

**Public Hearing for Burnside Ridge Estates (H-2023-0055) by Kimley
Horn, generally located on the south side of W. Victory Rd and the
west side of S. Linder Rd., in the NE 1/4 of Section 26, T.3N., R.1W**

- A. Request: Annexation of 123.28 acres of land with R-2 (11.91 acres), R-4 (89.55 acres) and R-8 (21.82 acres) zoning districts.
- B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 263 building lots, 33 common lots and one (1) other lot, which is a holding area for future re-subdivision, on 121.31 acres of land in the R-2, R-4 and R-8 zoning districts.

Seal: Now I would like to open the public hearing for Item No. H-2023-0055, for Burnside Ridge Estates and we will begin with the staff report.

Allen: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission. The first application before you tonight is a request for annexation and zoning and a preliminary plat. This site consists of 121.31 acres of land. It's zoned RUT in Ada county and is generally located southwest of the West Victory Road and South Linder Road intersection. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation is low density residential on the eastern 41 acre portion and medium density residential on the western 80 acre proportion of the site. The applicant is requesting annexation of 123.2 acres of land with R-2 zoning, which consists of 11.9 acres, R-4 zoning, which consists of 89.55 acres and R-8 zoning which consists of 21.82 acres as shown on the zoning exhibit before you for the development 263 building lots. One of the five existing homes is proposed to remain on a lot in the subdivision at the northeast corner of the site and that is on this lot right here. The other existing homes will be removed prior to development of the phase in which they are located. The low density R-2 zoning and medium low density R-4 zoning is proposed around the perimeter of the development as a transition to rural residential properties in the county and the medium density R-8 zoning is proposed internal to the development. An overall gross density at 2.62 units per acre is proposed for the subdivision. Low density residential future land use map designation allows residential development of three or fewer units per acre, while the medium density residential designation allows three to eight dwelling units per acre. As is the gross density of the low density designated areas 2.81 units per acre, which is consistent with the desired density. The density of the medium density designated areas is 2.27 units per acre with the conceptual lots in the holding area, which is slightly below the desired density. The Comprehensive Plan allows for adjacent abutting future land use map designations when appropriate and approved as part of the public hearing with the land development application to be used with the some caveats. The applicant proposes to use the abutting low density designation to the west and the low density designation on the eastern portion of this site toward a portion of the medium density designated area on this property as shown on the exhibit there on the left. With the proposed application of the low density designation the gross density of the low density designated area, including a holding area, is 2.4 units per acre and the gross density of the remaining medium density designated area is 2.64 units per acre,

which rounds up to three units per acre and is consistent with the desired density for both designations. Staff is supportive of the applicant's proposal for decreased density in the areas proposed as it allows for larger half acre abutting the west boundary, the subdivision adjacent to large rural agricultural lots in Stetson Estates Subdivision for a good transition in density as desired in the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed preliminary plat consists of 263 building lots, 33 common lots and one other lot, which is a holding area for future resubdivision and that holding area is located at the southwest corner of the site here. Two collector streets are proposed in accord with the master street map. One is a north-south street from Victory and that is this one right here if you see my cursor and the other is the east-west collector street along the southern boundary of the site. These are proposed in accord with the master street map. Average lot sizes are as follows: Half acre lots in the R-2 zone, quarter acre lots in the R-4 zone and .17 acre lots in the R-8 zone. The subdivision is proposed to develop in four phases as shown on the phasing plan on the right. The first phase located on the northeast portion of the site includes the northern portion of the north-south collector street and access on Victory Road and a local street access Linder Road. This phase is proposed to integrate all of the street buffer improvements including sidewalks along Victory and Linder Roads. The second phase is located on the northwest portion of the site and includes the southern portion of the collector street. The third phase is located along the southeast portion of the site and includes the east-west collector street access from Linder Road. The fourth phase is the Kelly property is located along the east side of the development between phases one and three and fronts on Linder Road and that is this area right here. Staff is recommending the phasing plan is revised to include the holding area lot in phase three and, again, that's this area right here. Currently the phasing plan excluded -- excluded this area and is not included with any of the phases proposed. Again the holding area located at the southwest corner of the site is not currently serviceable by city sewer and won't be for quite some time and so a temporary lift station on Ten Mile and a 15 inch trunk line for the lift station is constructed. At staff's request a concept plan was submitted for that area as shown, showing how the future development will integrate with this development. A total of 40 building lots are shown in that area, with the extension of local and collector streets. Again, none of these improvements will be made with the subdivision. That will simply be included as one large lot for future resubdivision in the future. The existing Jackson home that is proposed to remain is required to connect to city sewer and water service, take access internally from within the subdivision and change their address and, again, is this house here at the northeast corner. This lot here fronting on Linder. The property owner at 3801 South Linder Road Colleen Kelly -- again that's this area right here requests Council approval to remain on well and septic until her property redevelops with phase four and utilities will not be accessible until at a minimum phase three. Retention of her existing access from Linder Road is also requested until such time as the property redevelops. She is amenable to installation of the Linder Road street buffer and frontage improvements, except for the area where her driveway is located, including sidewalk being installed on her property in the interim. There are five existing driveways from Linder Road and four on Victory Road that will be closed with development of the proposed subdivision. A new north-south collector street South Farm Road Avenue, is proposed from Victory Road, which will extend to the southern boundary of the site with the development of the holding area. The right of way for this street should extend to the

east property line on the northern portion of the site as required by ACHD for future access to the collector street for the Coleman property and that is this area right here. A new east-west collector street, East Holstein Drive, is proposed from Linder Road along the southern boundary of the site, which will extend to the west property boundary with development of the holding area. Another local street access, Pivot Drive, is proposed from Linder Road to north of the collector street. Internal local public streets are proposed for access within the development. The development is required to comply with the subdivision design and improvement standards in the UDC. There are four block spaces that exceed the maximum block face standard. The plat should be revised to comply or request for Council waivers to the standard to be submitted prior to the Council hearing for Council's consideration. A 25 foot wide street buffer is required along Victory and Linder Roads, both arterial streets and a 20 foot wide buffer is required along internal collector street, landscaped in accord with UDC standards. Staff is recommending as a provision of a development agreement that ten foot wide detached sidewalks are provided along all collector and arterial streets within and abutting the site for public safety. The pathways master plan depicts a ten foot wide pathway along the internal collector streets and along the north side of the Calkins Lateral. Based on the area of each zone, excluding the holding area, a minimum of 12.59 acres of qualified open space is required to be provided with the development. The open space exhibit submitted by the applicant is 11.53 acres, which is 1.06 acres below the required amount. Some of the areas included are considered remnant areas and don't qualify, while other areas, such as the parkways aren't counted, but could qualify if they meet the required standards. The Calkins Lateral easement also doesn't qualify if the lateral is piped as proposed and isn't landscaped, but could qualify as linear open space if it's left open within the water -- with the waterway as an amenity and ten foot wide buffer is provided for active access along the waterway. Staff is recommending that the open space exhibit is revised prior to the Council hearing to comply with the minimum standards. An abundance of site amenities are proposed exceeding UDC standards by more than double. Based on the development area, excluding the holding area, a minimum of 25 amenity points are required to be provided, some from each category. A total of 42 points are proposed, which consist of a clubhouse, commercial outdoor kitchen, outdoor fire range, public art, two picnic areas and a fitness court from the quality of life category. A swimming pool and spa, tot lot and two sports courts, pickle ball, from the recreation activity area category, 1.25, approximately, miles of multi-use pathway from the pedestrian and bicycle circulation category and a bicycle repair station from the multi-model category. A holding area will be required to comply with the minimum UDC standards for common area -- common open space and site amenities with resubdivision. Staff recommends as a development agreement permission that the use of common open space and site amenities is shared throughout the development area between the holding area and the development proposed with this application. The Williams Northwest Gas Pipeline crosses the northeast corner of the site on the Jackson property within a 75 foot wide easement. The Calkins Lateral crosses the southwest portion of the site within a 60 foot wide federal easement 30 feet each side of the centerline and that is this green area right here, which is a little misrepresented, because the border -- Boise Project Board of Control will not allow any landscaping at all within their easement, so that will not be green space. The Boise Project Board has agreed to a lesser width of 40 feet on the easement

