

Seal: Second.

Fitzgerald: I have a motion and a second to allow the withdrawal of the application for Tara's Landing, H-2020-0048. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion passes. Thank you for that.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

4. Public Hearing for Teakwood Place Subdivision (H-2020-0006) by Hesscomm Corp., Located at 1835 E. Victory Rd.

- A. Request: Annexation and Zoning of 7.35 acres of land with an R-8 zoning district.**
- B. Request: A Preliminary Plat consisting of 22 single-family residential lots and 4 common lots.**

Fitzgerald: So, moving on down the agenda, we will reopen the continued public hearing -- oh, the returned -- remanded, sorry, public hearing for Teakwood Place Subdivision, H-2020-0006, and I will hand it over to Joe for the staff report.

Dodson: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission. As noted, this project was remanded back to P&Z by the City Council on the August 25th hearing after your recommendation of denial. Since then they have made some revisions to the plat and I will make sure I highlight those, but just for our new commissioner and just so we are all on the same page, I will go over the whole thing quickly. This request before you is for annexation of seven -- actually, I apologize. Let me share my screen first. Here we go.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, Joe.

Dodson: Absolutely. It's for annexation of 7.35 acres of land, with a request for an R-8 zoning designation and a preliminary plat consisting of 22 building lots and four common lots. Of the 22 building lots one is reserved for the existing home that is to remain. The future land use for the site is medium density residential, which allows detached single family homes and requires a gross density reside between three to eight dwelling units per acre. The applicant's revised plat has a gross density of 2.99, which is rounded up to three, and complies with the comp plan. As noted there, is an existing home on the subject site and it's on the left part of the screen. It is intended to remain and reside on its own lot within the subdivision. This is a change from the very first time you guys heard this. In addition, some of the existing accessory structures on the property are proposed to remain as well. Current access to the property is via a driveway connection to East Victory Road and now the applicant is agreeing to close this access and comply with the UDC. Instead, the current residents will take access internally via the new driveway access, which is right here, to the extended local street East Fathom Street. The applicant is also proposing to construct an emergency access that connects from this new local street extension to Victory Road. Staff is recommending a conditional approval that this

emergency access be constructed prior to any certificate of occupancy and this also helps solve an issue for the Tradewinds Subdivision that technically does not meet fire code by only having one entrance and exit and having more than 30 dwellings. Parking for the development is required to be provided according to the standards listed in the UDC for detached single family homes based on the number of bedrooms per home. The proposed street sections are 33 feet wide with five foot attached sidewalks and will accommodate on-street parking where there are no fire hydrants or driveways. In addition, the applicant has proposed a cul-de-sac with a 57 foot radius, which is nine feet wider than the standard and, therefore, allows on-street parking along the perimeter of the cul-de-sac also where there are no driveways. In most cases a five foot wide detached sidewalk is required along the street frontage along Victory Road. However, because there is no sidewalk adjacent to the site on either side and this section of sidewalk would be less than 300 feet in length, the UDC allows for the sidewalk to be attached. The applicant has proposed to construct a seven foot attached sidewalk in line with ACHD requirements. This is one of the changes from previously. The sidewalk should be constructed within the required 25 foot landscape buffer along Victory Road. A 25 foot wide easement is depicted on the plat and per the UDC staff has given the applicant the option of placing the buffer within the easement as shown or revising the plat to add a common lot. The submitted landscape plans do not show the correct amount of vegetative ground cover and the existing trees that are to remain within the buffer are too close together to meet UDC requirements. Therefore, staff has recommended conditions of approval to correct these items and the applicant has agreed to that -- the main points with those regarding the spacing with the trees along Victory and also just the additional vegetative ground cover beyond just trees. So, shrubs and grass. Based on the proposed plat of 7.35 acres, a minimum of .74 acres of common open space should be provided. According to the open space exhibit, the applicant's proposing approximately 37,800 square feet of qualified open space, which is about 11.8 percent, which is an increase from the previous time you guys heard this. The open space consists of common lots and half of the landscape buffer to Victory Road. The largest area of open space is located at the southern end, as seen on the right hand of the screen, and is more than 20,000 square feet in size. To the north and across the cul-de-sac from this open space lot is the next largest open space and also contains the proposed amenity, which is here. A water feature with seating around it. This open space also has a micro path that continues north to the temporary cul-de-sac on the new east-west street in the center of the project, adding another pedestrian connection to the project. The applicant has submitted sample elevations of the single family homes for this project. The single family homes are depicted as mostly single story with structures -- with a variety of finished materials of stone, stucco, and lap siding. Some homes depict extra -- also depict extra large spaces for RV at home storage. All single family homes appear to meet the design architectural standards, but there are no conditions or requests to limit them to single story. I will go over quickly some of the main points from the written testimony that have -- there has only been one since the previous hearing, but it's still -- I know they are the same concerns. So, the additional traffic going through the subdivision -- the Tradewind Subdivision as that is their only access for Teakwood. The concerns of how drainage will be affected here and concern over the building height for those homes adjacent to the Tradewind Subdivision. Those have been reiterated by numerous

members of the public and I just wanted to go over those quickly. Staff does recommend approval of the requested annexation and preliminary plat and I will stand for questions.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, Joe. We appreciate it. Are there any questions for staff? Hearing none, is the applicant with us and would like to join us for -- either in person or on Zoom?

Weatherly: Mr. Chair, he is on Zoom. I'm transferring him over now.

Fitzgerald: Perfect. Commissioner Yearsley, I'm going to use you as my eyes when I need to survey the audience. I usually call on Commissioner Seal to do that job --

Yearsley: Okay.

Fitzgerald: -- but I got to start coming in person here soon. I'm being a slacker.

Weatherly: Mr. Lardie, you should have the ability to unmute yourself.

Lardie: Good evening, Mr. Chair, Commissioners. Dan Lardie. Leavitt and Associates. 1324 1st Street South, Nampa. Here -- here we are again. I just want to first make sure that I say thank you to staff and I also want to say thank you to City Council. They allowed us to come back and address your concerns and, hopefully, we can gain a recommendation for approval back to City Council and move ahead. So, with that I'm going to -- I'm going to share my screen. I think. See if I can get it pulled up. Okay. This -- this is a little cleaner copy of what was there. See if I can zoom in. There we go. So, some of the key points that I -- I don't want to reiterate the -- all of Joseph's staff report, because he did a -- he did a wonderful job. So, again, the access -- the homeowners have decided to go ahead and -- and -- and give up that access. We have got them to agree on that finally and we are providing access via the extension of Fathom Street at this location and we also have provided a connection through which -- was which -- which came up in our last Commission hearing about this particular open space and this turn around. Since we have the turn around, we provided it as open space to surround -- since it sounds like it's going to stay for a while and provide a -- a pathway connection and an amenity of some park benches and a pondless water feature to allow for some trickling water and some -- and some park benches there to relax and enjoy that -- that area. We still do have the enlarged -- or not the enlarged -- the enlarged cul-de-sac per the Fire Department's request and trying to meet the zoning commission's need for parking. We originally -- I think at one point in time we had some parking in the middle. The Fire Department said, no, they wouldn't allow the parking in the middle. They did allow us to go with a larger -- with a larger cul-de-sac. The -- the large area in the back -- the open space area -- it is in the back. It's at the end of the cul-de-sac where -- where we should allow for people to play or utilize the area fairly safely. It also provides a buffer for our change in zoning to our Tuscany neighbors and, lastly, the -- I just missed the sidewalk and we have proposed a sidewalk -- attached sidewalk along Victory. With that I hope we have addressed all your -- all your concerns from previous hearings and look forward to a recommendation of approval. With that I can stand for any questions.

Fitzgerald: Thank you, Mr. Lardie. I appreciate it. Are there questions for the applicant?

Yearsley: Mr. Chairman?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Yearsley, go right ahead.

Yearsley: So, Dan, this is Steven Yearsley. I -- looking at your photos for your homes I have concerns that you can actually -- can you actually fit those homes on your lots? You have got several lots that are very small and these homes that you are showing are very wide. I'm a little concerned about a bait and switch of homestyles.

Lardie: I believe -- make sure my -- I'm still unmuted. Okay. Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Yearsley, the homestyles that are there -- I believe they will fit. I don't have a footprint -- I didn't see the footprint exactly. I believe it can be done with these -- with these particular lot sizes. Again, our -- our goal is not to build something small or that it's not commensurate with the neighbors to our -- to our west and to ourselves.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Yearsley, do you have follow up, sir?

Yearsley: You know, I don't. And, you know, without -- without actually looking at how wide those are compared to the lots -- I just -- looking at the lot sizes they are fairly small and narrow and I just -- like I said, I have concerns, especially with -- they are showing a three car garage with some home frontage, those are typically fairly wide. So, I just have concerns, since I live out in that area and understand what the other adjacent neighbors are concerned about.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Lardie, do you have widths on these or width and depth, so we can -- I see one, it's 73 feet wide. Yeah. Go right ahead.

Lardie: Can I ask -- could I ask Joe to pull up his preliminary plat. I don't have it in my slide presentation here.

Fitzgerald: Absolutely.

Dodson: Thank you, Dan. I will go ahead and reshare my screen. I don't -- I don't think I can zoom in, unfortunately.

Lardie: Oh. Okay. I believe -- I believe that's a line of 64s on the -- on the west boundary right here and I think that is some of the -- some of the larger lots are back here, but I believe 64 is the running -- the running theme.

Yearsley: Thank you.

Fitzgerald: I will say, I -- I do appreciate your guys' efforts to kind of understand where we are coming from. There is two questions I have and I think you have addressed them, but just -- I think that Chief Bongiorno -- I think he expressed that he was okay with this,

but the -- the half cul-de-sac turnaround, the Snoopy if you will, that's a permanent lot; right? An unbuildable lot. So, when -- if and when that goes through that will become -- it will get torn out and become a common area; correct?

Lardie: Mr. Chairman, that is correct. Or it can remain. They can plant a basketball hoop. It's going to be curb, gutter, and sidewalk all the way to the boundary and so if they wanted to they could plant a basketball hoop there.

Fitzgerald: Okay. And my understanding also is that the emergency access that you have onto Victory, that's the only access this property will get to Victory; correct?

Lardie: Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

Fitzgerald: Any additional questions for Mr. Lardie?

Seal: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Seal, go right ahead.

Seal: Just quickly, because I couldn't find anything on the concerns on drainage. I'm sure that's probably something that's been touched on in the past, but I know it's still a concern. Is that something that can be -- that you can speak to a little bit -- the applicant can speak to just as far as concerns that are out there and how you plan on mitigating that?

Lardie: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Seal, so the site is -- I'm not exactly sure what the concerns were for the drainage. The site will drain and be collected in an underground storm drainage system. Actually, it will probably be a pond with a -- with a below surface infiltration window and it's been graded preliminarily to grade back to the end of the cul-de-sac into the open space. The lots in between -- all the lots will be graded prior to -- prior to construction of those sites -- or at least fine graded after the construction of those sites, but they will -- they should be graded to allow for drainage to be collected and not run off onto their neighbors.

Seal: Okay. Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Seal, if you have any water questions you can ask Commissioner Yearsley, because that's what he does for a living.

Seal: Excellent.

Fitzgerald: But I will say that one thing they do have to do is -- you have to keep your own drainage on your own property. That's one of the -- the storm drainage is one thing, but everyone else has to keep their -- they have to maintain their water on their own property. So, hopefully, that's -- that's maintained. Commissioner Yearsley, do you have any thoughts on that?

Yearsley: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I guess my biggest question -- Dan, have they done a study to figure out what the seasonal high groundwater is out there and are you going to be above that seasonal high groundwater?

Lardie: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Yearsley, so groundwater is fairly shallow there. We are -- we are attempting to grade the site, so that it will be above the high groundwater and make sure that we meet DEQ requirements for separation between groundwater and our drainage.

Yearsley: Okay. Have you done that study just so you figure out what that seasonal high groundwater is?

Lardie: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Yearsley, I don't have it in front of me. I was thinking that it was about four and a half feet to three and a half feet deep is what our -- is what the geotech I believe reported.

Yearsley: Okay.

Dodson: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner -- oh, Joe. Go ahead.

Dodson: Thank you. And for the benefit of the Commission, the public testimony that we got regarding the storm drainage showed a lot of pictures of the -- the drainage ponds that are in Tradewinds. My understanding is that that same type of storm drainage will not be used here, which is good. I think that is definitely an improvement and will have the underground infiltration bed as discussed. So, I'm hoping that that is a better option for both these residents and to quell some of the concerns of the neighbors.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, Joe. Any additional comments or questions? Okay. Mr. Lardie, thank you. We will take public testimony and come back to you and let you close, sir.

Lardie: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

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

Weatherly: Mr. Chair, we had one person sign in and that's Sandy Blaser.

Yearsley: Please come up and state your name and address for the record, please.

Blaser: This is an improvement over last time.

Fitzgerald: Spoken like a true former chair. I love it.

Blaser: My name is Sandy Blaser. I'm a resident at 3370 South Como Avenue. I'm one of the residents on the properties just west of Teakwood and I appreciate the -- the

Commissioners and Planning in regards to the concerns we have had with matching heights of property to our -- our areas and the other issues with drainage. Our biggest concern -- my biggest concern and some of the others has been the -- the situation with the traffic through Fathom out to Locust Grove and at one of the hearings one of the Commissioners asked have we -- have we talked to ACHD about the traffic load on Locust Grove compared to -- to Victory and the reason I'm bringing that up and the other people in the development are bringing it up is because ACHD stated that Victory is a major arterial and they don't want to have a typical entrance and exit out to Victory and I'm submitting that Locust Grove at this point in time, not way back when they planned this -- this road, Fathom Road, to go into the property to the east, it's becoming a major arterial, because it's drawing traffic, people are looking at Eagle and they are looking at Meridian Road and they have now decided that Locust Grove is a good way to go between the two and with all the hundreds and hundreds of homes that are going to be developed south of us off of Eagle and Kuna, I think we are going to have a problem. We also know -- just found out that there is a development just west of us of duplexes and triplexes that's being developed on the -- I believe it's the southwest corner, which is just opposite our entrance and also that the property on the northwest corner is going to be developed with housing. So, I think we are going to have a problem and I think the solution -- we all feel the solution is to have a typical exit off Victory for egress and in and out of Teakwood for their people there. I just think it's going to be a major problem when we try to unload everyone off of -- I forgot the name of our entrance, but for our entrance in and out is all centralized along Locust Grove. Coastline and Locust Grove. And I think it's just going to be a mess and I would really like to have the Commission talk to ACHD about their logic of not permitting an entrance for Teakwood on Victory and having it all stream through Fathom out to Locust Grove to the west. And that's basically my concerns and I think a number of the homeowners concerns. The quality of life being affected by the traffic.

Yearsley: Thank you. We will have the applicant answer that after.

Fitzgerald: Thank you, Mr. Blaser. Any additional -- any additional attendees in the audience that would like to speak on this application at this time? Please raise your hand. Or if you are online, one of the attendees, please, raise your hand via Zoom.

Yearsley: I don't see anybody in the audience wanting -- raising their hand, so --

Fitzgerald: Okay. Thanks, Commissioner Yearsley. Madam Clerk, I don't see anyone online either. Is that correct?

Weatherly: That is correct.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Mr. Lardie, do you want to take a few minutes and close, sir?

Dodson: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Joe, go right ahead.

Dodson: Sorry. Try again. If I may I can address Mr. Blaser's questions.

Fitzgerald: Go right ahead, Joe. Give us more information. That would be great.

Dodson: Absolutely. Sorry. I -- following the previous Commission hearing I -- and while writing the staff report I did reach out to ACHD regarding why Locust Grove was not included and why Victory Road was. Short answer is that this property abuts Victory Road and is the arterial that it has frontage on, so, therefore, that's the road that was discussed. Secondly, Victory Road is already failing as an arterial road -- arterial road with its current access points. So, ACHD, period, was not going to allow any further access, other than what's there now. That leads into Locust Grove, which they understand is busy and continuing to get busier, which is why from Victory Road north Locust Grove is slated in the next five years in their integrated five year work plan to be widened to five lanes and a roundabout is slated to be built at that intersection. With those two new conditions coming to fruition in the next -- within the next five years ACHD finds that they will have enough capacity to support more development using this entrance, especially for the backup that occurs south of Victory on Locust Grove currently. With a roundabout it's designed to keep traffic flowing and especially if they are continuing north will have more lanes available to be used and keep the traffic moving north. So, that was the discussion that I had with ACHD. Trying to get that for the Commission and the public.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, Joe. Appreciate the information. Mr. Lardie, do you want to close up with any additional comments, sir?

Lardie: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, thanks, Joe. First of all, I -- I was going to see if you could defer, because I know you have had some discussions with ACHD and I notice they were in their staff report. You know, I -- I hope that we have addressed your concerns or at least addressed -- or attempted to address your concerns and that I look forward to a recommendation of approval if you can give it. With that I will -- I will stand for any more questions or sit down -- sit back down quietly. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, Dan. Any additional questions for the applicant or staff? Seeing none -- or hearing none, can I get a motion to close the public hearing?

Seal: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: Move that we close the public hearing for H-2020-0006.

Grove: Second.

Fitzgerald: I have a motion and a second to close the public hearing for H-2020-0006, Teakwood Place Subdivision. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Fitzgerald: Anyone want to lead off or start the fun and excitement? We have talked about this one a lot. Commissioner Grove comes off of mute. Yes, go right ahead, Commissioner.

Grove: I will jump in real quick. I don't have a whole lot, other than to say that the access for the residents that is remaining coming off of the new development, rather than Victory, makes a big difference in how they connect to the open space, made this a -- a lot better project in my opinion and so I like the changes and the work that they have gone into -- to address the concerns that were raised the first time through.

Dodson: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Joe, go ahead.

Dodson: Sorry. I have more information for you guys.

Fitzgerald: Okay.

Dodson: Regarding the groundwater. I looked up the geotech report and it looks like they found groundwater at seven feet.

Fitzgerald: That's much better than four.

Dodson: Correct.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Thank you for that. That helps, too. Well, first, I want to tell Mr. Lardie and Joe, both, thank you for your work. I think the conversation I had -- or my comments on this were very much -- if you start development you kind of got to either develop or not develop and that was -- there was a desire to keep access and do some things with their horse trailers and the house that's existing and I think this is a much better transition and it's -- it's better than it was -- much better than -- I think this is the third or fourth time we have seen this thing. I think the chief is happy with the fire access and emergency access he has. Obviously, we all have a connection to the north, but that doesn't seem like it's going to be for a long time and it seems like it's reasonable to -- this is not that many houses and I understand the impact it does have on the neighbors to the west, but I understand that ACHD is not going to allow anything else to access Victory and so we are in a -- in a weird spot there. But I do appreciate the work that's gone into the common areas, the -- you know, the amenities that were put in and utilizing that unbuildable lot as a turnaround for the fire department. I think those are all good improvements. I do share Mr. Yearsley's comments on -- that was one of our comments early on, but I -- we have gone a long ways from where we were where there was going to be no improvements on Victory, no sidewalk, no -- they weren't going to take access off of the internal road. We have come a long ways from there. So, I do appreciate that and so I do see the improvements and the effort being put forward. It's just a matter of does this fit within the

communities around it and I think that's what the Commission gets to determine. So, additional comments?

Seal: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: I share some of the same thoughts that -- that he just went through on this and I do -- I really like the addition of the pathway in there. I know that's something that Commissioner Holland also -- I think that was originally her -- her original thought was to kind of put a pathway through there, open that up a little bit more, provide for some more connectivity within the subdivision. So, you know, basically adhering to the, you know, what -- the staff recommendations on -- as far as Victory Road are concerned with putting in the sidewalk, closing off access and everything. I know the sidewalk and the improvements that are going to go in out there are no easy feat. I remember the picture that they showed us of that, you know, with the irrigation boxes and -- and the different grades that are out there, it's -- it's not going to be easy for them to accomplish that. So, I very much appreciate the fact that that is something that's now in the plan and, again, I know that that's -- that's not going to be easy to accomplish, so -- and, again, this is -- this is a long ways from where it started and I think it's a very good compromise, especially for an in-fill piece, which are always incredibly difficult to get those in and -- and just with a regular subdivision, much less something that wants to retain the original property in there as well. So, overall I think it's a good job with a -- with an in-fill piece. I'm very pleased with where it's landed.

Yearsley: Mr. Chairman?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: I have -- you know, for the most part I'm -- you know, the subdivision looks okay. I do have some concerns about the homes fitting on the lots. You know, they are looking at three -- three car garages with fairly large frontages with only 68 foot facings of most of the lots. That's really leaving no -- you know, that's -- that's really tight and I don't think that it can hit -- that those -- unless they shrink them up quite a bit. I do have concerns with the groundwater. I don't know when the -- the geotech report was done. We have huge groundwater influences from the canal that's close by. We have it in our subdivision, because I live in Tuscany, but not near this subdivision at all, but we have areas that we have -- our -- our drainage basins fill up with water during the summer because of high groundwater. So, my recommendation would have them do a -- a seasonal high groundwater check to make sure that they can do the drainage appropriately on that. So, not knowing when their current groundwater deal was done I question that it -- that they have seven feet. So, those are my concerns.

Fitzgerald: Would you have that done before Council if we go for a recommendation?

Yearsley: Unfortunately, the canals have gone out of the water and so your groundwater is starting to go down. They need to get it done immediately to test to see where it's at, because we are starting to see our drainages start to go down as well. So, I would recommend that they have that checked almost immediately to see where that groundwater is and -- and -- and report back that to Council.

Fitzgerald: Perfect.

Dodson: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: Yeah. I think I'm at a place where I could support this. You know, we have spent a lot of time on this little piece and I appreciate the changes that they have finally come back with, but I would agree I'm not sure that the homes that they have shown us -- I appreciate Commissioner Yearsley's pointing that out. I'm not sure that those homes that they have shown us are going to fit on those lots. But, you know, they might be predominantly the two car garage version with only a couple of threes out there I guess. But I do think it's night and day from what we had to deal with before.

Fitzgerald: Agreed. And I think, you know, the request if -- if I was -- and I can't make motions, but if -- you know, I think an immediate groundwater or a pit test or whatever -- high water -- high groundwater test prior to Council, as well as doing -- making sure that the elevations they are providing Council will fit on the -- on the lot, so that they understand what they are getting into, I think that's totally appropriate. I do think we have come far enough to -- to recommend an approval to the Council, because I do think it's -- I think it makes sense -- and much like Commissioner Seal said, for an in-fill property from where we started to where we are now I think it works. But I think there is some questions we could help answer before they get to Council with some additional information.

Dodson: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Joe.

Dodson: Yes, sir. Thank you. Members of the Commission. Commissioner Yearsley. The report has a letter date of December of last year with a request made in October, about this time last year. So, when they did this site testing was definitely the fall, winter.

Yearsley: Yeah. So, that's your -- my concern is your groundwater is not accurate.

Dodson: Understood.

Fitzgerald: Additional thoughts or comments or motions are always in order, so --

Seal: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: I will take a stab. I don't have the -- I don't have my cheat sheet in front of me, so -- after hearing all application testimony and information on file number H-2020-0006 for Teakwood Place Subdivision, I recommend -- I recommend that we recommend approval to City Council with the following caveats: That an immediate high groundwater check is done and, then, reported to City Council, as well as some updated elevations that are guaranteed to fit the plot sizes.

McCarvel: Second.

Fitzgerald: I have a motion and a second to recommend approval of file number H-2020-0006, Teakwood Place Subdivision, to City Council. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Lardie, Thank you guys. Good luck with Council and I hope the neighbors understand that we are trying to get as much information as -- to give to Council as they can and, hopefully, that will be good -- good logic for them to decipher on, so they can make good decisions -- a good final decision.

5. Public Hearing Continued from September 17, 2020 for Ada County Coroner (H-2020-0085) by Lombard Conrad Architects, Located at 173 N. Touchmark Way

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

Fitzgerald: Turning to our agenda we have the next -- next item, which is file number H-2020-0085 for the Ada County Coroner's office and we will start with the staff report.

Allen: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Fitzgerald: Sonya, are you ready? Go right ahead, ma'am.

Allen: Members of the Commission. The next application before you is a request for a rezone. This site consists of 1.34 acres of land. It's zoned I-L, light industrial, and it's located at 173 North Touchmark Way. Adjacent land uses to the west consist of retail stores zoned C-G, industrial to the north, zoned I-L, vacant land to the east, zoned I-L, and Franklin Road and vacant land to the south, zoned L-O. This property was rezoned in 2009 with the requirement of a development agreement. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation is industrial. The abutting property to the south is designated commercial. The applicant is requesting a rezone of 1.77 acres of land, including land to the centerline of adjacent streets from the I-L, light industrial, to the C-G, general retail and service commercial district. Because the adjacent future land use