

McCarvel: Second.

Holland: Okay. Got a motion and a second. All those in favor. Hearing none opposed.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

**ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]**

Holland: We will move on. Items moved from the Consent Agenda.

**ACTION ITEMS:**

**2. Public Hearing for Oakwind Estates Subdivision (H-2020-0093) by Engineering Solutions, Located at 5685 N. Black Cat Rd.**

- A. Request: Preliminary Plat for 94 single family lots, 92 townhome lots, 26 common lots and 3 common driveway lots on 24.54 acres.

Holland: To Action Items and the first item on our agenda is the public hearing for Oakwind Estates Subdivision, H-2020-0093, by Engineering Solutions, on Black Cat Road and we will begin with the staff report.

Tiefenbach: Good evening, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. Alan Tiefenbach, Associate Planner with the City of Meridian. This is a request for a preliminary plat and a development agreement modification. Let's see if I can get this to work for me here. So, it's a preliminary plat for 94 single family lots, 92 townhome lots, 26 common lots on just a little less than 25 acres. As I said, it also includes a modification to the existing development agreement, which designates the property for multi-family and self storage. Give you just a bit of history on this. In 2008 this property received annexation approval for a large master planned residential development at the time called Oak Creek. In 2013 the subject property was rezoned to the R-15 zoning district as part of the Ultra North Subdivision. So, this 24 and a half acre property is part of a much larger 295 acre property. So, this subject property, as I mentioned, was approved for multi-family on the north side and self storage on the south side. The self storage was only to be customarily incidental to the residential, so it can't be a standalone self storage as a primary use, it was only to serve the residents of that subdivision. The DA was amended at the time to allow this. In 2018 the multi-family portion of this property, about 16 some acres, was proposed to be rezoned to R-8 to develop single family detached. This was another amendment to the development agreement to remove that multi-family requirement. This went to the Planning Commission and the Planning Commission recommended approval, but it never made it to the Council and since has been withdrawn. That said, the Oaks North plat and the DA for the Oaks North are what still governs this property. Here are the maps just to sort of show you what -- what is recommended for in the future land use map is medium density residential, zoned R-15. This is the -- the red lines represent properties that are being developed presently now and yellow represents anything that's actively in hearing. So, I will talk a little bit about this plat. Again, as listed

above there has been several rezonings and DAs relating to this property and as part of the -- as I said, the Oaks North plat. Excuse me. And the property is about 24 and a half acres of the -- almost 300 acres of the Oaks North plat. The northern 17 and a half acres is presently zoned to allow multi-family of between eight to 15 dwelling units per acre. The southern seven, almost eight acres is zoned to allow self storage. This preliminary plat includes a new development agreement to allow single family -- I'm going to use this one, because I think it's easier to see this colored one. So, this preliminary plat would be -- would include a development agreement to allow single family on the northern half and townhouses on the southern half. The single family would be on lots of approximately 3,000 to 5,000 square foot. The townhouses will be on lots of between 2,100 and 3,200 square feet. The proposed street network stubs two streets, Cherrybrook Drive, which is here, and West Milano -- or excuse me. And West Daphne Street, which is here. And those connect to Trident, which you can see here. North Trident terminates up at the North Oaks and terminates down at McMillan to the west. This proposal would not provide direct access to the arterial, nor would it increase the number of access points to that arterial now. There are several internal roads, which you can see here, is Avilla and Milano and also there are -- there is an alley that you can see here. So, the townhouses are alley loaded. ACHD has commented that Marysville Street and Palustris, I think it's called, Avenue, that's these two streets here, are rather long and they are recommending traffic calming for these streets. That's one of the conditions of approval. And when we talk about traffic calming we are not saying speed bumps or road signs, ACHD is talking about things such as islands or narrowing it or doing more curves -- design elements to actually slow down traffic on those areas. I want to mention that the staff report mentioned that the applicant would be required to construct curb and gutter along with McMillan. However, it's been clarified that McMillan is an arterial and curb and gutter is not required. Another thing I want to clarify is that there was some confusion between the preliminary plat and the landscape plan. The preliminary plat showed that there would be five foot sidewalks built along McMillan. The landscape plan scaled out to be ten foot sidewalks. It's actually five foot sidewalks and if you look to the -- to the Oaks North to the east the sidewalks there are also five feet. So, the sidewalk would tie at the proper width. Finally, I guess I want to mention that the UDC states that residential development along the McDermott Road from Chinden to 84 is required to provide noise abatement and that would be here and that noise abatement would be by constructing a berm or a berm-wall combination. It has to be at least ten feet above the centerline of McDermott Road. As a condition of approval staff's recommending the applicant submit a landscape plan which meets those requirements prior to City Council. This development proposes 16 -- almost 17 percent of qualified open space. That's almost twice of what they are -- they are required to provide. This includes several grassy areas that are bigger than 50 by 100. That includes pathways. You can see one here. You can see pathways here. There are pathways running along here. There is pathways running along with the townhouses. There is also a central park, I guess you could call it, that includes like an outdoor picnic area. It also includes -- let's see. Hold on here. The applicant has provided building elevations, which I will show you here. These building elevations overall staff thinks to calling it good, but we did have concerns with these elevations, in particular the length of these roofs. If you look at this roof here -- we can start with that one. We believe that that roof should project across the home. We also had some issues with the length of the

roofs of these townhouses. We thought that these roofs should be broken up better. If you look at our architectural standards manual you will see that you can't have roof lines longer than 50 feet without having some kind of variation in the roof plain, so that was our recommendation. We also believe that these little roofs pitch elements that you see here should be carried around on the -- along the face of the townhouses. A condition of approval of the staff report was that the applicant revise these elevations prior to Planning Commission. I received some revised elevations today. This is what you will see. Overall I think staff supports the ones on the bottom. We still think the ones on the top should probably include some kind of elements above the garage door. We would prefer the roof or something like that be carried. If you look at the two on the bottom we think that they did a very good job of that. There is the roof continuing across on the bottom left. You can see they did like a -- like an exposed timber frame or trellis type elements above the garage door on this one. Moving along to the townhouses, they have since broken up these roofs. You can see how they have broken up the lengths of these roofs. We certainly like that. Similar to the elevations of single family, we think that these -- the little pitch elements of these overhangs -- there should be something above the garage door, whether they want to do another overhang like that or whether they do some kind of exposed timber frame, we think there should be some added visual relief. It would be our recommendation, looking at these new elevations, that the Planning Commission consider that and add that as a condition of approval. With that staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve this. We think that it includes less density than what was originally approved, but it still contains a diverse housing stock in terms of lot sizes, house sizes, in detached and detached housing projects. Also the qualified open space and amenities as proposed exceeds the minimum requirements. The amount of -- of open space is almost double what is required. It's central to the development and there is numerous pathways integrated into and out of the development. So, after -- so, with that staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council with the conditions as listed in the staff report and we still believe that there should be conditions for more enhancements to the architecture on several of the houses, as well as the townhouses, and I would entertain questions at this time.

Holland: Sorry, I was on mute. Any questions for staff from the Commission?

Seal: Madam Chair? Madam Chair?

Holland: Go ahead, Commissioner Seal.

Seal: Just a quick question here on the staff analysis, it's a little confusing. I think I understand essentially what's going on, but in the -- in Item B here it says: However, since the development agreement applies to the entire Oaks North and South, of which this property is only a small part, staff believes it would be better to leave the existing DA as is and create a new development agreement for this property. So, essentially, that takes -- what that's saying is take just this property out of the rest of the development agreement and leave that original development alone?

Tiefenbach: Members of the Planning Commission, Madam Chair, that's correct. We

would be removing this portion of the property out of the Oaks North development agreement and this would be a new development agreement that would -- that would apply to just this property, the 24 plus acres.

Seal: Okay. Thank you.

Holland: Any other questions for staff before we hear from the applicant? Hearing none, I believe Becky is with us to talk on the application. And if you wouldn't mind stating your name and address for the record, we would appreciate it, Becky. Thank you.

McKay: Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, Becky McKay, Engineering Solutions, business address 1029 North Rosario in Meridian. I'm hear representing the applicant BB Living, which is a division of Toll Southwest. Hang on here. So, the -- the property that you are looking at is that northeast corner of West McMillan and McDermott Road. As staff indicated, there is approximately 24 and a half acres there. You can see the previous phases that we have designed, recorded, or have submitted final plats and designs to the city on. The project Oaks North is proceeding forward. Oak South is completely built out now and so in this -- in this corner initially what -- what we had anticipated is based on the environmental impact study that was prepared by Idaho Department of Transportation for State Highway 16, phase two and phase three. They had indicated that McMillan Road would go up over McDermott and so we had -- initially when this was planned back in 2008 and came through as a pre-plat in 2013, that -- that we would have an overpass and so we would have significant grade that -- that would -- McMillan would start rising and so we proposed a use that we thought would be compatible with that, which would be mini storage that would service the Oaks development in its entirety and, then, we had multi-family buildings on the remainder. Over the past few years ITD has changed their plan and has submitted a new EIS to the feds and they are going to have State Highway 16 go over the top of McMillan. So, there will no longer be an overpass here and initially we had planned for a bypass of McDermott Road to come through our site, then, we had this significant amount of right of way allocated along the north and south part of McMillan Road to accommodate it and uses that would, obviously, be able -- would not be negatively impacted by the overpass. So, we kind of had to rethink our plans, because a lot has changed since 2008 and 2013. This is the property that you can see. This is a view of the property from the west boundary. As you can see it's relatively flat. We have Jump Creek Subdivision to the -- to the east of us. They come off of -- their access is off a Black Cat and off of McMillan Road. They have a collector that connects to us, extending out to Black Cat, aligning with the collector roadway in Bridgetower West. This was the original preliminary plat that was approved in 2013 by the City Council. As you can see we have -- where is my -- have to find it. There it is. So, we had this area that was going to be multi-family, R-15 apartment type development. We did not have any specific site plan. It was just approved for a certain number of units and, then, we had the -- oh, dang it. This thing gets squirrely on me. There we go. And then -- how come I always lose the cursor, Bill? There it is. Then we had this mini storage here and as you can see here was the overpass as it started to increase in elevation. State Highway 16 is west of -- west of McDermott about 300 feet and -- I'm having technical difficulties. And, then, we had what we call the McDermott

bypass -- that, then, McDermott would terminate and, then, bypass that overpass. So, obviously, with the changes in the ITD plan, we had to rethink what was going to transpire. So, this is -- this is what we came up with and one of the things that was, obviously, an integral part of our Oaks North and Oak South project was the fact that we would have diversity. Diversity in lot sizes. Diversity in different types of home -- housing products. We had significant open space. We had pathways. And so we -- we took a look at this and said, you know, what are we lacking as far as different product in the Oaks project. Townhomes were one. Secondly were patio homes for like empty nesters on smaller lots. We had our Garden product. We had our Woodland product. We had our Countryside product. And so we wanted to, obviously, add another dimension for the housing market in this project. This is the preliminary plat that you see right here. This is an overall colored rendering of what you see. So, we -- we kind of took the project. We have Trident, which is a collector roadway. So, I have no direct access onto McDermott, nor to McMillan. All of our access is on our internal collector roadway Trident. The number of vehicle trips proposed within this development are less than what was anticipated and accounted for in the original traffic study that was done on the site back in 2013. Ada County Highway District indicated that a new analysis would not be necessary, since we have been widening McMillan Road 17 feet from centerline in both directions, since we are north and south of McMillan, and we did construct a roundabout at our primary mid mile continuous collector, Rustic Oak, which exceeded a million dollars and so that -- that is -- has been constructed and is operational. So, what we looked at -- and we worked closely with BB Living and their architects KTGy, who are specialists in -- in this type of product, that the southern portion of the project that you see is townhomes. We wanted to have a mixture of front load and rear load, so that we had differing elevations. We have MEWs incorporated in the project and you can see that -- that some of the units are along a MEW. Some of them have front load. They all have garages. They all have 20-by-20 carport or car pads in front and, then, we do have one 20 foot wide alley, so we have rear load. The primary entrance into the project is Daphne. There it is. So, Daphne comes in right there off of Trident and we do have detached five foot wide sidewalks along Daphne on both sides. So, we have a nice soft entrance. That was a designated entrance. Meets all ACHD standards. All internal streets within the project are proposed as public streets, including the alley will be a public alley. So, we have a nice landscaped detached sidewalk coming into the project. Our primary amenity is centrally located and you can see that -- I don't know where that arrow goes. There he is. You can see our central amenity located at that location. So, it's easily available to all residents, since we have pedestrian pathways that go both north and south within the project and we have some pathways that go out to McDermott to the ten foot pathway. So, we have significant amount of pedestrian interconnectivity. Up to the north of the project we have the Creason Lateral, which was piped. There is a pathway along that Creason Lateral. It runs from McDermott and all the way through our project connecting to Jump Creek Subdivision, which is located on the far eastern boundary. Here is kind of a blow up of the amenity. What BB Living likes to have is a significant gathering place for their residents. They wanted to have an open lawn area and kind of a plaza area. This plaza area has playground equipment. It has an outdoor full kitchen. It has barbecue area. It has seating area. It has for -- for eating like a -- like a covered shelter and it also has kind of a conversation pit area where they have a fireplace. So, they are -- they are

big on creating a community network and as staff indicated we significantly exceed the minimum required open space under the ordinance with this development. One of the reasons that we require -- requested an amendment or revision of the development agreement is because the original development agreement that was tied to the overall project in 2013 said that the density within this area had to be a minimum of eight dwelling units per acre. Our gross density with the project is 7.58. So, we are under that eight dwelling units per acre, which required that we modify the DA. Now, obviously, over the past seven years there have been ordinance amendments. Things have changed. Some of the conditions in the original DA we have already satisfied. So, we are in agreement with staff to prepare a new DA for this 26 acres here or 25 acres. Sorry. So, that it's site specific and that's pretty standard when we have these older DAs trying to retrofit them. The code sections have changed. Other items have changed. Things that aren't applicable to this, but are applicable to other areas within Oaks North, so -- so, that -- that's the reason that staff has -- has requested that the Commission provide a condition to do a new DA for this project. This is kind of an example. I had BB Living from some of their other projects that they built in California, in Arizona, Nevada. This is -- this is their specialty. This shows you kind of an example of their shelter that they -- that they like and their plaza areas where they take great care to, obviously, make it inviting and landscaping. They have benches. They have picnic tables. They have a covered area. As you can see here is an example of one of their outdoor kitchens. So, they have -- they have barbecue areas, full kitchen areas. They kind of have a bar where the residents can gather. They are sheltered and -- and can converse and -- and, obviously, enjoy living in the project. This is another example where they have a plaza area. This one is not covered. It has -- it has barbecues. It has picnic tables. Hard surface plazas. Bike parking. So, they -- they want to, obviously, create an inviting environment for the residents and here is an example of another project that they have done where you can see they have -- they have a central fire pit. They have the Adirondack chairs. They have landscaping and -- to bring people together to enjoy the living environment. We did -- we did get comments from the staff concerning our elevations. The architects have made some revisions. These are not the final product. These are drafts. We did not have a lot of time. Once we received the staff report we realized that -- that the staff had requested revised elevations prior to Planning and Zoning Commission, not prior to Council. So, therefore, the architects were under the gun to prepare these drawings and so these, obviously, are breaking up that roofline in the townhomes where we have a continuous roof there. This -- this kind of shows you another breakup where they are breaking up and changing and modulating that roofline and you can see the same thing here. But, like I said, these are a work in progress and so the client is -- is, obviously, considerate of staff's comments and cognizant of the fact that the design review standards for the multi-family townhome -- townhome type buildings require modulation and articulation. On the single family dwellings -- I will wrap it up. Single family dwellings, we have provided staff with some additional elevations, basically breaking up that, creating kind of a porch, a little bit of more of aesthetic pleasing garage orientation and I will stand for questions.

Holland: Thanks, Becky. Any questions for the applicant from the Commission?

Seal: Madam Chair?

Holland: Go ahead, Commissioner Seal.

Seal: Just so I have a better understanding of the entire layout of the Oaks North and South -- and this relates to the Rustic Oak as it traverses through multiple subdivisions it looks like. What -- how much of that will be completed before this segment goes in?

McKay: We had a meeting this afternoon with the developers of Prescott Ridge, Hubbell Homes, to coordinate the timing of Rustic Oak. We have eight phases within Oaks North that have construction plan approval. We have I believe three phases that are constructed and recorded. We have phases four, five, six and seven that have been pre-conned and are underway. Rustic Oak was extended with phase one approximately 700 feet short of the south boundary of Prescott Ridge and, then, they will build Rustic Oak all the way to Chinden, so we will have a continuous mid mile collector, which was intended, and on a master street map. Phase eight, which we do have construction plan approval, and they will begin construction in the spring and complete next year. We will bring that collector roadway within -- and utilities within 300 feet of Prescott Ridge and in the meeting we had with Mitch Armuth and Don Hubbell this afternoon, they have agreed that if Toll will -- will construct Rustic Oak up to that 300 foot point, then, they will extend the sewer, the water, and the collector roadway up to their boundary and, then, within their first phase Rustic Oak will go clear to Chinden. I think everybody's on the same page. We also shared drawings, agreed on the transitioning of the lots, because they had some attached product next to some of our larger countryside bigger lots that are 11 and 12 thousand square feet on our north boundary and initially when the preliminary plat was approved in 2013 -- the reason those lots were so large on the north boundary is we had like 15 acre and 20 acre parcels with existing homes and they wanted transitioning. So, I did the transitioning and put our larger lots, our R-4 zoning along the north boundary, but today we kind of worked with Hubble and -- and Ryan Hammons with Toll and -- and Mitch Armuth and Don Hubble -- all agreed on appropriate transitioning, so that everybody was happy and the timing of the collector roadway. So, it appears that our phase eight will be under construction at the same time as their phase one. So, that continuous collector will be built in 2021.

Seal: And when do you see the occupancy and build out for Oakwind Estates?

McKay: You mean for -- for this project? We have it as two phases. We will begin construction plans here shortly and I believe they anticipate trying to get, obviously, underway shortly after we obtain Council approval and get the development agreement signed and recorded. Then that would allow us to, then, submit our final plat and construction plans. So, they would like to be underway I believe this winter and, obviously, paving their first phase in late spring, early summer, and, then, going vertical in the -- in the mid summer, late summer, and, then, they want phase two to be following shortly behind that. The staff has requested that we build all of our perimeter buffering along McMillan and McDermott with the first phase and we are comfortable with that.

Seal: Okay. And the reason I have asked the questions is because of the remarks from ACHD in their final letter that are kind of pressing to have that Rustic Oak completed really before there is occupancy in here and that's -- I mean essentially what -- that's what I read in the letter that they provided. So, that's why I'm trying to kind of press for -- is -- is that -- is that going to be a reality?

McKay: Madam Chairman, Commissioner Seal, their intent was not that -- that it be constructed prior to the occupancy in this development. I did attend via Zoom that ACHD meeting and what Council -- or Commissioner Baker wanted to be assured that the collector roadway would be connected up to Prescott Ridge, so that we could get the -- the additional mid mile collect established for the entire section to improve access for emergency vehicles and to, obviously, take the heat off of some of the intersections along the arterial, because we do have a continuous collector going from McMillan to Chinden and from -- obviously from McMillan wrapping out to Black Cat and, then, from Black Cat through Bridgetower West, which I designed, going out to Ten Mile. There was no stipulation that our occupancies would be dependent on that being in place. It was a recommendation, because that would be an off-site improvement and an exaction upon this project, because this particular project has two points of ingress and egress and we do meet the fire department regulations. We will be sprinkling the townhomes and according to my conversations with Joe Bongiorno, the single family dwellings will also require sprinklers, because we are at the five minute response and he indicated to me that even with the continuation of Rustic Oaks up to Chinden, it does not change the response time for Oakwind, but it does change the response time for Prescott Ridge. But we are -- I think Bill has been, obviously, pursuing the -- that the developers get together and do this in unison. So, that is what we are doing. We have come to an agreement and I think that's -- that's a critical thing, that we don't stop 300 feet short of them. We will allow them to build that sewer and water on that 300 feet and we will make up the gap when we design -- or build phase eight, which is designed and approved and ready to go.

Seal: Okay. Thank you.

McKay: Thank you.

Holland: Becky, one other question for you. On the southern side of the development where you have got the townhomes, the more dense product, I think my biggest concern is about parking. I know a lot of times when we see these kind of things -- and I know I saw a visual in the staff memo that showed where some parking areas would be kind of on the northern side of it, but I worry about that shared drive aisle, that kind of chunk that's in the middle there, that they don't really have a lot of extra parking and you are going to end up having people parked in the alley or parked around there. Do you have any comments about parking or some of those shared drives?

McKay: Yeah. Madam Chairman, we -- we did provide a parking plan for the staff, because that -- that is -- is not a requirement, but it has been strongly suggested by the staff when we do have narrower lots or we propose townhomes. So, all of our townhomes will have a two car garage. They will also have a 20-by-20 concrete pad. So, we will be



able to park four cars. And, then, we have provided a parking plan, which showed a significant number of additional parking areas available. Now, Daphne has no front-on housing and we only showed parking on the south side of Daphne. So, technically, you could park on the north side of Daphne. All of our streets are a full section, 33 feet from back to back, so we don't have any reduced street sections that would not allow parking. With those common drives we -- we did show the parking along the end blocks where -- where guests could park. We have to sign those -- those 20 foot wide common drives as no parking within those. I think we have between three and -- we have -- I think we have one that has four units on it. We tried to minimize those. It was just kind of difficult. We have reworked the site plan, both my staff and the architects, trying to minimize any of the -- the joint driveways and trying to provide as -- as much interconnectivity and parking as possible. As far as the single family lots, you know, those are -- those are patio homes. They will have two car garages. They will have a 20-by-20 pad and, then, on-street parking will be allowed on both sides of the street. We don't have any -- we have end block buffers, so there is parking at the end of the blocks without blocking a driveway. So, I think -- I think we have demonstrated that -- that we can accommodate guests within the project. Trident is a collector. There will be no parking -- there is no parking signs on Trident until such time as it goes north and we have front-on houses.

Holland: Thanks, Becky. Really quick, I'm going to ask -- Adrienne, it looks like Commissioner McCarvel got moved back to attendees. I think she had to call back in. If you wouldn't mind moving her back over to panelist.

Weatherly: Commissioner Holland, I'm trying. We are trying to work out a technical difficulty right now. I'm not able to move her over. So, I'm trying to work out if she can log out completely and, then, try to log back in, if we want to wait for that for a second while we lose our quorum and, then, regain it. I'm fine doing that. But, Rhonda, I can't get you back in, so -- we can try to do a fresh reboot with you if you want to hang up completely and try to get back in.

Holland: I will ask Andrea -- do we need to pause, Andrea, to have a quorum?

Pogue: It seems like it's taking a little bit longer than I initially thought, so I think we should take a break.

Holland: Okay. Sorry about that, Becky.

McKay: That's okay. One thing, Madam Chair. We did have two neighborhood meetings for the project. I had -- the first neighborhood meeting I had one individual show up that had bought a home south of McMillan within our Oaks South project. The second neighborhood meeting I had two residents that lived over off of Black Cat. They seemed to be pleased with the project and were happy that we had eliminated the apartment component and had gone to townhomes and patio homes. So, we did not --

Holland: Thank you for that.

McKay: -- have significant opposition.

Holland: Have a little bit of technical difficulties. Thanks everyone for hanging in there with us.

Seal: And, for the record, any delays are Bill's fault this evening.

Holland: It looks like we might have Commissioner McCarvel back. All right. It looks like we are back to having a quorum again. So, welcome back, Commissioner McCarvel. Was there any other questions for Becky before we open up to see if there is any public testimony?

Yearsley: Madam Chair?

Holland: Go ahead.

Yearsley: On your -- you stated it earlier, but in the development agreement there was a requirement for eight units to the acre. Is that the entire site or just the southern portion of this project?

McKay: No, sir. Madam Chair. That was just for the -- the R-15 multi-family areas that we had designated on the preliminary plat. We had three of them and in that -- in that initial DA it was just applicable to those R-15 areas, that our minimum density would be eight.

Yearsley: Okay. That's all I have. Thank you.

Holland: Thank you, Commissioner Yearsley. Any other questions? Hearing none, Madam Clerk, do we have anyone signed in to testify?

Weatherly: Madam Chair, we do not.

Holland: Becky, we will bring you back up in a minute.

Weatherly: Excuse me, Madam Chair. I'm sorry. We do not have anyone signed in on this project.

Holland: Okay. If anybody that is on the call would like to testify, if you want to raise your hand on the Zoom panel or wave at Commissioner Seal and he will let us know if there is anybody looking -- it looks like it's pretty quiet at Council chambers behind Becky, but --

Seal: Nobody in chambers.

Holland: Seeing none, Becky, do you have any final comments you would like to make?

McKay: No, ma'am. I think -- I think I have covered it all. I think we have a great project

and it's going to compliment the Oaks North development and provide an alternative type of housing that we don't have and the amount of open space and amenities is significant. This project stands on its own. These residents will, obviously, be able to use the pathways, clubhouse, pools, that are within Oaks North and Oaks South as part of their amenities also.

Holland: Thanks, Becky. If there is no more questions for the applicant or for staff, can I get a motion to close the public hearing for Oakwind Estates Subdivision, H-2020-0093, and move to deliberation.

Seal: So moved.

Yearsley: Second.

Holland: I have got a motion and a second I believe by Commissioner Yearsley. All those in favor? Okay. None opposed.

**MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.**

Weatherly: Madam Chair?

Holland: Adrienne, was that you?

Weatherly: I'm sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt you that prematurely. I will let you finish there and, then, I will interrupt.

Holland: I think we have a motion and a second and all were in favor, so we have closed for deliberation, but what's up, Adrienne.

Weatherly: My apologies. Commissioner Cassinelli is joining us at 6:52 p.m.

Holland: Thank you. Welcome, Commissioner Cassinelli. You are just in time for comments. You want to go first? I'm just kidding. Anybody would like to go first on making comments for the Oakwind Estates Subdivision?

Weatherly: Madam Chair, this is Adrienne again. I'm sorry, we are still having technical difficulties on Zoom, so, Commissioner Cassinelli, I'm unable to promote you to have your own ability to speak. If you would like to speak, please, raise your hand.

Holland: Got to love technical difficulties.

Weatherly: And that will be throughout the meeting, too. I apologize.

Holland: That's okay. I will just trust you to be my eyes and ears for Commissioner Cassinelli when he wants to speak. Could we get the picture back of the landscape plan for the Oakwind Estates? That may help for discussion. Since everybody else is jumping

the gun to talk, I will just say I don't have any huge concerns with it. I like that they have got the open space kind of in the central area. The biggest concern is kind of what I mentioned, that whenever you have got the higher density products, like the townhomes on the south side, parking can become an issue quickly for me on those. I also don't love the shared drives when there is more than three houses sharing a shared drive for the townhomes and I can't tell how many there are on that bottom right corner, but it looks like there is at least four townhome units that will be sharing that common drive. Could staff confirm that? I can't see that landscape plan very well.

Tiefenbach: Yeah. Sorry. Alan Tiefenbach. It looks like we have five townhouses sharing that drive down at the bottom right.

Holland: Okay. Thanks, Alan. That would be one of my requests is that they would limit it to no more than three on those shared drives. I just -- shared drives are always funky. They don't work super well and, then, you have got people who try to do big turns and, then, you get driveways that are blocked and people get mad and, then, it's hard with trash enclosures and trying to get all the cars on the edge of the common drive, it always seems to be a topic of conversation for the Commission. Those were one of my comments, though. Anybody else want to go?

Seal: Madam Chair?

Holland: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: Yeah. Same thing. The shared driveways are definitely cause for concern to me for similar reasons. They kind of cause their own traffic congestion on their own. One of the other things is just -- I mean the -- the parking plan that was -- that was shown -- and to me there just needs to be more parking in this -- you know, where the -- we have more -- more homes. It would be nice to see, you know, possibly some reconfiguration that allowed for more parking that was central to -- to the townhomes that are in this -- you know, something that might even expand the MEW or something like that. It just seems like there is -- you know, I mean, obviously, you want the density to be high, but with this high of density and the lack of parking dedicated to each one of the residences, as well as shared drives, you know, in here on the bottom of either side, I just see that there is going to be -- you know, I think that there will be continual issues with parking and ability to get around in here that could translate into, you know, emergency vehicles as well. So, that's something that I would definitely want to see is just more dedicated parking in here somewhere. Again, I'm not sure how they can accomplish that, but, you know, maybe give up a couple of the residents, expand the MEW in the middle, get some dedicated parking in there, something along those lines, as well as, you know, eliminating or reorienting things to only let so many houses on the common drives and I think -- I think your wording of no more than three is appropriate.

Holland: Thanks, Commissioner Seal. Yeah, I agree with your comment on parking, too. It always makes me nervous. I would like to see more of a dedicated parking, because I know what it's -- driving through some of these new townhome products that have the two

car garages and two driveways -- while it gives four parking spots, people aren't parking in their garages, they are putting stuff in their garages and parking on the driveway. So, you just see kind of rows of cars, which is unfortunate.

Yearsley: Madam Chair?

Holland: Go ahead. Was that Alan?

Yearsley: Steven Yearsley. Sorry.

Holland: Oh, sorry. Commissioner Yearsley, go ahead.

Yearsley: You know, I come back to this -- there is -- there is two things major that I -- I'm concerned. I think you are -- you are -- you are right on with the parking. I even think in the single family homes -- again, these are going to be very small homes, I mean the lots are 3,500 square feet. You are going to have a mediocre sized home, very small yard, they are going to have their garages full of stuff as well as -- so, they are going to be parking on the street and in the -- on the -- so, I think overall the other -- the -- the -- the -- you know, the whole project I'm concerned about parking, especially with the smaller lots that they have. The other concern that I have with -- given the small lots, you know, they have 15 percent open space, but -- and I would prefer to see 20, just because of -- there is -- there is no place for these kids to go. If they are -- if they have kids, you know, because there is -- there is no -- no space at their house to actually go in their backyard or maybe play a little bit in their front yard, but there really is no place to -- you just -- there is going to be a sea of homes with no -- with very small yards. So, I would prefer to see closer to 20 percent open space in this area as well.

Holland: Thanks, Commissioner Yearsley. Yeah, I always like it when there is more open space than required and I know that they are meeting -- or they are exceeding the open space requirement with the park and the pathways that they have in here. I don't disagree that if you are living in that southern area you are just kind of in a row of homes and cars and there is not really a lot of area for playing. So, I don't disagree with you there either. Commissioner McCarvel or Commissioner Cassinelli, any comments you would like to make?

McCarvel: Madam Chair?

Holland: Go ahead, Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: Yeah. I would definitely agree with the parking scenario. It just looks very compact down there and, you know, with the landscape visual and everything it looks pretty, but we know what's going to happen in real life and so I -- I would like to see a little more parking somewhere.

Holland: Yeah. Commissioner Cassinelli, I know you love talking about parking.

Cassinelli: Yeah. I don't have a whole lot to add, since I'm jumping in late on this one, but -- but those are the -- what's been said is -- you know, I would say -- I would just echo -- ditto those comments.

Holland: So, I'm not sure if anybody has some suggestions on how we would form that in a -- in a motion -- if we wanted to have them come back to us as a continuance and come back with another concept or if we would rather just make some conditions that sounds like there was agreement on eliminating the shared drive to no more than three, but we would need to see some additional parking and ideally a little bit more open space. Anyone's thoughts on that? Do we want to look at a continuance or are you happy to try and put some conditions in there that can help guide that?

Parsons: Madam Chair?

Yearsley: Madam Chair?

Holland: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: I think -- I don't know if we need to hold it up for that. I think we can put some conditions in the approval and move it off to the City Council for their review with those conditions.

Parsons: Yeah. Madam Chair?

Holland: Bill, were you commenting?

Parsons: Madam Chair, this is staff.

Holland: Go ahead, staff.

Parsons: There is -- there is a couple of things that are at play tonight that I want you to take under consideration is that what's before you tonight is a plat. What Council will be acting on is a DA modification. So, if that's something that you want -- if these changes that you want to see with the plat need to be incorporated as part of a recommendation as part of the DA modification that Council will take action on, because under the code just for a straight subdivision, the code only requires ten percent open space. So, it's hard for this body to say provide 20 percent open space when they are already exceeding what code allows. So, again, if that's something you want to see more parking, more open space, loss of units, then, I would recommend that you include that as part of some DA provisions that the Council could take under consideration. That will make them part of the plat conditions.

Holland: Thanks, Bill. Appreciate that insight.

Parsons: You're welcome.

Holland: So, if anybody wants to take a stab at making a motion, certainly welcome to, but it sounds like a couple of things we could do is move forward with recommendation of approval of the plat and, then, make a suggestion that Council would take into consideration a request to consider more parking and open space as part of the DA.

Seal: Madam Chair?

Holland: Go ahead, Commissioner Seal.

Seal: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to City Council of file number H-2020-0093, as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of November 5th, 2020, with the following modifications: That the plat be approved, but we are recommending for the DA that no more than three residents on shared drives, that they provide plans for dedicated parking central to the townhomes before City Council, and they work to increase the open space in the townhome area, as possibly part of the parking.

Holland: We have a motion on the table. Is there a second?

Yearsley: I will second that.

McCarvel: Second.

Holland: Commissioner Yearsley seconded first. All those in favor? Any opposed? Hearing none, motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

**3. Public Hearing for Goddard Creek Subdivision (H-2020-0092) by Conger Group, Located in the Northwest Corner of W. McMillan Road and N. Goddard Creek Way**

- A. Request: Development Agreement Modification (Inst. #102012598) to allow the development of an age restricted community consisting of thirty-four (34) attached SFR homes instead of offices.
- B. Request: A Rezone of approximately 5 acres of land from the R-4 to the R-15 zoning district.
- C. Request: A Preliminary Plat for 34 residential lots and 8 common lots in the proposed R-15 zoning district.

Holland: All right. With that we will move on to the public hearing for Goddard Creek Subdivision, H-2020-0092, by Conger, and we will begin with the staff report.

Parsons: One second, Madam Chair.