if the lateral is piped as proposed, but will not, as I stated, allow any improvements or landscaping within their easement, other than gravel. The Givens Lateral is piped and runs off site along the west boundary of the site. A seven foot wide easement exists on this property, which is supposed to run along the rear of abutting building lots. The board will not allow the easement to be located on building lots, therefore, the plat will need to be revised to include this area in a common lot to be maintained by the homeowners association. Conceptual building elevations were submitted as shown for the proposed one and two story single family residential detached dwellings and two different barn style concept elevations were submitted for the clubhouse as shown. The architectural style of the homes will be a mix of contemporary forms and modern farmhouse styles. Building materials range from stone to stucco and board and batten siding with natural colors. Home sizes are planned to be 2,200 square feet or larger, similar to home in surrounding development. Become homes on lots that face collector streets, Farmyard Avenue and Holstein Drive, an arterial street, Victory and Linder Roads, will be highly visible, staff is recommending the rear and/or sides to two story homes on these lots incorporate articulation through changes in two or more of the following: Modulation. For example, projections, recesses, setbacks and pop outs, bays, banding, porches, balconies, material types or other integrated architectural elements to break up monotonous wall planes and roof lines that are visible from the public street. There has been no written testimony submitted on this application. Staff is recommending approval with the requirement of a development agreement per the conditions in the staff report. The applicant is here tonight to present. Thank you.

Seal: Thank you very much, Sonya. Would the applicant like to come forward. Good evening.

Clark: And hi, neighbor. I think -- I think this is the first time I have been here for Brian to be on the commission stage. Welcome. So, my name is -- as some of you know is Hethe Clark. 251 East Front Street in Boise, representing the applicant. I think this application is actually in pretty good shape and so I'm going to kind of fly through some elements of it and highlight a few other elements of it, but we are largely in agreement with staff. As you heard there is a few items that need to be tweaked and one of those is that Calkins Lateral open space strategy, because that will answer the -- the overall open space question, so -- but I will show you what I mean by that as we go through the presentation. So, again, annexation, development agreement and pre-plat are what before -- before you. Some of you might recall this. It's got a bit of a history to it. This -- this was originally applied for back in 2021. Came before this Planning and Zoning Commission, got a unanimous recommendation of approval, then, we went to the City Council and ran into a situation where Council made some policy decisions as to whether they wanted to grow into that area or not, as -- if you are aware there was a reconsideration submitted and, you know, we think that Council maybe didn't take into account all of the facts with regard to what utilities and things were available at the time. But since then -- it's been a couple of years -- development has continued in that area and we think that this is appropriate to be back and forth in front of everyone. So, the project is on 121 acres. I just wanted to kind of remind everybody where we are located. It's got great access to freeway interchanges. It's right in the -- in the line of development as you are working

from east to west coming from the city. Adjacent developments. There is significant development all around it. We are against the city limits. We are within the area of city impact. As you can see Kuna is kind of sneaking up on us there on the south. There are large county parcels on our west and north and, again, city development on the east. Kind of wanted to emphasize this as well. So, it's an area that is ready for development. The square mile immediately to the east has been entitled and is under construction. The Windrow project that some of you might remember came before you just a couple of months ago, is that R-8 property that's down on the south here, if I can make the mouse work. So, that has completed the entire block face of Linder there in terms of entitlement and so this is certainly ready to move on to development further west. There were a number of opportunities and constraints. Sonya mentioned some of it. You have got the fuel pipeline on the northeast. You have the Calkins Lateral and the Givens Laterals. We identified a path forward with regard to Ms. Kelly's home and we will talk about that here in a little bit. And we are providing density that bridges between the more dense development on the east that's coming from the city and less dense development on the west that's already occurred in the county. So, this is just to kind of emphasize the locations of that pipeline and the lateral. So, this is where things are a little interesting and you saw that with the map that Sonya showed you guys about -- and with the land use designations and how they needed to be interpreted. So, as you can see here the property has a low density residential side of it and a medium density residential side of it, but what made that a little bit challenging is that the medium density side is on the outside, right, the area where you would think you would be going low. So, we had the low where we probably could have used some high and the high where we could probably have used some low and so we worked with staff, worked within the Comprehensive Plan to be able to use the -- slide those designations up to 50 percent in the medium density area and that way stay within the comp plan densities. But, again, we are -- we are within those comp plan densities and we are relatively low in order to be able to transition to the county lots on our west. Zoning as proposed is very consistent with what you see in the areas nearby with the R-4 or the R-8s and, then, it's been shown -- we have the R-2 on our west to help transition to the -- to the neighboring lots. So, again, this is an overview. As Sonya mentioned, gross density of 2.6 dwelling units per acre and 11.8 percent open space. This is a close up on the zoning, but I want -- I did want to emphasize that holding area. So, that holding area includes 21.05 acres. The -- that is an area that we had originally actually planned to leave out of the application and the reason for that is because it can't currently be served; right? So, we didn't want to have a suggestion that there is a portion of the property that can't be served so, therefore, it's not ready for annexation. Discussed that. You know, have a good relationship with staff. Discussed it with Bill. Staff's strong preference was that we actually bring it in now, even though it's not ready to be -- not eligible for sewer service and the reason for that is that staff did not want that area to somehow potentially become an enclave in the county if it didn't ultimately develop. So, we went ahead and did that, but just want to emphasize that holding area is not going to develop until the services are available. We included it because staff asked us to. I -- I don't know if this is a record, but it's pretty high to be able to close nine existing driveways and replace them with just the three is -- pretty is pretty great for area traffic safety. Obviously, every time there is a driveway there is a potential for conflict. We are making the expected improvements on Linder and Victory, so you will

have the green space and the 25 foot landscape buffers. The turn lanes will be provided and, then, internal to the project we will have the -- the type of traffic calming that you would expect. So, open space. So, our regional pathways are being provided in the locations that the path -- parks and pathways folks have requested. So, that's on Linder. It's up on Victory. It's along our internal collectors and it's along the Calkins Lateral. With regard to open space, as I mentioned, we are going to continue to work with staff to get more of the project qualified. And just to kind of add a little bit more of a gloss to that, so Boise Project has actually become more restrictive on what you can do in their -- in their easements than they even were before and they have taken the position that you really can only do gravel within their easement at this point. You used to be able to do some turf and some shrubs. It's gravel lonely. So, we are looking at two alternatives. One would be leave the lateral open. That means the 60 foot space. And, then, you have got the 20 foot buffer and, then, whatever additional you need in order to make it work. So, you could be looking at 90 feet at that point, which to us is a pretty big constraint on the project. We also discussed with Boise Project -- and I think this is the way we are going to go, is it if you pipe it they will reduce the easement to 40 feet and, then, you can put your pathway just outside that 40 feet, so we have ten feet for the pathway and, then, five feet for landscape and what we would like to do is work with staff to come up with a solution on that that would allow us to qualify a chunk of that as qualified open space. That would, according to my very non-engineer and non-surveyor calculations should make up for the deficit, because it's about a half to two-thirds of a mile that that Calkins Lateral covers and if we can qualify the pathway and the landscape areas we should get pretty darn close. But that's -- I think you have got a condition language right now that works to allow us to -- to get that sorted out with staff. Okay. So, the amenities. This is a standout element of the project. So, I have done -- you couldn't tell by my hairline, but I have been doing this for about 20 years and I have done a few large planned communities around the Treasure Valley. Planned communities are a different animal than a regular subdivision. Some of you might be familiar with them. But with -- with planned communities one of the things you have to do is this placemaking exercise and to show that there is areas internal to the project where people want to gather and they want to do things and so, you know, Harris Ranch is a project that I worked on Dry Creek and I have got another one going in Elmore county where we have these talent centers that we have designed, but you don't see that on regular subdivisions; right? That is one of the things that I think is really cool about this project is that there really is that level of placemaking here with the tribute to the farm heritage of the property and the attempts to reuse the farm implements and the architecture and the construction and so you have got these gardens and you have got fields and open spaces to bring everyone together at the center of the project and as Sonya mentioned, they more than double the number of amenity points that are required with this one, which is pretty remarkable. This is -- just kind of built on that, this -- the idea is to retain that legacy of the family farm, so a lot of these pieces would be reused within the project. The picnic shelter concepts are also, you know, a tribute to that agricultural heritage. The clubhouse concepts that you have already seen, you know, kind of that barn look to them and, you know, an entry monument concept that actually contributes to the placemaking as well, that provides not just a generic, you know, typical subdivision monument sign, but something that ties the project together and gives you a sense of place as you are driving into the project. With the

home designs you have seen, you know, we anticipate contemporary and modern farmhouse. Let's talk a little bit about utilities and this was to my point earlier about the prior application. I think it's important to just remember that the project has been planned and it has -- there is -- there are utilities at the project. The utilities were brought there as part of the -- the sewer concept planning that was done in connection with the large 1,500 acre annexation that the city did a few years ago and that sewer is there. Public Works - you can see their -- their review there down on the left saying that sewer is available at the site. You can see the manhole locations on the bottom right. Domestic water is the same. It's there. You can see the -- the -- the hydrant locations on both Victory and Linder on the bottom right as well. So, let me wrap this up. So, as we were looking at the project, again, there were a number of competing goals that we needed to emphasize. You know, one is we have got the county lots on the west side. We have got the city lots on the east side. We have got medium density residential designations on our west where we would like lower and we have got low density residential on our east where we would like higher and we have figured out a way to be the bridge from the more dense city development to the less dense county development. There are no traffic issues that have been identified by ACHD. We agree with their report and, again, we think we have worked within the Comprehensive Plan to bridge the gap between these various densities. So, in terms of our homework, you know, we see is we need to go work with staff to qualify an additional acre of open space and, then, we need to work with staff on the block face questions that they raised and the amenity designed around your irrigation facilities. Again, the Calkins -- Calkins Lateral pathway. But we are in agreement with the -- all of the remaining conditions, with just one tweak that I will mention, but these are some of the things that have been addressed, including the addition of the VRT bus stop. We are adding a multi-modal amenity, which, you know, in the larger concept in this project with the number of amenities we have provided, you know, a bike repair stand or something like that is not that big of a deal, but something that certainly helps and so we would ask for your recommendation of approval, but the one tweak I would ask for -- and this is more of an imposition -- not imposition -- limitation on us I would say, but I really want to emphasize this point that the -- the holding area can't develop until those utilities are in place and so I didn't want to have any confusion with the prior condition where it said that it would be included in the third phase of development. I didn't want anyone to read that and think that it's going to be developed with the third phase and so my suggestion was to just say that it will be part of the recorded development agreement, platted as a mega lot when the adjoining areas of the project are subdivided and that it would only be developed when municipal services are available on the site and I can leave this up for commission's use. So, with that I have talked a bit, so I'm happy to answer any questions that the Commission might have.

Seal: Thank you very much. Taking notes. For certain. I will -- I have a question to start off with here and that is the -- the timing between when -- when you think you will be to that fourth phase -- or third phase, fourth phase of the subdivision and when basically city services are going to be available to that area. Would -- what's the timing on that or what's the gap in timing that you project?

Clark: Yeah. Commissioner Seal, it's anticipated overall about a five year build out. So, call it three and a half to four years, something in that range sounds about right. And then -- so, that -- I think you may be focusing on the house that's down there and whether it's going to have access to services or anything like that in the meantime. So, we have the condition that allows it to stay on -- on well and septic, but that house is anticipated that it would likely go away. So, that's more of a temporary condition, which is being accounted for with the condition of approval.

Seal: Yeah. And that's -- that was my next question. But you -- you kind of answered it and I -- I'm kind of thinking on that one -- I understand why staff wants that -- that holding area included in -- in a phase, just so it doesn't get left out. But the house, in my mind, kind of fits that same stage, where I would kind of like to see that come in third -- in the third phase instead. I understand, you know, why you would want to keep that as long as you can, but at some point -- let's -- you know, let's tear the band aid off and get it done. So, I think that it would be more appropriate in the sooner stage than a later stage, but others can chime in on that if they want to.

Clark: And, Mr. Chair, I would just say that the timing for that -- you notice that it's a pretty small phase. The idea with that is to give that homeowner as much time as possible, you know, so she's not sucked into her prior larger phase and leaving all that prematurely. I don't know if that's the right word --

Seal: Right.

Clark: -- but that's the idea is to try to accommodate that homeowner.

Seal: Okay. Understood. But it's -- if the property is sold as part of this -- I mean you kind of got to go along with what -- we have to do what's right for the city, not for the individual. That's -- that's my only point in that. I do have question -- I'm going to take up a lot of time here. The windmill -- is it a working windmill? Does it provide power?

Clark: Mr. Chair, we are not sure if it's a working windmill or if it will provide power, but as long as it's structural -- so, I don't anticipate -- let me put it this way. I don't think that there are plans in place to have it connect to anything and actually powering it, it was more of a cosmetic thing, but that's certainly something we could look into.

Seal: Okay. And, then, on the -- basically the ditch that runs through there -- is the reasoning behind piping it just purely space? I mean is that -- that's kind of what I'm understanding, is it's just a -- it's just a space issue.

Clark: That's a major constraint. Yeah. Because if -- if you pipe it the easement goes to 40 feet. If you leave it open at 60, but, then, anything you need to do for the city goes on top of that 60, so you have, essentially, lost a row of homes at that point if you do that.

Seal: Yeah. Okay. My memory of this is that it's -- there is a significant pitch to the property, too, especially as you get higher on it, but is -- is there room in there to kind of push that space into the holding area to accommodate that space? And the reason --

you know, it's kind of known that I ride bikes and I like to ride bikes in Meridian, so the questions that I'm asking here -- because this sets the precedent for what's going to be done. So, whoever connects on either end of that is also going to do the same thing more than likely. So, I just -- I'm a fan of, you know, having that space open and having a pathway that goes along it. One of my favorite places to ride in Meridian is in between Ten -- Ten Mile and Linder between McMillan and Ustick. There is a -- there is a pathway there that wouldn't be like this if you did it that way, you left it open. They allowed landscape to happen in there, so I understand that that's one of the drawbacks of it is how do you beautify it if you can't put grass and shrubs on there, so -- but, anyway, just -- I'm a little bit concerned about that. I would like to hear a little bit more about it, you know, maybe some ideas around what might be able to happen in there to accommodate it to be more of a -- you know, more of something that's really an integral piece to it, instead of something we have to work around.

Clark: Yeah. Mr. Chair, so there is -- I guess I have a couple of thoughts on that. So, the -- the width of the pathway itself is going to be the ten foot pathway regardless of whether it's a tiled lateral or an open lateral. Really what we are talking about is the area that you have to keep open subject to the easement. So, it may feel more open, but it's the difference between 20 from centerline or 30 from centerline and so, you know, in our view -- and, again, we are -- we are open to recommendations from the Commission, because, as I said, this is something that we need to have additional conversations with Phil about, but with a 20 foot from centerline open space -- open area, 40 feet total, then a ten foot pathway, then five feet of landscaping, I don't think it's going to feel constrained at all for cyclists and like if you went down to -- on the -- in the Windrow project they had a portion that stayed open and, then, they had a portion that was tiled and that one it was more -- based on the geography and how to could work there. So, definitely there are practical considerations to -- to our preference currently to pipe the ditch, but I don't think it's going to feel like a closed chute. You know, it's going to feel fairly -- it's going to feel pretty wide open still. It's a shame that we can't work with Boise Project to allow for more landscaping, because the other issue that it does for us is because we can't do any of the landscaping we have a much harder time getting it qualified as open space, which means we have to provide that somewhere else.

Seal: Right.

Clark: So, that basically takes that open space, makes it something that we can't benefit from on the entitlement side and, then, we have to push density out elsewhere and we are already very low on -- on the density side right now. So, the losing lots pushes us outside of compliance with the comp plan. That was a bit ramby, but those are my thoughts.

Seal: I appreciate the feedback and I understand that we are right there. Got some limitations. So, we don't want to take anything away from that for certain, so -- commissioners, anyone?

Smith: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Smith, go ahead.

Smith: Yes. Just briefly. And I appreciate the -- the dueling kind of priorities that you have. You have just mentioned loss of density on the open space side of things. One thing just curious is whether it's been considered of actually -- and you have some areas that are lower than target density. Maybe slightly increasing density there to free -- you know, by shrinking lot sizes some to kind of claw back that open space. Has there been kind of some discussion of that possibly to maybe -- two birds one stone a little bit?

Clark: Commissioner Smith, so there is, like you said, competing motivations here. You know, we -- we feel like we are making a commitment to -- to the neighbors to try to keep those lots as big as possible. So, half acre lots within the city on city services is a pretty rare thing and you have to push the density up in the rest of the project to be able to be economical for the city to serve it, because half acre lots are not economical for the city. So, you know, I have looked at it from that perspective. We have also looked at it from the perspective of -- if I look at that open space map and I know what I still need to make up and I look at that Calkins Lateral is none of it being qualified right now, I see all of the delta being made up there as soon as we can figure out a solution with staff on that and so that's where our focus has been has been trying to figure out how to get that Calkins area qualified, because I think that helps us more than shrinking up lots against the neighbors.

Smith: All right. Thank you.

Clark: Yeah.

Seal: Commissioners, anything else?

Sandoval: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Go ahead, Commissioner Sandoval.

Sandoval: So, June 2022, you were denied by City Council.

Clark: Uh-huh.

Sandoval: So, other than the holding area -- and you had a seven -- around a seven and a half percent decrease, what burden is less impact on the city, I guess, where -- where is that? If we are going to go forward, I mean --

Clark: So, again, the decision to annex is a City Council decision and it's a policy-based decision and back when that decision was made there was two items that were cited. And, again, this came through P&Z with a full recommendation for approval and had a staff recommendation for approval. Council suggested during the hearing that utilities were not available and that this was not part of the priority growth map, which if you have

been around long enough you saw it circulated through the halls of the city, but it was never adopted. It -- the version that was referred to during the hearing was not -- did not reflect the current reality at the time. So, for example, it didn't have the new fire station, didn't show the new sewer shed, didn't show new development in the area. We requested reconsideration and we weren't able to get it back in front of them. So, in this case what we have done is we waited it out, we -- you know, two years have gone by, there has been an additional development immediately adjacent to us that has been approved that has -- you know, just like our application has shown no negative impact on the city, both in terms of traffic or the ability to serve with utilities. So, I -- Commissioner Sandoval, I guess I would say that I was confused by the Council's decision before, but we are pretty confident that with an additional two years and with the development immediately to the east and, then, showing, again, that the capacity is there -- and, you know, something I can't emphasize enough is that the city has actually invested in utilities to serve this area specifically. So, the city -- when we -- we did the big 1,500 acre annexation a few years ago, the city invested in running sewer and water lines out to this area and so to say we are not going to use that investment to me is a difficult thing to understand as well. So, I can't put myself -- I don't think I can actually say that I agree with the decision before, but I do think the circumstances have changed a bit and I think that if you look at the evidence that the factors for annexation are all satisfied given the services are there it is contiguous and the -- and there are no negative impacts.

Sandoval: Thank you. Is this an inappropriate time to ask the staff questions to --

Seal: No. Feel free. Go right ahead.

Sandoval: Okay. So, my main concern here is you're -- you're asking that they put this holding area in phase three, which says they cannot develop phase four, basically, until they are waiting on city services, correct, to be delivered? Is that not accurate?

Allen: Commissioner Sandoval, that's not it at all. That -- that holding area is being plated as one large mega lot, which will be resubdivided in the future and that means that a new preliminary plat will be submitted in the future to resubdivide it in a final plat down the road when services are available. Staff is asking for that lot to be included in phase three, because the current phasing plan does not include it in any of the phases and what will happen if it's not included in a phasing plan is it will be left out of the overall subdivision. It will not be included as one large mega lot and it will create a remnant parcel, then, that's not part of the subdivision. So, that is why staff is asking for it to be included in phase three. There are no services to it. There are no lots platted in it. None of the construction drawings show services to it. They don't show roads through it. Anything. Staff is not in favor of the modification of a condition that's requested by the applicant for that reason. Does that answer your questions or do you need further clarification?

Sandoval: It does to an extent and I didn't look at the phasing map, because the line were -- a little dashed -- a little hard to read. So, why not in phase four? Is that section of the property getting developed before?

Allen: Phase four is not adjacent to the boundary if that --

Sandoval: Okay.

Allen: -- is why.

Sandoval: Okay. Thank you.

Allen: It needs to be contiguous.

Starman: Mr. Chairman, could I -- could I just ask to clarify -- I was going to ask this question when the time is appropriate and this might be a good time to ask, if you don't -- I want to clarify the --

Seal: Absolutely.

Starman: -- the request from the applicant -- from Mr. Clark, because I think -- I may not be tracking the language, but as I look at the phasing plan right now, phase two and phase three only are adjacent to the holding area. So, it seems like your language gets to the exact same spot as what the staff condition requires, just sort of words it differently, but what am I missing there, because I don't understand the distinction.

Clark: Mr. Chair, Attorney Starman, so the reason I laughed -- and I meant no insult. I hope you -- I hope you didn't take any. The reason I laughed is because my concern with the condition was that someone would ask that question, so -- because I read the condition as implying that there would -- that it was somehow tied in to the development of phase three; right? I don't want there to be any confusion over the fact that we don't think the holding area can develop right now and that we are including it only at staff's request and so that's why my -- the suggested change that I have put forward really -- it arrives at the same point when it comes to platting it as a mega lot, if that's what was intended, but I do want to emphasize it can't develop. We -- we have to wait until the utilities are available, so --

Starman: Mr. Chairman, just to clarify. Thank you, Mr. Clark. That's helpful. So, just to kind of reframe, I think that the language is similar and I understand Mr. Clark's point in finding great clarity relative to the holding area -- is what I thought -- as I understand the condition, both what staff is trying to accomplish and the applicant is -- with the way Mr. Clark proposed language when it says when the phases surrounding the holding area have been -- have been subdivided, the mega lot needs to be -- needs to be platted at that point as well and -- so, I think that really because the mega lot is only surrounded by phase two and phase three, that it would have to be platted at the time phase three is platted. Would you agree with that, Mr. Clark?

Clark: Yeah. I don't disagree with that.

Starman: So, I think you kind of get to the same spot, but I will leave it at that. I just wanted to clarify. So, I wasn't seeing the distinction other than I understand Mr. Clark's point relative to clarity on the holding area.

Seal: Yeah. And I will kind of go back to the -- I mean now that I understand phase four a little bit better, I mean I think if you just got rid of phase four and did phase three and did that all in the last one, then, this would probably be moot for the most part, so --

Clark: So, in other words, can -- that phase four would be consolidated into phase three?

Seal: Correct.

Clark: And, again, that would just move up that homeowners --

Seal: Correct.

Clark: Okay.

Seal: Again, that's -- I mean there is a whole lot of things going on that impact a whole lot of people and we are trying to protect one homeowner -- protect is probably not the right word, but, basically, give them an extended period of time to enjoy what they have on their property, which I completely understand, but at the same time you are going to sell it and you are going to do it, it's just part of the plan. So, let's not drag this on for everybody else would be my -- you know, that would be the point I would make in that. So, that's just creating a lot more -- a little bit more work for the folks to have to do in order to accommodate that when to me let's just make it part of phase three, plat the holding area and we are done.

Clark: Yeah. Mr. Chair, I -- you, know the -- the -- the burden of that, you know, really falls on the applicant. It's not really a city services, city issue from my perspective. It's -- it -- yeah, it would save the applicant some money to do it all at once, you know, but the applicant is trying to work with this neighbor to give them as much time as possible. So, that -- that's the reason it's being done that way.

Seal: Okay.

Lorcher: Mr. Chairman?

Seal: Commissioner Lorcher, go ahead.

Lorcher: Phase three and phase four, aren't we talking three to five years anyway though?

Clark: Between those phases?

Lorcher: I mean -- right. So, you want to give the homeowner in phase four as much time that they can enjoy their home, but phase one is going to be a construction site and since I currently live in the impact area of Highway 16 I completely understand having very large trucks making a lot of noise and dust on a consistent basis, so -- but I mean phase -- by the time you get to phase three you're looking at three -- like three years; right?

Clark: Something like that.

Lorcher: So, would phase four be any further out than three to five years anyway?

Clark: I -- it would probably -- it would -- advise that home -- homeowner probably six months to a year. Typically -- you know, the typical track is -- I mean you're probably not going to do a final phase of each -- a final plat of each phase all at once; right? Typically you are not going to go that big, because of surety and bonding requirements and, you know, financing and all that sort of thing. So, if you could run through final plats on these -- call it every six months, you know, then, it -- with a goal of an overall build out in five years, that buys that homeowner probably a year.

Lorcher: Did the applicant give the homeowner a specific time?

Clark: It -- there is not a specific time, no.

Lorcher: So, they didn't say, okay, ten years from now --

Clark: You're out.

Lorcher: -- you have to go.

Clark: Yeah. No.

Lorcher: But it's open ended.

Clark: Uh-huh.

Lorcher: Got you. Thank you.

Clark: Yeah.

Seal: Yeah. And I mean my only concern in this is just that that -- it drags on and on and on and on and on. You know what I mean? That's kind of -- you know, it creates -- you know, it creates the opportunity for that for certain. So, I think that's -- in my mind I would like to avoid that. That's -- that's my opinion on it. So, I do want to say, Commissioner Grace, you did want to speak earlier, so I just want to make sure we are not skipping over you.

Grace: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to get clarity on -- I appreciated Commissioner Sandoval's question, because it was sort of going to be one of my questions about the -- sort of what has changed since the last time a project was proposed and brought to City Council and you described some things and just to clarify, you're saying that sort of the growth in that area that you have described has happened since that time that the proposal came forward in 2021, '22?

Clark: Yeah. So, it's in '21 and '22 and Bill might be the best person to answer some of this, but -- if I can find a good map for you. Okay. So, since '21 and '22 you have seen additional development in that square mile between Linder and Meridian, including the project that is immediately across the street, which is the R-8 project below. In that '21 to '22 period the City Council has also extended the plat approvals for Brundage Estates, which is immediately across the street and the development and the construction during -- in that square mile has continued apace since then. So, in my view, yeah, there has been two more years, there has been -- several applications have been approved -- their applications have been extended. The utilities, again, are all there and they all -- and they were there at the time and there seems to have been some confusion when that decision was made as to whether they were available.

Grace: Thank you. And that's what I was looking for just to make -- to just confirm that was -- it wasn't already there when they were considering it at the time. These are new developments.

Clark: That's right.

Grace: Mr. Chairman, just a follow up if I could. The -- one of the things that we have talked about a lot is the transition to these -- sort of the other larger county areas and I noticed in the staff report there was a comment maybe that -- that this body, this Commission, should consider whether the surrounding neighbors and the public believe that that was an adequate transition and I just wondered if you had gotten any feedback from those -- you know, those neighbors about whether they thought that was, indeed, a solid transition?

Clark: Yeah. Commissioner Grace, you know, I wasn't at the -- at the neighborhood meeting. There are not -- there is not any written public testimony. I'm sure you will hear from some folks tonight as to -- as to what they think. In my experience, you know, everybody wants more -- you know, more open space and -- and fewer lots around them, so I expect that there would be some conversations about that, but to have, you know, these half acre lots on -- within the city and on city services, you know, responsibly it's hard to go much bigger than that and that's the way that we have kind of looked at it and, again, our densities are on -- very much on the low end for what the Comprehensive Plan calls for this area.

Grace: And about those densities, I just want to make sure I understand, what -- what you are saying is that in order to achieve a -- an average gross density that complies with the comp plan, you're saying you use parts of the low density --

Clark: Yes.

Grace: -- with the medium density. Was that what -- what was the --

Clark: Yeah. Let me show you. So, the Comprehensive Plan anticipates some flexibility when it comes to the way that it's to be interpreted and, essentially, what it says is that -- and I'm sorry, this is slow getting through here. Essentially what it says is that you are allowed to use adjacent com plan designations, so long as you don't go across an arterial or a collector and so long as you don't use up more than 50 percent of that designation's open space within the project -- the project; right? So, if you look here, here is -- sorry. The mouse is not being very friendly. And of course it's jumping that -- you can see the north-south collector there that's got blue on the right -- or teal on the right and purple on the left. So, we are able to pull the low density designation to the west up to that arterial -- or to that collector, but we also have low density on the other side that we can pull the other direction. So, essentially, what it does is as long as we keep 50 percent of the medium density residential area, then, we are still in compliance with the comp plan and ultimately it's -- it's -- you know, if a neighbor is concerned and wants to see density reduced what we have done is we have applied more low density residential to the project than what the Comprehensive Plan currently on its face would show.

Grace: Okay. Thank you. I appreciate that, because I was a little confused when I read it and then --

Clark: Yeah.

Grace: -- so I appreciate the clarity.

Clark: It -- it took us a minute to wrap our heads around it, too, so --

Grace: Thank you, Mr. Clark.

Smith: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Smith, go ahead.

Smith: So, now that you have gone all the way over here I will -- I have a question back on the phasing.

Clark: Oh. Sure.

Seal: Have him go to the very last slide in the --

Smith: On the opposite end of the -- for the staff or -- I don't know -- for Kurt -- is there anything in code or any kind of requirement for how long a phase can last in terms of -- I'm thinking it seems like to my mind we can include maybe some language to assure that that holding area would be platted, but with the understanding that it wouldn't be

developed. Is there anything that -- also with the phase four aspect, is there anything that prevents them from, you know, completing a portion of phase three and giving that homeowner as much time as possible within the phase or is there something that requires them to finish within say a two year time period or something?

Allen: Yes. Chairman, Commissioner Smith, there are -- there is a two limit -- a two year limit time that they have to obtain city engineer signature on the final plat. They can request an extension on that, but just to clarify, there -- there are no improvements, so -- and/or proposed or required in the holding area. So, there is -- there is nothing there for us to require them to develop.

Smith: So -- so, that two years, just to clarify -- it's been a long day -- that's on per phase --

Allen: It is. Yes.

Smith: Yes. Cool. Okay. Thank you.

Seal: Commissioners, anything else? All right. Thank you very much.

Parsons: Mr. Chair, before we turn it over to public testimony, I would also want to let the -- the Commission know that their phasing plan is off a little bit. I believe when I read the staff report they were going to do all of the street frontages with phase one. So, that -- that one graphic doesn't represent it going along with Linder Road, so I just wanted to point that out that there is a significant infrastructure investment there with phase one as well along the street frontages.

Seal: Okay. Thank you. Appreciate that input. All right. Thank you.

Clark: Thanks.

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

Lomeli: Mr. Chair, no one has signed up.

Seal: There -- there is just a bunch of people in here. Does anybody want to come up and testify? Come right up. Always love the public to come in and tell us what they think. Just need your name and address for the record, ma'am.

Connelly: Paula Connelly. And 3878 South Rustler Lane. Meridian. I have more clarification questions regarding the holding area. So, am I understanding that they have to come back in and have that area reapproved after it -- when they replat it?

Seal: Sonya, you want to put that into code ease.

Allen: Yes. Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission. Yes, that -- that area is being platted as one large mega lot right now. That's it. But no development can occur on that until services are available in the future and they come back in with a new subdivision plat for that area.

Connelly: Okay. So, it will actually be considered a second -- like a second subdivision that --

Allen: Yes. Yes.

Connelly: So, at that point what happens to density? Do they -- because it's a new subdivision do they have to start back over and it's medium density and they have no low density to switch it with and -- because the original back in 2001, that area extended the half acre lots. What are the chances that all changes, because this is approved and, then, they have to go back and replat that and, then, they are now required to do everything a subdivision does, such as another ten percent of open space and everything else and densities aren't met, so, then, those lots get lower and they are up against five and ten acre -- and that's the transition that they were trying to be respectful of.

Allen: Yeah. So, that's why staff asked them to submit this conceptual development plan that's before you here. We wanted to ensure that there wasn't a higher density developed on that site. The density that they are showing is consistent with the density that they are approved for this application and consistent with the --

Connelly: So, if this is approved and, then, that essentially --

Allen: They are tied to develop the property in general conformance with this conceptual development plan.

Connelly: Okay.

Allen: If anything, their lots could be possibly reduced if they have to add space for common open space, but it shouldn't be increased.

Connelly: Okay.

Seal: And we have seen this before and I'm glad the staff did this, because we have had applications come through where either as a conceptual plan wasn't submitted, you know, to something that would be an enclave or they are trying to, you know, have a real huge variance to what that would look like. So, this right here kind of helps to protect that. This is basically no way makes it to where this is what they are going to do and this is how they are going to do it, but it does keep the -- you know, basically the -- the essence of what they are asking them to do with, you know, the larger lots abutting the county land and things like that. So, it's --

Connelly: But the one thing that can change is they could be required to add in ten percent, which is going to take away from those lots then.

Seal: I don't know that that would happen, but -- you know. And that's -- I -- you know, trust me, as a citizen if I owned one of the lots next to this I would feel much better about them having to submit the -- the concept plan and, then, understanding the spirit of what the application is and what staff is requiring although. So, I can tell you that as a citizen, so -- I will take my chair hat off and just let you know that I have seen stuff like that happen before. This helps protect against that. It's nothing that binds them to have to do it exactly like this, but there is an understanding that goes along with this. It's kind of like intent language for -- when you read a legal document. So, I don't read legalese very well, but the intent documentation that goes along with it makes me go ah-ha.

Allen: Mr. Chair, if I could add to that as well. Their request for the low density residential future land use map designation to apply to this portion of the site also encompasses this area. So, they are required to develop with a density under three units per acre.

Seal: Thanks.

Connelly: Thank you.

Seal: Okay. All right. Thank you. Appreciate it. Anybody else? Ma'am, come on up. Good evening. I will need your name and address for the record, please.

Dille: I'm Darcie Dille and my address is 5205 North Sun Shimmer Way in Meridian, Idaho.

Seal: Okay. Can you hear that okay? Okay. Yep. Just wanted to make -- got to make sure we can hear you.

Dille: Sorry. So, I -- I'm from Meridian. I was born and raised here on Star Road. I attended Zion Elementary School when it was Zion Elementary School and attended Meridian Middle School and it -- before it burned down and, then, it was rebuilt. Graduated from Meridian High School. I'm a real estate professional at Keller Williams Real Estate, Boise, and I have been in this industry nearly eight years. I have known Dave my whole life. I grew up on Star Road. His backyard backed against mine and I asked him if I could sit next to him while he was working on developing this -- this project. Dave Young. So, I sat next to him in Kimley-Horn and I just observed and listened. At some point Dave asked if I would meet with the real -- or with the neighbors of this project and so for about six months we, members -- myself and members of my team and members of Dave's team met with all the neighbors that would meet with us and there were -- there were a lot of them, which was awesome. We met them in their homes. We sat at their kitchen tables. We walked their properties. They had conversations about the project. We showed them proposed site maps. We answered questions, discussed their lifestyles and ask them what was most important to them. We asked them what they wanted this community to look like. We asked about builder teams, who they wanted to see in there, what they wanted the homes to look like, what was important to them about

how the community was shaped and what it offered and we haven't heard from the neighbors in this area. Just one. But they are incredibly educated about the area in which they live. They know a lot of builder teams. I was pretty impressed with all of the -- all of the information that they knew about the valley, how it's growing and the process of development and in my time with this project Dave's done a really good job of keeping the neighbors in mind, while also adhering to the density requirements that the city has been asking -- asking them for. And the community itself is beautiful. So, I just wanted to share my thoughts on -- on Dave's commitment to the neighbors and listening to them and what they ultimately want this community to look like. I think he has been very respectful to what the neighbors are looking for and has tried to provide that.

Seal: Okay. Thank you very much. Appreciate that. Anybody else like to come up? Is there anybody online? I don't remember seeing anybody on there, but --

Lomeli: Mr. Chair, there are two attendees online, so do you want them to raise their hand if they would like to speak?

Seal: That's the attendees? If either one of you want to speak, please hit the raise hand button. Give you a second for that. One more time for anybody in here. Say going, going, gone. So, would the applicant like to come back up.

Clark: Mr. Chair, Hethe Clark. 251 East Front Street. And, you know, in terms of the conversation just now, I would agree with Sonya's comments about the application of the low density residential on the holding area. But, again, we can't develop that until the utilities are available. So, other than that I don't have any -- anymore to -- to add, unless there is questions from the Commission.

Seal: Commissioners, any final questions? Commissioner Smith, go ahead.

Smith: Mr. Chair. Yeah. So, just one thing before we close -- just to make sure I'm on the right page with -- with kind of what the discussion was had. Are there any -- and I know there is a preference for phase four to be separate and distinct to give that homeowner as much time. If we were to recommend the consolidation of phase four and phase three, are there any strong -- is there any strong opposition that you have or is that fine? Just would like to err on the side of giving --

Clark: We would like to give that homeowner more time. So, you know, there are hills to die on, but we would like to give that homeowner more time if it's possible, so -- but we - - you know, obviously, we would very much appreciate a positive recommendation and we always like to hear from the Planning and Zoning Commission what your thoughts are, you know, to be included in that recommendation and, then, we can take that to the Council and continue the conversation.

Seal: Anyone else? All right. Thanks very much. Appreciate it.

Clark: Thanks.

Seal: And with that I will take a motion.

Garrett: So moved.

Smith: Second.

Seal: Moved and seconded to close the public hearing for File No. H-2023-0055. All in favor, please, say aye. No nays, so we will close the public hearing.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Seal: Who would like to go first? Any at all?

Lorcher: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Lorcher, go right ahead.

Lorcher: It took me a minute to remember this, because 2021 was a little while back, but it all looks good and now that there are other subdivisions in the area, it fits even more, especially with the low density. I guess my only comment is -- and I know that there will be continued conversations over the Calkins Lateral. Your concept of field and meadows and gardens and barnyards and to tile in the -- the open space -- excuse me -- the -- the lateral seems to kind of go against that grain and I -- I understand that the space will be wide enough to go through, but -- and you will put landscaping in and what that means, but as a citizen of Meridian, as a commissioner, the more we are tiling in the -- the more we are taking the history of the farm that came with it in the first place and with you trying to honor the farm wise out there, to tile it in, I hope you can come up with a good solution to possibly keep -- if not all of it, some of it open. I know irrigation has a very definite way of how they want to do things and so they are difficult to work with and I respect that and I understand that, because water has been a big deal for a very long time, but I would say the only thing that I would like to see is as a -- as a Commissioner and as a citizen to see that -- that those laterals continue to stay open. Other than that the phasing and the holding area -- it all makes sense to me.

Seal: Okay.

Garrett: Yeah. I would like to comment.

Seal: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: I'm on the other side of that tiling. I come from another community where we had ditches and it was much better to have them piped than it was to leave them open from an efficiency standpoint and from an evaporation standpoint. So, the farmers actually appreciated the piping from a standpoint of having the irrigation canals running.

Seal: Okay. Anybody else? Commissioner Grace, go ahead.

Grace: Yeah. Mr. Chairman. Just a couple comments. I -- I appreciate the willingness to reach out to the neighbors and I appreciate the testimony of Darcie in her efforts. So, thank you for that. And I appreciate your willingness to work with the city on the open space area. I'm confident you will get that -- that sort of sorted out. I like the amenities. I like the number of amenities. It looks like it's double. I appreciate the sort of agricultural tribute and the transition from the -- the more city to the -- to the -- to the larger more expansive rural existing community and I am satisfied that -- with the responses about the situation -- the current situation in that region and the growth that's occurred and, hopefully, the circumstances have changed since the last time an applicant -- an application for this property came forward. With that said, I guess I -- the only thing I did not favor that the applicant has proposed is the -- is modifying the language. I think after this discussion I have learned a little bit about the importance of having that in phase three or even maybe -- the chairman proposed alternative of combining the last two phases. So, I don't -- I can't say that I'm in favor of that piece. I understand that might mean a little less time for that one existing homeowner, but, you know, everything we do here is a little bit of a trade-off. So, overall, I appreciate the work that's been put in and I like the -- I like the proposal. Those are my -- my thoughts on it.

Seal: Yeah. I will weigh in here. Lots of things about this that I like. I like the transition and density. I like the fact that it doesn't go from -- you know, directly from one to the other to the other, like, you know, it just -- like we had to do it that way. This just seems like it has a little bit more thought. Geography probably plays into that a lot. It seems like a lot of this is dictated by geography. I kind of like areas like that. You get out of the flat garage farms that are out there. The work on the -- the low density area against the large -- you know, the large county lots that are there and if that's -- you know, again, all of that is really great. I like the entrance off of Linder, how that looks, how it flows. That really creates something that can be expanded on when the property to the -- to the west develops. So, it kind of makes a little bit more grandiose kind of opening and flow to go through there. So, as far as the holding area, completely understand. I'm glad there is a concept plan that goes along with that, just kind of a further, you know, future reference, just this is kind of what we hope to make it look like. That helps kind of protect everybody involved and gives an idea of what that -- that may look like in the future when it does develop. So, I'm kind of with Commissioner Grace, I think that the wording that staff has is -- is appropriate, especially if we do consider, you know -- you know, a recommendation of having them combine phases three and four. So, you know, again, we have to consider the entire community, you know, and not just necessarily one person. I understand the one person is probably what helped make this all available, but at the same time it just seems like there is a lot of emphasis on that where combining those two is going to kind of make this a little bit easier proposition as we move forward -- or as it does move forward. I -- in the same position on the -- on the Calkins Lateral, I would like to see that done more naturally. There is an opportunity to do so. I understand it comes at a cost, you know, and -- you know, I don't want to impede anybody's ability to make some -- you know, make some money off of this, but at the same time it does -- that -- that sets the precedence for what everybody is going to do on the other side of it, so it would be nice to take the opportunity to do that. I would highly recommend that you go look at the pathway that is between Ten Mile and Meridian. It's beautiful. It is a piece of the

community over there and it is used by everyone. So, it just -- it just kind of elevates the property around it. It gives people a sense of community. You know, people are pretty protective of that area and the ducks over there. So, even riding a bike, you stop for ducks. People will let you know if you don't know for certain. So, it would be nice to see that -- in my mind it would be nice to see that left as part of the community. So, understanding that that may not be the way it rolls out. I think that's all I have on it. So, I -- you know, overall I think it's -- I think it's going to be a good addition to the city. So, I think it's well done. And I -- I love the amenities and the concepts on that. So, that's pretty amazing to me. So, I love the fact that you are going to take some existing material and really incorporate that into it. We had an application not too long ago that they were trying to figure out what to do with some historical buildings that were there and just trying to figure out how to even do anything with that delayed the application for a long time. So, the fact that you guys are doing that as -- on the front of this application is -- I think a great thing for the community.

Lorcher: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Lorcher, go ahead.

Lorcher: Just putting it out there. The Eggers dual silos are available to be moved to your --

Seal: There you go.

Lorcher: -- to stay in the City of Meridian, so -- we would -- we would love to see that not in an industrial park, but you already have silos there, you could put a beautiful -- and Corey -- whoever -- the developer is going to take it down for you, all you have to do is move it.

Seal: Bill has -- Bill has their number. Commissioner Smith, go right ahead.

Smith: Yeah. I'm just going to kind of echo pretty much everything that's been said. On the Calkins Lateral side I'm -- I'm pretty much as close to a fence sitter as you can get. I see the value on other side of things and I'm confident that you will work that out with staff and the language seems like it's fine and will enable that to happen. I think the one thing that -- the one thing that I think is kind of not fully buttoned up that -- but it seems like everyone's trending in the right direction, same -- or not right direction, but same direction is on that phase three, phase four. I agree with Mr. Chair, I would probably like to see them combined, but I don't know that it needs to be combined, depending on kind of where the rest of the Commission is at. But broadly I'm supportive of this, so I think that's just kind of the last thing that I would like to see -- don't know if we have some on. It seems like Commissioner Grace and you might be in favor of consolidating those, but don't know if anyone else has some takes.

Seal: Just -- and the nice thing about being on the Commission for that is we can set that as a recommendation if that's the way that the motion goes and City Council can say, no,

we are not going to do it that way. So, that's the good thing about it. I -- you know, generally speaking I just -- this is our way of just putting it on the record, but that might make -- might make the build out and the transition easier in the long run for the city as a whole, so -- but that's -- I don't get to make motions, so -- that's up to somebody else. Mr. Sandoval, go ahead.

Sandoval: Now that I understand the phasing it make sense and the fact that you reached out and you have so much involvement in the community, I can really appreciate that. The one thing I really was concerned about, you know, was the additional burden to the city services, which I'm sure you are as well. So, I really poured through all the material. I think you did a good job with the holding area, separating that. The only other thing I really saw was the response time from Fire was ten minutes, which is still within their 12 minute recommendation for aerial. Other than that I don't really see anything that's in conflict, so -- I do -- I do like the phasing plan the way it is, though, with the four.

Seal: Okay. Good. Everybody has spoken, so happy to take more conversation or a motion.

Lorcher: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Lorcher, go ahead.

Lorcher: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to City Council of File No. H-2023-0055 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of April 4th, 2024, with one modification, with the understanding that the holding area will not be developed until services are available.

Seal: I think that's already in the staff report. Are we okay with that? Okay. Do I have a second?

Smith: Second.

Seal: Just -- I guess I should probably read my notes here. It's been moved and seconded to approve File -- File No. H-2023-0055 with the aforementioned modification. All in favor, please, say aye. Opposed nay? Motion passes. Thank you very much.