

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:05 p.m., Tuesday, May 25, 2021, by Mayor Robert Simison.

Members Present: Robert Simison, Joe Borton, Luke Cavener, Treg Bernt, Brad Hoaglund and Liz Strader.

Members Absent: Jessica Perreault.

Also present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Bill Parsons, Joe Dodson, Alan Tiefenbach, Jamie Leslie, Joe Bongiorno and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

☒ Liz Strader	☒ Joe Borton
☒ Brad Hoaglund	☒ Treg Bernt
☐ Jessica Perreault	☒ Luke Cavener
☒ Mayor Robert E. Simison	

Simison: Council, the meeting will come to order. For the record it is May 25th, 2021, at 6:05 p.m. We will begin this evening's regular City Council meeting with roll call attendance.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Simison: Next item is the Pledge of Allegiance. If you would all rise and, please, join us in the pledge.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

COMMUNITY INVOCATION

Simison: Our next item is a community invocation. Do we -- is Mr. Hanke here this evening? If you -- go ahead and come forward and if you all would like to join us in the invocation or take this as a moment of silence and reflection on your own part.

Hanke: We come before you now and we pray the words that Paul taught us when he said may the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with you and we pray those words now, that the grace that you have given us would be with us now in the decisions we make, in the way we treat each other, in the way we speak. That the love of the Father, that we as a community would show that love to one another as you have shown love to us, that the fellowship of the Holy Spirit would be guiding to us, that we would judge our actions and our words and our thoughts by what you have called us to and I pray that this great city, Lord, would reflect the grace in the love in the fellowship that you have shown us. I pray that every day our decisions would

lead this place to a greater understanding of these three things and that every day, God, we would make these decisions paramount in our life as we judge how they impact others. May you use us this evening, in your name we pray, amen.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Simison: Thank you. Council, our next item is the adoption of the agenda.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: There are no changes to the agenda, so I move that we adopt the agenda as published.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to adopt the agenda as published. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye? Opposed nay? The ayes have it. Motion is agreed to and the agenda is adopted.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

PUBLIC FORUM – Future Meeting Topics

Simison: Mr. Clerk, anyone under public forum?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, only signups under there were for tonight's public hearings and future public hearings.

Simison: Okay. Then there will be nothing under public forum this evening.

ACTION ITEMS

1. **Public Hearing Continued from April 27, 2021 for Compass Pointe Subdivision (H-2020-0100) by A-Team Land Consultants, Located at the Southwest Corner of E. Victory Rd. and S. Locust Grove Rd.**
 - A. Annexation and Zoning of 7.69 acres of land with a request for the R-15 zoning district.
 - B. A Preliminary Plat consisting of 38 residential building lots and 10 common lots on approximately 4.69 acres of land in the R-15 zoning district.

Simison: So, we will move right into our Action Items for the evening. First item up is a public hearing that was continued from April 27th, 2001, for Compass Pointe Subdivision, H-2020-0100. I will turn this over to Mr. Dodson.

Dodson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. Not sure if you want me to go over the whole project, but I can. Your purview.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I know that we have continued this item multiple times, but we have got a -- I think a large amount of the public that are here tonight and if -- if Joe is willing and able to and Council is amenable, I think it's probably best to have staff kind of go over this project again for us.

Dodson: Sounds good to me.

Simison: Okay.

Dodson: All right. As mentioned, this project is for Compass Pointe Subdivision. It's been through -- I think I have had it on my desk for over a year now. So, it's been a while between Planning and Zoning and a remand and, then, Council and our continuances here. So, it's been a long time coming. The site is located at the southwest corner of Victory and Locust Grove. In total, it consists of 7.69 acres of land, which is currently zoned RUT, which is rural urban transition within the county. It has county residential to the north that does have an application in process for low density single family residential and R-8 zoning directly to the east and south southwest. The project as noted was heard by Planning and Zoning Commission in December of last year. The Commission recommended denial and following this recommendation the applicant made a request to the City Council to be remanded back to P&Z. With that they revised the plat, removed the request for a planned unit development and revised the open space pursuant to the comments made within the staff report and by the Planning and Zoning Commission. City Council agreed with this request and remanded the project back to P&Z. The main changes were related to the number of units, which are down to 37 from 48, the overall road layout, and the amount of usable open space and the applicant is no longer requesting a PUD, which is a benefit. This is the planned development map and ACHD map for the road widening projects that are in the vicinity, which is the intersection directly adjacent to the site, as well as the road widening of Locust Grove north of Victory. Part of the roundabout project will also widen this area of Locust Grove directly adjacent to the site on both sides, which includes sidewalk and widening around the -- I guess you would call it the culvert for the Ten Mile Creek there. I will get into a little more detail with that later. Again, this is for annexation and zoning of 7.69 acres of land, with a request for the R-15 zoning district. A preliminary plat consisting of 37 residential building lots and ten common lots on approximately five and a half acres within the R-15 zoning district. So, to be clear this is for attached and detached single family. This is not for multi-family.

This is -- these are not apartments as has been misrepresented. So, I just want to make sure that's very clear. Private streets are proposed throughout the site and there was a request for alternative compliance to connect the private street directly to an arterial, which would be Locust Grove. The proposed uses are all single family residential, but within multiple types, which would be attached townhomes and triplexes, which is better seen here and detached duplexes, as well as four single family homes. As you can tell here there is single family, duplex, triplex, duplex, duplex, single, so on. The project is proposed with a gross density of 4.8 units to the acre, which is lower than the previous proposal. The gross density of the closest subdivisions, which are Tradewinds to the east and Tuscany to the west, are 4.4. So, it actually is in line with that density. If you remove the Ten Mile Creek area, the density bumps up to 6.6, which is still well within the medium density residential. Not a high density project by any means. The applicant is proposing to construct private streets as noted. They are 24 foot wide and are proposed with five foot attached sidewalks on both sides throughout a majority of the site, which is not required by code, but is appreciated by staff. The applicant is proposing an emergency only access to Victory Road, which is required if more than 30 homes are to be constructed. The proposed access for this development is to South Locust Grove and lines up with East Coastline Street on the east side of Locust Grove, which is the access to Tradewinds Subdivision. The access point into the development does not mean ACHD district policy, but they have to modify their policy to accommodate the access into the site, because this is the best possible access for development to the site, because it is the furthest access point away from Victory and Locust Grove, because it's a triangle shaped parcel. ACHD will not allow an additional access to Victory or any other point in the site. The site as discussed has major development constraints. It is a triangle shaped, bordered on two sides by arterials, and on one side by the creek. It has no possibility for future road connectivity for public roads, which is why ACHD recommended private streets and why staff has approved the private street request. City code requires that private streets to be used in either a MEW or gated development and this -- the applicant has proposed a gate at this location here to meet UDC requirements. There is no existing sidewalk on Victory or Locust Grove, but both are scheduled to be widened as part of the roundabout project as noted. The applicant is required to dedicate additional right of way and provide for a road trust for the sidewalks that will be constructed with the roundabout project. The applicant is proposing open space in excess of code, but a large portion of it is the Ten Mile Creek, which does qualify per UDC, because it is a natural waterway. There is now more usable open space throughout the site and has been improved overall from previous layouts. Staff appreciates the pedestrian connections to and from the central open space and to the adjacent arterials. The applicant submitted conceptual elevations for the proposed attached single family homes, both duplexes and the triplexes. The center elevations show all two story structures, two car garages, and finishing materials of wood and stone. In addition to the elevations show modern architecture -- architectural designs with shed roofs, second story patios with glass railings and stone accents that go from ground level to the top of the second story, which is actually pretty rare. Detached single family homes do require design review approval prior to building permits submittal. So, staff will analyze these in more detail at a future time. At the Commission hearing after the remand they did recommend approval of the subject applications. The public testified, as they will tonight, regarding the density of the

project, the additional traffic at the intersection of Locust Grove and Victory. Discussed whether or not the project complies with the Comprehensive Plan, because it is a different type of residential use than the surrounding residential and the proposed density. They noted that it was high density when the adjacent subdivisions are not and as noted this falls within the medium density residential. Commission discussed the density, traffic, clarification on how the private streets meet the required findings. Staff's concern with some of the recommended changes at the time and the timeline of ACHD roundabout. Commission modified a few of the conditions, which has been taken care of and the only outstanding issues for Council were regarding some of the conditions of approval for the pre-plat and landscape plan, but they actually have revised those and have been shown here with some of the revisions noted. So, there are no outstanding issues. Now, since the Commission hearing -- sorry. Since the Council hearing a month ago there have been -- at least as of this morning there were 22 pieces of testimony. I'm assuming more have been input since then. But they all discuss the same issues that I presented previously, so I won't go into many detail with that, but, again, regarding density and traffic mostly and, again, they represented it as multi-family, which this is not. So, after that I will stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you, Joe. Council, any questions for staff?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Joe, either a question for you or for the applicant when they get up. I know at some points in the staff report it talks about place sidewalks on both sides, but in other parts it talks about just one side. Can you maybe walk Council through where there is sidewalks on both sides and where there is only on one side?

Dodson: Absolutely. Yeah. The -- some of that might be from Commission and prior to an older layout, but as you can see here the darker gray is going to be the sidewalk, which is shown on both sides of the road everywhere except this portion of the loop.

Cavener: Okay.

Dodson: And I believe in older layouts they did just have it on one side, but they are proposing the five foot sidewalk on both sides of the road in I would say 90 percent of the site.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, follow up?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Joe, apologies. I recall -- no on-street parking would be allowed, then, in this?

Dodson: That is correct, sir. Because it's only 24 foot -- feet wide and minimum for one side would be 27 or 28.

Cavener: Thank you.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: With signs, Joe? No parking with signs?

Dodson: It was not one of my conditions, but you are more than welcome to add that, because there are private streets.

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Bill is nodding his head yes.

Dodson: I will default to him then. I would say that they -- more than likely they would be signed and signed that no parking, because they are private streets and will not accommodate on -- any on-street parking.

Parsons: Mayor -- Mayor, Members of the Council, the code requires there to be signed no parking per the private street standards and that's what the condition is in the staff report.

Bernt: Perfect.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for staff? Okay. Then I will invite the applicant to come forward. You are recognized for 15 minutes.

Arnold: Thanks. Mayor, Members of the Council, for the record it's Steve Arnold, A-Team Land Consultants, 1785 Whisper Cove, Boise, Idaho. 83709. And I will ask pretty much the same question that Joe asked. I mean we -- we have presented our stuff here before. If you would like a full presentation of it or abbreviation or a combination I can do both. But I do kind of want to go -- hit an overview of -- of what we feel the main issues are and kind of address those and I think Joe did that really good. The main thing is this has been misrepresented I think to the surrounding neighbors and the community as multi-family and apartments and it is not. It's the farthest from that. We are -- we are actually -- we have the marketing team in place. We are going to end up marketing the subdivision. It is a for sale unit and that's why we are doing a subdivision plat. On townhomes, you put them on their own lot so you can sell them as -- through conventional selling practices. So, again, these aren't apartments, they are townhomes. I will hit real quickly on the traffic. As you -- probably most of you know, I used to work at ACHD and ACHD has approved this at -- I believe 50 lots or 48, I can't remember, but it -- since, then, we have dropped it down from 40 -- 50, 48, to 38 and now 37. So, what we are essentially putting

out for a traffic count is approximately 37 trips in the p.m. peak hour, which that equates to one car coming in every minute and a half or leaving. Either way. The -- even -- even as the intersection stands that is bad right now, this project is not attributing much traffic to this -- to the area at all. One point -- one trip every 1.5 minutes is pretty minimal. I do agree that that intersection needs to be approved -- improved. Right now -- I have been out there during the -- the peak hour traffic and it's bad. It's currently stop controlled and they are not timed and it -- at those commuting hours it backs up significantly, but by the time that we actually are generating trips that intersection will be improved and the traffic won't be an issue there. It is now -- and I get that's why there is a lot of people that are scared of the project, frankly, because it -- it does add to that problem currently, but it will be fixed. Joe I think hit on the density pretty good. Yeah, if you count in the Ten Mile Creek, because it is -- we are rezoning a 7.69 acre site, you are at 4.8 units per the acre and neighboring properties are 4.4. So, the density on this is pretty minimal. It's not a high density project. You have seen me here a lot of times doing multi-family and those are, you know, anywhere between 16 to 20 units per acre. So, 4.8 is not much at all. You know, since -- as Joe stated, we have been working with him for over a year. Our client has been really amenable to all the changes that have been requested. We made I think every change that has been and I will go through those changes shortly, but, you know, the -- the developer is also going to be the builder, so they have got a lot of stake in this in building a nice product or project from the subdivision side. I will go through some of the changes that we have done since the beginning. Again, we have lost significant lots. Our density went from 6.24 to 4.8. We eliminated the PUD. There was some -- I know at P&Z -- I don't know what the City Council saw, but we had some pretty odd shaped houses, because we had odd shaped lots. So, with the modifications we nixed -- got rid of all of those. We did add more single family to it to create more housing variety. Again, the open space went from 35 to 44 percent. We added two pocket parks to the site. We eliminated the dead ends and put the lollipop in, which I think is a better design -- and when I say lollipop, it's -- it's the circle at the top, essentially. We added the gated entry and we attached pedestrian crossings and added sidewalk throughout. I think we went from two thousand linear feet of sidewalk to almost 2,800, so we made significant changes and, truthfully, I think it has made a nicer product -- project and in the long run it will be a good site. I can go into specific design things on the buildings. One thing to keep in mind with these buildings -- I mean the modern look was my idea and I have heard some pushback on it. We are not married to any of that. I mean we can go with a more classical style or a Craftsman style or whatever direction the Council likes. I just -- there is nothing out there like it, so I thought I would throw it out there. But the footprint of the home and the square footage of the home isn't going to change. We are going to try to be in that sixteen to two thousand square foot range. What we submitted was right around 18,000 and I think one was 19,000 -- 1,900 square feet. Sorry. So, if -- if it's the desire of the Council to modify the exterior look, we can do that. And like Joe said, it does have to go back through design review. So, this isn't the last shot at it. Some of those colors that you have seen -- my designer told me they weren't fully rendered, so I probably shouldn't submit them. Some were kind of orangey looking and that was my mistake. Our intent to submit here are earth tones. So, more like what you are seeing in these pictures with the fly throughs and I can go through those if you want to see them again or I could just stand the questions.

Simison: Council, would you like anything more or do you have questions for the applicant?

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I would like to look at his pictures.

Arnold: Okay. If you can start from the top, Joe, and I will just kind of go -- so, this is the picture at the entrance off of Locust Grove Road looking north and if you can see when we took the staff's advice on making the road changes, we were able to undulate it, so it helped break up a lot of the -- the massing along the front of the roadway. So, I think that was good. This is at the north end looking south. Kind of gives you another idea. And this is the main north-south road. It gives you a good idea of still kind of the undulations that are created by meandering road. And as you can see also we have put in raised pedestrian crossings as well. We have been doing that in other subdivisions. We think it's a nice way of getting pedestrian safety across and then -- next screen. This is on the east side of the road looking at our pocket park. Again, it just shows you how some of the buildings will fit and, then, you go to the next one, Joe. And this is in the pocket park looking at the -- on the west side looking at the other pocket park on the east side and it also gives you an idea of the pedestrian crossing. So, those are the pictures. If there is any other questions I can --

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Steve, would you mind walking through just so we have a good understanding of the timeline for this subdivision if it's approved and the timeline for the ACHD projects, the roundabout, the widening of the road and those types of things.

Arnold: Sure. So, ACHD planned to have the roundabout started now. They are currently redesigning it. So, their original plan was to start it roughly now and, then, complete it in November. So, my guess is, you know, it's -- it's going to be in the spring to early summer of 2020.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor. Do you know why?

Arnold: Why they would change it? No. No, I don't know. I just know that we are currently negotiating right of way with them right now and they have put that on hold while they are doing some redesigns.

Bernt: Okay.

Arnold: But it's still a high priority for them, but --

Simison: And they wouldn't be doing it now with the work going on Eagle Road. Until Eagle Road is completed they won't start this project. But that's also --

Arnold: You would hope.

Simison: No, they won't.

Arnold: No. And I guess I was going to finish up on your question there. What was the other --

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor. Steve, yeah, roundabout, the widening. And I suppose that's tied to that. And, then, your project timeline.

Arnold: So, as soon as it's approved it will take us about two months to do the civil design, probably another month and a half to get the design approved and, then, we are hoping that we can get a contractor on there and, then, it's probably a good five, five and a half months for the contractor to go in and build it. Our plan is to build one phase. So, we are going to be lucky to get it on by the end of the year, first of next year.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, follow up.

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: When you say first phase, how many -- how many units is that?

Arnold: Thirty-seven units.

Hoaglund: And, Mr. Mayor, that is for the end of the year? Of this -- of 2021?

Arnold: And that's hope -- yes. That's a hopeful schedule.

Hoaglund: Okay. Thank you.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Steve, you have been doing this a long time. Nice to see you back here. I think you are -- you are winning the top prize for many times before Council this year. Appreciate you being here. On the private streets, the piece that I always wrestle with is you put in private streets and roads and we put up no parking signs, but if somebody parks, Lieutenant Leslie is not going to come over or send one of our fine men or women from the Meridian Police Department coming in and force that, so how do you -- how do you enforce that in your neighborhood?

Arnold: Mayor and Council Member Cavener, what we have done in the past is you have the HOA and you assign a -- a tow truck company and the -- the HOA police are the ones that usually chase it and when you sign it it gives you the authority to get towed. The other option is that we could look at pulling the sidewalk off one side and widen it out to 29 feet or I can add some additional parking in here. Each unit has a two car garage with a two car pad in front of it, with the additional parking that we have provided we are not assuming too much of an issue, but if it's the Council's direction we can take it off one side.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Steve, can you walk the Council real quick through the amenities? You talked a little bit about the pocket parks and those illustrations are helpful, but -- I mean there is a lot of young families in Meridian and when I see a little gazebo that looks nice, but I also wonder what there are for terms of engagement for kids and maybe walking the Council through that.

Arnold: Mayor, Councilman Cavener, actually, Joe's recommendation -- and they are kind of aesthetically pleasing is climbing rocks was one of the things that we put in here. You know, I -- personally I don't see a lot of kids using the tot lots, but I mean we could add that to this if that's the direction. The main thing that we are putting out was the climbing rocks in the common areas. So, if you come in off of the main entrance we have got a gazebo there that is more of a sitting adult area. Yeah. Right next to the parking lot and, then, we have got the -- the climbing rocks next to it and, then, in the center part up by Joe's hand right there, that is another little climbing rock area for kids to play in. If it's the direction of the Council to add play equipment, we can certainly do that. I just haven't seen it used very much.

Bongiorno: Mr. Mayor? Over here.

Simison: Deputy Chief.

Bongiorno: If I can -- thank you, Mr. Mayor. If I can continue with -- to answer Councilman Cavener's question on the parking. When I first became the fire marshal one of the things that Ms. Kane and I did was we put in city code that no parking fire lane signs are enforceable by Meridian PD, even on private property. So, they can go in and they can write a ticket against that sign. So, that's why I now require on all that you have to use this sign, so that way we can enforce it.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for the applicant at this time? Okay. Thank you very much. Mr. Clerk, I saw a long -- long line of people signing up to testify this evening. Help us -- walk us through this.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. We have probably three dozen signed in, about half wish to testify, and, first, representing an HOA is John Buckner.

Simison: Mr. Buckner, if you could state your name and address for the record -- and if everyone can do that when you come up, then, you will be recognized for ten minutes representing the HOA. If you could state the HOA that you are representing.

