott. Couldn't have said it better. Our first notification was that postcard we got in the mail as well. Large impacts. We understand that development is coming and it has to come. Commissioner Grove, you brought up a very significant issue and it is Highway 16. To our knowledge no one has got Idaho Transportation Department involved in this process either. So, we are on the north side of this, but when we first saw that map on the postcard that has us in your impact zone in your Comprehensive Plan, we are here tonight just to go on record that we oppose any annexation.

McCarvel: Okay. Anybody else in the room that wishes to testify on this? Madam Clerk, did we have anybody online that is raising their hand?

Weatherly: Madam Chair, we have one person. Warren Ryrie. Warren, you should be able to unmute yourself and state your name and address for the record.

Ryrie: Yes. My name is Warren Ryrie. I live at 8478 West McMillan in Meridian. My wife and I own the property that's -- that's on the northwest corner of McMillan and Star Road. My concern is is that as this project began it appeared that the intent of the planning was to maintain more of an open, even an agricultural appearance for this land and preserving that -- that openness and that type of lifestyle that is so important and has been so important in the development of this area and as what I see happening here and even more today with some of the changes is an intense effort to move towards high density -- very high density housing associated with that and it appears to me that the comments that have been made by the folks that live in this area and that own property in this area, other than Mr. Bottles, has not been listened to and we do not agree with the -- with the shift towards such high density housing development in -- in this area. Thank you.

McCarvel: Madam Clerk, anybody else online?

Weatherly: Madam Chair, not that I see.

McCarvel: Then could I get a motion to close public hearing on H-2021-0047.

Seals: So moved.

Grove: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to close the public hearing on H-2021- 0047. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Lorcher: Madam Chair, I have a question for staff.

McCarvel: Commissioner Lorcher.

Lorcher: In regard to the designation and the gentleman who was on -- I think McDermott in regard to annexation, nothing's being annexed. Correct? It's all being discussed as far as just a designation. But in order for the parcel to be annexed it would have to be brought forth to the City Council or the Planning and Zoning; is that correct?

McClure: Commissioner, that's -- that's correct. There are no proposed land use changes. These were all adopted with the 2019 Comprehensive Plan and there are no proposed annexations. This is a text amendment only.

McCarvel: No. Sorry.

Grove: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: It's not you, it's the process. Mr. Grove.

Grove: Madam Chair. I would just like to make a point of reference here for the last three that presented. I know that it might feel sudden, because you hadn't read the documents or weren't in the area when some of the decisions were made. But this was part of the comprehensive plan that was an 18 to 24 month process that was formally voted on by the City Council on 2019. So, a lot of this was discussed prior to that. It was part of that larger Comprehensive Plan. So, just saying -- just want to make a point of order that a lot of this documentation and conversations have been had for many, many years and that's where some of these discussions came out of with the document that they are presenting tonight.

Wheeler: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Wheeler.

Wheeler: I -- I for one would kind of like to see -- like Commissioner Grove pointed out -- that this was something that was done in a process for, you know, 18 to 24 months. City Council take a look at it. Had I'm assuming focus groups go through the verbiage, things of that nature. I'm for one that would kind of like to see their plan that they have accepted kind of play out in this area, personally speaking. I'm looking at also just one of the points here under item one, about -- about being two to three story, mixed use buildings and a front. I go through Bown Crossing and those are all two story buildings as you drive down that street. Personally I kind of like the feel of that, rather than the single stories and the flats on that. For me, it's kind of -- and everything deals with ratios and some restrictions one way or another. We do that with open spaces. We do that with parking. We do that with densities all over and -- and that's what holds on to the community to make it viable for generations to come and to me that's part of what the Council underwent for two years in getting this input, going back and forth, putting it together and they came up with this verbiage in their mind of how this community in this four square mile block could look and really benefit. So, for me I'm -- I'm more of one that

says, hey, I would like to see this play out and if something comes up that needs something, then, it can be adjusted at a CUP or something at that time when something is submitted. But to go through and change the text is not really something I'm in support of.

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: I would like to thank staff and for the people that are feeling that this is all at once and that things are kind of being forced on you, like Commissioner Grove said, there has been a process in place to go through this. It took several years in order to get there. Unfortunately, we can't notice the entire city and the Comprehensive Plan literally dealt with the entire city area of impact. It is something that was very public that had a lot of involvement and in the end the properties that you have don't have to do anything. You don't have to annex, you don't have to sell, you don't have to do anything. You will be impacted, because, like you said, it's coming. I mean it's coming and, you know, I have got things -- I have got a nice farm field out in front of my house. It's not going to be there anymore. So, I'm in the same spot that you guys are. So, it's part of living in Meridian at this point in time, fortunately or unfortunately, depending on how you -- you know, how you view that. What the city and staff are trying to do at this point I personally commend, because there has been a lot of areas where people don't -- didn't get a notice in their mailbox until stuff was getting built. So, you all -- all of a sudden had multi-family sitting out in front of your doorstep, where they are trying to corral this in, set up a plan to where it looks good, instead of having pathways like the one that exists between Ten Mile and Linder Road that's like being on the Greenbelt that dead end and go absolutely nowhere. That's one of the ones that I ride all the time. They are trying to get in front of this and trying to make it something cohesive, something that's going to blend into the community and not just be an add on as more garage farms basically. So, I like the idea that they are going through this or trying to get in front of it and everything. I do have some reservations about the recommendations that are coming in. I mean I think some of these are good recommendations. But, again, I'm not a city planner. I mean I understand that there is reasons why they may not have taken these recommendations in, but I -- I don't have enough information to really know if that's the way that it should lean or not, to be perfectly honest. I mean as a Commissioner I would like more information on why some of these are or are not good recommendations, why they shouldn't be included. I know there is some things -- just the way overall amount of amendments to what's being submitted tonight has me thinking that this isn't ready. There is a lot of stuff that you guys submitted to change. There is a lot of things that are being recommended to change. I just don't think this is ready to go forward in its current iteration. I think it could use some more work, because I will use -- I will use the same thing on this as we do on developers as they come in. We get one chance to get this right. So, let's get it right.

Yearsley: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: I wholeheartedly agree. For me I need to take time to review what they are asking and kind of go back to the plan and have a chance to better review it to better understand what's being asked of us before I feel comfortable making a decision.

Lorcher: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Lorcher.

Lorcher: Looking at this map that they handed out today -- and if you break it down into little sections, over 67 percent that is being recommended as high density. Do we really need another -- and when we say high density, aren't we talking about things like multi-family housing, multiple stories, people kind of on top of each other with -- with shared spaces and there is definitely a need and a place for that in our city and we have seen a lot of that along the I-84 corridor and the Ten Mile interchange. But this quiet little farmland out in the middle of the edges of our town, do we really need another blast of high density housing? I just don't -- you know it -- it needs to be gradual where we have our density and, then, we kind of level out a little bit, so that the -- the history of Meridian and what we are about and the farmland has some existence. Otherwise, we lose what Meridian started as. So, I'm opposed to this plan in regard to -- I like The Field idea. I love having another city center out there. But surrounding it with high density housing and not having any medium or low density housing indicated at all would be a horrible addition to our city out in that area.

Grove: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Grove.

Grove: We are not litigating what's already been put into the Comprehensive Plan. We are -- we are litigate -- we are talking about the text that kind of clarifies some of the points that are already there. So, we are looking at this not from a five year standpoint, but more of a 50 year standpoint. What does this look like in 50 years? How is this built out to make the community sustainable? In this general -- like in this area we are looking at two major highway systems that are -- are at the northeast corner of this property -- or this general area. We are not talking about an annexation. We are not talking about a subdivision. We are talking about a general area that has much higher level pieces and I think if we start getting like sucked into the bubble plan that was out there or any of the images, then, we are kind of losing focus on what we are asked to be looking at tonight, which is a much larger, long-term piece of planning than what we are typically charged with looking at. It is much more complicated, much more nuanced in a lot of ways, but also a little bit easier, because we are not saying, okay, this is exactly where that road goes, this is exactly what this needs to look like, we are -- we get a chance to create an entire -- you know, they mentioned a sense of place and that is something that is not always available to us when we are doing smaller developments or looking at, you know, even a one square mile part. We are looking at four square miles here. We are looking at this from a long-term perspective. One of the things that Commissioner Wheeler said kind of resonated with me in thinking about, you know, the market might not do right now

the one -- you know, they want the one story. That makes sense. But does that have that long term viability for our community if we think about how does something redevelop, how does something have character, how does something have identity as we move forward and I think we need to take a few steps back and -- and look at what this document is, what it is being added to and why we are talking about it.

McCarvel: Any other comments or motions? I'm thinking on the general consensus we want a little more time to read through and digest what we have been presented with tonight. It is text amendment to the plan. It's not annexing or approving a plan at all tonight. Or with this presentation, so -- but there is significant text changes that they are asking us to look at and I think probably warrants some time to think and compare.

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: Yeah. I would like more time, but I mean, essentially -- I mean I would look at a continuance so that they can include all of those into their submission with anything that they also agree with from the group that presented tonight. That way we can have one comprehensive document in front of us that we are -- that we know what, you know, they are willing to yield on, what they are not willing to yield on and maybe some explanation as to why. That would be very helpful in this, because, again, just, in my mind, trying to make a motion of this with everything that we have been presented is -- it's not within my possibilities.

Starman: Madam Chair, I'm not sure how the Commission wants to proceed tonight and you will figure that out shortly, but I did want to -- maybe for the Chair and for the Commissioners, if you do decide to table us and come back, you may want to consider reopening the public hearing and continuing it, so you can take further testimony. You don't have to do that if you just want to deliberate amongst yourselves in two weeks, that's fine as well. But if you do want the opportunity for additional public input interaction, I would recommend that you open the -- reopen the public hearing and continue it.

McCarvel: And we need to do that to hear from staff as well; correct? To reopen the public hearing?

Starman: I missed the first part of --

McCarvel: We need to reopen the public hearing just to even hear from staff; correct?

Starman: I think if the Commission is just deliberating and has specific questions to staff, I don't think you need to reopen the public hearing for that, but I think if you want to take --

McCarvel: Additional --

Starman: -- feedback from the group that spoke tonight or from the public in general, then, you ought to do so.

McCarvel: Okay. Let's start there. Would the Commission like to keep the public hearing closed or reopen it?

Grove: Madam Chair, I have a question real quick. Are we approving or are we recommending approval?

McCarvel: Recommending.

Seal: We are the recommending body for this.

Starman: Commission is being asked to make a recommendation to the City Council.

McCarvel: Yeah. To the -- yeah.

Yearsley: Madam Chair, I think it would be --

McCarvel: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: -- advantageous to open the public hearing back up and -- and in doing so I would make a motion to open the public hearing.

McCarvel: Do I have a second?

Wheeler: Second.

Grove: Second.

McCarvel: It's been moved and seconded to open the public -- reopen the public hearing on H-2021-0047. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Yearsley: And I guess the next question I would have is when do we want to continue this to?

McCarvel: Yeah. The next available is October 7th. Madam Clerk, can you tell us what -- is that one already stacked or should we go onto the next one?

Weatherly: Madam Chair, currently on October 7th with the continuance of the Burger King CUP there are six hearing scheduled for October 7th.

McCarvel: Okay.

Weatherly: After that is October 21st. There are currently five hearings scheduled for October 21st and that date has not been noticed yet, so it's possible the Planning Department could add on another application.

McCarvel: Okay.

Weatherly: I could, Madam Chair, make a recommendation to the Planning Department that they don't add anymore applications that night if you want to continue this one. I'm happy to do that for you. I think Caleb could help me out with that.

McCarvel: Okay. I'm guessing the 7th is not just a whole bunch of small ones.

Weatherly: Madam Chair, so we have the Burger King conditional use permit. So -- let me get to my list. A small rezone of less than an acre and a short plat. There is an expansion of a wood products business on 3.1 acres. There is annexation and zoning of ten acres with a rezone of 6.84 acres and a preliminary plat on that one with 65 single family detached buildings, et cetera. There is an apartment's conditional use permit for multi-family consisting of 164 units on nine acres. On the 21st if you want to know what -- is that good enough?

McCarvel: Yeah.

Weatherly: Okay.

McCarvel: Okay. Next motion, please.

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: I move to continue file H-2021-0047 to the date of October 21st, 2021, in order to provide a more comprehensive summary and include any modifications in the plan before submitting back to Planning and Zoning.

Yearsley: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to continue H-2021-0047. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

McCarvel: One more, please.

Yearsley: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: I move we adjourn.

Seal: Second.

McCarvel: Okay. It has been moved and seconded to adjourn the meeting of September 16th, 2021. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:40 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS.)

APPROVED:

RHONDA MCCARVEL - CHAIRMAN

_____|_____|_____
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK