

7. Public Hearing for Reveille Ridge Subdivision (H-2023-0050) by Bailey Engineering, generally located on the west side of S. Eagle Rd., approximately 1/2 mile south of E. Lake Hazel Rd.

- A. Request: Annexation of 59.97 acres of land with an R-8 (34.69 acres) and R-15 (25.28 acres) zoning districts.
- B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 247 building lots and 37 common lots on 59.77 acres of land in the R-8 and R-15 zoning districts.

Seal: All right. Finally get comfortable, but not too comfortable. At this time I would like to open File No. H-2023-0050, Reveille Ridge Subdivision and we will begin with the staff report.

Allen: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission. The next applications before you tonight are a request for annexation and zoning and a preliminary plat. This site consists of 59.97 acres of land. It's currently zoned RUT in Ada county and it's located at 7355 South Eagle Road. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation for this property is low density residential on the eastern portion of the property. And that's approximately 31 acres of land. And medium density residential on the western portion of the land, which is approximately 28 acres. The low density residential designation allows densities of three or fewer units per acre and the medium density designation allows between three and eight dwelling units per acre. The applicant is proposing to annex 59.97 acres of land with R-8 zoning, which consists of 34.69 acres of land and R-15, which consists of 25.28 acres of land for the development of a residential subdivision. A mix of dwelling types are proposed consisting of 170 single family residential detached homes, 14 single family residential attached homes and 62 townhome units. The gross density is 4.13 units per acre overall and, then, broken down that's 2.96 units per acre in the low density residential designated area and 5.3 units per acre in the medium density residential designated area and that is consistent with the underlying future land use map designation. And note just -- I saw some -- several comments in the written testimony tonight and I just wanted to clarify that the density is no longer associated with zoning districts in the Unified Development Code. That did change back in 2017. The future land use map designations in the Comprehensive Plan dictate the density of each residential land use designation and no changes are proposed to the future land use map with this application. There is an existing home and accessory structures on this site that will be removed with development. A driveway exists from Eagle Road that will be replaced with a public collector street. Discovery Park, a 75 acre city park, exists to the west of this site. ACHD's master street map depicts two collector streets across this property. One from the southern boundary -- along the southern boundary, excuse me, and one along the western boundary of the site. Land transportation improvements in this area. Lake Hazel Road is scheduled to be widened to five lanes from Locust Grove to Eagle Road in 2024 and two five lanes from Eagle to Cloverdale in 2025. The intersection of Lake Hazel and Eagle Road is scheduled to be widened to five lanes on the north leg, four lanes on the south, four lanes on the east,

and three lanes on the west leg to be reconstructed in 2024. No improvements are planned to Eagle Road directly abutting the site. A preliminary plat is proposed as shown to subdivide the property consisting of 246 building lots and 38 common lots on 59.77 acres of land. The plat is proposed to develop in four phases as shown on the phasing plan on the right. The first phase is located along the southern boundary of the site and includes construction of all collector streets within the site. Second phase is in the northeast portion of the development. The third phase is centrally located and contains the pond and most of the common open space for the development, including the linear open space within the Williams Pipeline easement. The fourth phase is the northwest portion of the development. Staff is recommending that the phasing plan is revised to switch phases two and three, so that the open space is provided in an earlier phase for the enjoyment and use of the residents. Access is proposed via South Eagle Road with stub streets to adjacent properties for future extension and interconnectivity. Collector streets are proposed in accord with the master street map, along with local streets, alleys and a common driveway for internal access. A 25 foot wide street buffer is required along Eagle Road, an arterial street, and 20 foot wide buffers are required along collector streets, landscaped in accord with UDC standards. There is a large existing pond on the western portion of the site shown there on the plan before you that is proposed to remain as an amenity for the development. The Farr Lateral runs along the northern boundary of the eastern portion of the site within a 55 foot wide easement, 30 feet of which is on this site. The Williams Northwest Gas Pipeline bisects the site within a 75 foot wide easement. The applicant is requesting a waiver from Council to UDC 11-3A-6B-3A to allow the Farr Lateral to remain open as linear open space and not be piped. A six foot tall wrought iron fence is proposed adjacent to this southern boundary of the easement to preserve public safety. Common open space and amenities are proposed in accord with UDC standards. Based on the area of the site a minimum of 8.97 acres or 15 percent qualified open space is required. A total of 11.77 acres or 19.69 percent is proposed as shown on the common open space exhibit, consisting of open grassy areas of at least 5,000 square feet in area, linear open space, a pond with picnic areas and active and passive open space areas. A minimum of 12 site amenity points is required with at least one from each category. Twelve points are proposed, consisting of three picnic areas and a fitness course with six stations from the quality of life category. A half mile of multi-use pathways from the pedestrian amenities category along the Farr Lateral and along the Williams Pipeline easement. And a tot lot from the recreation activity category and a bike repair station from the multi-modal category. A six -- six foot wide pedestrian pathway is also proposed as an amenity within the common area around the pond. Staff is recommending a ten foot wide pathway proposed -- excuse me -- provided along TAPS for connection between the two multi- use pathway segments. So, real quick here are the -- the Farr Lateral is in this location right here, if you can see my cursor. This is one of the ten foot wide multi-use pathways along here. The other one is within the Williams Pipeline easement that bisects the middle of the site here and, then, the staff recommendation is to provide a ten foot wide multi-use pathway connection in between here. Several conceptual building elevations of one and two story single family residential detached, front-loaded and alley loaded. Single family attached and townhome dwellings, front loaded and alley loaded, were submitted as shown. Building materials consist of a variety of horizontal and vertical siding and stucco with stone and brick veneer accents.

Final design of the attached units and townhome units are required to comply with the design standards in the architectural standards manual. Written testimony was received from the applicant Kelly Black, Bailey Engineering. They are in agreement with the conditions in the staff report. And 15 letters of public testimony in opposition to the development were received and are included in the public record. Some of the reasons for opposition include the following: Opinion that the proposed density is too high. The proposed development will greatly overburden already overcrowded schools and area roadways and will negatively impact property values of existing homes. Staff is recommending approval of the proposal with the requirement of a development agreement per the provisions in the staff report. Staff will stand for any questions.

Seal: Thank you, Sonya. Would the applicant -- applicant like to come forward.

Garrett: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to recuse myself from this conversation.

Seal: All right. Thank you.

Garrett: My primary residence is very close to this.

Seal: Okay. Thank you very much.

Allen: Mr. Chair, can you give me just a moment here before we start the time --

Seal: Absolutely.

Allen: -- get the presentation up. There we go. Thank you.

Seal: Thank you.

Bailey: Thank you, Sonya, and thank you, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners. My name is David Bailey. Bailey Engineering. My office address is 1119 East 8th Street in Eagle. Representing Trilogy Development for the Reveille Subdivision and thanks to Sonya for being really complete on all that stuff and Kelly Black with our office has spent a lot of time working through any issues we might have had at this and so we are -- I will show you a presentation here, but we are really pleased to bring you a plan that meets all your codes, meets all your requirements and exceeds, you know, what we would expect to see with -- within a development of this size as far as the open space and product mix and we think it's just a really fantastic product to go in that area. So, as Sonya said, it's -- it's west of Eagle Road and south of Lake Hazel and the city park is just to the northwest -- actually, our -- our pathway doesn't quite reach it, but it will reach it through -- it -- we actually touch at the very northwest corner and there is a subdivision approved to the north for Brighton -- I think it's Brighton -- that will actually continue our pathway along the Farr Lateral to connect to the park also. So, we expect a lot of great connectivity to go in that area. The future land use map shows this as civic with the park, medium density residential on our west side and low density residential on the east portion, as Sonya pointed out. So, low density residential is a -- is kind of an enclave of that designation within the FLUM. So,

to the east of that is back to the medium density residential and to the south of that is as well. So, that's a piece that splits this in half. We were constrained by and met with the requirements of making sure that the development within the low density residential met the -- the requirements of that -- of the future land use map in that area. The pond in here -- this is the previous site of the -- of the Bogus Creek Outfitters and so it's a really nice pond, a really nice landscaping that we are going to retain quite a bit of and even make better and add more landscaping throughout the site and as Sonya pointed out, the -- the Williams Pipeline goes through the center, which is a restriction for us and we have got extra work to do to cross that. On the other hand, it provides a great central amenity and a great open space and Williams Pipeline does allow us to improve those with landscaping and pathways along them. So, it's a really great -- great amenity we can use in there. The zoning -- we are requesting for this site as -- as she said, R-8 and R-15 and the R-8 will be limited by -- in that northeast corner by our preliminary plat. So, we are proposing lots that are from R-2 in the northeast and -- and the north and the east on that side or actually meet R-2 dimensional standards, R-4 transition and, then, down into the R-8 as we get closer to the west here and then -- so, we are -- we are -- we really think that we have made, you know, some -- some great efforts to meet the future land use map, but also to buffer and provide this really gradual transition of -- of lot sizes from those larger R-2 lots to the north. So, we have matched them exactly on the R-2 -- R-2 dimensional standards, at least on the abutting lots up there that were separated by the Farr Lateral. A hundred single family -- 170 single family detached lots total, 62 townhomes centrally located, most of them around the pond -- or access to the park and the pond specifically. Now, 14 duettes, which are two unit townhomes on there and the total, as she said, of 4.12 units per acre on the project. That shows a little bit where they are laid out and where the single family versus the townhouses and that are set together. We are required on the site -- you know -- and it shows up on the -- on the map and we are following through with that -- to bring the collector street all the way through from the western end of this, connects to the park through this area and, then, connects us all the way to -- to Eagle Road through this area. So, we are building the majority of that. There is -- another developer is working on the portion to the south who would build a half -- a portion of half of it on the very south end there when they bring in their project on that end. And one of the conditions pointed out is that we continue this regional pathway that goes through the William Pipeline across that little section to the south of our collector street there, which we are happy to do there and that will connect into their -- their pathway as well. Amenities for the site. We do have the -- the picnic tables with the shelters. The fitness stations along that pathway there. We really think this is going to be a great walkable community. A tot lot in here and bike repair station. And, then, we are in agreement with the requirement to add the -- the multi-use pathway, the wider pathway along the Tap Street that connects the Williams Pipeline pathway to the Farr Lateral pathway at the north end and there is a comment in the staff report -- and I think we got it resolved about extending our pathway along the Farr Lateral and the first thing I would point out is that there is the easement for the Farr Lateral, 30 feet there. We provide an additional 20 feet outside of that, right, and so -- that our pathway is in and there would be actually an open fence on both sides of that adjacent to the Farr Lateral easement and, then, those lots would have an open fence adjacent to that pathway along there, too, to keep that open. Those lots along that area are fairly large, too. You know, those are

the R-2 side lots, so they are really -- really nice lots in that area. Several multi-use pathways and we talked about adding on there. I get ahead of myself here. Kelly's going to give me a hard time. Farr Lateral. And go back there. Go back. So, on the phasing plan we had originally planned to work over in this area. This first phase, you know, is the tough one for us, as we are building all the collector on the west side -- side and building the collector all the way through the site to connect to Eagle Road and we need that for -- and we are also bringing the sewer in from the west. So, we want to start in -- start in on that end. So, we were going to get across the Williams Lateral there and do some more lots in this phase two here. I understand the city's code requirement to make sure that our amenities are -- are not backloaded too far within the development and so the developer has agreed to the condition to swap phase two and three within the development here. To move those around. Meets the objectives of the Comprehensive Plan, as Sonya pointed out. We have a variety of housing types in here. The neighborhood connectivity, through connected pathways, which we think we do a great job of in this -- in this here. Timeline on a build out for this would be in the range of -- you know, we will get through the process, we might be building the first phase in 2025 and, then, we usually do a phase every year and a half to two years moving through that -- that area there. So, we are looking at a 2031 possible build out on this if everything went right, subject to market demand, of course. We provided some elevations for the buildings in here and we do understand that the -- while the single family houses -- homes don't undergo design review, all of the duettes and attached housing need to go through design review with the -- with the city, as well at the CZC after that. Anyways, they have to go to design review if they are attached units. And that's all I have. I would be glad to stand for any questions you may have.

Seal: Thank you. Commissioners, do you have any questions for the applicant?

Smith: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Mr. Smith, go ahead.

Smith: Just to confirm I think I saw on the last slide -- you don't have any issue with any of the conditions in the staff report?

Bailey: We do not.

Smith: Thank you.

Seal: Okay. All right. I will just have you sit down, because we are pretty sure there is -
- I'm pretty sure that people in the room are here for something and this is the last application, so --

Lomeli: Mr. Chair, Dave White I have signed up.

Seal: For anybody coming up to testify, we will need your name and address for the record when you -- before you start.

White: I'm Dave White. I live at 2884 East Darcy Drive in The Keep that's north of the subdivision. We have lived in either Century Farm or The Keep for the last three years and it's been a challenge moving in and out of south Meridian. Obviously, we know that, you know, development is a part of -- of living here and we love it. My -- our only request really was on the densities. I don't know -- based on my research it seems like it fits within what the staff is recommending that our infrastructure in this area, even with the widening and everything that's going on, it seems like when one road opens another closes and so it's really challenging for us. We also have a lot of kids that live in all these neighborhoods and we just want to make sure that we are not putting too much density all collected around, you know, this intersection, so specifically from a traffic and safety perspective. So, that's my -- that's my thoughts.

Seal: Thank you, sir.

Lomeli: Mr. Chair, the next person I have on my list is Jeff Lucky.

Lucky: Mr. Chairman, Council Members, my name is Jeff Lucky. I'm currently residing at 4355 South Langdon Avenue in Meridian. I sent a letter. I don't know if you had the chance to read it. If you want a feel good you might, because I complimented you significantly in there for what I see is people embracing the vision and values of the community for growth and frankly think you have done a very nice job. I purchased a plot of land at The Keep three years ago. I waited to begin building until just recently. I made the decision. I saved up all my pennies and I decided that I could afford to live in a low density housing community and I made that decision on the data that I read from June of 2022, which showed the land here in question as low and medium density. So, that's why I'm standing here. I am seeing what I believe in that vicinity -- what I think -- and I'm not an expert -- a -- a disproportionate amount of medium to high and high density approvals for -- for zoning, but I'm not challenging that, because I actually think you are doing a wonderful job in managing the growth of the community. What I am challenging is the concept of annexing further and, then, compression -- compressing what was already color coded as low and medium housing and making it something different. I started researching this when I heard this was coming about and for the life of me I cannot find anything that talks to growth of Eagle Road south of the intersection at Lake Hazel. The intersection coming. The feeders going all the way down to Locust Grove and the other way -- all of that is -- you know, huge roundabouts looking fantastic, but you take one step south of Lake Hazel on Eagle and all you see is a sidewalk for The Keep across the street -- if you step off the road you are going into the ditch and I mean you are going down. You go up a little further you have got Sky Break -- I'm going to round up to 300 or so homes in there and, then, you go down further, you go past the church that's there and, then, you get to some properties that this property that we are here in question kind of wraps around and my question is was there a study done for traffic improvement that would support five seven -- one thousand doors in that short vicinity along Eagle Avenue? And if there hasn't been a traffic and safety impact study -- I would first ask why, but I would also caution you to think about it, because I am trying to figure out how a child gets on a bicycle and goes down the road towards the intersection of Lake Hazel. Now, it may

not be this developer's problem, but it's somebody's problem and the safety of the children is paramount. So, growth is one thing and challenging the rate of growth, but you have to do what you have to do. I would ask you to take pause and think really hard about annexing compressing without something factual about the safety of the roads right outside the property.

Seal: Okay. Go ahead.

Lomeli: Mr. Chair, those were the two that we had called marked that they wished to testify. The others on the list did not mark that they wished to testify.

Seal: Who would also like to testify? Just have to raise your hand. Come on up, sir.

Miller: My name is Brian Miller. I live at 6876 South Pemberley Place and my -- my house essentially backs up -- I think we saw it in one of the pictures that was up, so -- so, I -- I appreciate that you have been willing to take the comments on this subdivision. I'm here to express my -- my position that this should not be approved at the current density that the developer is talking about. Many organizations in our communities make their plans around our future land use plan that has been in place now for several years. When the plan -- as we have talked about roads before, it's simply the rebuilding the Eagle and Lake Hazel Subdivision -- or intersection right now based on what was probably what they thought would be the use going south. If you are in any of those subs -- any of our other organizations who are also making plans around that, could probably reasonably expect that land to have had 80 to a hundred houses on it based on that designation and now it's over 250 is the proposal. I mean that's a massive expansion. If we were to consider for the schools, for instance, right now Mountain View and -- and Victory Middle School have the highest attendance in the -- in the West Ada School District. This is an area in which I'm not sure if the developers contemplated which school will these -- the subdivision would attend, because the school district boundary cuts the -- the development essentially by about one-third into Kuna and about two-thirds into West Ada. Kuna is so overcrowded they can't pass a bond. They are bursting at the seams. They have been asking for developers to contribute at least 3,200 dollars per house to the building fund, so that they can help contribute to new schools, because they can't fit anymore students in. Meridian Fire Department in their comments on this very subdivision pointed out that there was risks associated with it, that they can't meet the current response times, that they don't have water rescue. There is both a canal and a pond has been pointed out in this subdivision, yet many of these kinds of concerns could simply be allayed by reducing the density. By reducing the number of people in that area we reduce the risks of needs for the fire, for water rescue, we can reduce the need to have additional buses on roads and additional schools being built. I'm not saying that subdivisions should not be built, simply that the density is too high. All of these answers -- all of these entities in our neighborhood and our communities have planned on being able to build around this. I would like to point out that in -- as -- in the proposal Bailey Engineering offers no compelling reason why they should go to high density, simply that they would like to build a lot of houses. They don't say that there is any benefit. They point out things that there are connectivity and -- and amenities, but all those could be

done with low density housing as well. There is no compelling reason to do this, except for the developer's profit. I mean there is people here today in this meeting who have made their decisions, who have made their plans, in addition to all these organizations in our community. Those should matter more than developer's profits. It's nice to see them want to turn a profit. I'm sure they can on a medium and low density housing. There is no reason -- Bailey has nothing that says, yes, this fits and that's all I really have to say.

Seal: Thank you very much, sir. Appreciate that. Anybody else? Sir, come on up. Good evening.

Langston: Good evening. My name is Jarron Langston. 6865 South Pemberley Place. Meridian, Idaho. 83642. So, I know a lot of you guys. I was a developer of The Keep Subdivision and so I get all the feedback -- the colorful feedback. I think really the biggest concern for -- for the residents in my community there is really, obviously, the density. We have talked about safety. You know, I'm currently in the process of developing another phase of The Keep, which will be on the west side of The Keep phase one and when I had my neighborhood meeting with the residents there I kind of proposed a more medium density of development, of which, you know, they kind of -- the neighbor came to me and said, hey, we are nervous about the kids, we are nervous about safety or we are nervous about what this could potentially do to our property values. Is there any way you could do something similar to what you did with The Keep, you know. So, me, just like Bailey Engineers and their -- and their developer you want to be profitable. So, I went back to the drawing board, looked at, okay, what do I need to do and I went from 38 lots to 22, which is where I'm currently at, and so I think a lot of the concern here is that transition; right? They said that, yes, they have met the designation for the R-2 zoning - - or the size requirements. The average lot size in The Keep was 33,000 square feet per lot. The smallest lot in the community was 24,000 -- just over 24,000. Their biggest lot that's neighboring The Keep is about 12,500 maybe on average. So, I think if there was a transition of one to one at a minimum I think that would appease a lot of feelings within our community, especially for those residents that -- I know the Smiths that have a five acre parcel to the west and so do the Wilkins, who is a deputy for Ada county, and they have got, you know, now -- I don't even know. It's larger lots, you know, upwards of five or -- five to ten lots per their five acres, which, again, you don't expect a one to one maybe on the five acres, but, again, I think that transition -- if it could be a little bit healthier, a little bit larger would -- would appease a lot of problems and -- yeah, I think that's everything I would like to share. Thank you.

Seal: Thank you. Appreciate that. So, anybody else? Sir, come on up.

C.Smith: Craig Smith. I have the property at 7191 South Eagle Road, which directly borders the east portion of this -- this proposed development. I'm under construction right now and it just -- I echo what everyone else has said and it just -- I have five children and this is my forever home. I have five acres right here. I bought it. I paid a premium, because I thought that this was going to be low density, and it scares me for one thing to know that this road right in front of my house -- I think -- I mean like most of this community is going to be passing right by my property with my five kids. I also wish that right here

where they have got -- it looks like about five dwellings per acre butting up against my property and the Wilkins just south of me, which are both five acre parcels, which there is no intent of ever putting any more homes on those parcels. That would just make a huge difference to me if -- if it just wasn't such a -- like they made concession to The Keep, but I even have a larger -- I mean I have got five acres there and we have got all these homes butting right up against us and I just -- it just makes me really sad to see that after what I have tried to create for my family. That's all I have.

Seal: Okay. Thank you, sir. Is there anybody else who would like to come up and testify? Ma'am, come on up.

C.Miller: Commissioners, my name is Carrie Miller. I live at 6876 Pemberley Place in The Keep. Maybe I'm a little too close to that. I just, first of all, want to thank you for being here and letting us talk to you. A little bit of my background. I grew up on a farm and my dad raised cattle and he had 10,000 acres of land and there was a spot on his farm where there was a preexisting pond that he asked that he could build a reservoir and that was to irrigate some of our crops and it was already on our property and in our thoughts it was going to provide more places for wildlife to be. However, it was denied for my dad and at the time I thought how could it be denied? And now I live in The Keep and my house butts up to this subdivision that is being proposed and if you had gone to the subdivision is this -- this -- this area behind our house, it is beautiful. The pond that they already pointed out and the big trees -- huge trees that are going to be cut down that are mature and absolutely gorgeous area. I'm not proposing that we don't have a subdivision, I am proposing that the subdivision that they are asking for isn't at all what we said that we were going to have when we first moved into this property. We have lived in Boise for 18 years and 17 of those years we have been saving to build our forever home and right now when we decided to build that place we were told that this was going to be completely different than what is being proposed and I feel like that some of that should be respected, some of those feelings and concerns that we have for those of us that have saved for a very long time to be able to build our forever homes. Thank you.

Seal: Thank you, ma'am. Anybody else like to come up? Going once, going twice. Oh, sir. Come on up. Give us your name -- name and address and ask for whatever you would like.

Pond: Matthew Pond. I live at 2865 East Wickham Court in Meridian in The Keep. Is there a picture of -- that's panned out with the -- the -- like the satellite view?

Seal: I don't know.

Pond: I thought I saw one that kind of showed the proposal with the other neighborhoods. Yeah. If we can kind of look at that and kind of toggle back and forth between that plat plan -- because the thing we were talking about -- they, you know, talking as everybody else has said -- and I honestly haven't spoken at a city council meeting since I was 12 years old for my Boy Scout award -- Boy Scout merit badge, so if we can look at The Keep plan, that -- that satellite view and we are talking about that transition. If we look

here we have -- I count the two five acre properties, low density residential, plus one, two -- what is that four lots there in The Keep, zoned at the R-2 low -- low density residential and if we fast forward, the transition to the plat plan, looking at just that one area there is now where there were four lots we have one, two, three, four, five, six, seven -- at least eight lots I'm looking at, without looking at it there. So, I think a lot of people say -- and I'm just going to reiterate it again to beat that dead horse, you know, that transition -- it may be meeting the overall letter of the law, but definitely not the spirit of the law as far as, you know, that low density, the transition. You take away that little bit of a green space in the middle and you just kind of cover up like this, we are not meeting any of it. So, that the transition from what The Keep -- as true low density residential with four lots in that area, up to whatever it was, eight or nine, I think that transition point is kind of what we are focusing on and kind of emphasizing. Thank you.

Seal: Thank you. Appreciate it. Anyone else? Okay. I will take a motion to close the public hearing.

Smith: So moved.

Lorcher: Second.

Seal: Wait. Would the applicant like to come back up? Sorry. It's not that we are getting tired of you.

Bailey: I would be. I get tired of myself sometimes. David Bailey again with Bailey Engineering. Sure appreciate the comments of the neighbors on this and -- and I sure get their concerns, you know, with the project. I guess -- I guess I would start with, you know, when we talk about traffic on this thing is that -- of course you guys and the highway district and everybody, you have done these -- these studies on these, you know, and we do the -- we do the capital improvement plan every -- like every six years. I have participated in three of them over 15 years and we take the city's comp plans first and we take the city's Comprehensive Plan and we decide how many lots are going to be in a particular area, going to impact the roads, and we build a model, which costs a lot of money to build that model and go through and plan these roads way into the future. What's going to happen. Then that boils down to a five year plan and, then, down to an individual plan. So, the improvements that you are seeing being built just to the north of this have been on the books for 20 years and they are -- they -- they come forward, because the model gives impact fees for the lots based on -- it calculates the impact fees based on the cost of the improvements that we are going to have to build when they are built. So, it's a responsive model that we have in the highway district and the cities and they all participate in this responsive model. As we build these we will provide the money to build the roads adjacent to them. In addition for every single project we do that has more than a hundred lots and this clearly does, you know, we provide an individual traffic study that takes into account all of that traffic information, projects that are in the process and have been approved, recent traffic studies and look at whether this is appropriate and it looks at improvements to not only within the site, but all of the major roads around and all of the intersections within a scoping area that they provide at the beginning. So,

there is a lot of homework that goes into the traffic for these and one of the issues of this is that that collector street that we built through this whole project benefits everybody in the area. Benefits the projects to the west. There is an L&R project to the west which is -- which is, you know, connected in here, which will connect this street through to Eagle Road. Provides this mid mile collector. Provides fire access. Provides emergency services access and access for people to get to where they want to go, whether it's Meridian Road or Eagle Road in this area. So, you know, the traffic planning really -- really does get a lot of thought and I know I'm preaching to the choir here, but, you know, I guess when we get the questions asked and I get a podium to answer I'm like -- I think I feel a duty to do that. This -- this project has been accepted and reviewed by Ada County Highway District. They have provided as conditions of approval, which we have agreed to and we are going to meet all the requirements and pay the impact fees they require for this project. We do not have a concern with the roads not meeting the requirements or that the roads aren't going to be there and I get it, Eagle Road is a two lane road right now, you know, adjacent of this site, but probably by the time it's built out we are going to be seeing -- be seeing that -- those lanes built out there and keep our neighborhood safe. I guess kind of the same thing goes for Fire, you know, is that that the Fire Department has reviewed this, they have approved it, we got a recommendation of approval from your staff and they are going to be able to provide, safe, adequate fire service to this site and we are confident of that and if we can't at some point, then, the city stops us regardless of our approvals; right? That's necessary to do. As far as the density of the project, you know, haven't been involved in the process since we use the Comprehensive Plans to build the -- the model that we do for the -- for this area for everybody's planning. They usually use in the mid to upper ranges of the comprehensive designation; right? So, we are talking about three to the acre on the low density portion here, which wasn't even taken up by The Keep. Granted they got bigger lots, but that -- that -- that density of use here for the planning we have done has not been taken up within that area and in the medium density residential they are probably going to use about four to five to the acre when they do their traffic model for that -- that end of it. So, I would argue that the -- the density of this project has been included in the plans of not only the highway district, but of your Fire Department of your city Planning Department, your emergency services, you know, and the sewers -- certainly the sewer water departments have this plan to provide adequate services. Schools as well, although a little more disconnected from this, and certainly the city has the ability to deny an application of the -- if the schools don't have adequate capacity to handle this. But I haven't heard any of that and the schools have - - you know, have not said a comment that we can't serve the children in this community at this density. Comprehensive Plan is what it is. You folks create the Comprehensive Plan and their problem is not necessarily with this particular project, but their comments are about the density that's specified in the Comprehensive Plan and that's what we bring into you is something that is reasonable, has reasonable density transitions on it and provides the open space that you require and provides what we think is going to be a really nice community for these folks and will not negatively impact these neighbors. Large lots next to a five acre lot. That lot could develop into -- into R-4 for reasonably. It's in the -- it's in the low -- you know, you bring that -- bring that in here with an R-4 development on that, even though they don't intend to improve it, it's still eligible for that and so what should we say, well, we will make bigger lots if they want to reduce their

density in the future. It just doesn't work that way, you know, as we go along. We think we have provided a great transition across that Farr Lateral, so that these homes in this area will not impact them. We don't connect directly to their subdivision. Traffic won't go through there. Even pedestrian traffic from this development will not go through there, you know, and we have quite a bit of separation between those homes, which are on rather large lots to the nice homes that will be on -- on rather large lots adjacent to that, so -- now as far as a compelling reason, you know, we think this thing brings a lot of benefit to the people who live here and who will be members of the community and it brings a lot of benefit to the city as well. We get a pathway -- we get pathways in here. We get a collector street built through here. We get nice amenities in here. We get connections to your city park. We get connections between Eagle Road and Meridian Road and we just add to the character of the community, which is very consistent with your comp plan and the goals of that. The landscaping we are doing, everything we do within there is really consistent with building more of the Meridian you asked us to bring you, right, with your comp plan and your standards. So, that's how we got here. I hope I addressed stuff there. But if I didn't I would be glad to stand for any questions.

Seal: Okay. Thank you, David. Commissioners, questions, comment? Oh. Hold on. Hold on a second. Yeah. Generally we are not going to call you back up. So, if there is --

Starman: Mr. Chairman --

Seal: Go ahead.

Starman: Mr. Chairman, you can make a decision, but, you know, we can't have comment from the audience. We can't pick it up for the record. So, I think either you as a chair can make a decision to invite the gentleman back to the podium if you want. That would be atypical for probably not take testimony from -- from the audience, because we can't capture that for the record.

Seal: Understood. So, at this point I -- I -- and I can probably address some of that as we go into comments, so --

Smith: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Smith, go ahead.

Smith: I do have a question. So, I'm going to be completely honest, I think the western half of the project I love. I think it's great. And I think I'm close to the eastern half of -- the eastern half as well. I do -- I get some of the concerns about the transition and I know that you have done -- you have made efforts to kind of create a transitory space. Looking at kind of some of the numbers, what it looks like in that low density range, you are kind of pushing the upper end of the low density, but on the medium density area you are kind of right in the middle of what that allotted -- allotted space is, so with that kind of a consideration I am just curious, could you walk me through -- and you don't have to go

into detail -- but maybe how you arrived at like this level of -- this gradient I guess of increasing density as you get further west and south and why, just as an example. You don't have necessarily maybe larger lot sizes near the north, offset by maybe some townhomes mixed in at the bottom as to the transition, you know, in -- into that medium density, just -- could you walk me through kind of the decision making for this level of density at the very top and kind of a smoother transition versus maybe something that is -- starts a little bit less dense and, then, gets a little denser near the bottom. Does that make sense?

Bailey: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Smith, I want to make sure I understand your first -- your question first, is that I think you are asking should there be -- what was the thought process that went into making the transition? You had this specific level of density -- a specific level of transition and in my experience -- and I laid this out myself, so I'm the right one to talk to about this -- is that usually, you know, we will look at adjacent lots for transition purposes and your code doesn't specify -- there is no specific code for this. Am I wrong on that? Some consideration, but there is no dimensional -- dimensional said you have to meet two for one or anything like that. But we do understand those standards and historically, you know, Boise city used to have a two to one, Kuna used to have a two to one -- or one and a half to one -- or put a number on it: right? The City of Meridian code does not. But we still look at that when we do the transitions that we don't do more than two to one is usually kind of my rule and that's on the adjacent -- immediately adjacent lots; right? And a lot of times we will have requests to not do two stories on those, even if they are two stories on the ones next door and, you know, we often try not to follow those, because they don't make sense. The number -- the distance you are away when you are doing those transitions doesn't make sense, but we don't have that problem here. The other thing we will look to do is if we match the size of the minimum lot size in the zone for the adjacent lots, right, then that -- that -- that in our experience is a really great transition; right? So, I'm not even going two to one from the rezone. So, there could be a lot on that side that would be -- you know, that would be 12,500 square feet. If I meet that, you know, then, here -- and I'm -- we are asking for an R-8 zone, so, obviously, they could be a lot smaller within that, but we didn't think that would be appropriate. So, usually matching that zone minimum size is a really good transition, okay, in my experience, meaning less than two to one is acceptable, right, and, then, matching lot line for lot line if it's close is what I would really love to do in a lot of cases, but, you know, 24,000 square foot lots in here to match those one -- one per one on those lot lines or can I make these 90 feet deep, you know, and -- and 200 feet wide doesn't make any sense either. Matching those -- those one for one on there didn't make sense for this area and -- and for this builder; right? This builder building on a 24,000 square foot lot doesn't make any -- any sense for them. But we do want to provide a transition. What this also does -- it makes those lots really deep, so those houses are going to be closer to the road, you have big backyards, you have the pathway in between that, plus the Farr Lateral as separating view for those. So, that -- that's on the immediate adjacent stuff. When we have really large like five acre parcels in there we will say what could it be zoned to and we would match -- match that zone of what would be reasonable for them to develop. So, that's the east side is what we did here. And, then, we will usually do another tier of -- in between. So, we go from R-2 to R-4 size, which we did there.

Those are -- those are matching that size there and, then, we will move down into -- into the next zone from there. So, the R-8 below that. As far as -- you know, we certainly always want to maximize the density on the property without just overdoing it; right? I mean that's just our job is -- is to see that. That provides homes for people at the prices that makes sense for them to buy it at, you know, so all that goes down the road as doing that. So, the reason we didn't provide more there -- and we just pushed against that -- against that three to the acre limit, you know, but we made sure that we were under that and that we weren't violating any requirements and we think this is a really great transition, you know, for those neighbors there. I can't ask them to agree with me on that. But in my experience -- and a lot of lots I have done this is a really good transition. Thank you.

Seal: Other questions?

Lorcher: Mr. Chair, I have a question.

Seal: Commissioner Lorcher.

Lorcher: When there is -- in regard to transitions from R-2, is there anything in code that says it needs to go to R-4 before it goes to R-8 or is it -- or is there some -- because there is a lateral in between it doesn't -- it's not considered adjacent?

Allen: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Lorcher, Commissioners, there is nothing in the code that requires a transition. There are policies in the Comprehensive Plan and goals so far is transition, but there is nothing specific.

Lorcher: So, it's really up to the discretion of the developer?

Allen: And the -- and the approval body. Yeah. Commission and Council as well.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Allen: Thank you. This is an annexation, so you could require, you know, a greater transition if you would like.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you.

Smith: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: I do have one other question I just remembered. I know there was some discussion about trees and maybe some older growth trees. I don't know the specifics of the trees in that location, but have there been any -- is there any discussion or consideration on your end about opportunities to kind of maintain some of those trees where possible or to, you know, transition them somewhere else, you know, rather than cutting them down? Just curious about any of those thoughts or discussions.

Bailey: So, we have had a lot of discussion about that -- that, obviously, and our plan here is to -- you know, to keep some of those around the park, you know, in areas where we can around the area there where we can keep them, but in addition to that, you know, we have a landscape plan that meets the city's requirements for the preliminary plat, but you do have a landscape ordinance specifically and a -- and a city arborist and the requirement in the condition of approval that we provide all of the mitigation required for all of the trees that are there and so we will follow that plan or landscape architecture will be that and they will be counted -- they will be counted as we go along to provide that mitigation and as we understand there is going to be some mitigation required -- off site probably even, because we probably don't have the room to do it all -- all we need to do here, so -- but we are fully prepared to meet the city's code requirements, you know, and to go through that and meet that.

Smith: Thank you.

Seal: Any other questions? Thank you very much.

Bailey: Thank you very much.

Seal: With that I will take a motion to close the public hearing for File H-2023-0050 for Reveille River Subdivision.

Smith: So moved.

Lorcher: Second.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded to close public hearing for File No. H-2023-0050. All in favor, please, say aye. Opposed nay? The public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Seal: I will jump in on this and try and address both sides of it. So, first off I will just address the school. So, my -- my least favorite issue and the thing that I disagree with probably the most adamantly is how the cities do business. So, their models are you -- if you build it we will -- we will come. You know, that's how they fund this. That's how they build these. That's why the schools get super overcrowded and, then, they build a new school and, then, they are not overcrowded and, then, they build in -- you know. And, then, they get overcrowded -- so I mean it just -- that's just the way they operate and to me that's frustrating. So, it's gotten to the point in Meridian where they don't even submit a report anymore, because it was just -- it was -- it provides no value. Basically they can't say they cannot service it. So, I recommend that you go to the school board for this and let them know that that's not okay, because to me it's not okay. It's why -- you know, my son attends a charter school, because the public schools just -- I have had other children that were in our public schools that went through this. Overcrowded, not overcrowded, overcrowded, not overcrowded as communities grow. So, I don't necessarily agree with

the model that they use for that. Unfortunately, it's the model that they use. You know, as far as the roads and just the way that I go about some of this stuff, because I think that the growth in Meridian -- in order to be responsible that we have to look for areas that we can pump the brakes, so schools are one of them. You know, if the school presents a really good case -- and, again, I have been doing this for six, seven years now. I have never had the school district present a good case as to why not to do this. They have always said yes. That's all they ever say. So, ACHD, they have submitted reports that show that the roadway systems are not going to support what's going in. Don't currently support it, won't support what's going in. Great reason to pump the brakes, you know, and we have. You know, we have recommended denial or denied applications that have come through on that. So, you know, we try to be mindful of that as -- as we move forward. Fortunately or unfortunately, this area looks really good as far as roadways. I mean the roads around this whole area are set to develop to accommodate all this traffic. That's not something we are used to. I live in the area of Black Cat and Ustick where those two roads intersect. Trust me, I feel your pain every time I have to go through that intersection. Before there was a stoplight in there it was -- it was almost impossible to take a left turn to go west on -- on Ustick. So, I completely understand what you are saying. But, again, this -- this area to me has developed better than a lot of places in the city. I started -- my first home was in Kuna, so I completely understand. You go south of Amity or other roads that are out there, yeah, there is not a lot -- there is not a lot out there, but I guarantee there will be. Last time I drove -- drove down Ten Mile Road out to Kuna I had to pull over, because I thought I was lost. I thought maybe they extended the road over the river or over the creek out there, because there was just so much development out there. I didn't even recognize it until I got to what's now the junior high. So, surprising amount of development that's happening out there. So, as far as the application itself, I do agree that the transition could be better, but it's really hard to make -- it's hard to develop a product at this stage of our growth and how much housing costs that's going to align correctly with that, you know, adequately. One to one is probably never going to happen. So, I mean the -- the idea that, you know, acre lot to five acre lots are going to be readily -- readily available in Meridian is probably a thing of the past, just because it's -- it's just so expensive to do that. You know, there is just so few people that can actually do that anymore. So, being responsible about the lot lines and having just the acknowledgement that two to one is really what we try to do and we really press hard on people to try to meet that requirement, try to align the lot -- you know, try to line things up as much as humanly possible. Where you do have yards that backup to each other, don't put windows on the second story, just things like that we have -- you know, we have been through this and we fight pretty hard for those things as they come through. This application, honestly, there is no shared driveways. You know, the transition to me looks like something that was very well thought out, because we get so many applications in here that are just cookie cutter and they are literally designed to cram a house on every square foot that they possibly can. They are pushing every -- every limit that they can on there as far as, you know, how many houses they can put in there. The least amount of amenities they can put in there. They don't want to put in ten foot pathways. They kind of argue everything as -- as it goes forward. This is not one of them. I mean they basically have a park in the middle of this thing. They are doing ten foot pathways. They are working with their neighbors to connect the ten foot pathways to provide safe connectivity

to the park system. So, speaking to the gentleman that has kids, this is going to help your kids safely get to the park. I mean this right here is golden to me. I -- where I live at there is a section that's between Liberty Road and Ten Mile Road that has this -- basically the same thing there. A ten foot pathway with little amenities along the way. Little tiny parks, little tiny tot lots and things like that there along the way. I can't describe how much better that makes the community to have that safe passage between two very very busy roads. Unfortunately, it just ends at Linder Road. It just comes out, spills on a road that has a lot of schools, doesn't go anywhere. So, we have a lot -- a lot more work to do. But things like this to me definitely do provide some of that safety that you are looking for for your children. So, you know, as I think about, you know, they are going to want to go to the park, what's the safest way to get there? You have a ten foot way -- you know, pathway in the middle of a giant green -- you know, green section that's going to get them there. So, that -- that helps. As far as the -- you know, the higher density housing that's out there, I also have a son that's -- you know, he is -- wants to stay in this community. Really really does. Has a great job. He is an engineer out at Micron. Got married and struggles to afford a house. You know, every time he thinks he's got 20 percent socked away he goes and tries to bid on a house and gets outbid by ten grand. It's tough. It's hard play. You know, he is a smart kid. He has done everything right. It's hard for him to live in the community. So, that's what this -- you know, a lot of this housing to me represents, you know, the -- the ability for somebody to have some affordable housing in there and there is all kinds of people that are going to be living in our communities. So, I live in a nice house on a nice size lot. I can appreciate the fact that not everybody can do that. So, I don't look at those -- you know, I don't look at people that can't live where I live or how I live is that they are going to lower my property values, so -- I haven't seen a property value in Meridian lower since I bought my house over a decade ago. So, they are still a pretty hot commodity. So, I -- there is not much that's going to drive down the value of property in -- in -- in Meridian at this point. I mean if -- if development stops, then, yeah, that will drive down the price of your house. So, anyway, I hate to get too preachy on this, but I really liked this application for a lot of the reasons that I just mentioned. I mean they are not using every square foot to try and cram everything in here. They are just doing a lot of things right here. So, to be honest, I wish more developers develop like this. So, that's all I got., So sorry to get a little preachy there.

Smith: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Go ahead.

Smith: I wanted to add some thoughts. I think you covered a lot well. As I may not look it, but as someone who has only been able to afford a home in the last couple of years despite the balding head and starting a young family, it's a -- I have been in the position that you are talking about of not being able to afford to live in your hometown and so I get that. I also get the concerns of -- you know, concerns around transitory -- your transition space and things like that, but I think you are spot on. I live in a spot near Settlers Park, but there is a development between and rather than an obstacle, that is the route we take, rather than walking down Meridian. It feels safer. It feels more pleasant. You can ride your bike down and not have to worry about constantly looking over your shoulder at

traffic, making sure that you are safe. One thing I wanted to add regarding this -- I think -- I agree that this is -- is developed really well relative to some other areas in the city. I would encourage you guys to look at the integrated five year work plan that -- that the city submits to ACHD every year. There are some areas that are not in very good shape, you know, on -- been on that list for a bit. But I think another thing that's helpful is with an integrated five year work plan it is -- it is rolling and so we are constantly looking five years out. I have the pleasure of sitting on the Transportation Commission as well and we just passed -- we just put to the City Council what we think should be in the integrated five year work plan and we are constantly tweaking that and making adjustments based on developments and changes to traffic patterns and things like that and working with staff to make the -- the asks that we make to ACHD -- or recommend City Council make to ACHD fit the neighborhood and I think one thing that we didn't mention that I really appreciate, especially given the -- some of the concerns is that phasing plan that we have an integrated five year work plan and that the phasing plan is six years long. I think there are some benefits there of being able to keep an eye on things and -- and monitor and by the time -- you know, if something happens in phase one of this development, by the time the rest of the development is complete there is potential to have addressed it in the -- in the five year work plan. So, I will stop myself from getting preachy, but I just -- I wanted to also just extend that as a resource to keep an eye on and if you have concerns there are other outlets to -- to bring them to -- you know, bring them to -- in the city and other commissions, to ACHD, and they are heard, they are, you know, worked on and they are addressed, so --

Seal: Commissioner Lorcher, anything?

Lorcher: Yes. Briefly, Mr. Chair. I was concerned about the one person who testified that there was a bait and switch, that they were told one thing and it became something else and I -- I think about the story that you tell about Rock Harbor Church on Chinden. It's right in front of Spur Wing Country -- Subdivision Country Club over there. Originally it was proposed to be storage units -- single story storage units and a person who lives in that subdivision said, you know, not in my neighborhood, it's not going to happen. So, they got the storage units out there that were going to be single story and, then, a three story Rock Harbor Church went right in front of her subdivision and, you know, blocked everything. And kind of channeling Commissioner Yearsley from years ago, we can only -- you can only control where you live and the surrounding areas around you, you know, we don't own and so if a developer comes in three years, five years down the line and fits the code, it's very difficult for us to say no, because it was already slated to be that way at the beginning. So, I don't like the transition between the lateral to the -- the lower density, you know, because they are R-2 and you are going straight to R-8, but I understand that it's everybody's backyard and there is a lateral and there is a pathway in between there, but I have a five acre parcel as well and I have the benefit of having five acre parcels behind me, so I don't -- I don't have to look at that; right? It's not going to be part of my vision and whereas you are going to be looking at your backyards and you are going to see, you know, these houses, whether they are one story or two. So, from a design standpoint of the subdivision I would love to see a little bit more less density just on that portion of it, but as residents of The Keep whatever that real estate person told

you what was going to happen, you know, may or may not have come to fruition, because they don't own it. It wasn't their development to be able to -- you know, to tell you and so it concerns me that if a person is telling you one thing and it turns out to be something else and they are not informed and that's -- that's a disservice to you as homeowners who are buying something that you think you are going to get and, then, all of a sudden, you know, it turns into something else. So, overall I do like the plan. I would like to see that transition a little bit less dense for those people who are in The Keep or whomever have those larger lots, because they talk about that to have that open space, but I agree with Commissioner Smith and you, Mr. Chair, that these pathways are actually a huge benefit to this community.

Seal: Thank you.

Sandoval: Mr. Chair, one thing --

Seal: Commissioner Sandoval, go right ahead.

Sandoval: Mr. Chair, I will be quick. I echo everyone's thoughts up here and I appreciate the testimony and concern. It does appear that it adheres to all the UDC and comp plan requirements and I think the distribution density is fair. That's all I have.

Seal: Thank you. Commissioner Smith?

Smith: Yes. Sorry about that. I do think from the question we asked the applicant and if -- so, if I'm incorrect someone please correct me. I do think that transition, just speaking to Commissioner Lorcher's comments -- like the zoning is R-8, but from what I understood based on the response is that it is -- the -- the density that they have allocated is as if it is the minimum R-2 lot size and, then, it steps to R-4 and, then, R-8 as it gets south -- and the applicant is nodding. So, I think that is the case. So, I do agree, you know, I do have is -- it is about two to one. If we can make it 1.5 to one or something, just a little bit nicer, that would be nice. But I personally don't have too -- like too much of a problem with it. I think doing that -- I don't even know what other trade-offs of it elsewhere in the development that would create and so I think to me this looks like a good development and I don't want to make the perfect be the enemy of the good I guess.

Seal: Anything else?

Lorcher: Mr. Chair. Is that something that the city -- when it goes to City Council for annexation, is that something that they would take up as well, the transition? Would they, you know, ask the developer to change -- instead of two to one to 1.5?

Seal: Yeah. I have -- I have been -- I mean just on this body alone I have been -- in annexation we have a lot more latitude to kind of make sure that it fits. So, as it's been -- you know, as I have been educated on it, so -- and I mean if you -- if that's something that you feel strongly about what I found is I would be careful about putting something in there that's too rigid as far as a recommendation. That said, you do have to spell it out

pretty well and, Kurt, if -- you know, if you want to add to that statement I just made I would appreciate it for sure.

Starman: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, I agree with that assessment. I think that with annexation you have some discretion and in particular the rules require in the best interest of the city gives you quite a bit of latitude. So, I think it's within your purview to -- to make a recommendation in that regard. So, if the Commission as a whole was inclined to do so, I think that would be appropriate to include it in -- in a motion or recommendation to Council.

Seal: Okay.

Lorcher: I mean I don't think I'm an expert on this, I just want it to be able to point out to the -- to the City Council that we have concerns about the transition. I don't know how to put that in a motion. You know, just be aware that, you know, we have concerns about the transition. I'm not -- I don't have any specific numbers, because I'm not qualified to do that.

Starman: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, I have two thoughts. One is I know for a fact that all of our Council Members review the minutes and/or video of your meetings, so just by having the discussion you had tonight I know that the Council Members will hear that discussion and we will take notes. So, that's a possible course of action. Secondly, if you want to sort of craft a motion that is recommending approval in accordance with the staff report, which the applicant has agreed to in terms of conditions and, then, add a supplemental thought or even a second motion that you would, you know -- I don't want to put words in your mouth, but something to the effect that you would recommend that Council take a closer look at the transition from, you know, The Keep to the northern portion of this particular subdivision. You can probably do it that way as well. So, I think -- but I will take -- you know, I said just a moment ago, I know the Council Members do read your minutes and/or watch your video, so I know they get the message regardless, but you could make it more explicit by taking that second alternative.

Seal: And in the past what we have done -- I mean, essentially, kind of makes -- you know, you get to make City Council -- and they are the decision makers and so I was -- I call them they are the bad guys; right? So -- but what -- what we have done in the past is basically just recommend that City Council, you know, review the transition for appropriateness, just something along those lines, so it's not so rigid that, you know, it's kind of out of our purview, but at the same time it's something that genuinely we know of just by, you know, reading of it that that's something that we want them to take a look at, because, again, I mean outside of that I mean I just -- I -- personally I have no issues with this -- with this development. So, are we ready for a motion?

Lorcher: All right. Mr. Chair?

Seal: Okay.

Lorcher: You might have -- you all might have to help me here, but I will give it a go. After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to City Council for File No. H-2023-0050 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of February 15th and ask that the City Council review the transition of R-2 to R-8 along the Farr Lateral between the two subdivisions as is -- as if to be in the best interest of the city. Is that right?

Seal: That was beautiful.

Lorcher: Okay. That's my motion.

Smith: Second.

Seal: Okay. It has been moved and seconded to recommend approval to City Council of File No. H-2023-0050, with the aforementioned modification. All in favor, please, say aye. Opposed nay? Motion passes. Thank you, everyone. Really appreciate your testimony there.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.