Buckner: John Buckner. I live at 3877 South Picasso Avenue in Meridian. Council, Mayor, thank you for the time and opportunity to be here. I want to ask you to reject the application and instead to approve a rezoning of R-8 or lower, with 14 or more units less in a comparable design that matches the surrounding neighborhood. The Meridian vision reaffirms the desire to preserve Meridian's character. The vision reinforces the core values of guiding strategic growth and being good stewards of the public trust. I see in this paragraph two chief values, character and being good stewards of public trust. The comp plan action item 0307 encourages compatible use and site design to minimize conflicts and maximize use of land. The public sentiment is clear. The current development clashes severely with the surrounding neighborhood and there simply is no precedent for an R-15 in the neighborhood. According to the housing and the comp plan, high density housing must be strategically located to public transportation, community services, and employment areas. If we look at Locust Grove and Franklin, for example, we can see that this R-15 here is located next to light industrial and commercial. Over at Locust Grove and Fairview, again, we see that R-15s are located next to community businesses, commercial, and light industrial. And, again, Locust Grove and Chinden we see R-15 again located near general retail, community business and limited office and, of course, over here to the right is Eagle, which is notorious as we all know. What about our neighborhood? Well, you see in this lovely red triangle here in the middle it is surrounded by low to medium density R-4s and R-8s and, then, there is this small nonresidential area which is just the church. Up in the corner we see R-15s and R-40. Again, following the pattern of limited office, commercial, and community business and, again, off wonderful Eagle Road. Comp plan 05-01-02 says to support and protect the identity of existing residential neighborhoods. Now, answer this question. Does this development support and protect the identity of the existing neighborhood? Oh-oh. Can I get it back? The comp plan describes urban and suburban character. For example, the urban character is marked by higher land use intensity and higher lot coverage. Suburban character is marked by more building separation and lower lot coverage also according to the keys, urban character, housing is small newer, single family lots, multi-family dwellings and yard and landscaped areas are reduced. Let's look at an example. The existing Tuscany Lakes Subdivision, which is R-8 right across from the planned developments, is, for example, the Brennan Family Trust, what do you think is here? You see a property with narrower, smaller size and higher lot coverage. What do you see with something with lower lot coverage and higher landscaping? Or, for example, what about the development? Do you see a house that is larger in size or more small and narrow? Or take, for example, one of Mr. Arnold's little private parks or pocket parks, which is basically the size of the backyard of the property right across the way. It's basically the size of my backyard. Does this seem to mark the same characteristics of the surrounding neighborhood and does it protect the identity of the neighborhood? What you see here

is an accident that occurred on Sunday, May 16th. The comp plan action item 05-01 is to sustain, enhance, promote and protect elements that contribute to the livability and high quality of life for all Meridian residents. Now, you have heard time and again from written and verbal testimony that there is a major traffic problem on these streets and at the intersection. Let me just stop right here and say I was not driving this fast. The playback was just sped up. I was obeying the traffic laws. But when you have heard time and again the traffic is a problem, do you consider it a stewardship of public trust to just simply dismiss the problem as being an ACHD problem. We all know here that the city is not responsible for ACHD and vice-versa. But you are responsible for your decision to approve so many lots and zonings today and what you do today will affect our community tomorrow. So, again, how will you be a good steward of the public trust in the situation? Now, safety and traffic are not the only issues of quality of life. As Mr. Arnold pointed out, our housing market right now is kind of scary and because of this we are actually pricing out all of our local people. This is a fair point. And it would seem that Mr. Arnold has the product type is ideal for local residents. If we do a quick search on realty websites we can see that the average price of houses currently in this zip code is 480,000 and the average income is 30,000. Compare that to the 500,000 dollar price tag that he showed us back in March. Back in March. Whereas the current price is 400,000 for 30k earners. And using a simple calculation that even I can understand, 129 dollars a square foot, which is the average price back in March, times the average lot size of 2,700 square feet, comes out to 355,000 dollars back in March and the price back in March for Mr. Arnold was 500,000, which is 1.5 times the price for a house and it's half the size. And answer. Who does this really benefit? Does this benefit the local residents who make 30,000 or does it benefit the realtor or the California developer who is not even here today to represent this case? I'm afraid that this development will hurt public trust and, in fact, it already has in my case. According to Planner Dodson and applicant Steve Arnold, zoning is mainly so that we can create smaller lots and still have an open field, but go down to those reduced dimensional setbacks. So, it's a setback issue. Or at least it was. Zoning is mainly so that we can get this product type. So, it's -- it's really about the product type. The duplexes, triplexes, everything. Well, they also said that they eliminated the need for the PUD. Mr. Arnold claimed confidently they removed that. So, that means that you eliminated the setback issue, which begs the question why the R-15? Mr. Arnold also said we are not tied in any way to the design, which he just restated today. So, it's not about the product type. According to the unified development code zoning is -- oh, I'm sorry. As you can see here the setback requirement for the R-8 and the R-15 is actually the same. Without the PUD, then, you don't really need the R-15. So, why the R-15? Well, Mr. Arnold said so himself. It's so that we can create smaller lots. As you can see the R-15 requirement is half of that of the R-8. So, you can fit twice as many homes in an R-15 as you can in an R-8. Again, who does this benefit? Now, Mr. Dodson likes to point out again and again that the density is tied to future land use and not zoning. I think this is a verbal sleight of hand and a misrepresentation to the community. Zoning is what we are here for today. It's what the applicant is here for and it's defined by the Unified Development Code, which is referenced, as you can see, by the future land use zoning. So, let's talk about density. According to the Unified Development Code density is the ratio of the total number of dwelling units divided by the total whole area, which does not include resident areas that are not residential lots. I took Mr. Arnold's plan and I counted

up all the square feet which comes out to 100,000 square feet and when you divide that by 37 units you get, as Mr. Dodson claimed previously, high density. So, we have a suburban area being plunged in -- or an urban area being plunged into a suburban area. We have R-15, which it has no precedent in our neighborhood, and you also have high density. Is it good stewardship to approve this? Here is my proposal. We use an R-8, which is the on the high end of the existing neighborhood, and with that I did a rough drawing -- I'm not a drafter, but I did a rough drawing, which basically comes out to 23 units, at a 500,000 dollar price tag or the market value, that's still not pretty bad in my opinion along with all the income and all the impact fees that are going to come from that and since Mr. Arnold is clearly not tied to the development or the product type, he should see no problem in changing the design to at least match the surrounding neighborhood character. Just some final thoughts. On the way here the hearing notice still showed that the hearing was scheduled for April. Last month. And according to the Clerk he said he was going to change it by Wednesday. He also called me personally last Tuesday to discuss the application. Me alone. And when I told him that I couldn't speak on behalf of all these people who are here today, his response was, well, we will just wait until the hearing on Tuesday. That was a week. Even if you tried to gather the whole community you would have only done so in a week. He waited until the week before the hearing to contact me. As you can see in this little clip, there are five Oregon counties that have voted to secede from Oregon and to join our great state of Idaho, for many of the same reasons that many Californians, like myself, are here today. We want more independence. We want more freedom. We want more control over our lives. We also know that our planner Mr. Dodson comes from San Diego. He has his training and education there. San Diego is one of the most progressive cities in the country and most Idahoans want nothing to do with that. So, let me ask you. Is it stewardship of public trust to start implementing urban policies that are driving many people here and out of their hometown? Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton. Not a question, just a comment. I thought that was a lot of great content, good information to consider. I think some of it was somewhat ruined by a critique of our clerk and our planner, which wasn't probably what you intended, but not the most constructive way to -- to present that part of it, because I think you got a lot of good valuable content.

Buckner: Thank you.

Cavener: Thanks for saying that, Joe.

Simison: Council, any other comments or questions? Okay. Mr. Clerk.

Johnson: Next is Todd Ebeling.

Simison: Does Todd represent an HOA or himself?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, no.

Simison: Recognized for three minutes.

Ebeling: Todd Ebeling. 3536 South Lamone. Mayor and Council Members, thank you for allowing us to testify and I'm speaking for we the people, the people behind me, as well as myself and my wife. So, I have been pondering this project for some time now and, you know, when something doesn't seem right or is out of place there is usually a reason; right? And thus the phrase follow the money. So, I asked my developer friends and builder friends their thoughts on higher density of all levels over putting a handful of houses on that property and, of course, I already knew the answer, I just wanted to hear them say it. You know, they say don't talk politics and religion with your friends and family. Well, you can add to that don't talk Planning and Zoning with your builder friends and so that makes for awkward conversations at times. Already knew the answer. It was all about money and higher profits in the end. So, the question to the Mayor, Mayor Robert, Council Members, and Planning and Zoning, is should maximum profits be at the expense of those who already live there and have to put up with the decisions that are made today that affect us tomorrow and so on. And, you know, why can't a lesser amount of homes be built on that property? I have lived in a big city for quite some time and had to put up with the negative effects of higher density housing, traffic congestion and gridlock and higher -- higher crime, to name a few. So, in conclusion, we the people of this four mile square -- square mile area that centers on what's going to become the new roundabout at Locust Grove and Victory, so no thanks to this plan and I would respectfully request that you deny this and have it reviewed to a lesser amount. Thank you for your time.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: I do have a question, if you don't mind, Todd. Do you know how much the developer paid for that property?

Ebeling: I don't.

Hoaglun: Do we know how much the cost of those units will be?

Ebeling: Well, isn't that beside the point?

Hoaglun: It is beside the point and that's my point.

Ebeling: Uh-huh.

Hoaglun: We don't know what it is. We don't -- so when you say follow the money, I get that from that one sense -- we cannot deny it based on their making too much money.

Ebeling: Right.

Hoaglund: That's -- that's the hard part for us. We have to have some basis to make that determination whether deny or to remand back to Planning and Zoning Commission to redo it. So, for -- and this is more for everyone when you come up here -- we need to deal with the facts and understanding of what's going on in the area. So, just -- just so -- you know, I'm using your example to get a message out, so I hope you don't mind, but --

Ebeling: No. I understand. That's --

Hoaglund: I understand your point about if the money follows -- yes, we understand developers and they come from out of state and it is definitely changing what we have had here for a long time and so, yeah, it's -- it is difficult, but I -- it just -- for -- for us to make a good decision that will stand the test of law, because state law is very clear on how we have to do things, that we just need real substance here. So, if you -- if -- that would be very helpful, so -- but thank you. Appreciate you coming.

Ebeling: Thank you.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, next is Joe Hess.

Simison: If we can keep the clapping -- we don't need to clap. We are all here. We understand. We appreciate what everyone is saying, no matter what they say. Let's just keep it respectful and keep the meeting moving along, please.

Hess: Mr. Mayor and Council, thank you. Joe Hess. 3093 South Gold bar. I have a degree in geophysics and worked ten years as a geotechnical environmental engineer in the state of Ohio. I want to review some brief facts about the water and the Comprehensive Plan, the USGS information, and, then, we will discuss how this relates to Compass Pointe. In the water master plan that was created in 2017 -- and that is to be updated in a five year plan prior -- or as conditions dictate -- the city's primary concern is radionuclide contaminants and uses numerous engineering strategies to address the elevated levels of uranium in the water. I mention this only because I recognize the ongoing extensive engineering and budget resources required by the city to bring us drinking water with all the development that's occurring. In 2016 the USGS, in collaboration with Idaho Department of Water Resources, had been working toward an improved understanding of the Treasure Valley Aquifer System with the groundwater model that was to serve as a tool for water resource management and planning and that five year study was to conclude in 2021. So, we should have some data either soon or within the next year. But how does all this relate to Compass Pointe? So, with residential wells recently going dry at the Five Mile and Amity area in Boise, reported from development that's going on, data suggests that residential groundwater and aquifer systems are being impacted now. Currently talks in the Five Mile and Amity area aren't ongoing regarding a class action suit against developers. However, this is Boise. But my point is aquifers are not respective of different boundaries and there is a report of a well going bad just east of the Compass Pointe area. By zoning R-15 this greatly increases

water usage and a large budget tied to that use. The point being is a small development, such as Compass Point, worth the effort and risk to push R-15 or be better spent where there is more conforming with less impact to the quality of life of the existing residents. If traffic infrastructure is behind how do we know that the appropriate resources are being allocated to the water delivery infrastructure or aquifer system, since we cannot see it in the subsurface beneath their feet. I want to ensure if Council is planning to approve Compass Pointe to meet an agenda for available land space, that they are working from the most recent available data and have contacted all pertinent valley agencies that this will not tax our current available resources now or in the future. Currently the City of Nampa is considering a pause on future development to review infrastructure in place and what makes sense for their future. Should Meridian consider that same smart planning scenario? And in my opinion Compass Pointe is an opportunity to show trust within the community, given all the feedback. Thank you.

Simison: Council, any questions?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Just to -- if you don't mind staying for a second. Just so I can understand your concern, is your concern specific to the wells -- the private wells in this area being depleted? If you could just maybe hone in on your specific concern there.

Hess: Okay. My -- my concern is that that is just a small portion of what could occur. So, when groundwater goes it goes from the tap down. So, we don't have the modeling that I know of -- at least it's not published from USGS on the groundwater model of Treasure Valley, but when that groundwater goes that's a signal. So, that's -- that's the first step that we need to recognize. And the city already knows historically the deep -- deep wells in the area had been pretty stable, but we know the shallow wells are impacted and we think that they are on the same aquifer system or that smaller aquifer feeds it. Residentials are governed by code. They can't go down under 200 feet. We can go down roughly 700 feet with the city wells. So, that's just a sign that possibly there is some impact. The other thing is we are taxing resources to do this. As far as the city water through a blending process -- not to be confused with mixing. Filtration, reverse osmosis, all this is resources and there is a great budget that we understand goes into that. So, this is a small -- Compass Pointe is a small development, but it's part of the picture and my concern goes for all development. Are we considering resources we have now and where are we going in the future?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. Just to -- last year I was the liaison for the Public Works Department and just to comment a little bit on that. We sit in a little bit of a basin geologically with our

aquifer and I know that our Public Works Department puts a lot of resources into monitoring our water supply and also not only the supply, but the quality of the water as well, which was something that you touched on and so I -- you know, I think that perhaps it might -- aside from the Compass Pointe development that perhaps you should follow up with the city individually. But just to comment that, you know, we take the water supply, both availability and the quality, very seriously and it's not something that is a new issue for us or that the city hasn't, you know, been aware of.

Hess: No. I don't dispute that at all. I have drank up to six cups of water a day for the last 24 years and here I am. I would rather drink that than where I came from in Cleveland. It's safe. I only brought it up to mention that the amount of resources and budget that go into that to get us that good water. Some of the best water in the country -- or pretty pretty large.

Simison: Thank you. Yes. Water is more valuable than gold.

Hess: It will be the currency someday.

Simison: Yep. Absolutely. Thank you.

Hess: Thank you.

Simison: Appreciate it.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. And being from Ohio I can say Lake Erie was on fire quite a few times and so -- we will talk about that later. Next is Susie Link.

Simison: Okay. If you can state your name and address for the record.

Link: Good evening, Mayor and Council. My name is Susie Link and I live at 4252 Rangewood in Meridian. I have been here for a couple years now and I'm still acclimating, so forgive me. I'm here to oppose the Compass Pointe project as last submitted in March and hope the Council will take into consideration the community's arguments made to reduce the density to R-8. Even with that adjustment I believe this project will not enhance my neighborhood. I like the open spaces where I live. It means a lot to me. The Cambridge English Dictionary state's high density building consists of a lot of buildings close together. That is Compass Pointe. The 33 townhomes are referenced as duplex and triplex style on less than five acres. This triangular piece of property is in a flood area. The applicant has not submitted a land use change application with plans to the Nampa-Meridian Irrigation District, but staff stated that the applicant would likely be responsible for a new pump station, when I spoke to them on the phone. I confirmed that the property would be part of the district's service area. Having said that, the irrigation district with its five cities that it services is unable to keep up with the growth. They have not measured the existing wells in years. The city has not updated its water conservation plan since 2011 and Ada county is abnormally dry in a drought right now. For all these reasons the development as proposed should be denied. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions? All right. Thanks.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, next is Rhonda Unruh.

Unruh: Good evening and thank you, Mayor Simison and City Council Members. My name is Rhonda Unruh. I live at 3246 South Murlo Way in Meridian. Again, I would like to respectfully communicate my objection of the proposed R-15 rezoning and the current plan of the new Compass Pointe Subdivision. When reading through the Comprehensive Plan I have seen that one of the outcome measures under public health and safety is improvement on how well the city is ensuring public safety. I have also read that one of the city's goal statements is to prioritize investment of city and infrastructure and encourage road and school facilities in identified areas to grow responsibly and maximize the delivery of city services. Improvement on how well the city is ensuring public safety and growing responsibly needs to be discussed. Building 37 housing units on a piece of property that is unusually shaped and cannot be fully utilized due to Ten Mile Creek running through it is not responsible growth. On top of that, this property is situated on an intersection, as we have all talked about, in such a manner that any proposed development cannot plan for more than one exit or entrance for its residents. So, has the developer thought about how in the mornings all these vehicles will be lined up inside on the street as people are trying to navigate a locked gate and, then, enter traffic on Locust Grove? How does the developer or applicant propose those exiting onto Locust Grove turn left towards the intersection when traffic is backed up in both directions north and south? This proposal does not offer any improvement of quality of life for any current or future resident, plus the daily commuters, is not demonstrating responsible growth, nor is it ensuring public safety. With Meridian being one of the fastest growing cities in the nation I believe it is time to push the pause button, take a deep breath, take a critical deep look at what we are becoming. It is time for us to reevaluate if we are still working towards our outcome measures and our goals. Are we growing responsibly or just reactively? In other words, can you say that you truly believe that this project is modeling responsible growth, ensuring safety for all the residents in this area, and improving quality of life? Are we willing to continue this rate of growth at the expense of losing the dream of being a premier community? Please hear our input, your constituents, and carefully consider what Meridian is becoming. By continuing to approve new subdivisions like Compass Pointe we are only adding to the complexities that our citizens must navigate each and every day. I have talked to my neighbors about this situation and there is deep frustration building. Frustration because many have moved here and not to Boise because of the feel of our community and open space. I could go on, but I won't. So, we are just asking that you listen and that -- we are asking for rezoning -- lesser rezoning to an R-8. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions? Okay. Thank you.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, next is Deena Weber. Mr. Mayor, Ms. Weber indicates she's representing Caven Ridge Estates.

Simison: Okay. You are recognized for ten minutes.

Weber: Pardon?

Simison: You will be recognized for ten minutes.

Weber: Thank you, Mayor Simison and Council men and women. I appreciate this opportunity to visit with you. Again, my name is Deena Weber and I live at 514 East Claymont Court, Meridian, and I am an interim board member of the new HOA that we are developing and it's located right below Reflection Ridge. I'm here to object to the Compass Pointe development as it's currently proposed and planned and I'm not anti-development and I'm not anti-growth and, on the contrary, I don't think we can live in the Treasure Valley actually and be happy and be anti-growth. I have lived here since 1996. In fact, the city planners and government officials and residents should all be responsible to ensure that we have sensible growth that adds value and contributes to a premier community. What we do today we will have to live with in 20 years and it will be our legacy; right? So, as our city grows it is a great opportunity to plan thoughtfully and build our community in ways that are unique and appealing. This includes ensuring a well thought out road infrastructure, expanding school system, and just as we just heard the irrigation water volumes through the Nampa-Meridian Irrigation District and I can speak to that as -- as I lived in Los Alamitos off of Locust Grove for 21 years and moved at -- a mile and a half up the road and so we have been involved with the Meridian Irrigation -- Nampa-Meridian Irrigation District for that many years, 24 years, and it has been interesting to see how the pressure does go down a lot more than it ever used to. We just had another pressure issue and, in fact, all the water stopped for one whole day. So, it does happen quite often, I just don't think a lot of people hear it. It doesn't last a long time. We just make one call and it takes care of itself. The neighborhoods surrounding the proposed Compass Pointe development are well described in the city's Comprehensive Plan. They are unique, yet traditional. They have their own identities, yet they don't distract or detract from one another. They enhance each other and bring value to Meridian and they contain amenities for the enjoyment of residents and visitors. We ride our bikes all the time, my husband and I, and we go through all the subdivisions. We go through Reflection Ridge, through Tuscany, we come back out through Roaring Springs and we go out -- or Thousand Springs and, then, we go out through our old subdivision and down Overland and through the Meridian Greens and through Observation Point -- we ride all through the neighborhoods and we love it. We love being able to see and enjoy all the neighborhoods around us. In contrast, the proposed Compass Pointe is quite different from any other of the neighboring areas. It's vertical housing in the midst of horizontal housing. The design appear starkly modern and I understand that Mr. Arnold is willing to change some of the design stuff. I -- I understand that and I appreciate that. But right now it looks very different and the proposal doesn't appear to contain any real shareable amenities and even if it did it's a gated community. So, the rest of the community around us are locked out of Compass Pointe; right? So, we can't really enjoy riding through and visiting and getting to know our neighborhood. The development contains one entry and exit that is located on a road that is getting more crowded by the week as people use Locust Grove to bypass Eagle Road; right? It's not because Eagle Road is under construction, not going north or -- yeah, north from Victory; right? It's all going on -- going south. That's where all the -- the construction is going on.

It's increasing -- the traffic has been increasing for a while and is likely to continue increasing. When we moved here in 1996 it was two lanes. Seen a lot of development since then; right? So, we are not against it, but we just want to see that we are thoughtful in going forward with it. Compass Pointe may be suitable development and a suitable design along one of the city's more urban corridors. I think that John explained it well, that that kind of development is usually in areas where there is more commercial, there is more, you know, ability to get the -- the busing and all that other kind of stuff. So, it may enhance the city in a different location, but it does not enhance the city's jammed into a highly visible -- and I guess I thought I understood that they had lowered the acreage on it, that it was going to be more like three to four acres and now it's back up to the full seven acres. Am I mistaken on that? But, anyway, on the corner of Locust Grove. We can accomplish the city's goals of building cross-sections of housing types, but location really does matter. As I said earlier, I have been here since 1996. My husband and I moved here from eastern Oregon and I have observed Meridian evolve into a very sought out area by out-of-state land speculators that purchase plots of land and, then, hire locals to represent their development to our city councils and not just in Meridian, but Boise or any other city. I mean you see Star, Eagle, all of them growing exponentially. While private business and landowners have a right to invest and profit has been well stated earlier; right? We understand that. They don't tend to be as committed, since some don't live and work in our community. So, they are not as tied to a legacy as we are who live here and retire here, which is what my husband and I are doing. They make their money and they move on. They are not as committed to detail -- committed to detail as residents and, hopefully, our elected representatives. So, I ask the Council to please object to the application as it's been submitted. I just asked that we, please, uphold -- respectfully uphold the standards and goals of our Comprehensive Plan, so that Meridian is, as the plan describes, a livable, vibrant, premier town with distinct engaging places that are appropriately located and that preserve our historic charm for future generations and that corner lot, it's nice to have that open. I don't know who owns it exactly. I don't know all the details, but there is a lot of very mature trees there, a lot of habitat there, it's nice to have that open space, especially with so much traffic right there. Maybe a better use of that property might be a park or something. I don't know. But it just seems so -- it would be so much traffic caused by having all those homes there and the left-hand turn I don't think I will ever be able to make. Not during traffic hours, because it's -- it's incredibly busy and even with the roundabout it's going to be a continuous go and there is no busing for the high school students that are in that south area. They all have to ride their bikes or they have to ride their -- or drive their cars and I personally had a very close friend of mine -- if you recall on Locust Grove right in front of the LDS church, there is now a light, because my friend's son was hit there and had a traumatic brain injury and, then, there was a hit and run girl on Locust Grove and, then, there was a killing -- a young boy that was killed on Eagle. Now, granted, that was Eagle, but it was a five lane road. It doesn't matter whose fault it was, there was still a death and one death is too many. So, I'm really concerned about the five lanes. I don't know what the plan is, if it's going to go further south from Victory, but I can imagine that it probably will eventually. Five lanes is a lot and it's going to -- it's going to be just be increasingly -- and the other point on the traffic, I have seen this personally through our subdivision. Reflection Ridge people come through our subdivision, through Caven Ridge, to go out onto Victory or they go on that

private road that's behind there or they go out Standing Timber, so they can make a left on Victory, so they can bypass Locust Grove and Victory; right? So, they do a lot of that. And they also do a lot of traffic through Tuscany to -- to bypass a lot of the need to go through Locust Grove. So, I really think that the subdivisions in the local area around are starting to really take a hit to the traffic, because we are finding other ways to get away from the traffic on Locust Grove and on Victory. So, we are having a lot of that happening, too. So, we got a lot of traffic, more so going through the subdivisions. So, anyway, that's all I have for you this evening. Thank you. Do you have any questions?

Simison: Council, any questions?

Weber: Thank you for your time.

Strader: Mayor, I do.

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you. Just so I can understand -- and -- and from your perspective as a representative of multiple people in the neighborhood. So, the surrounding neighborhoods have a density of like 4.4 dwelling units per acre. They can't, obviously, develop on the creek, right, and there is the rub. But, you know, this works out to be -- if it was that same density as the surrounding neighbors it would work out to be about 34 units; right? And so I -- is the concern really the -- the traffic and do you think that could be alleviated by the timing of this project? Like would you feel better about it if it happened after the road improvements took place or is it the aesthetics and it not blending in with the neighborhood or help me really understand the it doesn't fit kind of comments.

Weber: Like I said, I'm not against growth or development and I think if we can get it -- if -- if this piece of property is seen fit to be developed, then, I would ask that it would be lower density. So, the 20 some units would be better, because by having less density you are going to have less people trying to get out on that road and what happens, you know, when there is, you know, an emergency in that time frame and the road is completely -- during -- during busy hours there is -- it's going to be very hard to get emergency traffic through there. In fact, I had a friend do a drone video just last week on a Thursday between -- I think it was like at 5:00 o'clock and it -- did the drone and there was literally traffic lined up on Victory from Locust Grove almost to Eagle. It was crazy. And, then, from -- from Victory almost to Standing Timber or Observation Point and where we turn in to go up to Caven Ridge and, then, on Locust Grove it was incredibly built up. So, what's going to end up happening is even if they put a roundabout in there it's -- right now it stops traffic with the stoplight, so it makes it even harder and with the roundabout it will keep it going, but it's going to be a continuous going, especially in the mornings and in the evenings, because I worked in Boise for quite a few years until February of last year and I retired and going to work -- there was no way I was going to take the Meridian freeway exit, because there is three lanes of merging traffic onto the freeway, that scared the crud out of me, because it was three lanes going into one, so I would refuse to do that. So, I would go all the way down Victory, go up Eagle, to get onto the freeway there,

because at least I felt like I was safer getting on one -- one time -- one at a time, instead of three of us trying to get on at the same time and a lot of other people are starting to see that. They are starting to figure that out. So, what are they are all doing, they are all going down to Eagle and getting on the freeway there and, then, you get back up on Eagle in the morning. So, it's definitely traffic. Part of it is definitely aesthetics and the density. The safety issues. And I do know that the Meridian Nampa Irrigation District is starting to see some struggles with them being able to keep up with everything and this is too small to really make that much of a difference, I get that, but it all starts to add up. It all starts to add up. You're welcome. Thank you.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Real quick, Deena. One question, though, because it might be a question for the applicant to -- to talk about when he comes back up and that's -- you talked about, you know, riding your bike and whatnot and it's a gated community and being locked out, but I think -- are you concerned about the pathway being something that you can't access? Is that the -- the concern?

Weber: I just think that what's been very fun for us is that from living in Los Alamitos and I -- we go -- we have friends in Tuscany and we -- we ride our bikes and we have the ditch banks with -- with the -- the pathways and stuff, it's been really fun to interact with our neighbors and our neighboring neighborhoods to be able to ride bikes through there and just enjoy ourselves and when you have that triangle piece it's -- they are just going to be cut off from the world, so to speak, because there isn't any way to really get in there or do anything and share their -- their little area with everybody else as well.

Hoaglund: Okay. Thank you. We will check on that.

Weber: You're welcome.

Simison: Thanks.

Weber: Thank you.

Simison: Thank you.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, next is Dwight Pond.

Simison: Good evening.

Pond: Good evening, Mr. Mayor and Council. My name is Dwight Pond. I live at 2699 South Bayou Bar Way. I am impressed with this crowd behind me. They came way more prepared than I did. The only thing I bring to you is nothing new. I was aware that we have been through an incredible growth spurt in the last ten years and I was Googling

this morning and it turns out Meridian is about seven percent growth over the last ten years and we have had bigger numbers in Boise. The only percentage one that was higher was Star and I got to thinking about that and I was thinking about our Locust Grove expansion, because we live off Timezone right where the traffic light is getting ready to go in and so we weren't super keen on the expansion anyway, because it would just mean for us more noise, more traffic, just, you know, more stuff. But at least with the traffic light people can at least make access into Locust Grove and so we thought that would -- that would be a benefit. But, then, when I heard about the project and I just learned about it in the last couple days, my biggest concern is when Locust Grove is already a problem that you are addressing or ACHD is addressing with expansion, I don't understand why we would be even considering adding a higher density to put even more flow into a problem that we already recognize exists and that was why I decided I would at least come here tonight and express my opinion. It's like when you have a problem -- I'm in business, I work at a hospital here, we don't typically make the problem worse by just simply adding more to it and so I would hope that we could maybe come to a better compromise with the developer. I'm certainly in favor of smart growth and I don't think the Treasure Valley is slowing down anytime soon, but it just doesn't make sense to me to put even more pressure on an artery that seems like it's already jacked up as it is and so I would respectfully request that the project as planned be adjusted at least to a smaller footprint and maybe we can find a common ground with the development organization. But Locust Grove, in my opinion, is not going to be well suited to take on additional -- additional traffic. Thank you for your time.

Simison: Council, any questions? Thank you.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, next is Chris Groll. Okay. He did sign up, so we will go to Jared Smith. Is there a Jared Smith? Next we have -- oh, Jared is online. One moment. Jared, you should be able to unmute yourself.

Smith: Can you hear me? Awesome. Well, thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. I'm here tonight because I recently received multiple flyers containing very frightening reasons to oppose this rezoning. One thing that's interesting to me about this flyer was Mr. Buckner's phone number at the bottom listed with the Area Code 562. I thought it was really interesting, because that's also my area code and if you are unaware, it's an area code for Orange and Los Angeles counties in Southern California. Yeah, I'm one of those dang Californians. Just like the California realtor being derided tonight and exactly like Mr. Buckner himself. Since moving to Idaho from California I have had plenty of people say things like welcome, we are glad you are here, but remember why you left. I have also heard some less kind versions of that as well. I personally, though, think it's valuable to discuss why I left, because I think it's relevant tonight -- to this hearing tonight. I personally left California because my now wife and I were concerned about being able to afford a home. As a young couple our combined salaries would leave us unable to get a leg up and prepare for our futures and the high house prices in southern California left my parents unable to retire anytime soon and after working in the state legislature on housing issues, it became clear to me that housing in California is so expensive because it is so dang hard to build, mainly due to the efforts of existing residents trying to stifle

development in favor of things like, quote, smarter or, quote, more reasonable growth and things were never going to change and so we moved and, yeah, don't get me wrong, I love my neighborhood and I think my neighbors are some of the most kind, generous and caring people I have met, but I think the approach is misguided. I remember why I left California and I'm frustrated to see the same conditions here that made me unable to start a life in my hometown. In my experience the common refrains when people are concerned about this type of housing is the traffic will spike, the design clashes with existing buildings, housing prices will decrease of our existing homes and, you know, to the first I have to say that the ACHD study and the -- you know, the numbers provided by staff, it doesn't show a significant terrifying growth that, you know, is -- as -- that's reflected in the flyer that was passed to me. And to the second, anyone about, you know, design clashing, anyone who walks from Tuscany to my subdivision in Bellingham Park or, you know, further down to Wells, will see that there are different designs ingrained in each of these communities and they change from community to community and that's not a bad thing. It adds character and it adds flavor to our communities. I think we all, though, ought to be less concerned about the character of our homes and more concerned about the character of their inhabitants. What does it say about a developer who has worked tirelessly to accommodate concerns, offered to completely change the designs of his homes and reduce the number of lots, only to face the same unchanged opposition as before. Just as some are opposing this -- this development based on, you know, a concern about traffic and differing design standards, I know that someone just opposed my home on the same grounds when it was built in 2011. I know that beneath plenty of these arguments lies the reality that many are concerned about the value of our homes where much of our net worth is stored, but what worries me more is the fact that one day my son or daughter will be in the same position that I was in and will be unable to afford a starter home in the place they were born and raised. Lastly, I -- you know, I echo Mr. Buckner's view, that people are moving to our great state and to our city because they want freedom, but what, then, does it say about the efforts of a president of a neighboring HOA to use the city as a cudgel to limit the ability of others to build and live in our great city, even after the Commission and staff have approved it? I don't mean to cast aspersions, but this inconsistency is glaring and at times frustrating to me. Mr. Buckner is right when he says your actions today will impact our future of our community and I hope that the impact they have is one of fostering a welcome community and not one where we climbed the ladder before hoisting it up behind us. Because of this, because of my respect for my neighbors concerns is outweighed by a greater concern for my children's future -- my future children's future at that, I respectfully request you approve this application and I'm happy to answer any questions or -- you know, I know you guys have limited -- limited time, so feel free to move on to the next.

Simison: Thank you, Mr. Smith. And, unfortunately, I have got to ask you, much to maybe the chagrin of the people in this, for your address. Hopefully no one is going to come by your home later, but --

Smith: You know, I'm always happy to have these conversations. I'm actually neighbors with Ms. Link. I am at 4259 Rangewood Way.

Simison: Thank you.

Smith: In Bellingham Park.

Simison: Council, any questions? Okay. Thank you.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, next is Annette Alonso with the Southern Rim Coalition. Annette, you can unmute yourself.

Alonso: Good -- good evening, everybody. This is Annette Alonso at 2204 East Hyper Drive in Meridian and I'm representing the Southern Rim Coalition. I have kind of -- I'm very neutral on this development. You know, I just -- I think part of what's aggravating people is they are -- you know, let's move to Idaho, but let's shut the door kind of a thing and that's not realistic. You know, we all come from somewhere else at some point and -- and I think our -- our community is growing. It's growing very rapidly. You know, we have approved R-15 south down on -- on Lake Hazel off of Eagle Road. So, I think -- I think saying R-15 should be -- you know, it says that it should be by commercial and housing and things like that, but in reality that's going to come eventually and in this area especially it's going to come. So, you know, the only -- the only thing I might have a problem with on this is, you know, the R-15 zoning and an R-8 -- and -- and that worries me only because if this development -- they end up not doing this development and they end up selling it to somebody, then, we have an R-15. Granted, they would have to come back to the City Council and Planning and Zoning and do some things again, but that's my -- really my only concern is we are changing the FLUM right after we have done it again and we said we are not going to do that. So, you know, the road thing -- if the road thing is the road thing, I think the roundabout will take a huge pressure off of this intersection. I mean I go through this intersection all the time. I live in this area. As you know I have been pretty much involved with every development that's happened in this area and -- and when it's an in-fill, you know, the Southern Rim is trying to -- it sits back and go, you know, in-fill needs to happen, we need to in-fill, it's the far reaching stuff that's more of a concern to us. So, that's my two cents worth.

Simison: Thank you, Annette. Council, any questions? Okay. Thank you.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, next I -- I'm not good at reading the writing, but I believe it's Kent Gale? Is that -- great.

Gale: Mr. Mayor, Councilmen, my name is Kent Gale. I live at 4680 South High Cliff Avenue. I'm opposing this development due to the fact that the City of Meridian is growing extremely rapidly, as everybody here is aware of. However, the road systems here have not been keeping up pace with the population growth. The traffic circle at Victory and Locust Grove may be great for that portion of the intersection, but the entire length of Locust Grove from Overland all the way down to Amity is a two lane road, a lot of traffic, no turn lanes. I ride a motorcycle every day to work and I have been hit almost three or four times on that road to begin with, because people get impatient with the traffic flow and they will just try to dart out in front of anybody and everybody. Adding higher traffic

density to that road is very concerning to me and like was said earlier today, ACHD is not planning on doing Locust Grove until maybe next year, but they are already talking about building -- starting the construction on it the end of this year. What happens if that project gets delayed on Locust Grove to a later date? We have just added more traffic to a congested area already that just does not make sense for the citizens who live in that area and try to use Locust or Victory as an alternate route. Again, appreciate your time. Any question?

Simison: Council, any questions?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Gale: Thank you.

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you. I understand that -- the traffic concern, but I guess really what we come to is -- it's that question of are you going to kind of pull up the ladder behind you? I get there is the infrastructure concern, but do you think that the City of Meridian should stop all development? I mean why this development particularly? It's 37 units? Help me understand. I mean do you think we should just stop growing for a period of time? What -- what's your view on that?

Gale: Personally, ma'am, I think that the city needs to stop all growth until the road systems are upgraded to accommodate the growth rate that's going on in this city. I mean because without a road system and the infrastructure, then, where are we going?

Strader: Thank you.

Gale: Thank you.

Simison: Thank you.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, next is Mike Bierman.

Bierman: Good evening. Can you hear me okay?

Simison: Yes.

Bierman: Great. I'm a retired educator and I want to compliment you guys on your focus, seeking to understand where everyone's coming from. You have a tough decision. I'm not anti-growth, although I do we like open areas. I have lived in this area all my life, where I used to hunt pheasants, not even close to where I can do now. But my main concern with this project is the one entrance and one exit on Locust Grove and until -- I mean if it were me until I had an understanding of how it's going to work, I would be a little concerned and I drive and ride my bike in that area and if I lived in this new

development and I came out on Locust Grove, I would not try to turn left, I would have to turn right would be my only shot and, then, I'm worried that they are going to take another right into Tuscany Village, which, I'm sorry, I didn't tell you where I live, but I live in Tuscany Village and that is a road -- on roads that just have parking on both sides and lots of children. So, that's a real concern of mine. It's a safety issue and I would just hope that you can look into that concern. If that can be answered, then -- then great. But if it can't it's a safety thing for me, because there are a lot of kids in that subdivision, there always will be. That's the type of subdivision it is and if people are going to come through there and, then, turn left on Victory, they get to that Meridian -- it would just concern me a great deal. Have any questions?

Bierman: I live at 1204 East Pienza Street in Meridian.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Bernt: Mr. Mayor, just a comment.

Simison: Councilman Cavener -- or, sorry, Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: That's okay. It's a compliment, actually. I feel for you in regard to the hunting, you know. I'm not going to lie, but if I could walk out my back door in county property and shoot a couple pheasants in the morning, I think I would go for that ten out of ten times.

Bierman: No, I'm not expecting that, by the way.

Bernt: I know -- I -- I know you are not, but what I'm saying is I miss -- I miss those -- those times as well.

Bierman: Okay. Thank you. And you have a tough decision. I appreciate your time.

Simison: Thank you. If I could ask a question maybe to Joe or Bill or -- do we have ACHD -- is Kristy on the line this evening?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, she is not.

Simison: Okay. Just out of curiosity, was it ever explored -- I know we have an emergency access off a Victory. Because with the roundabout one of the nice things -- I am going to say something about roundabouts. Everyone ready? One of the nice things about a roundabout -- if you had a right out onto Victory it would allow for easier left-hand turn movements at the -- at the roundabout. ACHD is already diverting from their policy for one. Do we choose the wrong one to divert for their policy for a left-hand turn movement or is the other one already in and the roundabout is so close that it's not plausible? Just out of curiosity, if that was ever explored.

Dodson: Mr. Mayor, those conversations that I know of were not had specifically. The best I can say is that from the beginning ACHD was adamant about these being -- the

Locust Grove access as being the only access and the subdivision having private streets. That's the -- unfortunately, how part of this conversations went, because they were pretty much at a hard stop.

Simison: Mr. Clerk, continue.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Next is Chris Paul.

Paul: Good evening. My name is Christopher Paul and I'm at 3823 South Como Avenue. I know a lot of these points have been touched, so I'm going to try and hit the ones that haven't been touched. So, in response to Jared, he mentioned, you know, his kids future. I guess he didn't read that Mountain View High School with the report is 109 percent to capacity. Victory Middle School is 105 percent to capacity and Hilddale Elementary School is 132 percent to capacity. So, Jared sounds like a young guy like myself and it is a concern of mine that the nearest schools are already overcapacity and I do have concern about education, putting more homes in there. Another thing I will mention is no parking in the gated community. When you are not able to park in those areas I am curious what's going to happen on holiday weekends, you know, if people are having parties and events, they can't go park in their neighbor's driveway. Are they going to be parking in our communities and walking over to the -- to the gated area -- or to the gated community? So, that's a real concern of mine with parking and, then, also I know traffic's been touched a lot, but I noticed that the traffic widening -- and maybe someone can clarify it for me -- is that the widening and the roundabout only goes up to a certain point and it almost looks like the -- where the one exit is that is not widened. It might be in the future. I just was a little bit confused on that. And also I truly believe that the traffic -- the current issue -- we are solving for the current issue, not the future with -- with this roundabout. We also have a lot of communities or subdivisions going at -- on Locust Grove south of Amity. So, those homes are also going to continue to cause traffic and I also had another question. Was the report done with ACHD in regard to those subdivisions that already have been approved? And how about the 41 homes that are going in across the street? And, then, lastly, from a safety issue I know that there is that access point from Victory. That's an emergency access point, but, still, I know he is -- I know it was mentioned that it's only 1.5 cars a minute, but, really, it's -- in a 24 hour period when you take that out when people are sleeping, it's everyone's going in and out at the same time. So, what if there is a fire truck that's trying to come in, even through the emergency access point, where -- and, then, there is cars lined up, are they even going to be able to get to the emergency in that situation? And, lastly, I know it was mentioned four point -- 4.8 homes per acre or -- in terms of density. I know that technically it's near -- okay.

Simison: You can finish your thought.

Paul: Okay. Yeah. I was just going to say technically it's near that and other communities, but, really, you can't build on the -- on Ten Mile Creek, so it's really much higher and I would like everyone to just consider that.

Simison: Okay. Thank you. Council, any questions? Thanks.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, that was the last of those that indicated positively they wished to testify.

Simison: Okay. Is there anybody else in the audience that would like to provide testimony on this item? If so you are welcome to come forward at this time and state your name and address for the record and be recognized for three minutes. Or if you are online and would like to provide testimony, please, use the raise your hand function and we will work you in appropriately. Go ahead, ma'am.

Allen: I didn't come prepared either, because I just found out about this. I just have a couple questions.

Simison: If you can state your name and address for the record.

Allen: Doris Allen and I'm at 2624 South Inglenook Place. So, I'm off of Locust Grove. Have a hard time -- have had a hard time getting on and I don't think that the roundabout is going to fix it, because I wait for the traffic light to stop traffic so I can get on, so -- and I have been at -- at roundabouts before, but the roundabout is going to just keep on letting traffic keep coming on the busy -- at the busy times and it's not going to stop traffic, so that I can get out there, especially when school's on and people are going to work, because when I was working I could not get to Overland and once I got to Overland I couldn't get to Eagle to get on the freeway to go to work. So, if you were a few minutes late off your time schedule you were a half hour late or more -- 45 minutes late getting downtown and that was 2012. So, now combine that -- I don't do an 8:00 o'clock or a 7:45 or even a 7:00 o'clock meeting now, so -- but I recently had a leak at my house, found out that the psi inside my house was a hundred and Meridian water came over and said that is what all the houses was a hundred. I had to put a pressure valve -- pressure reducing valve in my house to reduce the water pressure in my house, so that it didn't blow out all my plumbing. So, if we continue to put more projects, more housing developments out, they have to increase the water pressure to get water to those developments. What does that do to the existing developments that we already have? And when you talk about Nampa Irrigation, I have had to put in a new -- a new pump -- or not a pump, but an irrigation site with a filter -- with a triple size filter, because it turns my water system off. I can't leave a day without having to clean that filter. So, I don't know -- and I have had Nampa Irrigation down there. They don't -- my -- the person putting it in says so much dirt and everything is coming through there it would clog up my -- my drip lines, so -- schools.

Simison: If you can --

Allen: Who is going to pay for the schools, who is going to pay for the sewer, who is going to pay for the roads, who is going to pay for all the infrastructure that we don't have in place to put these in. Where that -- the only thing I would say where that Compass is at is -- is a bad -- it's a bad location where the structure is. We talk about one -- one car, it's a two car garage and, then, if they have friends they must be going to have like a parking structure for those friends to go and park at. So, you are going to have a lot of parking.

Simison: Thank you, Doris. Council, any questions?

Allen: That's why I oppose it.

Simison: Thank you.

Lambert: Mayor and City Council, my name is Debbie Lambert and I live at 3698 South Arno. I -- I would reiterate a lot of things, but I won't waste the time. I think one thing that we haven't talked about is the wildlife in the area. I'm very much a bird watcher. I'm a lover of birds of prey and all those trees that they are cutting down on both of those corners house a ton of birds. I count birds for the bird society. We have seen a decline in the kestrels. We have a lot of hawks in the area, a lot of birds of prey hawks. They are losing their homes. One of the questions I would ask is what is the plan for the trees along Ten Mile Creek there at the back of that subdivision that's going in. I do oppose the subdivision at the rating that is being asked to be put in at. I would ask that it be declined for all the reasons that other people have brought up. Thank you. Questions?

Simison: Thank you. Council? Is there anybody else that would like to provide testimony on the item?

J.Lambert: Good evening. My name is James Lambert. I live at 3698 South Arno in Meridian and I really basically have a comment, even though I -- I totally opposed this project. I bring up the fact that at the corner near Overland and -- and Meridian Road there is a Dutch Brothers Coffee located there and I know Luke's been on NextDoor neighbors often about the problems it's generated there and people are scratching their heads on what to do to correct that traffic issue there and I think that's the exact same issue we are looking at with the left-hand turns coming out of this subdivision. If we approve it is what are we going to do down the road, because it's going to be a problem. Like the gentleman said, it's either going to go through his neighborhood or something. But we need to do that now. Don't scratch our heads like we are for the Dutch Brother issue over there. That's all I have.

Simison: Thank you. The good news is there is a solution coming for the Dutch Bros. soon. ITD and ACHD are working together on a light for that intersection. Is there anybody else that would like provide testimony? It's look like we have got a couple more.

Toledo: Hi, Mr. Mayor, Council. My name is Aaron Toledo and I am at 4323 Rangewood Way. So, hopefully, I don't come across too -- too crass. I will try to refine it in my head. First of all, not sure if you guys have been on these roads lately, but there is a reason why I was late today. Now that -- with the whole COVID thing getting done -- over and done with, we forget that a lot of these folks were tele -- teleworking; right? So, you're just seeing -- and I mean everyone here's seen it. We have seen these -- these lines that are ridiculous and, you know, for all the reasons that we mentioned; right? The traffic. The gentleman with the degree in geophysics that talked about the aquifer system. You know, all these reasons -- we could go in circles all day, but I think what it boils down to is, you know, we got to ask ourselves like what is the function of government; right? At all levels.

To further the will of the people. And just judging by how many folks are in favor of this, we have, what, that one gentleman Jared so far. One lady was neutral after him. So, that doesn't really count. That kind of equalizes. And, then, all of us that have, you know, come to show up. I think it speaks for itself, that we do not wish for this proposal to continue as planned. You know, I'm -- I'm very pro business. I'm -- you know, I'm not anti-business. I'm not anti-growth even. But as everyone has reiterated here, smart growth -- maybe we can revisit this and just alter it somehow. I mean I just -- I would say why complicate this issue, you know. My son loves math. If I could ask him, hey, if there is one person that spoke in favor, one person neutral, and all these numbers, which one do you think you should listen to? I think he would come up with the answer. So, let's just keep it simple I ask and -- and, please, consider voting in opposition of this proposal. Thank you for your time.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Not a question, but just a comment. Thank you, Mr. Toledo. I -- I think it's important to keep in mind that when we are making land use decisions we are in a state with very high emphasis on private property rights and so to Councilman Hoaglund's point earlier, when we make land use decisions we are not making it by taking a poll of the room of how many people are in favor or how many people are against. We can make lawful decisions about what's in the city's best interest. We can take into account comments about the traffic, about whether this fits for the zoning or for our future land use map, but certainly it's not a popularity contest and I just want to make that comment. That's just not how -- how this can work.

Toledo: Understood. But I mean the traffic already is bad. So, it doesn't make any sense to make it worse.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any further questions? Okay. Thank you.

Toledo: Thank you.

Paul: Mr. Mayor, City Council, thanks for your time. My name is Walter Paul. I live at 563 East Piazza Drive and that's in Caven Ridge. I just wanted to share some thoughts with you, maybe beyond this development. I have had -- spent most of my life in New York and 14 years in the state of California. I have seen growth beyond all of this completely. Explosive growth. And the one thing that government has struggled with, you know, through everything that I have witnessed is they do not keep infrastructure up with the development or the growth of people and housing and I know this is a tough decision for you, but when -- what I find is is that sometimes we have roads that are 20, 30, 40 years old and we have an influx of people. Tremendous amount. When we look at Locust Grove it certainly is not -- from Overland south it's not capable of handling what

we have today. We continue to see developments going in it's just going to continue with the problem. Water was a problem in California. Where I came from they continue to build and they just told people to keep using less. So, what you are doing is government is putting pressure on people to do less with -- have lesser quality of life. You can't use water, you can't drive on your street. Should I go to the lake today, because I may not have -- you know, because traffic is bad. I would second guess going to a beach in California because of the traffic. So, it does dictate and it does really ruin the quality of life. So, going forward my -- just my -- my thoughts that I'm sharing with you tonight is just, you know, this is beyond just this development, because I think we are starting to see the stresses and strains of this and, again, this is bigger than just this development going on over here.

Simison: Thank you, Walter. Council, questions?.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Yeah. Just maybe a comment. I think there is a question here. We will see. Walter, you know, you -- you raise a good point, you know, that -- that infrastructure doesn't keep up and just like our schools -- we had a good meeting with the school board here a couple weeks ago and found, yeah, they don't start building schools if they are below capacity. They wait until we are capacity and above before they build the next school and it's -- unfortunately, our tax structure for our road system is kind of the same way. Impact fees are paid by developers who come in and we get impact fees for police, fire, parks and -- and Ada County Highway District. So, you need those fees. You know, we want growth to pay for itself. But, unfortunately, we have to have that growth so, then, the money can be there. Now a couple years ago ACHD tried to raise registration fees on vehicles and the voters turned it down. So, that means there is not more money for roads. We haven't had a gas tax increase, which is a state legislature thing, for many many many years and so -- and the cost of maintaining roads goes up. So, I guess if we have a solution to have funding to do that in advance, I would love -- love to hear it, because it is difficult.

Paul: Yeah. If I have one comment to that I would say sometimes in life -- and I know most governments struggle with this. Sometimes you have to take a pause. Sometimes you have to step back and say we need to pause. Where are we at? What's it doing to our -- our environment, our community, our roads and are we now ready to continue on or do we have to take a pause now and, then, see where we are at and, then, step and go forward at that point of time. So, I think everything is always a rush and that's what I have seen in all these other places on business. I traveled a lot. I have been to Seattle. I have been to Portland. So, all the mistakes that I'm seeing in those places, as well as where I grew up and as well as the 14 years I spent in California I'm seeing now you're faced with those same problems and those same issues and a lot of times they just don't stop and take a pause and, then, that's why everybody is running here. But we are running out of places to run to, because, you know, basically, you know, we were going

to become them and, then, it's going to be what's the next, you know, big city or state to go, so -- so just some observations for your -- for your consideration.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, if I might follow up.

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Those are good observations, Walter. I appreciate that and -- and it's also involvement for you and others in this room to be involved in the legislative elections, because some of the tools they give us is to widen Eagle Road The Village was going to pay for that widening and that's how Eagle Road got widened. Chinden Road, we needed it to be widened 20 years ago and to do that you have to approve development, like a Costco, so, then, they will pay for the road improvement and widening of it and, then, the state allows them to collect the revenue back over a period of time. It's called the STARS program and, then, collect the small amount to repay them to widen that road. So, I find it ironic that we have to approve development to get the roads widened.

Paul: Yeah.

Hoaglund: It's just --

Paul: And I knew that about Costco and Chinden, which was -- was tremendous and I think because this is becoming more of a destination point and is growing, I think you can lean on these businesses that want to be here and make money, you know, for the long haul to help maybe all of us in terms that we shouldn't be bearing all of this, because they need to be sharing in it with us. You know, they want to be sharing it with us. You know, if they want to share in the profits from us, which they can share in some of the costs, too.

Hoaglund: Yeah. And Mr. Mayor. To your point, Walter, that's a great point and I think in this case the developer is -- is giving ACHD land -- or I don't know what the arrangement is, but we require that of developers all the time. They have to provide those easements for future widening. If they want to develop you are going to have to contribute and we do have some really good developers who provide school sites and whatnot. So, yes, to your point, you are absolutely right that they have to have skin in the game and most of them do, so -- I appreciate you speaking tonight and the dialogue. Hopefully -- hopefully it was educational for everybody.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor, I really appreciate the comments that have been made in regard to smart growth. I couldn't agree more and I won't -- I won't get into it too much, but there has been a couple of comments that have been made in regard to taking a pause and just stepping back and watching and analyzing -- and I'm now -- I don't necessarily think that that is a viable option as well. I travel on -- we all travel on the same roads you guys

do. You know, we -- I live near here, this -- this -- this development and I do a business in a development that's nearby. So, I'm always on this. I totally get it. We all get it. The economic consequences of putting a pause on growth would be catastrophic. Would be absolutely catastrophic and I think that sometimes as a community we have short term memory loss when it comes to this, because I was involved in the great recession that hit our country 12 years ago and the amount of people who lost their jobs because growth stopped -- now I get that wasn't local government that made that choice, it was -- it was because of different circumstances for sure, but -- and I'm not saying that I -- I empathize with you. I -- we all do. But I'm not sure that a pause right now would be the answer. Smart growth for sure. And I really appreciate the comments that have been made and brought up with regard to smart growth. I really appreciate it. But pause, I -- I think that would be enormously catastrophic to our -- our community.

Simison: Councilman Bernt, we did take a brief pause as we were waiting for the legislature, but the word I have heard people use is moratorium, which has -- and that's the city's official way to do things, but there are sideboards that limit that only for a brief period of time, so --

Bernt: Right.

Simison: But, again, I think going back to the point of understanding the state law and getting involved with your legislators is how you can help us address issues perhaps in the future. With that we are still open for public testimony on this item, so if you have not yet testified -- yes, ma'am. Come on up. If you would state your name and address for the record.

Alexander: This one?

Simison: Either one.

Alexander: Thank you. My name is Linda Alexander and I live at 1650 Susan Drive, which is south of Amity on the rim. I came here 26 years ago from Montana and we chose to come here. We had options for when my husband was going to be transferred. We had the option of staying in Montana or come here. We came here because we were whitewater rafters and skiers and so this area appealed to us for our kids. They were in high school at the time and Idaho is awesome. It offers -- it has so much to offer all of us. My concern about this growth is -- and I'm not opposed to growth by any means. I -- my parents were in the Air Force. I moved all my life. I can't -- this is my home, because I have lived here the longest, but -- and I have experienced a lot of growth in various places that I have lived. I'm opposed to this growth, because it's too much. I know that he did calculations and says it's not high density, but it is considering the surrounding areas. I actually think it should be R-4 and I do admit I had a mistake, I thought this lot was the one north of there with the -- that was backing up to Cabella. I did not realize it was the small little -- and it's small. I mean it's six acres. But if it were R-4 that would be 24 homes and they are talking 37 lots. How many people -- how many families are going to be with -- you are talking triplex -- or no. Yeah. Triplex and duplex. That's a lot of families

in that tiny -- and that's rather small. I -- I live on an acre and so it's -- it still looks small to me for 37 lots with triplexes and duplexes. That's just way too many people in a small area that's only going to have two entrances and it's with a private gated area. It's just too much impact we already have and someone mentioned -- the earlier man mentioned all the housing that's approved going in already, it's being built. They are putting in the sewers south of Locust Grove and how many homes are going to be there? You guys approved it. I do not know. Many. Many. And that's -- they are not going to travel south when they are commuting, they are going to go north and make the roads worse. When we moved here 26 years ago we were told that Locust Grove was going to be three lanes within five years. It's still two lanes and it's still the quality of a farm lane. That is Locust Grove to the south and so I think it should be actually changed to R-4 and go with the growth, but reduce the number of houses per lot. It's just -- per acre. Just -- it's absurd what -- what's going on here with -- with the roads especially. It took me 50 minutes -- 50 minutes to get from the West Y down to south of Amity today because of the traffic and I don't normally drive at that time, but I was able to work out -- you have to sign up and so that was the only time available for me to work out.

Simison: Ma'am if you can --

Alexander: So, please, consider changing it to R-4, not R-8.

Simison: Thank you.

Alexander: Thank you. Thanks for all you do.

Simison: Council, any questions? Appreciate it. Is there anybody else that would like to provide testimony in this application?

Hess: Good evening. My name is Linda Hess. I live at 3093 South Gold Bar in Sherbrooke Hollows. It's about a quarter of a mile east of the proposed development. I won't repeat a lot of what you have heard tonight. One thing I will say and add on to what has been said is that I was at the last hearing and my husband and I have looked at all the plat maps. I have worked for developers. I have worked for builders. I lived in the state of California in the Bay Area for ten years and came back. I was born and raised here and so I have been a witness to all the growth. I have gone outside of the state. I have seen the growth and what happens on the other side of the scene, okay? There is a lot of work and there is a lot of money and time invested in putting together these developments and master planned communities. I get that. I know what it's all about and I know that you guys have your job to do. I think what I would like to say is that I would like to see a balance of what is going to happen on this property. I would like to see the density reduced. I am a mom. I am a grandma. I am a wife. I am a lot of different things every day and my daughter could not afford to live in this community as it is. My daughter probably will not be able to afford to live in that community even if it is reduced. If I was able to live in this community and I was babysitting my grandma, I would be scared to drive out on -- out of that roundabout onto Locust Grove. I understand why ACHD is requiring it to be private. I understand why that roundabout -- not that roundabout, but

that round entrance in and out onto Locust Grove -- that is a huge concern for me. So, the density, the housing within that property, I would like to see it reduced, because it is a safety issue and I understand that Locust Grove is going to be expanded and that roundabout is going to continue the traffic. That is not going to -- that is not going to reduce the safety there, because if you are trying to pull out of that subdivision onto Locust Grove, even if we put off building this subdivision after the construction has been done, it is still going to be and exist a safety issue, because the amount of people and the way you have to pull out. That traffic is going to be continuous. That traffic there is not going to be a stoplight. So, I think from my perspective, living in that community, I walk my dogs in the community, I bird watch in the community. I don't pheasant hunt. But -- but -- I don't. But, you know, again, just being part of the community and a concerned citizen, I would like to live there with my granddaughter and pull out and feel like I was safe and all the other kids that are coming back and forth from Mountain View and all the nearby schools, I guess what I'm saying, please, consider reducing the amount of residents.

Simison: Thank you. Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor, I got a question. Ma'am. Just one question. There has been a lot of comments tonight in regard to affordability and it's a really interesting topic and trying to wrap my arms around that. Can you walk me through how you think us denying this project would -- is going to make affordability with housing going forward?

Hess: I am not requesting or suggesting to deny the project, what I am saying -- I think that we should reduce the number of housing units that we are putting on this property. I am not anti-growth. Again, I work on the development side. I have worked for the best home builders in the country when I lived down in California. I know what goes on behind the scenes. I know what happens when you have to approach city councils for approval of your master plans and your developments. So, I am not saying to put this project -- or cancel the project --

Bernt: Right.

Hess: -- I'm just saying let's wait until this -- let's wait a little bit until this Locust Grove is complete and maybe do a little bit of more investigation or future studies on it.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor, follow up.

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: So, if -- if -- just hypothetically if we were to approve this -- this project at a lower density do you believe that that would affect affordability?

Hess: I don't know at this time. I don't think anybody can say what is going to happen. We don't know what's going to happen next week. Again, you know -- you know, I would like my daughter and my family -- I would like to -- you know. Yeah. Could I afford to live in there? I don't know that.

Bernt: I get it. I was -- interesting you're the first person to mention that tonight. I just wanted to --

Hess: Oh, you know, I -- I haven't really talked to anybody else about that.

Bernt: I get it.

Hess: But, again, you know, coming from the -- living in the community, being a grandma, working on the development side -- and, again, I appreciate all the money that the developer has put into the project. I'm just saying from the other side of things -- and sometimes we have to step back and put ourselves in other shoes, our shoes and theirs, and what is the best for all of us --

Bernt: Sure.

Hess: -- combined and that's definitely finding a balance.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any further questions? Okay. Thank you. Is there anyone else that would like to provide testimony on this item? State your name and address for the record, please.

Zarate: My name is Helen Zarate. I live at 3440 South Murlo Way. Excuse me. It's allergies I believe. And I have lived there for -- since 2005 when the houses were new and I have watched, you know, the cattle, the sheep, the birds, the trees, you know, all disappear. So, my backyard faces the development. This is Locust Grove and I have a new tenant. My niece lives with me now. And she's noticed since she's been there all the traffic accidents in the -- on Locust Grove near the -- near the intersection and so my main -- I -- and I have grandchildren who go to Mountain View High School, but they are almost through it. They are almost graduated. But they have had trouble getting to school, too. So, I know the high density of the area. I mean it's concerning, but -- so my concern mainly is -- I don't know. Losing the natural habitat and the peace and, you know, all the traffic that's been added and all that it's like -- but it's still a beautiful place. I still have -- I mean they didn't cut down all the trees, but I was -- I -- there has been a lot of trees cut down recently and -- I guess I'm getting nervous. Excuse me. So, where was I going with this? So, I have seen a lot of change and I was hoping that that land would eventually be parkland, because, you know, it -- but, you know, that's what -- way back when people talked about, oh, they will never turn it into -- you know, because of the odd shape and the triangle and triangles and in the location and everything. But so it was disheartening to find out, you know, 58 units were planned. I went to the first meeting on that site and talked about the trees coming down and all that and now it's -- it's, you know, good to hear that those -- it's been reduced to 37, but still, you know, it's a natural -- it's like a natural creek in there. So, you know -- it is a natural creek and it's beautiful. There is irises growing and I'm concerned about how they are going to alter that, too, as well. But I guess my main concern is safety, the traffic. I'm retired now. I don't go -- when I went out the other day there was -- am I done talking?

Simison: If you can finish -- if you can finish your thought.

Zarate: Okay. When I went out the other day there was -- I had never seen it that way before from the intersection of Locust Grove to Eagle, all lined -- all lined of cars and, then, hearing testimony they are saying it goes on and on the other way. So, you know, I mean adding more traffic in there -- in those left turn, right turns, those issues and rerouting traffic -- I mean I'm like -- I don't even go out in those hours, but I know what they are talking about. And my street is -- has a lot of children on it. So, the rerouting through my street, my areas, my community is a concern. So, thank you for listening.

Simison: Thank you very much. Council, any questions? Okay. Thank you. Is there anybody else that would like to provide testimony on this item?

Prumers: Hi. My name is Emily Prumers. I live at 2230 East Horse Creek Court, Meridian, Idaho. Public speaking is not my thing, so as I stumble through this, please, bear with me. I did -- I know that everybody's made a lot of these points and I don't want to be redundant, so I'm going to try to be quick and I talk fast anyway, so if I'm talking too fast, please, tell me and I will try to slow down. I did want to say just in general, not specific to this intersection, I understand that our infrastructure is just not keeping up with the growth and I understand that pausing is not a viable option, it would have very bad consequences on the area and I understand that, but I think smart growth, like you said earlier, is definitely the way to go and I don't feel that this high density development in this area is smart growth. I'm sorry, I have a couple points. Locust Grove -- I know a lot of people have talked about traffic and the issues, but I want to throw some numbers at you really quick that I actually got from the agency responses that were out on the website. So, the acceptable level of service for a two lane minor arterial is E or 575 vehicles per hour VPH for short. The ACHD rating for Locust Grove Road right now, not including all the growth that's going on south that's already been approved and all that jazz, right now it's F at 676 VPH. Victory is also an F at 651 VPH. And I think it's really important to consider the timing of these ACHD improvements that are happening to the road. You know, I have seen them get it delayed a couple times. We are talking about end of the year here for this development. What happens come February when these -- these improvements to the road are still out, you know, a year or two years, we just can't sustain this amount of traffic and I think everybody would agree with me. I think we have all sung the traffic song. I would also like to point out -- I know that somebody mentioned this, again, and I apologize, the area schools are already at max capacity. I'm going to stop hitting that. The area schools are already at max capacity. What I haven't heard anybody mention is the fire station and MFD's response was that this development is closest to Station No. 4, which the current reliability is only 77 percent and the targeted goal is 80 percent. So, we are already under what we want to be performing for the fire station and I haven't heard anybody talk about that. And, then, again, I just want to reiterate the high density housing, it doesn't align with the zoning of the surrounding area, which are RUT, R-4 and R-8. So, I am, obviously, opposed to this and I would request that it's R-8 or lower and I also just want to -- on a personal note I just kind of want to make the point that I feel like every time I hear about Idaho it really prides itself on recreation, you know, we promote outdoors and the beautiful -- you know, all these things that they explore

Idaho and overcrowded high density housing does not enhance that image, it destroys it and that's all. Any questions?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: No question, just a comment. Emily, I know public speaking isn't always everybody's favorite thing to do, but I thought you did a great job of presenting your facts. I think it's -- Mr. Mayor, can we let -- give her a quick round of applause.

Prumers: I'm going to go have a heart attack now, so --

Cavener: You did a great job. Thank you.

Prumers: Thanks.

Simison: Is there anybody else that would like to provide testimony on this item? Go ahead.

Crandall: My name is Richard Crandall. I live at 1319 East Observation Street. That's in Cabella Creek Subdivision, which is like about a hundred yards west of Locust Grove on Victory right across from Tuscany. So, it's pretty close to the intersection. So, I -- my work is only like five minutes away from me and -- on a good day, but trying to get out -- I actually take Lake Creek, which is about a couple hundred yards north of the intersection on Locust Grove to turn out onto Locust Grove and get there. So, if there is no traffic it takes me like four minutes to get to work. Lately in the morning it's like 7:30, 7:35, it takes me like 15 to 20 minutes. So, that just -- and all that time is pretty much spent trying to turn out onto Locust Grove and I see the line just going all the way back to the intersection. That's just personal story. I know we have all talked about traffic and stuff. But another thing is -- just a note as far as the density, I think Cabella Creek seems to be pretty -- a pretty average neighborhood in the area. I mean at least from what I have noticed and I don't have all the specific numbers, but it seems to be three and a half, four times bigger than the -- the lot that is in this proposal and there is only 47 homes in that subdivision, so I don't know if that kind of gives a good idea of the density of the area or whatever if that's helpful. Obviously, I oppose the proposition, but I just thought some of that personal input might be helpful in you guys reconsidering this.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions? Thanks, Richard. Anybody else that would like to provide testimony on this item this evening? Okay. We are going to go ahead and take a recess before we ask the developer to come up and make your final comments and go into our conversation. So, we will take a ten minute break. Before we officially go on a break I just want -- I'm going to do a self plug, sorry, Council. Next Wednesday is the State of the City address at 3:29 it will be broadcast live and also be put up on our website, but I think a lot -- you can at least hear a lot of my comments on these issues that you have brought up this evening if you want to go in and watch it live or after the

fact regarding transportation, education, growth and infrastructure and services, especially in southeast and northwest Meridian. There is your preview for the -- on my portions of the State of the City. With that we will take a ten minute recess.

(Recess: 8:15 p.m. to 8:26 p.m.)

Simison: All right. We will go ahead and come on back from our recess. So, we have finished up with the public testimony. Joe, I'm going to turn this over to you to help us go through a few things before we ask the applicant -- applicant to come forward.

Dodson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I appreciate it. I just want to touch on a few things that Steve may not be able to answer quite as well, because not knowing the code as well. I'm not going to touch on density. I have beat that dead horse. I did want to note that the site was not required to be posted again, if there is questions about that, it's because the Council continued it, so the only way that would be required to be posted again if Council made that specific decision, which was not part of the motion. The other part of the zoning and -- not just the density, but is also the private streets. R-8, which is what I keep hearing is what would be preferred, requires public street frontage. R-15 does not. Therefore, private streets can only be used with R-15 and up, because they do not have the required street frontage. Private streets are, therefore, not just tied to the -- I guess ACHD's decision regarding the private streets, but also what zoning you can request with that. So, it's kind of a convoluted circle where we go in here with ACHD doesn't want public roads, so, then, we have private streets, so, then, we need a zoning that doesn't require public road frontage, so, then, you have to start with R-15. So, again, it's not just to get 50 units on or 80 units or anything like that, it's -- it's also -- there is other pieces to it that I haven't touched on. So, I just wanted to reiterate that, that it's not just the setbacks. That's one piece. It's not just the lot size. That's another piece. But it's also that private streets can't be proposed within R-8 because of the requirement for a public street frontage. I just wanted to make that clear for Council.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions for Joe on those points?

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: One quick question. Is the ultimate source of the private street requirement one that comes from ACHD or from the applicant's request?

Dodson: It can vary.

Borton: In this case though.

Dodson: In this case it was largely ACHD. They pushed it immediately, even in our pre-application meeting they said that they did not want public roads, because the public -- the use of public roads is for interconnectivity. This can't have any interconnectivity.

There is no stub street from the west because of the creek. The -- this access to Locust Grove already doesn't meet their policy for access to a double arterial intersection, not to mention with a roundabout. So, then, the other length along Victory is even shorter, so no access would meet their policies there. So, it was really pushed by ACHD. They -- they have noted in their staff report that if the City Council prefers public roads, then, it would be drastically -- take up a ton of the space on the site and would render it a sea of asphalt in large part.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for Joe at this time? Okay. Then I will ask the applicant --

Bernt: One question, Mr. Mayor.

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Just for the -- just for the public interest, are you saying that if it weren't for the recommendation from ACHD to have this be R-15 for private roads, it would be an R-8 given the density?

Simison: Well, again, with the density it's not tied to the zoning. Granted with the dimensional standards -- if you put public roads you are never going to get this many units, because of the site constraints. So, it would automatically reduce the density, but that could be with R-4, with R-8 with -- I mean it -- it's not only because of the private streets, no. But if the applicant did request or want public roads, the density would be reduced. Note that that was a circular answer. I apologize. It is my understanding that there is no desire to have the public roads by either the applicant or ACHD, because there is no interconnectivity. We would -- you know, tax dollars would be expended for roads that only serve this one community which is a tertiary component of private roads.

Bernt: Got it. Thank you, Joe.

Parsons: Mayor and Council, I would like to also add that the private street approval is a director level decision and so staff's -- the director's already approved the private street layout for this particular development. So, I just wanted to share that information with you as well.

Simison: All right. Ask the applicant to, please, come forward for comments.

Arnold: Mr. Mayor, Members of City Council, again, it's Steve Arnold, A-Team Consultants. I think I will hit on some of the biggest concerns which -- oh, I'm sorry. I will hit on some of the biggest concerns which was the traffic and there has been a lot of discussion about density, number of units, traffic, impacts to the adjacent roads and intersections. If we reduce down to what has been suggested tonight down to the 20 units, that's 17 units down, and although that impact is minimal, the reduction on the intersection -- we are minimal right now with 370 trips. Now, you drop it down to 200 trips, the p.m. peak hour is not reduced by anything respectively, but the reduction in the

number of units greatly affects our developer's ability to build this. So, the -- the -- the impact loss is greatly skewed, because the impact to the neighboring community is minimal in the reduction, but huge to the developer. There was -- Mr. Bruckner brought up the fact that I -- I tried to meet with him a week before. I know it was one of the Council's questions -- I think at several of the hearings that have we met with the developer and when it came down to it, you know, I didn't hear anything -- I -- I was proactive and reached out and at that time it was told to me that it didn't make sense. Annette Alonso did reach out to me and we had, you know, quite a good conversation with it, so we have -- we have tried to be good stewards out there, as can be seen with the 58, 50, 48, 37. We are -- we have got a lot of faith in your planning staff's abilities and I have taken a lot of direction from them and I -- again, I will reiterate I think we have gotten it down to a very nice project. There was talk about geotechnical stuff and groundwater. I have probably got one of the best soils engineers. No relation to me, but it is Bob Arnold and he does a lot of the work for me and the -- the best management practice is along with the city's stormwater pollution plans and stuff, we will make sure that our stormwater doesn't affect the drinking water and, again, the -- the drink -- because we are not using any wells, you know, we are connecting to city potable water, we are connecting to city sewer, we will be adding a pressure irrigation station, so -- because this is, basically, an enclave with the city surrounded by it, we are using all existing city services. So, there really should be no impact to wells and water and drinking water quality. There was one discussion about the pathway and whether it's going to be open to the public. There is a pathway on the west side. We are adding a pathway on the east side adjacent to the homes. We are fencing that property boundary off with a four foot visible fence. There is not going to be -- although the whole subdivision is private, we are not blocking anything from the public use. That's nearly impossible and a lot of times you will see HOAs that try to make their -- their parks private and that's not -- not feasible and it does not work. So, there is nothing that we are going to physically do that blocks the public. However, you know, my guess is that people use the new sidewalks along Locust -- on Victory and Locust, you know, and most likely they -- they can get onto our sidewalk along the Ten Mile Creek. There was a discussion tonight about pausing growth. I just wanted to kind of take a sidestep about what is going on in our housing market. My wife mainly deals in the new construction --

Bernt: Mr. Mayor, I think -- I don't mean to interrupt, but I think that they were referring to a moratorium. I think that's different.

Arnold: Moratorium or pause. I think it -- either one. It's got the same impact to the housing market. We are -- our median house right now is -- in Ada county I believe at 480 and that was probably three weeks ago. It's probably changed since then. You know, the affordability of our homes here in the valley -- it's going out the door and, you know, my kids, although Mr. Bruckner seems to think that I'm making bank, I drive an old pickup, but I mean they are not going to be able to afford homes and it's going to become a problem here and not that this is going to be -- automatically reduce the housing costs, what it's going to do is provide more -- more products, more homes on the market that helps keep the house -- the prices from inflating as they are. So, that's a side note. I think stopping or halting would just exasperate our current problem. I know -- is Annette

still on? If she's listening, one of her concerns is that we zoned it R-15 and that, you know, potentially our client could sell it and now we got another developer comes in with R-15. This project will be subject to a development agreement and that development agreement will run with the land. So, when it's approved and the development agreement goes in play, even if it is sold, the development agreement trumps the zoning and I learned that lesson from a project I worked on in Meridian, so -- there was discussion about Locust Grove Road between Overland and -- and Victory. That is still slated to be widened out to five lanes. That's the main reason why ACHD came and designed the roundabout for the Locust and Victory. That has not been delayed and as -- as far as I know the delay on the roundabout, it -- it has been minimal, although it could be pushed. This project, before we get any traffic on the road, you know, it will take me until the first of the year '22 to get the site improvements done and, then, right now we are about six to nine months on construction. So, you know, the timing -- the intersection will be well done before we get any houses there and/or people moved in. There was a discussion about other traffic and has ACHD taken that into effect, the growth south, and as a part of all the traffic studies on those projects, they do take into account additional traffic. So, ACHD has looked at this and the -- the growth in the area and has approved it at a staff level. So, the -- that is in their -- their traffic report and they have got numbers and projections. So, the people at ACHD have already approved it. There was some discussion about the continuous flow of traffic at a roundabout. Well, actually, a roundabout does stop it and put a -- oh, I forget the -- a gap or a section where there is the ability that people can get out, just like a traffic signal. Traffic signals, the way the traffic engineers design them is so that they do put breaks in traffic, so that the side streets can get onto the arterial. So, there will be breaks where people can get out. Eventually Locust Grove will be widened from the Victory -- Amity is three lanes. So, we will eventually have a center turn lane there, too. We did -- as we are on the ACHD topic, we did push originally to try to get a public road out to Victory Road and connected it to Locust Grove. What I had drawn at that time is I had drive aisles coming off the public street that served a cottage type product and that's when ACHD denied us and said, no, you only can have the one access on Locust Grove, but, then, they granted us a fire access onto Victory. So, we went with that design and there was some discussion of the trees out there. These are cottonwoods, so they are not terribly safe and they are not considered a tree of value. I will stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you. Council, questions for the applicant?

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Just going to use the question to say if there was a final comment you needed to make to close up your remarks?

Arnold: No. I -- yeah, I guess I will reiterate the project itself. You know, I think we have done a lot of work with Joe over the last year and I think four months. I think we have honed this in and -- and got something that the city will be proud of. I mean out in the

area, you know, it's -- people talk to like, you know, I'm a one and done. I have been doing this in the valley for 26 years. We have done -- let's see, Observation Point, Glacier Springs, Tuscany. I think those are all nice projects. When this is said and done I think it will be as nice as those. It's going to be unique. We want to bring a unique product type on. You know, we are going to be in it for the long haul and you will see me again at probably another project in Meridian with this exact group. So, that said I will stand for those questions and thanks for the additional follow up.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Had a couple of questions that folks had kind of brought up I thought you could touch on. One, you know, Ten Mile Creek someone mentioned that it's a flood area. I don't think it's in the flood zone, but can you touch on that? Is that a -- I don't think you need flood insurance for your project, so --

Arnold: So, Mayor, Councilman Hoaglund, yes, there is a flood way down in the stream, but we are -- everything that we are developing is out of the flood way or floodplain. We are going to leave it in its natural state, so we are not disturbing it at all, so it will, you know, still be scenic and nice. We are just getting rid of the -- the scrub trees that are out there.

Hoaglund: Okay. Follow up, Mr. Mayor.

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Yeah. And one of the people testifying -- concerned about the lock gate and a left turn onto Locust Grove. Can you give us how many -- how much distance is between the gate to the opening? You know, if traffic backs up it's, you know, morning rush hour and people are going out. I think that was a good question and -- is there enough room for everybody? How does the gate operate?

Arnold: Yeah. Mayor, Councilman Hoaglund, what we could do is -- some of those gates you put timers on them, so during the rush hour they are fully open and, then, they shut and during the -- you know, in the evening commute. But between the gate and the right of way I think we have got 150, 175 feet and we have got areas for people to either park -- turn around right before the gate. So, I don't expect any -- any backing on it and, you know, going to the traffic, one -- one car every 1.5 minutes, we won't see any backing on it.

Hoaglund: Okay. And last one, Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglun: And this is something that you raised and you have kind of addressed, Steve, is that at Victory that right-in, right-out type of -- especially the right-out to come out on Victory so you can make a left on -- onto Locust Grove makes sense, but is that definitely a no go with ACHD?

Arnold: It -- yes, it -- we were told no. It's something that we could potentially pursue, but I got to assume I'm going to hear no again. They were fairly adamant about only taking access to Locust Grove and -- yeah. So, I -- I can't tell you that I would be able to get that approved.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: To piggyback on -- on Councilman Hoaglun's questions in regard to the entrance to your subdivision, one of the concerns that I have is the traffic -- you know, the times during the day in the morning commutes and the evening commutes, what that will look like trying to go from your subdivision, taking a left going north onto Locust Grove, giving the huge amounts of traffic that are over there during that particular time.

Arnold: I guess to address that right now, it -- you know, it backs up past that. So, you know, it -- but I -- once the intersection is completed we are going to see a whole different traffic pattern out there and we will see a -- not the continuous flow, but it will -- it will be a broken and, you know, ACHD, who is our traffic expert, are the ones that reviewed it. They wanted us to line up directly with the place across on the east side. So, we are just taking their lead.

Bernt: Right. Mr. -- Mr. Mayor, follow up comment.

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I get this -- you know, this is not on you. I get that, you know, ACHD is the one that's driving this boat, but it is a concern for me, knowing that area well and knowing the amount of traffic that is currently on that road, it's -- it's going to be tough to get out of that subdivision, you know, in the morning. So, just bad timing. I have no idea. I think this would be a much different -- I would have a much different approach or -- but certainly would alleviate that concern. If that roundabout was already installed. I think it's going to make a huge difference with traffic in that area, especially widening the roads and such, so -- the only concern that I have -- I just wanted to put that on the record before we close the public hearing.

Arnold: Yeah. And I -- Mayor and Bernt -- or Councilman Bernt, yeah, I get that. Traffic tends to take the -- the direction of the least resistance --

Bernt: Right.

Arnold: -- and what will likely happen is if -- if it is a problem or it's backed up, people will make a right turn, go to Amity and, then, go eastbound if they need to go.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Just to follow up on Councilman Bernt's questions regarding that, there -- the -- and I don't know if we have the slide that shows the roundabout with extra lanes, Chris or Joe, whoever has that, where you match up with that entrance across -- across Locust Grove, it looked like to me on the diagram that the road narrowed right there, so there is not even a center turn lane going to be put in? Is that correct?

Arnold: Correct. There currently is not a center turn lane, but ultimately there will be.

Hoaglund: That's -- yes. Mr. Mayor and Steve, that's -- that's my question. Will there be a center turn lane with the improvements made to that -- that roadway at that point where those -- that intersection is.

Arnold: Yeah. The -- the plan from Victory to Amity is a three lane minor arterial with a center turn lane all the way between Victory and Amity.

Hoaglund: Okay. Mr. Mayor, follow up.

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: So, then, my question is will that center turn lane at that point, just prior to Ten Mile Creek, will there be a center turn lane upon completion of the roundabout and the widening -- because it looks like it narrows down -- will that center turn lane be there upon that completion or will it be when they do the improvements for the rest of the way up to Amity?

Arnold: Mayor, Councilman Hoaglund, I don't know that question. I don't know the timing of that. Like I said, I got to rely on ACHD and them telling me where -- where my driveway approaches go. There is a center turn lane coming south from the roundabout, I just don't know how far south ACHD has it planned. You know, I -- ideally we would have them extend it at least down to our entrance and that's something I could work with ACHD or the -- the city could accelerate that, because they are going to have the right of way to do that turn lane from us and from the subdivision to the east of us.

Hoaglund: Thank you.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you. You don't have to comment on this, but I wanted to give you an opportunity if you choose to, to comment on the prices you think -- or the price range you think you would be offering these units at?

Arnold: Yeah. Unfortunately -- Mr. Mayor, Councilman Strader, unfortunately, prices are going up as we speak. New construction is between 305 and 310 a square foot right now. These being 1,700 square feet and 1,900 square feet, we are definitely, you know, in the higher end of the medium price for Ada county. But that's everywhere right now. The cost of lumber right now is high. Material -- all the building material is high. Trying to get contractors is high. So, I don't know where the price will be in a year and a half from now when we are ready to start building. I'm hoping the price has come down and lumber comes down. We have seen some lumber reducing over the last couple weeks. You know, I'm hoping that now that they have freed up the COVID restraints that the supply chain starts getting things to the suppliers and hoping it gets more affordable, because it's expensive right now to build.

Strader: Mr. Mayor, additional question.

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: If you could comment on -- you know, we have seen ACHD delay projects in the past and it's a concern of mine as well, the traffic. I don't think that the two Council Members that have voiced that are the only ones that -- I certainly share that concern, you know, on balance, if that's a major concern. Are -- are you open to some type of a delay as a possible solution or how would you tackle that or -- just wondering if you have been thinking about that at all in the context of this conversation.

Arnold: Mayor, Council Woman Strader, no, I have not thought about that much. I know that the five -- the five lane from Overland to Victory on Locust Grove has not been delayed. So, I'm fairly confident that this is still going to occur before we get our -- our building permits and, again, right now building is taking between -- you know, I'm lucky at six months, but it's closer to nine months to turn a new home around. So, I'm fairly confident that that roundabout will be done prior to any of this adding traffic to it. My understanding -- the only delay is they are really looking at right of way. It's not the roadway design itself per se or the roundabout, but it's just right of way width.

Strader: Thanks for the comments and I guess maybe just to check back if ACHD has joined the meeting it might be worthwhile to hear from them.

Simison: I still don't see anyone from ACHD joining us this evening.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Steve, I want to make sure that I heard you correct in kind of the opening party rebuttal. We heard it was suggested by a number of the residents tonight about -- they seem to be more supportive in a reduction of units. I recognize from where this project started where we are tonight, a lot of units have been reduced already. But did I hear you correctly that any further reduction in units would make this project unfeasible for you and your client?

Arnold: Mayor, Councilman Cavener, I have not had that conversation with my client, but I -- that great a reduction I guess it would.

Cavener: Thank you.

Simison: Council, any further questions for the applicant? Okay. Thank you.

Arnold: Thanks.

Simison: I assume we will leave the public hearing open for a few minutes while we talk amongst yourselves -- ourselves.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I'm happy to least get the -- the conversation going and I think it's a challenging spot for this applicant, because the draft of problems he did not create, this is kind of the fly that's breaking the camel's back and you all know I -- I live right over here, I'm right off of Victory and Locust Grove. So, when I hear folks talk about the challenges there, I'm with you. I changed my schedule at my job so that I could avoid that intersection at 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. So, I sympathize. I hear what you are saying. But those challenges weren't the applicant's doing, it's -- we are all to blame. We are the ones who moved there. We are the ones who have -- have clogged up these streets and roads and so I -- I was somewhat challenged to hold the persons before us accountable for the decision that we have all made to live there. But I am sympathetic that we don't want to add anymore traffic to that particular intersection. I voiced some real concerns about this project from the get go. I really tried hard to do my due diligence and go back and look at both the historical from before we remanded it back to P&Z to where we are today and applaud the applicant for trying to take necessary steps to reduce this to try and meet the intention of the Council. I -- as I was sitting here kind of debating this, Council Member Borton, Council Member Strader really brought up kind of I think where I have landed, which is that this project very well may fit in this part of Meridian, but I don't think that I feel comfortable with it fitting in this part of Meridian until we figure out what Victory and Locust Grove is really going to look like. When we had this before us in March I -- I voiced some concerns about the design. It was a little out of whack with what we have got over there in the -- in -- in that part of Meridian. I have come to kind of appreciate it. It is a little bit different and anything that's different and new it takes me a little time to wrap my head around. I think these could be cool, I just don't know if they would be cool in this

part of Meridian. So, I think that's kind of where I'm at, is that I'm not supportive of this project moving forward. I don't know how we could continue it out or limit it until the roadway improvements have been completed and we can look at it. I'm open to suggestions on that. I appreciate keeping the public hearing open if there are suggestions or ideas around that, but -- I have tried really hard to convince myself that this would be a good fit and it very well may be, it's just not I think a good fit right now.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: I just a comment. I just feel like I don't have enough information from ACHD to really know if this is workable or not. I think if it's a definite no on right-in, right-out, okay, that's a piece of the puzzle. Center turn lane, what is the length of that right of way and the expansion going to be when that roundabout is constructed? How does that work there? And also the overall timing of that roundabout. I really think -- I mean this choir was well prepared, they all sang about traffic in one voice. It sounded pretty good, too. Didn't even rehearse I bet. So, to make an informed decision I just -- I just think I need more information before I'm ready to say yea or nay on -- on this project. There is a lot of good elements to it for a difficult site and I know for you folks who -- who live in R-4 or possibly R-2 neighborhoods, to see those types of neighborhoods in Meridian now for what we see, they are rare. This is what we are seeing throughout our community now. It's just the way it is. We are trying to lower the price point or at least keep it reasonable and I am sure a lot of you are like me, I cannot -- I would not be able to afford the house I live in today to purchase it now at its value. I don't make that much money. So, the value has skyrocketed. It's great, you know, on paper, but -- yeah. And so it's -- it's that balancing act for my kids and future generations, how do we make everything fit? We also have a comp plan that talks about -- and staff reminds us from time to time that don't forget we need a diversity of housing. We don't want everything to look the same and we just -- well does it fit here, does it fit there. So, I guess my bottom line is I would like to get more information from ACHD and have a discussion -- whether it's at the staff level for them to get some answers on a definite right-in, right-out, a timing of the roundabout and where does that road narrow down? Is there a turn lane? That -- that to me -- I would like to have that before I make a decision.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Somewhat of a pivot off of -- off of Councilman Hoaglun's comments. It's an annexation application with a zoning request. The applicant's presented this. The question for us -- it's just an exercise of discretion, if this is in the city's best interest to approve this at this time as presented and the materials and preparation for today and all the public comment has highlighted some of the -- the well stated concerns with this application as presented and the comments about reducing zoning or reducing density isn't something that the Council can do as part of the decision making process. The

application is accepted or it's not as presented. The applicant can choose to apply how they -- how they see fit. With that mindset that's how I looked at this in preparation and in hearing today's comments. I'm comfortable making a decision tonight. The way I look at a situation where there is -- if there is incomplete information to make a decision, then, it's not something that I'm comfortable approving. One of the challenges I have with this application here and to the earlier comment of is it in Meridian's best interest for this application to be on this site at this time, I don't have sufficient information that makes me convinced that the answer is yes and some of those comments I don't think it remedied with more information. I think this -- there is a reason why ACHD would prohibit access even as presented and there is a reason why ACHD has to make an exception to their policy just to allow this access to exist. It's the furthest they possibly could get, but it is -- it is from an engineering perspective too close to the intersection. It could still be approved, but it begs the question is it the right decision. Just because you can doesn't mean you should. The fact that this is extremely busy highlights that concern. The fact that there are -- as has been pointed out -- unanswered questions as to the ultimate design and timing of this roundabout at this extremely busy location, compounds those concerns. The fact that ACHD doesn't perhaps want to put public streets in here, does not move me much. That's their job. That's what we pay taxes for and they very well should fund it themselves. If ACHD permits public streets that, therefore, might allow much less intense use at this very tricky location, that -- and that's the best decision for Meridian long term, then, let's do that. So, I don't think we are there and, quite frankly, I don't think time gets us there. I think it's a beautiful project. Steve always does great work and he's a straight shooter, I just think it's the wrong spot for a great project. So, I'm comfortable making the decision, but it's not something that I would approve as presented.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: You know, I -- just looking at this I share a lot of my fellow Council Members' comments and thoughts and considerations. You know, I think it's important, though, to keep in mind -- we really do need to keep building housing, so I want to make sure that that message is clear. I don't think that a moratorium on building housing is in Meridian's best interest at all. I have just heard that comment a lot tonight and I think that would devastate our community and we have had a huge housing shortage. That being said, the traffic situation right now is very acute and that's coming through loud and clear. Clearly this is a very tricky piece of land in that context and so I -- I'm not there on this project tonight. I would be open to seeing it in another -- after a period of time if ACHD, you know, can further clarify their concrete plans and we had more definitive guidance from them that -- that these road improvements were going to happen, I do believe that it would seriously help this area. So, I'm not against this project at all. I -- I like this project in the sense that it's -- it's contributing housing -- hopefully additional supply will help keep prices reasonable, but at this time I do agree that the traffic situation is not -- not at a level that can handle any additional housing. So, that's where I am at.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor, you are looking at me like, Councilman Bernt, are you going to say something or not?

Simison: I will if you won't, but I want to give you the opportunity first.

Bernt: I have already -- I'm good. I have already explained my thoughts, so --

Simison: Okay. Well, like Councilman Cavener, I live in this part of the community and I drive down Locust Grove and I come out and I drive through this intersection every day on my way to work. So, very familiar with -- with the challenges. I do think that when the road improvements are made we will see a change in the traffic in the area for a while. But there will be other problems, too. But as it relates to this specific application, you know, specifically I think the best thing for this property is to find out what happens when the road improvements are made, so that we actually see what it looks and feels like in this part of the community.

Bernt: Perfect.

Simison: Because it is -- I'm not -- you know, I am no fan of roundabouts, but I have told ACHD I'm not going to oppose this one, because there is a place and time for roundabouts, how they interact and how people can move in and out of them effectively can help determine whether it's -- and I am concerned when ACHD starts putting a lot of restrictions on the property and, you know, I'm going to be as transparent as I can be on this one, you know, if there is -- if there is restrictions to access on this property I can see this being a lawsuit at ACHD. I can see this being very expensive for all of us taxpayers that we are going to have to pay, which, guess what, your road improvements are going to be made in other parts of our community, perhaps in south Meridian. You know, because when this -- this is a very tricky, difficult piece of property with its location and proximity to a roundabout in this -- in this case. So, I may be a little further than from where Council is of I don't think we should really consider annexation of this property until we see how the road network changes with the -- with the Locust Grove improvements and the intersection improvements right there. That's where I would be before I would hope that an application would come back, including all the issues that Councilman Hoaglund raised about other issues from that standpoint. Those are my comments.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I think we are in agreement that, you know, if we were to vote on this tonight and based on the information that I have available I could not support this application, because of -- you know, the information is not there and I can't hope it's going to work out. We have got to be fairly certain of some things. I guess it's a matter of do we -- you know, deny or is it something that we bring back? Do we remand to Planning and Zoning? You know, I don't think we have closed the public hearing, so I don't know if the applicant would like to speak to that, knowing the sentiments that have been expressed on how

that process moves forward, because it does -- how we go about that does impact if they do make changes in a timely fashion and where the timeline is, I don't know, but I look to others to provide guidance on that as well.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Unless they want to come up and speak, that's fine, but I think that -- I think that -- I think that tonight I think we are in a position where we can make a decision and I think that I have heard my fellow Council Members and what they have said and what they are ready to do, so I think that -- to answer your question, Councilman Hoaglund, I think tonight I think we are in a position where we can make a decision. But, Steve, if you want to come up and -- I guess, Mayor, If you are -- if Mayor is --

Simison: Absolutely. It's not closed.

Arnold: I guess from the developer's standpoint, obviously, we would prefer not a vote tonight and to get further information from ACHD. That would be our preference. But, you know, it's your vote.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Steve, you have heard the comments from Council tonight. Do you think the highway district could provide greater clarity to us about our concerns in a timely manner?

Arnold: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Cavener, yeah, when you say timely, you know -- you know, if we can maybe delay it to a date uncertain, but -- or delay it for a month. I think I could probably get answers from ACHD within a month about -- because I have heard right-in, right-out. I have heard timing on the intersection improvements and some other questions about the widening of Locust Grove Road and I think having a person here from ACHD would be of benefit to the Council.

Cavener: All right. Thank you.

Simison: Council, what's your pleasure or thoughts?

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: I think your comments with regards to timing are -- are well stated here. Sometimes continuances make sense. I think we are in a spot to make decisions and I think we have to make a decision tonight. Otherwise, you are continuing it to 2026, right,

in essence, to sort of see how this builds out and that doesn't help you either, so to be honest to you and in this application, I think it's incumbent upon us to decide it tonight. I do.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I move we close the public hearing H-2020-0100.

Borton: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to close the public hearing. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, move to deny file number H-2020-0100 as presented in the hearing on May 25th, 2021, for the following reasons -- as has been summarized by all members of the City Council. There is a variety of reasons, but most specifically this project does not -- just does not meet the best interest of our community at this time.

Borton: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and second. Is there any discussion on the motion?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I just -- I think this is, again, a high score in terms of public involvement. Appreciate the applicant and the community being here tonight. Had a little bit of a rough patch at the start, but I appreciate everybody's willingness to be respectful and neighborly. You guys are all good examples of our community and I appreciate you all being here.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Just to highlight what Councilman Cavener mentioned about how -- about the rough patch at the beginning. Just -- and I know there is a lot of eyes and ears that listen to these meetings, but those who are providing testimony, it never helps to disparage any member of staff or -- or any employee that works for the City of Meridian. If you truly do have concerns about how we do business, I think it's way more effective to have those conversations offline and, honestly, they do nothing to my opinion, whether it's for or against. It's just emotion and it's not needed.

Simison: Any further question -- or any further comments on the motion? Clerk will call the roll.

Roll call: Borton, yea; Cavener, yea; Bernt, yea; Perreault, absent; Hoaglund, yea; Strader, yea.

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries and the item is denied.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Simison: So, with that let's take a five minute recess while we let the room -- for those that need to -- that aren't sticking around for the rest of the meeting.

(Recess: 9:14 p.m. to 9:20 p.m.)

2. Public Hearing for Gramercy Commons (H-2021-0022) by Intermountain Pacific, LLC, Located at 1873, 1925, and 2069 S. Wells Ave.

- A. Request: Development Agreement Modification to amend the Kenai Subdivision Development Agreement (Inst. #106141056) for the purpose of amending the concept plan to incorporate 164 age-restricted multi-family housing units.

Simison: All right. Council, we will go ahead and come back from recess, so we can try to move through the rest of our evening agenda. Next item is a public hearing for Gramercy Commons, H-2020-0022. We will open this public hearing with staff comments to turn it over to Joe.

Dodson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. As noted this is for Gramercy Commons. It is for a development agreement modification. The site consists of 6.9 acres of land currently zoned C-G, located across three different parcels on west of South Wells Avenue. It is adjacent to the east boundary of Mountain View High School. It was annexed and zoned in 2006 under the Kenai Subdivision. Has an existing DA as noted. It's platted, final platted -- and why did I put -- okay. The Comprehensive Plan out here is mixed use regional, which contemplates looking well beyond the existing sites for not only different land uses, but also interconnectivity and how all the land uses work together and integrate with each other -- complement each other if you will. The request before you is to modify

the existing development agreement for the purpose of amending the concept plan, which really is, essentially, just the preliminary plat. Didn't have any other development other than this shown, which was just the zoning and the three lots. It is for the purpose of amending the concept plan to incorporate 164 age restricted multi-family housing units, instead of general commercial. As noted the existing concept plan is just the plat with the C-G zoning. The new development plan depicts a singular building that is a multi-level age restricted multi-family apartment complex that is wrapped around a parking structure, something we have not seen here in Meridian. The parking structure is proposed to contain a majority of the required parking spaces, which you can see the parking data on the right-hand side and they actually did include our future requirement of one space per ten units, which they did not technically have to do. There is a concurrent conditional use permit application, which, depending on their decision tonight, will be heard next Thursday. So, some of this data has not been analyzed for this specific presentation. In addition to the building, the new development plan depicts multiple areas of open space and amenities located along each side of the building to include a pool and other amenities within a south courtyard, an entry plaza along the east side of the building, fire pits and lounging areas along the west side and a community garden and pickleball court along the north side. All of the open space and amenities appear to meet -- or they appear to be connected with sidewalks and easily accessible for future residents. The submitted elevations are for illustrative purposes only and further refinement is necessary to comply with the architectural standards manual, as well as the additional design elements within the Gramercy development overall. As seen on the proposed development plan, the applicant is proposing to connect to three adjacent drive aisles to provide access to the apartment complex, which would be one to the north and two to the east. The two to the east are currently existing, the one to the north exists at the north side of the northernmost property and they will be constructing this segment of it. ACHD does not act on development agreement modifications, but has provided a response letter with the concurrent CUP as noted. In the response letter ACHD noted that no improvements are required to any public roads and they also did not require a traffic impact study, because the development is not estimated to generate enough peak hour vehicle trips, despite the proposal -- the proposal being over one hundred units. ACHD has noted that all adjacent public roads are overbuilt and are capable of handling additional vehicle trips without issue. Therefore, staff is supportive of the development in regards to its transportation impact. The applicant also intends on connecting to the multi-use pathway abutting the site to the south for added pedestrian access to the commercial uses within Gramercy and to the public park south of the school. Staff finds that proposing an apartment complex, specifically age restricted in this area of the city that is in close proximity to commercial development, child and charter schools and establish regional pedestrian facilities warrants a DA mod and supports the proposed development. Staff does recommend approval and following that there was no written testimony against or for this project, so I will stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you, Joe. Council, any questions?

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: One quick question, Joe. In general is -- is the application to approve the DA amendment to allow the use, but not necessarily the actual plan itself, or is the -- is the plan as depicted part of your approval, understanding that there is architectural design review later. Are we merely being asked to approve an expansion of the usage of this parcel?

Dodson: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Borton, that's a great question. It's kind of both. It is also to replace the use of general commercial shown on the existing plat with multi-family age restricted, but also generally the concept plan, yes. This is the same plan that they are proposing with a CUP, which generally they wouldn't be required to present this much detail in the concept plan, but they have chosen to do so, which we appreciate always from staff's perspective. Obviously, minor adjustments might be made here and there. I know that there are some continued discussions with how the trash enclosure and compact area may be redesigned. That's something that wouldn't require an additional DA mod, but we would handle that once the CUP and/or with the CZC. So, it is for both to -- as a short answer.

Borton: And is it tied to this?

Dodson: Yes.

Borton: Thanks.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for staff? Okay. Would the applicant, please, come forward. So nice to see everybody in person again.

Clark: It is very nice to see everybody in person. I was just thinking that the only thing I will miss about Meridian Zoom meetings is I won't be able to covet Council Member Cavener's awesome office desk chair anymore. That thing is awesome. Hethe Clark. 251 East Front Street is my work address in Boise. We are here tonight to discuss an amendment to the development agreement for Gramercy. Everyone's very familiar with it. It's a successful mixed use project. It's been going for about 15 years. The back side of it has been a little bit slower to come along and this is going to help I think move that process forward. That area is less visible, therefore, it's less commercially viable. That's why we are -- we are -- that in a nutshell is the reason why we are here to have this conversation tonight. So, our presentation is going to move forward in two phases. First going to Council Member Borton's point, we want to make sure that you as a Council know exactly what it is that -- that is being proposed here. We have a condition of approval that our proposal -- or that we move forward with something that's substantially in conformance with the concept that we are going to be providing tonight. So, we have Tiina Ritval and Mark Sindall with GGLO Architects. They are online and they will provide kind of a basic overview of the look and the feel, how it fits within the neighborhood and, then, I will return, I will go over a few technical detail -- details and, then, talk about -- a little about the process, how we go forward from here. In the meantime, I do want to note

that Aaron Elton and Mike Chidester with the Meridian based ownership group are also here and they will be available to help answer questions if -- if I drop the ball on anything. So, with that let's switch over to Tiina and Mark. So, I think they are online, Chris.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, Mr. Clark, they are and they have the ability to unmute.

Sindall: Good evening. This is Mark Sindall. Can you guys hear me okay?

Simison: Yes.

Sindall: All right. So, Mark Sindall, principal with GGLO, 1199 Shoreline Lane, Suite 290, Boise. In Idaho, of course. That's the work address. And, then, I will just say advance on the slides for whoever is controlling the slideshow. So, let's go ahead and keep going. So, we would like to start with your comp plan and this is directly from your comp plan related to the zone and specifically it talks about multi-family residential may be allowed in some cases, but should be careful to promote a high quality of life through a thoughtful site design, connectivity and amenities and this really became the basis for the development of the design that you are seeing tonight. Next slide, please. Of course next we looked at the Gramercy experience and the notion of homes, workplaces and shopping blending seamlessly into an urban inspired community and we are pretty confident that the proposal that we have got before you is going to be successful with proximity and walkability and perpetuate the basic goals of the Gramercy district and there is an amazing start of the Gramercy experience with the work to date and we think this is an evolved way to grow that experience and to really accomplish the goals. We are pretty excited about that. Next slide, please. Of course, location wise the site is adjacent to ball fields and a school. It's walking distance to shops, parks, commercial and health services and overall the site is really ideal given those proximities to age restricted multi-family housing and if planned wisely it can open up opportunities for adjacent future development sites, particularly to the north. Next slide. It shows proximity to some of those connections that Joe mentioned. The trails and as also mentioned we are looking at having a well connected network of pedestrian amenities that, then, connect to the broader network of the district. Next slide. Which brings us to parking. So, livability, a goal of the Gramercy district, means more space for people and open space and a recognition that absolutely we need to accommodate cars, but not at the expense of livability. So, to that end we studied the impact of a four level wrapped garage over a surface parking lot -- choosing that over a surface parking lot and what that could mean for livability goals for the district. The punchline is that we are reducing by two-third how much of, quote, unquote, paradise is being paved by a parking lot for you '70s or even '90s rock fans and there is an added benefit, of course, that most residents park on the floor that they live on. So, proximity for parking is really strong in this arrangement. Parking is hidden, parking is not diminished, but that leaves an outward expression of quality building frontages and open spaces for the community. So, if you keep going. Next slide. Keep going. So, here is what we are proposing a parking garage tucked behind the high quality building with large amenity spaces immersed in a beautiful regionally expressive landscape. The project faces the district with outward facing plazas and frontages. Next slide. Keep going. As you see here this is more of the public facing

commercial expression. Keep going. And, then, with residential scale frontages and amenities -- amenities facing the more pastoral ball fields and the high school and as we rotate this view you can see the garage wrapped and immersed in that landscape with the convenience of parking and some of the amenities that Tiina will talk about a little bit more. So, first of all, a little more amenity on those -- a little more detail on those amenities. If you go to the next slide. As was mentioned there are community gardens proposed on the north, as well as pollinator gardens, pickleball courts and a pool deck and, then, the firepit lounges on the west. The pool deck you see on the south, you see the pickleball court, community gardens on the north and, then, plaza on the east. So, let's get into some of the architecture next. Turn it over to Tiina.

Ritval: You can keep going. Yeah. Good evening, Tiina Ritval, GGLO, 1199 Shoreline Lane, Boise. That's the office address in Boise. I will walk everyone through the current development -- the design and explain a little bit about the thinking that went into this proposal. As Mark mentioned, the Gramercy district vision talks about a blending of uses, shop, work and live and an urban inspired community. In the visual on the left we have highlighted retail in red, office in yellow and residential in blue. We recognize that in inserting residential into this office swath of development we would need to make some references to the current buildings in the vicinity. We also recognize the opportunity for the scale of the building to bridge between the high school and smaller scale residential and office around the north, east and south sides of the project. So, on the top right we are suggesting using the Gramercy brick. The renderings we have shared in the packet and here show it a little bit more orange, but the intent is to be consistent with the district brick color. On the middle right here you see residential bays along the western edge of the project. We will use stucco also in the palette of the rest of the development and bottom right we want to express a residential texture. So, an alternating lap siding is proposed for the upper portions of the east and the majority of the building body. Go ahead, next slide. Each side of the building demands a different response. For example, the eastern edge is the more public side of the project with amenity uses clad in the Gramercy brick. The west will get pounded by solar rays and is adjacent to the Mountain View High School. So, on that side we focused on shading strategies, consolidating glazing areas and a more residential modulation. Next slide. The east entrance plaza -- we were careful to make this side of the project relatable to the office or commercial uses in the zone by bringing in a base that references that Gramercy retail district and weave into the established language of the district. The upper levels on this side bring in that residential texture of the lap siding. We understand we have some work to do to present a more residential, high quality aesthetic and we want that to -- we want this to be a great place for people to live and to love living here. Next slide. By stacking the parking in a structure buried in the building like -- like Mark stated, we gain considerable open space to consolidate areas for more significant outdoor amenity areas. The amenities take on a bit of a commercial or resort vibe with clean volumes and stucco on a body of residential texture. Next slide. We added this rendering of the western edge of the project. We didn't show that in our package before. It illustrates the intent of this side to be the more residential phase of the project facing the high school. We are using stepped base to create shading from the afternoon sun. Next slide. And the elevations. The top elevation shows the east side of the project adjacent to other office and commercial parcels in

Gramercy. The center of that elevation houses the entry plaza and amenity spaces. The building terraces down a story to the south relating to adjacent lower rise structures. The south elevation is at the bottom of the page with the amenity building in the middle. This outbuilding provides privacy for the pool deck. The south facades feature consulted glazing areas and deep overhangs to both take advantage of views to the south and to protect against harsh rays. Next slide. The west or high school facing elevation is at the top. A layering of bays help protect private open space from solar exposure, yet allow the views to the southwest. Again you see the building terracing towards the low rise to the south and, then, the north elevation ties into the retail and office vocabulary here. Below inset decks at the upper levels provide protected private open spaces to residents and views out of the pickleball court and gardens. The garage entry is from the side and will incorporate clearance to get emergency vehicles into the first level of the parking garage. Next slide. And I will pass it off here for some nuts and bolts regarding the modification request.

Clark: Okay. Well, it's Hethe again. 251 East Front Street. So as we finish this up I just want to focus on kind of the process to -- how to get where we are hoping to get. So, again, this was previously annexed as part of the Kenai Subdivision that we now know as Gramercy at 15 years old. It includes this development agreement. It's already zoned as C-G. So, multi-family could go just as a matter of zoning with a conditional use permit. It's only the development agreement modification that needs to occur here and as Joe mentioned this has been set up such that you get a chance to look at it first before we go to P&Z next week on the conditional use permit. As we look at the proposal it's a well developed, detailed application. It meets or exceeds the requirements for parking, open space, amenities, meets the dimensional standards. We are proposing that it remain within the existing Gramercy development agreements. That means that the cross-parking and cross-access and everything that we like about Gramercy remains in place. It's an age targeted facility. It's very near services. As Tiina and Mark mentioned, all of those services are well within walking distance. So, it's a great spot for this type of a project. It provides a very nice buffer between Mountain View High School and its facilities and the residential and commercial development on the north and on the east. As far as agency review, the agencies have indicated no issues. ACHD, again, shows no improvements to required area roadways. Staff has been great to work with as typical. We appreciate Joe a great deal. As we looked at the staff report there is just two things that I wanted to mention. One was that staff had identified that they wanted to see a more delineated connection between the project and the pathways to the south. So, we have done an updated plan here to show that we are -- we are going to include those. We will use pavers or other elements to make sure that that's very clear, that people would be guided down to those pathways. And, then, the other was just kind of a clarification on the fourth additional staff item. It had indicated that the northern property would not be used for any sort of multi-family use, essentially, in a nutshell. As you can see here on this drawing there is some overlap there in terms of shared facilities and so we are all on board with the content or the concept of that condition. What we suggest is that we just tweak that a little bit to just say that the condition would not preclude joint use facilities. You can see that about halfway through the paragraph there, including parking areas to be used for the subject property, which is the area with the project we are talking about

tonight and parcel 323, blah, blah, blah, which is the one that would retain commercial use on it and that's the parcel there to the north that's shown here in blue. So, with that we appreciate everyone's review on this and we would ask for your approval and happy to answer any questions.

Simison: Thank you, Hethe. And I will start the questions off. So, when I go to lunch at my favorite restaurant in Meridian, Gramercy Park Pizza and Grill, I could come park in your parking garage?

Clark: Mr. Mayor, that's -- I don't know about in the garage, but we are providing additional surface parking.

Simison: Okay. Glad for the clarification, because I know cross-parking out there is -- can be a big issue.

Clark: It is. And I work with the Gramercy developer and with the Gramercy owners association, as Mr. Nary knows very well and so we are working to address that issue.

Simison: Okay. Council, any additional questions? Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Hethe, it's great to see you in person. I guess a comment and, then, a question. I love the parking wrap and putting that on the interior core of the building. That makes me so happy to see that here. So, I appreciate that. Question for you. I guess I'm a little puzzled by your comment about joint use facilities to the north. Could you just give me an example of what that might mean?

Clark: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Strader, I don't -- did I say joint use facilities?

Strader: Yes, I believe --

Clark: Oh, I'm sorry, I misunderstood. Okay. I -- I apologize. So, what I was referring to there -- and I -- Council Member Strader, I apologize, I was picturing way further north, like in the -- in the other commercial areas. So, in -- when I refer to joint use facilities what I'm really referring to is the yellow area that you can see here. That would be shared parking between this lot and the commercial -- future commercial on the north and so when I refer to joint use facilities I'm talking about that.

Strader: Thank you.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: If I can dovetail on that. If we can put that -- that condition up again? It's a great question. I was wondering the language -- to nerd out a little bit, it says shall not preclude

joint use facilities, including parking, which presumes is a joint use facility that's other than parking. So, what would you contemplate to be a joint use facility that's not parking?

Clark: I would contemplate that to be, you know, maybe potentially utilities, you know, items that are serving both sides of the -- of the two projects, because it is in common ownership, so there would be the possibility of those types of uses and we are happy to refine that language.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: It's really helpful back to the DA that started this that precluded multi-family unless it came back, which is the only way Council gets to see it. That's great, because it allows us the chance to go through what we are doing now, since this CUP doesn't get to us. So, if there is language that might more narrowly refine what you mean -- it sounds like it's basically parking and maybe some ancillary utilities. Just so some future council isn't asked to interpret like joint facilities, that could be interpreted to be pretty broad, too, which isn't your intent, so --

Clark: No. Absolutely. Yeah. Absolutely that's not the intent. This is really just a clarifying amendment. It's not substantive. We are not trying to be substantively different, which staff's intent -- it was to just ensure that that northern parcel remained on the commercial side of things. Because of this overlap we wanted to make sure that we weren't automatically going to be in violation of that. As it stands right now it's really just the parking facilities that we contemplate being on that other side.

Borton: Okay. You and -- as part of this -- I don't know if you work with planning staff or legal to come up with some language that more narrowly describes that.

Clark: That would be great. Yeah, we would be happy to do that.

Borton: Great. Thanks, Hethe.

Simison: Council, any further questions for the applicant?

Clark: Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. All right. This is a public hearing. Mr. Clerk, do we have anybody signed up in advance to provide testimony on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we did not.

Simison: Okay. Is there anybody in the audience that would like to come forward and provide testimony on this item or anybody online who would like to provide testimony. If you would like to do so, please, use the raise your hand feature at the bottom of Zoom or

step up to the podium. Seeing no one wishing to testify, would the applicant like to make any final comments? No final comments from the applicant. Council, what's your pleasure?

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Borton.

Borton: We take pretty good caution in permitting multi-family in C-G, protective of the commercial. This one has been available, ready, willing and able for commercial for a long time. Where it's located is perhaps permanently hampered its ability to develop as such, so this might be one of the more fitting exceptions I think to allow multi-family. The way it's been presented makes it even easier to justify altering the DA allowing that use as presented, understanding that there is pretty firm sideboards on how it's going to be designed and I think Council Woman Strader's comments about the garage is spot on. You are going to hear that from all of us, that's a really neat feature for this. So, hopefully, we see more of that in some of these multi-family projects, so I think it's -- I think it's one we can certainly move on and should approve. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: If there is not other discussion, I'm just going to move that we close the public hearing on H-2021-0022.

Strader: Second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to close the public hearing. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: I move that we approve H-2021-0022, the DA modification request as set forth in the staff report of May 25, 2021, to include the applicant's comments with regards to the -- the staff conditions, the joint use facilities, and crafting language with legal that narrows that as discussed in today's hearing.

Strader: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

Roll call: Borton, yea; Cavener, yea; Bernt, yea; Perreault, absent; Hoaglund, yea; Strader, yea.

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries and the item is agreed to. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

3. Public Hearing for 3175 N. Ten Mile (H-2020-0122) by Mason & Associates, Located at 3175 N. Ten Mile Rd.

- A. Request: Rezone of a 1.16-acre property from R-4 to the L-O zoning district commensurate with a provision within the Meridian Comprehensive Plan for the purpose of constructing an approximate 10,000-square-foot office building in lieu of residential development.
- B. Request: Development Agreement Modification to replace the existing agreement (Inst. #111024535) and enter into a new agreement to develop the site consistent with the proposed development plan.

Simison: Council, next item up is a public hearing for 3175 North Ten Mile, H-2020-0122. I will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Dodson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. You got to hear me one more time. Tonight at least. Sorry, I'm not -- that wasn't about my future employment or anything, just -- this is my last item tonight. 3175 North Ten Mile for a rezone and development agreement modification. The site consists of 1.1 acres of land, zoned R-4, located at the southwest corner of Ten Mile and Ustick Road as seen on the maps. The adjacent land uses are C-G to the north and additional commercial zoning in general. R-4 and single family in all other directions. It was annexed in 2010 under ACHD Ten Mile. It was originally an ACHD owned property from my understanding. They sold it off and there was an existing development agreement and which required modification after further staff analysis. The request is to rezone this property from R-4 to L-O, consistent with a provision within the Meridian Comprehensive Plan for the purpose of constructing an approximate 10,000 square foot single story office building with 42 parking spaces. Only 20 are required for the size of the building, in lieu of residential development, which required the development group modification before you tonight. Commission only heard the rezone. Following that the applicant applied for the concurrent development agreement, because it only needs to go to Council. Their point for that is to replace the existing agreement altogether, enter into a new agreement based upon the current and proposed concept plan. The subject site is somewhat of a residentially zoned outparcel due to the fact that is located in a hard corner of two arterial streets and has no local street access, similar to our earlier projects, just much smaller and not for 37 homes. The proposed use is for a dental office, which is principally permitted within the L-O zoning district. The applicant has submitted a site plan that shows compliance with all dimensional standards for commercial development. With the proposed site plan and

proposed use staff finds the rezone and use to be consistent with the comp plan. The subject site was annexed in 2010 as noted. Staff analyzed the application and existing DA and realized that the DA mod is also required, since the original app -- sorry -- the original DA contemplated residential versus commercial. A number of the proposed parking spaces are facing directly towards a home, which does exist here, and to the west and south. A number of the parking spaces face towards this lot in the southwest corner of the site. Staff finds the proposed landscaping and existing wood fence may not be enough screening to mitigate light and noise pollution from those patrons using those spaces. Therefore, staff did recommend that the landscape buffer be widened to 30 feet, instead of their minimum required 20 feet, for just this area adjacent to the southwest corner, because of the parking spaces facing in and so just this buffer. The change would not compromise any other dimensional standard on site, because the drive aisles are currently shown as well over the minimum requirements. They would still be at least five feet wider than the requirement. Commission agreed with this condition and recommended approval with that. Access to the site is proposed via two connections from the applicant, one right-in only access, which is proposed to Ustick, and one right-in and right-out access to Ten Mile. The proposed access to Ustick does not mean ACHD policy, but was a negotiated access at the time of the property sale. The proposed access to Ten Mile also does not meet ACHD policy, but is recommended for approval within their staff report, because, again, it's the furthest place they could -- they could place it from the intersection. Staff supports the proposed unlimited access to Ten Mile commensurate with the approval from ACHD. In addition to the access on Ustick not meeting ACHD policy, the city can further restrict access despite ACHD previously granting it. The proposed access to Ustick is proposed as an entrance only, but there would be no true way to restrict vehicles from exiting. In addition, this access point is directly within the right-hand turn lane on Ustick, which intensifies the safety issues associated with the access point. Therefore, through UDC 11-3A3, staff does recommend the proposed Ustick access not be approved and, instead, utilize it as an emergency only access with with knockdown bollards that Mr. Bongiorno approves. This applicant is still requesting to keep the Ustick entrance only access. Planning and Zoning Commission as noted did recommend approval of it at the hearing. It was discussed -- the fire access concerns, if any, but specifically regarding the reduction in the drive aisle width. There was also discussion on the kind of uses that could reside within the building beyond a dentist's office, because the dental office is not expected to take up all 10,000 square feet, which to answer that would be limited office, very low intensity uses. A restaurant is a conditional use, so that would come before Commission if anybody ever proposed that. That came up at the hearing, so I just wanted to bring that up. Different options of mitigating the noise and light beyond the widening of the required landscape buffer was also adjacent -- or adjacent to the residential was also discussed. The applicant did not submit revised plans showing the enlarge buffer, but staff is not concerned, as we can handle that with the future CZC if the application is approved tonight. After that I will stand for any questions. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you, Joe. Council, any questions?

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Joe, just to confirm, this is a dentist office; right?

Dodson: Yes, sir. They are -- it's just not taking up all 10,000 square feet. There is potential for -- be a multi-tenant building. I believe it's the right-hand suite is not a part of the dental office, but it is the dental -- dentist who owns the property and will own the building.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: And just to follow up on that, Joe, that -- that does restrict -- because of how it's being conditioned and whatnot, the hours are restricted 6:00 to 11:00; is that correct?

Dodson: That is correct. 6:00 to 10:00 because of the L-O zoning adjacent to residential.

Hoaglun: Thank you.

Simison: Council, any further questions? Okay. Is the applicant with us? If you could state your name and address for the record and be recognized for 15 minutes.

Petty: My name is Jessica Petty. 2882 South Honeycomb Way. I am the architect on the project and I'm representing Dr. Rigby tonight. Dr. Rigby is the owner and he will be the owner of the dental office as well. What we are proposing is a 10,000 square foot building. He will occupy approximately a third of it for his dental -- family dentist practice and, then, right now it will just be a vanilla TI for the other two tenants until we find someone, but like Joe said, ideally it would be another orthodontists, veterinary clinic, something of -- very similar that would work well and work well within the neighborhood. We are proposing to put the building in the far upper right corner to keep it away from the existing neighborhoods. We have been working very closely with the neighbors trying to listen to their wants and needs, as well as keeping our project feasible. We are completely on board with all the staff recommendations for increasing the buffer to 30 feet. We are going to propose to do a berm to kind of hide the parking, hopefully decrease some of the noise, headlights, whatnot, that was a concern for the neighbors and in general we are -- we are on board with everything. The only thing we are asking is that you do consider the right-in only access point. When Dr. Rigby purchased the property -- before buying it he did his due, diligence he went to ACHD, he talked to them about what -- what they would allow and kind of how he envisioned his building working with the -- the flow of parking and so for him it is important to have the right-in only off of Ustick, as well as the two way off of Ten Mile. We feel that having the right-in only we will help reduce some of the traffic flow from all of it only coming in and out of Ten Mile and that was a big concern, especially for the residents down in the southern corner with their kids and just their family life having an increase in traffic. So, we do ask that you consider that, but ultimately

tonight we would just like to walk out with our approval, so we can get onto design review, so thank you. If you have any questions.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions for the applicant? Okay. Thank you very much. This is a public hearing. Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone signed up to provide testimony on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we did not.

Simison: Okay. If there is anybody in the audience that would like to provide testimony, please, come forward at this time or if there is anybody online, please, use the raise your hand function at the bottom of the Zoom. It looks like we have someone online.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, Steven Rankin.

Simison: Okay.

Rankin: Hello, everybody. Myself and my wife --

Simison: Sir, if you can unmute yourself and state your name for the record.

A.Rankin: Yep. Can you guys hear us? Can you hear us?

Simison: And we cannot hear you.

Rankin: Hello?

A.Rankin: Hello? Hello? Hello?

Johnson: The audio appears to be moving, we are just not receiving it here. Let me try something on our end to make sure it's --

Rankin: Yeah. Please do.

A.Rankin: Yeah. Can you guys hear us? We can -- we are unmuted on our end, so it's something going on on your end. Hello? Hello?

Rankin: Hello, can you hear us?

A.Rankin: Hello? Hello?

Johnson: I can hear just barely. Give me one second here.

A.Rankin: Okay. Let us know. We will keep knocking.

Rankin: Should I hold off on speaking or --

Johnson: It looks like we have a YouTube feed coming through and we disconnected from the --

A.Rankin: Hello?

Simison: From YouTube that's being picked up somewhere else.

A.Rankin: Can you guys hear us now? Can you hear us now?

Johnson: It looks like they have left and hopefully are coming back in. Mr. Mayor, they are back and I think we have audio now.

A.Rankin: Yep. Can you --

Rankin: Can you hear us okay?

A.Rankin: Hello?

Simison: Yep, we can hear you. Can you hear us?

Rankin: Okay. Great. Hi, there. This is Mr. and Mrs. Rankin. My name is Steven Rankin, I'm here with my wife Alexis.

A.Rankin: And hi there, you guys. We are the family that they -- that she was just referring to that had concerns with the drive-in, drive-out off of Ten Mile. I definitely would concur with the architect, that it's probably necessary to have one drive-in on Ustick. Our main concern, aside from that, is that the area between our fence and the drive-in, drive-out from Ten Mile is way too close to our fence line. It definitely poses a major safety issue for us and our small children in our backyard. You know, though, we live on Ten Mile and that's a risk not anybody's willing to take, to have people slowly pulling in and out on such a busy road at all hours of the day, it makes for a really, really -- you know, a huge opportunity, unfortunately, for somebody to get T-boned coming in and out of there and they are going to go directly into our yard and we have small children in the yard and animals. We ask and would like to politely request that the 30 feet that's going in on the other side --

Rankin: That would be on the side -- on the west side of the fence line.

A.Rankin: Yeah. Would also be considered for our side as well, especially considering we are going to be the ones dealing with the pulling in and out, but, you know, consistently throughout the day and we take a much greater risk of somebody actually flying into our yard because of that.

Rankin: And on that note -- I mean, again, without knowing the exact litigations behind the setbacks of the ACHD and the distance that needs to be away from the corner of Ten Mile and Ustick, if it's already under those restrictions and you are doing it as far away

from the -- from the street as possible, please, take into consideration the risk factor that is in place with children and dogs and our family on the other side of that fence. Doing the research leading up to this meeting just before 6:00 o'clock and as exciting as it's been so far, I must mention that the average length of a car is between 15 and 16 feet. So, if you just took your average sedan and you are looking at 15, 16 feet, that gives you a reference. When you look at 20 feet, how far away that interest is to my fence line and, again, looking into the restrictions of what ACHD has in place, being as far away from that intersection as possible, if it's still under that restricted code, please, also take into factor that if you can go further away, whether it be 30 or whatever it might be, to take the fact -- safety factor, you know, at highest regard, we as -- as civilians in this area and as -- you know, as the worried neighbor, without having to, you know, put up a stink, we just want to make sure that everybody's needs are met here.

Simison: All right. Thank you very much.

Rankin: Also -- wait. Also really quick. One thing I didn't mention is the lights. I would like to know the height of the lights. One thing that the architect did mention there is she's been in close contact with the neighbors. Little did I know. I live here, I'm here all the time, we work from home oftentimes and never once did we have a knock on the door, never once even called from the architect. So, I'm not saying there is lies being put forth, but there has been little to no communication with me and we share a fence line with his property. I have been in direct contact with dentist. Great guy. We have had an amazing opportunity to meet and chat and he's been great, we have no quarrels with -- with the -- with the dentist whatsoever. We want to see this project happen. We just want to make sure that, you know, there is two major lights that are closest to our property line leading out to that -- you know, that exit. The height of those -- I mean inevitably, everybody, this is going to go right into my backyard.

A.Rankin: And right into our master bedroom.

Rankin: To give you a reference -- yeah. In the master bedroom as well. For instance -- sorry to cut you off, Alexis. Referencing this, you have to -- you have to also consider -- when I walked to the -- to my south side of the yard, which is right up against that fence line, I can literally see right over the fence based on the way that the land is -- is -- is shaped and in the way it's sloped. So, we -- again, we take the impact of the lights. I would love to know the height of those lights and the brightness of those, so we are not blinded every night until, you know, whatever, 11:00 o'clock or 10:00 o'clock with -- with traffic coming in and out of there.

Simison: Thank you very much. Council, any questions? Joe, would you just like to respond on the light to shed information about our white standards and directional --

Dodson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Yes, the -- any streetlights that are going to be required with this have to be shielded and they have to be face down, they cannot have any light trespassing on any adjacent residential properties. With the future CZC application they have to provide a photometric plan that shows that, that there is no footcandles of light

trespassing. I can't speak to the vehicle lights coming in. A lot of people here have those tall trucks, even though they don't go off roading and, you know, get high levels of light in people's fences, but I can't -- we can't mitigate that. I will say that staff is amenable to increasing that buffer along the south boundary. ACHD is going to approve it regardless from my understanding. Ten feet shouldn't make a difference. I can't speak for ACHD, but I can't see that they -- if they had their way it would be right on the property line, but because we require a buffer I think they are understanding that if we require bigger buffers that they will accommodate that as well.

Simison: Well, since they are not here this evening, we can do whatever we want.

Dodson: I like it. How about that Linder Village -- Linder Road overpass.

Simison: Council, any further questions? Sorry. Is there anybody else that would like to provide testimony on this item at this time? Okay. Would the applicant to come forward and -- for final comments? Okay. Council, turn it over to you.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Question for Joe. The comment about Ustick access, I understand the applicant's request for it and the project probably requires it to be financially viable and the tradeoff is if it's right-in only it really is going to be a right-in, right-out. People aren't going to go that way and back up. Right? If they have to turn right they are probably just going to --

Dodson: I would.

Borton: -- those on Ustick and -- on Cherry Lane and Linder there is one coming out of the old Chicago Connection, same idea. So, that being said, is it your -- is it kind of a soft recommendation to make that emergency only bollard still be funky if people drive that way and backup or --

Dodson: Councilman Borton, we have project review meetings on these every few weeks, whatever, for the upcoming hearings and that access was one of the only concerns brought up by multiple departments. So, I understand the concern, I understand the desire to still want that, but I agree with you, I mean if someone goes down a hundred feet of driveway there, they are going to continue. I would. I guarantee you I would sneak out. But it -- that's why we have that concern and especially because that's a right-hand turn lane, that's not even the lanes of travel right there, so, then, if someone does have to turn right or trying to turn right there and they are going to head east more, they are going to be crossing multiple lanes of traffic, which we just -- we don't want to incentivize that.

Simison: If I can make -- there is one development that has done this correctly that I'm aware of, it's the corner of Victory and Cole Road in Boise into that commercial development right there where they have very successfully made it one way in only, you cannot get out that way, so if it is something, I think it can be done, but it takes some -- some -- some very concentrated effort to make it appropriate, but it can be accomplished. I promise you. I can't turn left out of that.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: Would we require signage, you know, not an exit, all those things, trying to -- you know. And people do what people do, but at the same time we are still trying to tell them don't do this, you know. I assume that's going to be required, if that's allowed, right-in only?

Dodson: Councilman Hoaglun, absolutely. We would -- I would -- I didn't put it in my staff report as a DA condition or condition of approval, because I was recommending it -- I would recommend if you decide to keep it that you require signage there to make it very clear this is only an entrance and nobody should try to go out. In addition, fire doesn't need that secondary access, I just didn't -- I wanted to give them another opportunity to have it. So, therefore, if -- if it's going to not be an emergency access we can choke down that drive lane to the minimum 12 feet, which is for a one way drive aisle, so that would help incentivize people not going down that as well from within the site.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: How would we -- how would we approve this with different -- a different design aspect that you speak about?

Simison: Do a good job? Sorry, I mean it -- I know it's tough.

Dodson: Mr. Mayor, I will say that I -- I have seen it I believe in Gramercy when I went over there for a site visit. They also -- they did curbing to try and utilize that to help make it very clear that people cannot enter into that -- or exit and that one you will not -- you will be fighting traffic just to go around the curbing, so I believe additional curbing would be necessary. I did see someone make a left-hand turn in that that they shouldn't have made, but that you -- this -- it would not occur, because there is the median there, I believe, along Ustick. If a recommendation was before to keep that, I would recommend including that the applicant work with ACHD to have some curbing there in the edge of the right of way.

Bernt: Okay. Perfect.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: With that discussion does that change the applicant's desire to make any last comments? Apparently so.

Rigby: I'm Vince Rigby. I'm the owner of the property.

Bernt: Can you state your address, please?

Rigby: My address is 4163 Philomena, Meridian. We will do what we need to do to keep it a one way only. If -- if that example that was given is the one that we need to follow, we will do that and add extra curbing, signage, whatever we need to do to have the access. I also -- I would just add that part of the -- part of the reason why we would like to have that access is -- is to reduce some of the traffic as was mentioned by Jessica off of Ten Mile, so -- that's it. Any questions for me?

Simison: Council, any questions? Thank you. And, Joe, I think, actually, yours was a better example on Gramercy. Those are definite limitations are what way you are going.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Question back to staff. From this discussion do you have enough specificity to include in the DA modification language that sets forth the right-in only parameters?

Dodson: Councilman Borton, I do. I'm making notes even though I probably won't be able to read them again, but I will -- it's up here. I got it.

Hoaglund: And, Mr. Mayor, question for --

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: And do we need to include anything about the 30 foot on the south side, attempting to --

Dodson: Councilman Hoaglund, if that's your desire, yes, I would include -- I would -- you would modify one of the existing conditions regarding the other 30 foot and just say include the southern boundary as well.

Hoaglund: Okay. And Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglun: Follow up to that, Joe. We are -- we are assuming ACHD would approve that. I mean --

Dodson: Yes, sir. I would assume --

Hoaglun: Because they wouldn't take any contingencies or anything else, based --

Dodson: Correct. Because they are allowing the existing buffer. So, if we say that the buffer is 30 feet, they -- they should be able to accommodate that.

Hoaglun: Okay.

Simison: So, with that, Council, do I have a motion to close the public hearing?

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: I move we close the public hearing on File No. H-2020-0122.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, second the motion.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to close the public hearing. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Hoaglun: I don't know if we need, Mr. Mayor, much discussion on this, so --

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: -- I will make a motion that after considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony I move to approve file number H-2020-0122 as presented in the staff report and public testimony of May 25th, 2021, and just for noting modifications that we do require signage that it's not an exit to Ustick Road. The appropriate signage. That they work with ACHD to find a curbing solution to prevent a right turn on Ustick and that on the south boundary near the entrance that the 30 foot buffer be in place for the residential area.

Cavener: Second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second. Is there discussion on the motion? Okay. With that Clerk will call the roll.

Roll call: Borton, yea; Cavener, yea; Bernt, yea; Perreault, absent; Hoaglun, yea; Strader, yea.

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries and the item is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Simison: Thank you, Joe, for your work this evening.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, real quick, before Joe leaves. Does Alan owe him lunch or dinner or anything? Oh, you owe him --

Tiefenbach: The other way around.

4. Public Hearing for Skybreak Neighborhood (H-2020-0127) by Laren Bailey of Conger Group, Located at 3487 E. Adler Hoff Ln. and 7020 S. Eagle Rd.

- A. Request: Annexation of 80.46 acres of land with R-8 and R-15 zoning districts.
- B. Request: A Preliminary Plat consisting of 329 building lots, 40 common lots and 14 other lots (i.e. 12 common driveway lots, 1 private street lot and 1 lot for the existing home) on 79.69 acres of land in the R-8 and R-15 zoning districts.

Hoaglund: There we go. Yeah. I got it right. Okay. Just wanted to clarify before we got started in the next one.

Tiefenbach: Everybody owes my wife dinner.

Simison: Counsel, do we need any breaks or any conversation about doing this one this evening? I mean everyone still seems to be here for that, so I know there was a question about -- it's getting late, if we wanted to do this this evening or do this tomorrow, but is everyone -- thoughts?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Cavener.

Cavener: Just a conversation for Council to have. We have -- we have tried to refrain from going late. It's been a good practice that we have followed. Again, I don't know what the status is of the applicant and the public. I appreciate that they have been marathoners and sat with us all night. I just -- I don't know if that's the direction Council wants to go, if we want to barrel through, or -- or continue this for another point in time. Open to either suggestion.

Simison: I guess the first question that was asked was we have a meeting tomorrow evening. If this would be continued until tomorrow would that work for everybody in the

room to come back and be part of that? I see some shaking no's. I don't know -- the meeting tomorrow is at 6:00. We have one other item -- two.

Bernt: One of them's pretty quick. One is just a -- Mr. Mayor, just like a -- like a code text something.

Simison: We had some people shake no this evening.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I'm just curious, but would it be possible to go ahead and take some public testimony from anyone that really -- oh, we can't do that? Like split it?

Simison: We have to open the hearing and go through that first process.

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, you can do that. I would strongly urge you not to do that. It breaks the record up and it makes it much more complicated if we go beyond one or two hearings that you have. It's a very disjointed hearing where you have got some testimony, you haven't had a presentation, it makes it a little bit harder to follow from a record standpoint.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Maybe we take a comment from the applicant and see what their opinion is.

Simison: Yeah. Definitely need to start there. This is their hearing this evening.

Nelson: Mayor and Council, we are open to coming back tomorrow evening. We would ask to be heard first after wading through the business, if that's possible.

Simison: Mr. Nary, would there be any concern with that, with how it's noticed for tomorrow?

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, the clerk did just ask me that, so you can amend your agenda. You will just have to put on the record why. So, you are allowed to do that. You can certainly put it first. Ms. Suggs' application is also tomorrow and that was set over a couple weeks ago and, then, the other one is -- is the staff one. So, it's totally your decision. It's up to you.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: If the applicant is amenable to it, then, I think that we can do it tomorrow, we can make it so that you guys are first on the agenda.

Nelson: Appreciate that.

Bernt: Okay.

Simison: Okay. If there is anybody who can't be here tomorrow we do take remote testimony as we have seen and we have that information. So, we -- you know, if you -- if you want to come up afterwards and make sure we get you all the information in order to do that.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Another suggestion is, you know, we have taken recorded audio testimony. I think there was even some of that on this particular application. So, if they are not available at the time, they can record and send it and have it added to the record and maybe even the Clerk could play it tomorrow. Just another suggestion. So, we can -- we want to make sure that we hear all the public testimony.

Simison: And we want to give this due diligence for everybody's purpose. So, it can be disposed of wisely and prudently.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor, I think it's important, I think that this is -- any application is an important application, but it's important to have -- you know, to deliberate wisely and effectively and I know I have drank four Diet Cokes tonight, but I -- I feel like it would be in everyone's best interest if we deliberated about this tomorrow.

Simison: Okay. So, with that do we need to open the public hearing and continue it until tomorrow?

Nary: Yes, sir.

Simison: Okay. So, with that we will open the public hearing for Skybreak Neighborhood, H-2020-0127. Do I have a motion?

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I move that we continue the public hearing on H-2020-0127 until June 26th, 6:00 p.m.

Nary: May.

Simison: May.

Hoaglund: May. May 26, 6:00 p.m.

Simison: Do I have a second?

Cavener: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to continue this public hearing until tomorrow night at 6:00 p.m. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it and this will be continued until tomorrow. Hopefully Alan can be here. Oh-oh.

Bernt: Sorry, Alan.

ORDINANCES [Action Item]

- 5. Ordinance No. 21-1929: An Ordinance (H-2020-0046 – Gateway at 10 Mile) for Annexation of a Parcel of Land Situated in the West ½ of the Southwest ¼, Section 11, Township 3 North, Range 1 West, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, as Described in Attachment “A” and Annexing Certain Lands and Territory, Situated in Ada County, Idaho, and Adjacent and Contiguous to the Corporate Limits of the City of Meridian as Requested by the City of Meridian; Establishing and Determining the Land Use Zoning Classification of 41.284 Acres of Land from RUT to R-40 (High Density Residential)(17.273 Acres) and C-G (General Retail and Service Commercial)(24.001 Acres) Zoning Districts in the Meridian City Code; Providing that Copies of this Ordinance shall be Filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as Required by Law; and Providing for a Summary of the Ordinance; and Providing for a Waiver of the Reading Rules; and Providing an Effective Date**

Simison: Council, I need one more -- oh, we actually have an ordinance. Next item on the agenda is Ordinance No. 21-1929. Ask the Clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. It's an ordinance related to H-2020-0046, Gateway at Ten Mile for annexation of a parcel of land situated in the West ½ of the Southwest ¼, Section 11, Township 3 North, Range 1 West, Boise meridian, Ada county, Idaho, as described in Attachment “A” and annexing certain lands and territory, situated in Ada county, Idaho, and adjacent and contiguous to the corporate limits of the City of Meridian as requested by the City of Meridian; establishing and determining the land use zoning classification of 41.284 acres of land from RUT to R-40 (High Density Residential)(17.273 acres) and C-G (General Retail and Service Commercial)(24.001 acres) Zoning Districts in the Meridian City Code; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission,

as required by law; and providing for a summary of the ordinance; and providing for a waiver of the reading rules; and providing an effective date.

Simison: So, you have heard this ordinance read by title. Is there anybody that would like it read in its entirety? Okay. If not, do I have a motion?

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 21-1929 with the suspension of rules.

Cavener: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve for Ordinance No. 21-1929 under suspension of rules. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, all in favor signify by saying. Opposed nay. The ayes have it and the ordinance is agreed to.

FUTURE MEETING TOPICS

Simison: Council, anything under future meeting topics? Do I have a motion to adjourn?

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I move that we adjourn.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: Motion and second to adjourn. All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it and we are adjourned.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 10:22 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON
ATTEST:

_____/_____/_____
DATE APPROVED

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK