

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:01 p.m. Tuesday, April 8, 2025, by Mayor Robert Simison.

Members Present: Robert Simison, Luke Cavener, John Overton, Doug Taylor, Anne Little Roberts and Brian Whitlock.

Members Absent: Liz Strader.

Other Present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Sonya Allen, Jamie Leslie, Steve Taulbee and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

<input type="checkbox"/> Liz Strader	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brian Whitlock
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anne Little Roberts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John Overton
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doug Taylor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Luke Cavener
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mayor Robert E. Simison	

Simison: Council, we will call the meeting to order. For the record it is April 8, 2025, at 6:01 p.m. We will begin this evening's Meridian City Council meeting with roll call attendance.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

COMMUNITY INVOCATION

Simison: Our community invocation is not here yet.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Simison: So, we will go ahead and move along to the adoption the agenda.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Move we adopt the agenda as presented.

Little Roberts: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

PROCLAMATIONS [Action Item]

1. Education and Sharing Day Proclamation

Simison: As mentioned Item 1 is not here.

COMMUNITY PRESENTATIONS [Action Item]

2. Global Just Serve Award Presentation

Simison: So, we will go ahead and move on to Item 2, which is the Global Just Serve award presentation. I don't know if this is going to be Karen, Jana -- are you up to the podium for any comments you would like to make and we will take it from there.

Wolf: Hello, Mayor Simison, City Council Members. My name is Janalie Wolf. I am the Meridian area Just Serve specialist and this is Bryn Booker, who is the Boise area Just Serve specialist. We are excited to be back here with you today. We previously awarded you with a Just Serve city award. There are currently 58 Just Serve cities across the US, Canada, Chile, Argentina and Hungary and you are one of them. Today we are here to recognize the City of Meridian as a recipient of the Global Just Serve city award, a distinction honoring cities that demonstrate exceptional commitment to volunteerism and community engagement. Meridian is just one of the ten global city awards. In November you will be celebrated by Just Serve for your commitment to service at the National League of Cities in -- at the city summit in Salt Lake City.

Berman: Meridian does an incredible job promoting volunteerism and community partnerships that uplift the lives of residents. Because you care about them and their sense of belonging your residents continually show up to do good. In fact, this week volunteers will give service at a Do The Right Fair, which is a collaboration between the city Just Serve and the West Ada Community Collaborative. At the fair we will display this honorary banner that you see over here celebrating today's award. We congratulate Mayor Simison, the Meridian City Council, the City of Meridian and especially the volunteers for this well-earned global recognition. Thank you for leading by example and showing unity and a commitment to service as a way of life. Now we would love to present you with a framed certificate and take a photo in front of the banner if you would allow us to do so.

Simison: Yeah. Council, if everyone wants to go down and join you. So, Council, I would ask them not to go anywhere just to say a few more -- a few things real quick. First and foremost we really appreciate the recognition, but we know it's not because of

anything that we do up here. It's the community out there that's doing all the work. But I do -- I do just want to emphasize that I think the city staff have embraced Just Serve as a valued community partner, but it's really the people that are signing up every day to go out and do the work that are really making a difference. So, we -- so, we just really want to say thank you for what you continue to do to help support our community in so many different ways and the other thing that I -- you know, so when I was at National League of Cities in Washington DC -- it's not just going to be recognized, but Just Serve is the title sponsor for the city summit in November. I have not heard what the recognition will mean or look like down there and traditionally the city doesn't have a lot of people to go to the November one, which is a little bit more of the -- where you learn items, but, you know, we will try to figure out if there is a -- even going -- driving down for the day to be part of a component when we know a little bit more we -- that may be something that we would want to do, you know, road trip collaboration in November to Salt Lake City to be part of that and we just really want to say appreciate Just Serve stepping up to be the sponsor for that National League of Cities conference. So, if you can, please, pass that along to others. It was really great to see that when I was in DC. So, appreciate it very much.

PUBLIC FORUM – Future Meeting Topics

ACTION ITEMS

- 3. Public Hearing for Pollard North Subdivision (H-2024-0037) by Brighton Corporation, generally located approximately 1/4 mile north of W. Chinden Blvd. at the north end of N. Levi Ave. on the north side of W. Waverton Dr.**
 - A. Request: Modified Development Agreement to the existing Development Agreement (Inst. #2019-060655) for a new agreement for the residential portion of the development with an updated development plan.
 - B. Request: Rezone of 14.90 acres of land from the R-8 to the R-15 zoning district.
 - C. Request: Preliminary Plat for 157 building lots and 32 common lots on 19.76 acres of land in the R-8 and R-15 zoning districts.

Simison: So, Council, with that we will move on to our -- the next items on our agenda, which is Item 3, which is a public hearing for Pollard North Subdivision, H-2024-0037. We will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Allen: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. Council heard this project on January 14th and -- and remanded it back to the Commission for review of the revised plans and an updated recommendation. The Commission had previously recommended -- recommended denial to Council based on their belief the proposed

rezone to R-8 and TNR would create too much density for the area and not provide enough transition to lower density development to the north. Following the commission hearing the applicant submitted revised plans to address some of those concerns raised by neighboring residents and the commission, which included a reduction of 20 building lots, an increase in the width of the lots along the northern boundary between Pollard Lane and Schwenkfelder Avenue from a minimum of 50 feet to 60 feet and replacement of some internal single family residential attached and paired units with detached units and open space resulting in 3.4 percent increase in qualified open space and additional pedestrian pathways. The applicant also changed their rezone request from TNR to R-15 with R-8 remaining along the north and east boundaries of the site. The applications before you tonight are a request for a development agreement modification, a rezone and a preliminary plat. The site consists of 19.76 acres of land. It's zoned R-8 and it's generally located a quarter mile north of West Chinden Boulevard at the north end of North Levi Lane on the north side of West Waverton Drive. The subject property is part of a larger area annexed with R-8 zoning in 2019 and included in a development agreement and a preliminary plat for Pollard Subdivision. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation for the property is medium density residential, which calls for three to eight dwelling units per acre. The applicant proposes a modification to the existing development agreement for a new agreement for the residential portion of the development with an updated development plan. The approved plan is for the development of 74 building lots for conventional single family residential homes, independent living units for 55 and older, and an 88 bed assisted living facility. The proposed plan is for 157 single family residential detached and attached homes. A rezone of 14 -- sorry, I couldn't get my slides to work a second ago. The top drawing there is the approved concept development plan in development agreement and the one on the bottom is the proposed development plan. A rezone of 14.9 acres of land is proposed from the R-8 to the R-15 zoning district as shown there. A preliminary plat is proposed to develop in two phases and consists of 157 building lots and 32 common lots on 19.76 acres of land in the R-8 and the R-15 zoning districts. The minimum lot size proposed in the R-8 district is 4,350 square feet, with an average lot size of 4,805 square feet. Minimum lot size in the R-15 district is 2,238 square feet, with an average lot size of 2,801 square feet. The gross density of the development is 7.95 units per acre. The net density of 13.33 units per acre, which is at the high end of the density allowed in the medium density designation. A mix of single family residential detached and attached units are proposed with front loaded and alley loaded options. Conventional front loaded detached homes are proposed along the perimeter boundary to the north and east, which will transition to existing and future homes, with alley loaded attached and detached units on the remainder of the site. A 20 foot wide street buffer is required along the portion of West Waverton Drive designated as a collector street east of Levi Lane. Levi is this stub road here that comes in from the south. A minimum of 15 percent or 2.96 acres of common open space is required to be provided with development that meets the qualified standards listed in the UDC. The applicant proposes a total of 3.94 acres or 19.94 percent qualified open space consisting of several open grassy areas exceeding 5,000 square feet in area, linear open space, the street buffer along the eastern portion of Waverton Drive, collector street, and parkways along streets as shown on the open space exhibit, which complies with and exceeds the

minimum standards. The amenities are required to comply with the associated standards for such in the UDC. Several concept building elevations were submitted for a two story detached and attached single family residential home as shown. A variety of siding are proposed, including vertical and horizontal lap siding, board and baton siding, stucco and fenestration with masonry accents in a variety of colors and design elements and features, with varying roof profiles and wall modulation that demonstrates a high quality of development proposed. All single family residential attached structures are subject to the residential design standards in the Architectural Standards Manual. The commission recommended approval of the proposed rezone and preliminary plat. I will go through a summary of the commission public hearing. Jon Wardle, Brighton Corporation, the applicant, testified in favor. There were several folks that testified in opposition as follows: Jake Jensen, Ken Fenwick, Kyle Ensler, David Hitz, Chase Taylor and Leah Taylor. Written testimony was received from the applicant Eli Benski, Brighton Corporation, and from Aaron Kwan. Key issues are as follows: They were against the degree of the increase in the number of homes between the existing approved plan and the proposed plan. Traffic and parking concerns due to the increased number of residents between the existing and proposed plan. Concern residents will use the Fairbourne's common areas for recreation. Opinion home values will decrease in this area if the proposed development is approved. An opinion that the proposed density doesn't match the area. The Commission was generally in favor of the proposed changes to the development plan and reduction in the number of building lots. The Commission did not make any changes to the staff recommendation and there are no outstanding issues for Council. No written testimony has been received since the Commission hearing. Staff will stand for any questions. The applicant is here to present tonight.

Simison: Thank you, Sonya. Council, any questions for staff? Okay. Would the applicant like to come forward?

Wardle: Good evening, Mayor, Council Members. For the record my name is Jon Wardle. My address is 2929 West Navigator Drive, Meridian, Idaho. 83642. And I represent Brighton and we are here tonight to talk about the Pollard North project. And just share -- there we go. When we were here before in January, the Council requested that we go back to Planning and Zoning Commission. We had proposed some changes that were brought before the Council that night. They were -- I would call last minute changes in discussions with staff and it was requested that we went back to Planning and Zoning Commission. The items that were addressed at Planning and Zoning Commission based on their changes that we made were a reduction in density, maintaining the R-8 zone against adjacent neighborhoods. Removing the TNR as an option and using R-15 and, then, clarification on traffic concerns and after we presented that to the Planning and Zoning Commission there was a unanimous recommendation of approval bringing it back to you tonight. So, that's kind of a history of how we were here, there, and now we are back. This was the original plan. I won't spend too much time on it, because I have another slide that compares it, but this is what we had put in the application for 177 homes on the project here with about 17.86 acre -- percent of open space. When we had the conversation with staff and, then, we came and

presented to you in January, we had made some changes to the plan. We decided to maintain the R-8 zoning along the perimeter and I will get into that in a second, but R-8 is directly adjacent to us on projects that have already been rezoned and annexed into the city, that we would reduce the residential density by 20 homes. We actually increased the width of the lots along the northern boundary and lot -- in Block 1 and 2. We reduced the number of paired homes. We added six more common lots and added some additional pedestrian connections. It is important to note that there aren't any waivers, variances or exceptions requested with the project as is before you tonight. The future land use map does designate the area that we have highlighted here as medium density residential, which is -- gives a range of three to eight units per acre. So, what we decided or what we ended up doing was, again, maintaining the R-8 zoning directly adjacent to the properties of the north and to the east. This is consistent with the prior approval back in 2019. The area to the south we are transitioning to an R-15 zone. Previously we asked for a TNR. There was comments made at the Planning and Zoning Commission and I think in response to that, that the TNR allowed by right multi-family. We never proposed multi-family here. We did propose paired units on platted lots, but we pulled that off the table as not needed. There is history to that. Not really important to this conversation, but we removed the TNR and the right for multi-family outright. On the left here this is what the project originally was when we submitted our applications and on the right are the changes. Like I said, we have reduced the density by 20 homes. The -- the overall density is 7.9 units. So, it's on the top end of that three to eight units per acre in that range. Open space is about 19.94 percent, which also increased over the -- what we previously proposed and the areas of highlight are where we have enhanced or increased the open space throughout the project. This also highlights where the changes are on the plats between what was submitted and what is before you tonight. Wider lots in the area one. In area two we reduced the number of lots in there and made those single family detached and, then, the green areas, three through six, are increases to open space throughout the project where it is equally even -- and evenly distributed throughout the entire community there. This also highlights where the amenities are and what the different amenities are in the project. We -- with a tot lot, covered pavilion, tot and a dog park and pedestrian pathways throughout to provide better access for the neighbors in the community. This gives an example of some of the homes that are proposed. We decided that instead of making all the homes the same we would offer four different living options. We have some front-loaded homes, which we call conventional, so the garages are on the front facing the street and we have carriage lane homes where the access to those garages is taken from a carriage lane or an alley and so this shows you the different variety of homes that are offered in Pollard North, giving a little bit variety to lifestyle options for living and creating a little bit more diversity with the housing types. Just a little bit more focus here of some renderings of the central park and the carriage lane B types, which would be the attached or paired homes. Then this one gives an example of both our convention -- the conventional homes on the perimeter of 60 and 70 foot wide lots. One of the questions that was brought up -- and I think we just wanted to clarify and we shared this with the commission, but was how is the traffic going to move through our project? You -- our project here is representative in the teal of the Pollard North local streets connecting down to Waverton, which we have already built. It's the east-west

road that connects from Pollard Lane on the left-hand side here all the way over to the right-hand side. Then how Fairbourne connects to the Waverton collector system to Black Cat and Levi Lane and also how the future Alden Ridge would connect. So, there was comments made about traffic going through other neighborhoods. In reality all of our traffic is connecting out to a collector road, which, then, gets out to US -- or State Highway 20-26 or Chinden Boulevard. Yes, it's possible that traffic would go out of Pollard North over to Black Cat, but, in reality, that traffic is either going neighbor to neighbor or going out to the signal and Waverton is a collector road as you can see in the dark blue color there. One of the things brought up was why the change and this is representative of why the change happened, among other things. One of the things that we did change from the project was assisted living. It was proposed previously. COVID happened and it made it -- operationally it became very difficult for us to do that, although we are involved in some other ones on a go forward basis. It's not -- it's not a -- an offering that we are able to do and others are not doing the market either. But the bigger change was Highway 16. When we brought the project to you in 2019 Highway 16 was not on the table. There was no funding for it. There was no right of way that had been acquired for it. It was viewed to be something that would be out there in the future, but the future came a bit quicker than for all of us. In '21 and '22 the state allocated dollars not only for right-of-way acquisition, but for construction of the Highway 16 corridor. The little graphic here on the left-hand side shows what is currently being constructed in gray and so that is representative of -- from coming from 20-26 all the way down to the freeway. The areas in blue are additions to. So, some overpasses and things like that. But the interchange here at Chinden and 20-26 was expedited and changed with the anticipation that traffic would be at -- at these two intersections and so we looked at that and that's why we had decided to perhaps pivot and look at some other alternatives that would offer lifestyle choices and be more consistent with the future growth and transportation improvements that are happening here at this intersection. We do concur with the staff report and the commission's recommendation of approval. Like I mentioned, there are no conditions that we are asking for any exceptions, variances or waivers on and we do concur with the report that's in front of you and we request your approval tonight for Pollard North and stand for any questions that you might have.

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

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Can you jump back -- you had a slide that was showing a -- kind of a comparison between what was proposed in terms of amenities versus what you are doing now. That one right there.

Wardle: That's one of them. So, this one is a good place to start. So, on the left-hand side under the original we had about 17.86 acres of qualified open space.

Cavener: So, Mr. Wardle, thank you for that and that's maybe where my questions come from. The staff report showed that it was 21.26 and so I'm just trying to understand -- do we have an incorrect number in our staff report or is there -- because the -- I guess -- excuse me, Mr. Mayor. Let me ask this question a little bit better for you, Mr. Wardle. When you are talking original, this is the version that came with a recommendation of denial from the Planning and Zoning Commission; correct?

Wardle: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Cavener, the box on this slide would be representative of what was recommendation for denial.

Cavener: Okay.

Wardle: The box on the right side and the exhibit below represent the new application.

Cavener: Okay. I just -- I will have to dig into that. Okay. Thank you very much.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for the applicant at this time?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Just to kind of dig in a little bit more on what Councilman Cavener was mentioning. So, on what's currently approved, 74 building lots for conventional single family resident homes; right? That -- is that correct?

Wardle: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Taylor, that is correct. The original preliminary plat had 74 single family lots that were approved --

Taylor: Okay.

Wardle: -- with the assisted living and, then, we submitted a new application for 177.

Taylor: Okay. Thank You.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Mr. Wardle, can you -- I know in the commission meeting, as I reviewed the minutes there, there was some concern about parking and as -- on one of your maps you showed the conventional homes would probably be on the border, but the homes that are along Waverton would all be alley access with garages in the back; is that correct?

Wardle: Yes. Mr. Mayor, Council Member Whitlock, that is correct. In this slide here the pink and the blue would be the conventional with garage facing homes. On the orange and the yellow they would be accessed from an alley, but each of those homes also has a 20 foot driveway apron in the back of those homes and so not only do they have a garage, they have a typical driveway just like you would on a front-loaded home conventional. They are able -- guests could park on the street in front of those homes, but they are not competing with driveways that would also limit parking on an alley loaded home.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: So, Waverton is the street on the south of this; is that correct?

Wardle: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Whitlock, yes, it is.

Whitlock: What's the street to the north?

Wardle: To the north?

Whitlock: To the north in the blue and the --

Wardle: It's called Flat Rock.

Whitlock: Flat Rock.

Wardle: So, Flat Rock is the northern road and, then, Waverton is the southern road.

Whitlock: So, Mr. Mayor, I guess my question is on Flat Rock on the north side you have got the conventional homes. On the south side you have got the rear access or alley access homes with the potential that there would be parking on Flat Rock for both the conventional, as well as the rear access homes; is that correct?

Wardle: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Whitlock, yes, it is.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Mr. Wardle, just remind me, were you -- in the pink shading that the R-8 and in the blue that -- that kind of wraps around, what is the -- as it's adjacent to the -- the next property, I'm just forgetting, was there a berm? Does it -- is there a fence? What's the transition between those properties?

Wardle: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Taylor, that is a fair question. Let me move to a different slide here really quick. This represents how everything is kind of stitched together. Actually, let me switch to a different -- make this a little bit larger, so it can be perhaps seen better. I'm -- it kind of splits between -- kind of the east and the west. Alden Ridge was brought in as a preliminary plat and they created on their project a 30 foot common lot. A common lot is -- if you remove the common lot it is currently the Old School private road that the other two property owners to the east, Ernst, Panter and Schwenkfelder used to access their properties and so there was a common lot that they created. As we have worked through this there is not a berm between us and that. There is the common lot between the two. We have also had conversations with Ernst and Panter and with Schwenkfelder about the transition between us and them and they are -- based on those conversations they are fine with a fence without a berm. The berm becomes something that would go over into their property as well and I don't think the -- they are interested in the long-term maintenance of that, but we have discussed that with them and have had conversations about that. So, between the two it would be fencing between us and the properties to the north. Our property over along Fairbourne, we share a fence line with them and so we would just be extending that fence line along the two properties here. This also shows kind of the difference between the -- the transition from lots to lots -- ten lots -- if you are going west to east ten lots from us against 12 lots for Alden Ridge. Seven and a half lots against nine. Six and a half against Ernst-Panter. You can tell the previous approval was eight and a half lots up above. And, then, on the east side Schwenkfelder at 13 lots compared to 14. And, then, we reduced from seven lots down to six. So, that's how we have also adjusted the density against our common property line between these properties.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor, quick follow up.

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Thank you. That's a very helpful explanation and just -- I kind of got lost in the ownership of parcels without looking. So, Alden Ridge, the 12 lots and the nine lots, right there is that going to be just that common lot or is that going to have the fence line there, too?

Wardle: We would -- Mr. Mayor, Council Member Taylor, we would have a fence line on our property. It is a common lot. Typically those common lots are open fencing and so I think that would be the requirement. But there would -- we would put a fence on our property line just so there is a difference between the common area that they own --

Taylor: Okay.

Wardle: -- and our property.

Simison: Council, any other questions at this time? Okay. Thank you very much.

Wardle: Thank you. Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone signed up this evening?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, first we have Leah Taylor.

Simison: Good evening. I imagine you know the process by now, so --

L.Taylor: Yes. Been here a lot. Had to rearrange a lot of family activities to be here all of these times. My name is Leah Taylor. My address is 7000 North Pollard Lane. Good evening. I just wrote my notes down, so that I don't get frazzled. But quick note. I do -- and it was kind of pointed out. He keeps mentioning the original plan. The original plan. But that was a plan that was not -- the one he's referring to was not ever approved. The original plan that we should be thinking of is the one that was approved and so it doesn't seem like it's not as much of a compromise as he is acting like it is, because what was approved is about half of what is -- he is requesting. Now, he also says that by changing zoning from TNR to R-15 they give up the right to multi-family, but R-15 does allow for multi-family, whereas R-8 does not. So, that's something to consider that he could come back later and change that if this is approved. More importantly, R-15 allows for a much higher density, which is ultimately what we are opposed to. My two main concerns are the overcrowding of the school and safety with that much density along Waverton Road. Mayor, I believe you recently visited Pleasant View Elementary, which is where my kids go, which is where the boundary is for this area. My kids were very excited. They thought that was really interesting is when you came. I was speaking with the principal. Currently they are -- the school is built for 625 to 650 students and currently it enrolls 786 students, meaning it's over capacity by more than 150 students and enrollment continues to grow. Projections show enrollment reaching approximately 1,300 students within three years, double the intended capacity and this is without changes to the development as we have. I assume that when those projections are made they are going based off of approved developments, which would be the original ones that were approved. So, I think that's something that we definitely need to really consider. I also don't know of any other schools nearby that are being planned for the near future. My kids already go -- it's a mile to the bus stop and it would be straight down that Waverton Road, so I am very concerned about lining that with cars. I know that they will have driveways in the back, but if someone's coming to drop by or drop something off or drop someone off or drop kids are going off, they are not going to be -- if they are not very familiar with the family going inside they are going to be using that parking -- that road for parking and I just feel like that's a major safety concern. Years ago this development was approved with a plan for significantly fewer homes. That approval was granted with the understanding that the surrounding community infrastructure, including roads and schools, could support that scale of growth. The current request seeks a major zoning change that would allow for 157 homes about -- sorry. I think I got my number wrong. More than -- or yes. No. That's right. About double than what was originally planned and would substantially increase resident density. So, this overcrowding isn't a hypothetical issue, it is already happening. Adding a dense new development without expanding infrastructure will only exaggerate -- exasperate the problem. Overcrowded schools lead to larger class sizes, reduce attention for students and strain on teachers and staff. I request that you guys deny or -- or require a reduction in the number of homes and density. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Cavener: Mayor, a couple questions.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thank you for joining us. I appreciate it. And it sounds like elementary students and so I have elementary students in school, so I -- I sympathize with where -- where you are coming from. A hundred more students in high school feels much differently than a hundred more students in an elementary school for sure. As I understand, West Ada has actually seen a plateau or in many cases a decline in student generation. So, they are anticipating less students next year than they currently have this year. Knowing that we are seeing a decline in students in the schools, do you see that as -- I guess I'm looking at it from a standpoint of if we are going to have less students in our schools that problem is largely somewhat going to take care of itself and the taxpayer don't want to build more schools than we need. I know West Ada is really committed to that. How do you think we as a city council should wrestle with that? Because I will be honest, I -- I have been up here many nights and I don't approve developments that have more students when schools are over capacity. But I'm also trying to look at the reality of where the world is shifting in West Ada and that we are seeing less students in those schools. Give me some advice as a parent that's over there how should we be looking at this?

L.Taylor: Thank you for asking. That's very kind of you. I have heard the others -- that the projection overall West Ada is declining, but all of the schools in this boundary that is not the case. Star Middle School was only opened a couple years ago and they are already over capacity. Owyhee High School is already -- was opened a couple years ago and I know that they are at or close to over capacity and the principal for Pleasant View Elementary also mentioned that other schools are not necessarily at capacity, but this one is over and so maybe my advice would be to redistribute where the growth is and really be mindful specifically in this area. That means there is other areas for growth and that maybe this is not the place to let a whole bunch of more density come in.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, can I follow up?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I agree with you to a point and it makes me frustrated at times that -- and we are not in charge of the schools and we have a great working relationship with West Ada trustees and I'm a big fan of Superintendent Bub, but it is hard when I know there are elementary schools that are at 50 percent capacity right now and we have schools like yours that are over capacity, because to me it's a frustrating and challenging process of doing district -- district boundary lines. That's a process I wouldn't wish on anybody. But it is challenging when you have an applicant that is here that is trying to do something that the city has somewhat encouraged in terms of our Comprehensive

Plan to say because of another entity is not moving students around efficiently that we should say no. So, just -- I guess I might be vocalizing a little bit the back and forth that's going on in my head, so you know that where I'm coming from, but you -- you touched on a couple of other things that I think are important and I can understand some of your hesitation around multi-family and certainly we received some correspondence from residents that shared that concern. If the Council were to -- as part of their action tonight prohibit multi-family as part of their development agreement would that give you the comfort that you were seeking?

L.Taylor: Not fully. I would better appreciate a reduction of some of the homes in this planned development even 20, 30 -- any develop -- any reduction would be great. I wouldn't be here protesting this if the original plan was laid -- was continued. I'm not here to stop any growth, to stop any change. I know that's a positive thing and that has to happen and that's inevitable. But I just think what we have planned here is too dense for the area.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, one more.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I know you have been to a lot of these meetings and I remember your -- we are being very kind, but your frustration about the being remanded back to Planning and Zoning and so I also want to be respectful of your time. So, if there is anything else that you think the City Council should know from your opinion on this. I know your time ran out, but because you have been so patient with us I wanted at least give you the opportunity if there is anything else you wanted to share with me.

L.Taylor: Thank you. That's so kind. I'm probably a little too frazzled to look in my notes and see what I missed.

Cavener: You covered a lot. I was very impressed.

L.Taylor: Tried to do it quickly, but clearly, I don't know. I think that's pretty much it. I just -- really just -- you know, we work hard to -- we have kids in elementary and middle school and high school here and, then, still more to come. We have got six total. And so we are very well immersed in the community. We love to be a part of it and I just want to make it a good community for everyone and I think generally Brighton does a great job, but I just think this is just a little too much for the space, especially with -- you know, we are kind of in that corner with Highway 16 and we do have that Levi Lane exiting, but it's already a really long light down at Black Cat. I just feel like with the whole plan there it's going to be really sticky and messy when everyone's trying to get their kids in and out of school and in out of work and just a reduction would help out immensely. So, thank you for your questions. Thank you for all your -- your service here. I appreciate it.

Johnson: Mr. Ensler with Alton Ridge HOA.

Ensler: Good evening, Mayor and Council Members. My name is Kyle Ensler. 5720 West Old School Lane in Meridian. And I'm not going to be able to do nearly as good of a job as she just did. But this -- this one's a tough one for me, because as a developer I'm also here representing the Alden Ridge Subdivision. You know, I have been before you as a developer before, so I wear that hat and -- you know. And, then, we live there. So, I'm a father and a husband and so I have these -- you know, all these different things going on and I really try to look at this objectively from that point of view. But I'm here tonight to respectfully voice my opposition to the application as it's currently proposed and in an effort to, you know, try to get all the collective voices of those families that have already invested in -- in Alden Ridge Subdivision, I have presented a -- or prepared a little write up. So, initially, you know, Mr. Wardle has highlighted the applicant's adjustments and specifically the reduction of 20 lots and the increase in qualified open space and while these changes may appear responsive to public and commission feedback, in our opinion they fall short of addressing the core concerns that we have raised previously. So, just a little bit of historical context. Leah kind of pointed it out. But what we are viewing on the application is the first proposed change to the originally approved preliminary plat and so, you know, as -- as Mr. Wardle pointed out six years ago what was approved included this heavy commercial component. Office buildings. Medical centers. Even a hospital. Along with the R-8 zoning transition that really softened the density towards the low density neighbors to the north. So, our Alden Ridge piece is only half of what's there to the north. The other half is -- in the proposed future comp plan it is low density residential and currently it's a five acre piece and a 15 acre piece. So, tonight we find ourselves only revisiting the remaining 18 acres and I think that despite the public opposition six years ago, the application that was approved in large part because of that thoughtful transition of R-8 to the north. The broader context of that original plan, the commercial development that was integral to its approval, is largely absent from this conversation. One of the other questions that came up in the explanation of what the previous plan was and what the current plan was, just for historical context, when Alden Ridge brought their application, we brought the application in based on working closely with Brighton. In fact, we went to Brighton and we said where are your roads? We lined up our roads. At one point Brighton came back to us and said, hey, we actually want to change where the road location is. We had already done a lot of planning. We changed our road location to match up with theirs. Really trying to work together. So, by staff's recommendation and working with Brighton, we created the R-8 transition border to match what they had proposed. We also created the landscape strip, the 30 foot buffer, to match with their landscape strip, because originally their plan had a landscape buffer, that's what Mr. Taylor had asked about, and it included landscape buffer along the whole south side. Now, when Bright -- when Mr. Wardle was talking he is primarily referring to our landscape buffer and -- which would bring their -- their houses further to the north. So, in December 2024 the commission denied the revised application, stating that it created too much density for the area and the trans -- transition to lower density is not enough. We still concur with that original assessment and despite the minor adjustments the proposed changes, in our opinion, do not constitute a meaningful shift in density or traditional planning. So, our major density concerns -- on page eight of your packet the average net density of the surrounding area outlined in red, which I believe is a one mile square, is 4.76

dwelling units per acre. Alden Ridge, our subdivision to the north, is approved at 2.6 dwelling units per acre and Fairbourne Subdivision is under four units per acre. So, the current proposal from Brighton seeks nearly twice the average density of the area and I would argue that's not a concession, that's a significant escalation. More specifically this zoning change would allow up to 80 more homes in the original plan, even under R-8 zoning without the assisted living component a maximum layout might accommodate around a hundred homes, which results in a density of about 5.06 dwelling units per acre and while still higher than the surrounding areas, this feels closer to a -- to a compromise and a more appropriate transition northward. So, I will echo Leah's sentiments and just to be clear I'm not asking for the city to deny this application outright, I'm asking for a fair compromise, one that will honor the investments made by surrounding neighbors and developers alike and I just -- you know, we just feel as a proposal with 7.95 dwelling units per acre bordering the maximum density allowed in medium density residential does not reflect a reasonable compromise, nor does it reduce strain on the school's traffic or neighborhood character. In conclusion, if -- if part of this application is approved we respectfully request three conditions be added to the development agreement on behalf of the 45 plus acres of neighbors immediately to the north. Number one is, please, implement no parking zones on both sides of Schwenkfelder Avenue and Woodhead Avenue. These are the few -- the two future road stubs that connect to the north properties and we just feel that street parking on these specific streets -- Waverton is already a public road. There is nothing we can do to stop the parking there. But on these specific roads we feel like parking -- allowed parking would propose a significant safety risk as they become the major connections to the north. Number two is to help maintain privacy for homes to the north we request that restriction on second story north facing windows. Homes can still be two story, but by orienting egress windows to the east and west we can significantly reduce visual intrusion into neighbors yards. This is a requirement that this council has required on other similar subdivisions and we ask for the same. And, number three, we invite the Council to require dark sky compliant lighting on north facing exteriors for the houses along the north side. We feel like this would help reduce the light pollution and align with the City of Meridian's UDC lighting code and help maintain the rural character of the neighborhood. So, again, thank you so much for your time and consideration. I -- we really hope that we can arrive at a solution that respects both the city's vision for growth, as well as the integrities of the neighborhoods we have invested in. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: So, Kyle, you probably captured -- or mentioned it, but I just want to make sure I'm clear. The transition between your properties and this property you are saying the R-8 is not quite right. Did I miss what you were suggesting what you would prefer to see as that transition or were you talking about the entire property project as far as the density? I -- maybe I'm just kind of missing a piece there.

Ensler: Yeah. Council Member Taylor, thank you for the question. So -- so, it's a very narrow piece of land. It's very wide at 19.7 something acres, but it's a very narrow piece of land. So, initially there was two rows of houses. One that ran along Waverton in their first application and one that ran along the north border and separated between the north border and our property was their own landscape strip. What the split zoning allows is a third row of houses across the whole property. But in order to get that third row both the split zoning is required and the elimination of that common area to the north in order to fit that third row of houses and so when questions are being posed about what is the transition, it's a -- it's an R-8 zoning, so it's a 12 foot rear setback. So, the houses are going to be 12 foot from the property line and any kind of transition other than the fence that was discussed is the transition that we created on our property of a 30 foot landscape border. That only goes about halfway down Brighton's property, because to the -- adjacent to the north. The other 20 acres -- currently that's zoned RUT and still in the county and does not have just boarding directly.

Taylor: A quick follow-up, Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: So, the common property on your property, if I remember hearing correctly, is it currently the -- an access road driveway, so that will be turned into just like a common green space? Will that be a road? Like walk me through what that's going to look like when that's fully --

Ensler: Yeah. Thank you, Council Member Taylor. So, Mayor and Council Members, that -- that currently is a private drive that there is a cross-access agreement, because that is the main access from Pollard to all of the east properties, including mine and the -- and the properties to the -- to the north and so this application -- Brighton's initially was six years ago, so everybody was under the assumption that the stub ends would happen sooner and I guess the history of that is probably irrelevant, but to answer your question, currently it's a cross-access agreement. It would go away -- that private road would go away in lieu of public road further to the north and that would turn into a 30 foot landscape buffer with a walking path that goes around the subdivision.

Simison: Council, additional questions? Thank you very much.

Ensler: Yeah.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, next is Jake Jensen.

Simison: Good evening.

Jensen: Good evening, Mr. Mayor, Council Members. Jake Jensen. 5011 West Caragana Street in the Fairbourne neighborhood. I come voicing as a concerned parent as well with the increase in density. I would also remind -- and as has been mentioned that this is the original plan of 74 homes; right? Remember that? And that --

to create this as a compromise to go from 77 to 154, it's still a big jump. It almost seems like a -- let's shoot for the stars and if we land on the moon we are in a good spot. I would -- I would just say, as Kyle mentioned, that we only asked for a compromise to end up somewhere in that five units per acre -- seems more reasonable to end up with that hundred homes and my concerns are similar to that of Leah's concerns in that having four kids all in schools in this area, concerns for, you know, my child who maybe struggles learning in scattered environments being in a class with 30 some kids and it's a difficult place for them to learn. We are not setting up our kids for success in that kind of environment. The other thing is we -- we used to live in Texas and Texas is very common for alleyways and they constantly have alleyways in all their neighborhoods and to think that no one's going to park on the road it's just not true. You go to those cities in Texas, they -- a lot of them park on the road. The garage is storage. Maybe one car is in the garage, but everyone else is parking on the road and it can be a safety concern for our kids. Concern for the strain on -- on the Fairbourne community. Fairbourne has a hundred and -- let's see here. I have it down here -- 175 homes with 66 acres. This is 154 homes and 15 acres. Where are these kids or families -- where are they going to end up? What common areas are they going to end up to? There is a path walking straight over to the Fairbourne community. We are all very nice people, nice neighbors, but what kind of strain is that going to unnecessarily put on our community. Again, we would just ask for some kind of a compromise on this. Let our voice be heard and come somewhere in the middle, rather than making this leap to 80 homes -- 80 homes above what was originally asked and I think that's all for me.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Mr. Jensen, thanks for your testimony. I, too, am a father of a little one who learns differently from other kids and so can appreciate that. Mr. Jensen, does any of your children attend Pleasant View Elementary?

Jensen: They do. Two of them attend there and one next year.

Cavener: You -- you may be able -- very qualified to help me answer this question. I understand that Pleasant View has an enrollment cap for next year. Are you aware of that?

Jensen: Yes.

Cavener: Does that cap, then, satisfy -- I think for me to a degree it addresses my concern about limiting the number of students into that school, into that classroom for that very reason that you -- you testified tonight. I understand because you are still here testifying opposition based on that -- that doesn't satisfy it. I'm hoping you can give me

a picture from somebody who attends that school as to why you don't feel that that decision to cap enrollment will -- will address the issue that you are concerned about.

Jensen: Sure. Wonderful question. You know, I think it comes back to just where they are at currently and it's -- it's crowded, you know, and is the cap -- is it going to fix that? Maybe it's going to fix the future growth, but it's already crowded. Where are those kids going to go? Are you going to bus them down to Star? Where -- where are these kids going to go that come into this community? So -- which could, in turn, cause -- you know, where are they going to draw the line now? Are my kids now going to have to drive past Pleasant View to go to a different school and get situated in a different area? So, all of these things seem to cause, you know, re-boundaries and changes of lines in order to get kids somewhere, which, again, you are taking a kid from their comfort zone of their friends, their teachers they know, saying, sorry, we have growth, we have to move you somewhere else.

Cavener: Okay. Thank you very much.

Jensen: Yeah.

Simison: Anyone else?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, online we have David Hitz. Mr. Hitz, I'm allowing you to unmute.

Hitz: Can you hear me okay?

Simison: Yes.

Hitz: I am David Hitz. I live at 6669 North Elmstone Way in Meridian. 83646. I am in Fairbourne and my backyard actually backs right up to Waverton. One of my primary concerns is, in fact, the traffic that will inevitably come right behind my house. Just the other day as I was coming home from work there was a car that was coming from that area where they work to Black Cat and they were probably going 50 miles an hour right behind my house. So, naturally, I honked and I slowed down and they stopped and they stuck their hand out the window and they flipped me off, as if I was somehow in the wrong for asking them to slow down in the street inside the neighborhood. This is before a development is even there and if we look at the original proposal and we look at the R-8 zoning, if we keep the R-8 zoning to me that still feels much more reasonable in terms of a transition to go from Fairbourne to look at Alden Ridge and what they are planning on developing and, then, the future growth and zoning of commercial and whatever else is going to go over there and so right now with this split proposal the R-15, that is going to increase the density dramatically, where now we have safety concerns as far as the traffic goes. My kids play all around the neighborhood. Fairbourne is a great community and we have our dues that pay for open space and for parks and the pool and in crowded communities when they don't have a whole lot of open space and things to do, they are going to go to the surrounding areas. That just happens often and naturally. So, I have got some concerns there. Another concern that

I have -- is a slide that was actually presented after all of the public commentary last -- at the last meeting that is trying to justify that this R-15 makes sense, because in other areas there are spots within, you know, a couple of mile radius that are also R-15. However, those R-15 areas are next to Wal-Mart. They are next to Costco. They are next to Rock Harbor Church and each one of these has multiple egress points. It is a natural transition in those areas and while I don't appreciate a tactic of holding that until after all of the public can give their opinion, my bigger concern is the justification that is trying to be implied there. Again, R-8 feels natural as a transition where it is right now to account for -- for starter home areas for this transition of -- it's going to happen, but if we allow this split with R-15 it's going to overcrowd everything, including the school systems and I also am a dad with four kids. Two of those go to Pleasant View. One will go in two years.

Simison: Mr. Jensen, just want to make sure you heard the timer. I don't know if you can hear it online or not.

Jensen: No, I can't hear it

Simison: Okay. Yeah. Your time is concluded. If you have any final remark.

Jensen: Nope. Any questions?

Simison: Council, any questions? All right. Thank you very much. Okay. That is everyone who signed up in advance. Is there anybody present who would like to come forward and provide testimony on this item? If you are online you can use the raise your hand feature. We have someone --

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, Karen Ernest and you should be able to unmute.

Simison: If you can state your name and address for the record and be recognized for three minutes.

K.Ernest: Hello. My name is Karen Ernest and we own the property that's labeled Ernest -- it's at 5650 Old School.

Johnson: Karen. Sorry, I interrupted you. You want to mute or turn the audio off on what you are listening on. We are getting feedback here. And you can unmute yourself and start over.

K.Ernest: Is this -- no.

Johnson: Still getting the feedback.

K.Ernest: I'm sorry, I don't know how to do this.

Simison: We are still getting the feedback.

Johnson: If -- if you -- if you are able to turn the volume down on your computer or mute -- mute the volume there.

K.Ernest: I have turned it down. Does that help?

Simison: Yes.

K.Ernest: Okay. I live at 5654 Old School Lane and I am in agreement with the others who have spoken regarding wanting lower density and also I want to emphasize the three points that Mr. Ensler made regarding no parking on Schwenkfelder Lane and the other entrance to the properties on the north. Also the lights and no two story windows facing our properties. And just a couple of things. Once the new entrances are made to the north properties the part of Old School Lane along our property will probably be reclaimed into pasture, so there is not going to be any kind of walkway there that we are planning anyway and so far we are still working with -- with the developer Mr. Wardle on a fence. We haven't really settled on anything there. I appreciate being able to speak and to support the people who have already spoken. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions? Okay. Is there anybody else, either online or in the audience, that would like to come forward and provide testimony on this item? If not, I will ask the applicant to come forward to close.

Wardle: Mr. Mayor, for the record Jon Wardle with Brighton. I wanted to respond to a couple of items. One of the first ones is actually related to zoning and transitions. Mr. Hitz made this comment and the reason that we did present this was there were comments made that this is uncanny, this is not happening in the city, these type of transitions and so we did show this exhibit. Our property -- this area that's bounded in red is the area that we are asking for R-15. The area in blue, those are all areas that are zoned R-15 already and a lot of those cases it's back to back. Some cases across the street. It is true that some of them are adjacent to large retail users or commercial users. When, in fact, we actually have a large commercial use that is planned with the medical office and future hospital on our C-G property and so we are transitioning. We kept the R-8 against the neighbors to the north and did an R-15 to the south. I do want to clarify that, yes, the -- the plan has changed from the original, the preliminary plat that was approved and, then, there were some questions about the revision or the new plan we submitted and based on that feedback we did modify it. One of the things that comes up a lot is the lack of housing diversity. If it's all the same, it's all the same. But I can guarantee you that the same does not necessarily equate to diversity within our community. Here is an opportunity for us to provide housing in our community, so our kids generation can be here as well. Related to schools, it's interesting, because, you know, you -- you get a recommendation or you get a letter from the school district. The school district is doing two things and Council Member Cavener indicated a change that they are making to Pleasant View with a cap, but they actually have already noticed neighbors to the south of McMillan, that those homes and those residents will be going to Hunter and so my neighborhood where I live in Quartet, which is South McMillan, we have already received that notification that the elementary age kids -- those that are in

Pleasant View will get an opportunity to stay there, but those that are new are going to transition down to Hunter. So, that's one way that the school district is already addressing capacity. The second one is they have already funded a new elementary school for Star. Now, Star is a little ways away, but there are people -- kids that are coming into Pleasant View that could be moved to Star when that school is available. That's in process now. The reality of what we have here is even if we turned dirt today we are at least 12 months away from residents moving in and we are not turning dirt today. There is still the next process of design of the phase and bringing it to you. So, we are at least 18 months away from any residents and potential student population coming in. The elementary school, the middle school, the high school, they are all community resources. We believe in community resources. In fact, I don't want it to go unmentioned, but the neighbors that live here and their kids go to Pleasant View. That was based on a donation from Brighton when we did Bainbridge. We have been an advocate in this community. If you look at schools across -- West Ada in the north. If you go west to east you will find a trend that the schools on the east side are transitioning less. Those on the west side have kind of this snake moment where there is a large population, but it does move and I think the school district is trying to address that. Related to traffic, Waverton, Black Cat and Levi Lane are all collector roads. They are all designed for and carrying traffic out of these neighborhoods to the arterial roadway system. Black Cat currently does have a signal on it. We paid for the signal at Levi Lane. That money has been given to ACHD. ITD is in the loop. The signal won't go there until they finish phase one of the 16/20-26 intersection, but it's already been paid for, so there will be another signal there that will also improve the transportation access out to 20-26. The roadway system is there and each of these projects Fairbourne, Pollard, even Alden Ridge, all participate in the planning decisions for the highway district and we have been able to help them create a transportation system that works. One last item related to buffers. We -- I just want to clarify that there was never a common lot that was required on our property when we brought our preliminary plat in in 2019. There -- we had discussions regarding the transition between us and the neighbors to the north. At the time that the neighbors to the north there were five property owners. It was Messenger, Restucci, Hayes, Ernst, Panter and Schwenkfelder. Since that happened Alden Ridge came in and Alden Ridge purchased Messenger, Restucci and Hayes. I will note that although they do have a preliminary plat in place it's not been final platted. I believe they have asked for a time extension for that to occur. But there is no Alden Ridge Subdivision as it exists today. But they have a plan in place as well and we designed our plan to match what their plan was. There was a comment regarding the access points between us and the project -- the projects to the north represented with these two roads. There is this road where Alden Ridge will get their second access, which is required through Pollard North and, then, there is an access point coming, which was called Schwenkfelder, but coming here, which accesses for Schwenkfelder and Ernst -- Ernst and Panter. When those access points are in, in particular the one that's for Ernst, Panter and Schwenkfelder, that roadway can go away and they can create their common lot. But we don't have any issue -- we don't see that there would be any need for parking along those roads. They are not directly -- they are adjacent to our project, but not in front of homes. They are on the side. So, we don't see that as an issue. We don't agree, however, for the restriction on two story

homes. These are single family homes. Against single family homes -- I don't know that there has been another case where lots are similar in size or greater in size and there has been a restriction on two story heights. Also I don't think the city has -- has a position or has taken any requirements on lighting. If we want to look at it globally on dark skies, we can look at that, but lights and people's back porches and things like that are different than streetlights and that restriction has not been applied for single family against single family. We did have conversations with Mr. Ensler. He did come to our office. And we did work on access points and we have been able to do some things that allow his project to come forward in the future. One is we built a roadway system that he can connect to. We have actually built a sewer lift station that he doesn't contribute to, but we paid for that. We don't get reimbursed for that. We paid for a signal and we continue to be good partners in the community by providing educational opportunities that all the residents to the north have taken advantage of in a very positive way. Fairbourne didn't pay for the school property. Alden Ridge hasn't paid for the school property. But there is solutions in place. It's a short-term issue with a long-term solution and the school district is behind that. So, with that said we just go back to the same -- our conclusion that we had before. We do request your approval for Pollard North. We agree with the conditions that are before you. We have not -- there are no exceptions or changes to the staff report and we request your approval for Pollard North, the rezone to R-15, the preliminary plat for 157 lots and a new development agreement that would lock in this plan on a go forward basis. And stand for any questions you might have.

Simison: Thank you. Council, additional questions?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I did have one question I forgot to ask earlier on your phasing, phase one, phase two. Can you ballpark or to the best for your ability some dates on that in terms of how long phase one might take? I understand market conditions can change some of that, but can you give me a sense of timing to see this fully built out?

Wardle: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Taylor, that's a good question. The phasing on this is the part on the east side, which is shown here in green, would be phase one. If approved we will, then, begin our design of that. So, it would be probably two and a half, three months of design, submit and we would start development work late this summer with the goal to have it paved by this fall before snow flies and so if that's the case, then, home construction would start at the end of this year. Home cycle is usually six to seven months, maybe eight months, next year, then, we would start phase two. I can't tell you exactly when that would be, but, you know, it's sequential and my guess it would be the start of the spring of the next year. So, those lots would be available by the end of 2026. So, end of 2026 the next group of homes could start under construction.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor, quick follow up.

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: So, when you are talking about phases, it sounds like you are talking more about the roadway sidewalks being in as the phases, not necessarily that all the homes will be built out in phase one before you start phase two.

Wardle: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Taylor, that's correct. It is -- it is a sequential process. So, we would have all the development work done this fall and, then, home construction starts. Let's just say you would start four homes a month and so that's the process. You start four homes in about six, seven months after those first homes start, then, the homes start to become occupied and then once we work through that we would start development and by the time those homes were complete or constructed, then, we would hope to be in a position to start phase two home construction.

Simison: Council, additional questions? Okay.

Wardle: Thank you.

Simison: Thank you.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Taylor: Taylor.

Simison: Taylor.

Taylor: Thank you for the compliment. Question for staff maybe to clarify. Does -- does R-15 allow multi-family development?

Allen: Mr. Mayor, Council, yes, it does. I believe it's a conditional use permit though. They would have to amend their development agreement in order to do that, but, yes, it is a possibility.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Unless anyone has any other questions for anybody in the public, I would be willing to make a motion to close the public hearing.

Cavener: Second.

Overton: Second.

Simison: 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 and the public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Just to kind of start off with some thoughts. I'm kind of curious to hear the rest of the decision -- or discussion among my colleagues before I -- I think decide what I think is the right decision here. This is an interesting project, obviously, having it a couple of times -- have some time to think about it, review the public testimony, various times from both the Council and P&Z. I keep thinking back a little bit, my mind goes to kind of a real estate clause force majeure where there is clauses in real estate contracts when there is a -- something outside of normal conditions that would force you to be released of your obligations in a contract, things like earthquakes or natural disasters or in this case it seems like a pandemic -- not that there was necessarily a contract, but as I contemplate some of the discussion about the decision before us is not to look at what's -- the proposal that was rejected, but the proposal that has been approved, which included a pretty significant development in regards to assisted living facilities and when you look at that -- that's -- that's a -- very much a business proposition to not just develop, own, operate or if you were to sell that to someone to own and operate that, that's a significant change. So, I can certainly understand as this was maybe contemplated before COVID and now after COVID, this is a very very different world that we live in and we are still trying to come to grips with how that may affect how businesses operate and -- and even how our community is developing. So, to me it's very reasonable to -- for the applicant to come back and say, yes, our original plan just doesn't work anymore and so I think there -- we, as a Council, should consider heavily if we are to reject the current -- the application tonight we are telling a private business, no, this is the business you are going to be in. You are going to be -- you need to do that. The odds are they probably just would leave the ground -- the ground would just sit there and they probably wouldn't develop it, because there is probably not a business case, at least that's what I heard in the testimony was it just doesn't really work for them to be in that line of business and so a lot of my -- my thinking is, well, what do you do with this property if it's approved for assisted living facilities, yet the applicant doesn't really want to engage in that -- in a business. So, I -- I think about that a lot and I think, well, then, what would you do, what's a reasonable thing to do. One thing I have learned in my short time on Council is that transitions are -- are pretty hard between different development types and I -- as I look at the Comprehensive Plan that was put together and we really really stressed what are really good transitions and that's a conversation we have had over and over and sometimes it's multi-family to single family to commercial and those transitions are hard. So, this is not a unique conversation we

are having in terms of transitions between neighborhoods. This is not really an in-fill project, but it kind of feels like it. It kind of -- you are sort of sticking this little project in between different things, so it kind of has an in-fill feeling to it, which, again, also makes it hard, because here you are right on -- what's going to be a -- there is going to be a lot of activity around this part of the valley with the transportation network that will be in place and what sounds like will be probably proposed. We have heard the discussion about what's been proposed there for years. So, it's hard to kind of think what you would do. So, I think it's maybe a little awkward to get to what is maybe the best decision we can get to, because it's not going to be ideal for all the applicants and all the people and the property owners there. We need to figure out what would make some sense. With respect to schools, this is a hard one, too. I mean I'm certainly sympathetic. I have children in elementary, middle school, high school as well. When I look at Pleasant View this is what I look at, current enrollment as of today, as reflected in the West Ada School District website, in Pleasant View fifth grade there is 2,910 students. In first grade there is 2,436. So, there is 500 fewer kids enrolled in first grade than fifth grade. That trend is actually pretty consistent across West Ada where first, second, third grade enrollment numbers are less than fourth, fifth and sixth and even when you extend that into middle school that's -- the trend continues, which means we have fewer younger kids enrolling in West Ada. So, while we are certainly going to be bringing some new families in and some new kids, 500 fewer kids in first grade than fifth grade is a trend that we are seeing across West Ada. I predict in five to eight years from now West Ada is going to be closing some schools is probably where it seems like we are headed. So, I was unaware of the cap. I think -- or the kind of rerouting some of the kids. We have to leave it up to West Ada to help us navigate this. I don't -- this is a tough one, because that -- that part of the valley seems like it's not going to slow down either. So, we are -- we are probably going to need to figure out what to do with some more properties there. Those are just some of my thoughts. I'm still just kind of -- want to hear what the rest of my colleagues are thinking. But those are just some of my thoughts as I'm kind of contemplating what's -- what we want to do here.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: You know, you can't help but look at an application like this and draw upon hundreds of other ones we have looked at and in doing so there is -- there is certain rules to what's -- what's easily not acceptable. If this was a multi-family sandwiched next to residential, I would have a real easy time saying absolutely not for multi-family or high density apartments. If this was a development that was being built that was going to be pushing high levels of traffic out on residential streets, it would be easy for me to say absolutely not. But the way this is designed, staying all single family is pushing traffic onto approved collector streets that are going out to not just signals, but high volume arterial streets, what's about to become one of the newest high volume roadways through our valley, if there was a place to have this type of development it would be this close to that new interchange that's about to go in. I think you are going to see a lot of developments with higher levels in and around this interchange as this

develops now, as that becomes closer to fruition. We have talked about schools and we -- it seems like we are always talking about schools. You don't see the West Ada School District standing in our chambers telling us we can't do these developments and the reason for that is the same reason you don't see ACHD, the highway district doesn't tell us you can't build. They are both, by the very nature of how the business is done of growth, their reaction to our decisions. ACHD builds roadways and improves roadways and builds signals based on where the growth goes that's approved by the cities as we go. The school district makes changes to boundaries. They have been doing it for 25, 30 years as to growth of Meridian from a small town to what it is today has changed as we have grown. It's going to continue. The fact that we are seeing numbers dropping in the schools now is a first. It's always been it's growing, it's growing, it's growing and we started hearing the rumors that the numbers were starting to fall over a year ago and, you know, when we first hear that I'm kind of, okay, let's wait and see. You know, I want to -- I want to see a little more proof, but it's continued to be that way. We are continuing to see numbers fall. But the problem is they don't fall everywhere at the same time. They fall in different areas. At one time Mountain View High School and Rocky Mountain High School were the two big high schools and you couldn't get a student into it sideways, but Meridian High School had all the room in the world and they had to move things around and change where people went to school to balance out that load and that's what West Ada does very very well and Ada County Highway District, another one of our great partners, does a fantastic job in figuring out as our city grows where are our priorities and where do we need our money for roadways next? Those are the realities that we deal with when we sit up here. I wish every project could come up here with everybody supporting it, but that doesn't happen all the time and I commend every one of you for either being online or being here present and speaking about your concerns and why you do or do not -- or absolutely do not want to see this development going the way it is. But I have to tell you I see it a little different. I see it as a good transition between the medical center and the R-8 that will go in behind it to the north. I think it's a tough piece of property to develop and we see this every once in a while, you have got a -- just a 19 acre thin rectangle that's being developed. You have only got a few solutions to how you could do it and I think they have come up with a pretty good plan for how it's going to move forward. It's unfortunate that the original plan didn't get built, but this won't be the first or even the second that I have heard since the pandemic hit that they have changed their minds on what they were looking at building and I don't think it will be the last one. I do appreciate very much in the proposal the fact that the way this is developed and the way the land around it is done that we will be putting all of this traffic straight out to collector streets. I don't think it's going to be the traffic problem that we think, because it's going to divert all of it out away from the residential streets around it. So, unless we need to make a recommendation that we absolutely prohibit any multi-family or apartments in this project, I would be supportive of it as written tonight.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: I appreciated our council president confessing that he was sharing the conversation that was going on in his head, because I'm having the same conversation. I think our community needs this type of housing. I think there is a high demand for it and in great need. So, I like this project from that standpoint of making those types of homes available. I'm still a little bit troubled with the concept that there might be traffic -- or parking on both sides of Flat Rock. Those homes to the north, the conventional homes potentially could have cars there. Those homes to the south, if -- if they have visitors they are going to park there as well and, you know, I just -- I worry about fire access. I worry about just having too much -- too much parking on Flat Rock. So, that -- that still is a concern and a conversation going on in my mind. I love the fact Brighton has made investments. They have put the money in the bank for a light at Levi and Chinden that's absolutely necessary. I represent this area and I can tell you that I get a lot of comments about the traffic at Black Cat and Chinden as well. So, from a traffic standpoint something needs to happen at both Levi and even at Black Cat with the signal that's already there. So, that compensation in my mind, too. Thank you for getting that money to ACHD and -- and once we get Highway 16 completed that interchange all set, I look forward to having that light and in that safety aspect at Levi as well. So, those are just some of the things that I'm -- I agree this is a difficult difficult piece of property to try to develop and make it work. Then, conversely, I also say this is kind of the end of the road. There is nothing to the west that will feed into Waverton. This is what it will be. So, I think the neighbors in Fairbourne have a legitimate concern about an increase in traffic, but, again, it will be limited, because there won't be much future development. This is the end of the road for that particular part of our community. So, I just wanted to share some of the things that I'm struggling with. I don't know where I will be on the vote. I appreciate the work that's gone into this and I appreciate the testimony from the neighbors and the concerns. I'm still struggling if this is the right project at the right place.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I certainly came in to tonight's Council meeting with a similar point of view as Council Member Whitlock and, you know, when we are up here trying to gage what our infrastructure needs versus inconvenience management and mitigation and when I think of infrastructure certainly it goes to police, fire, clean water, the other two big pieces of infrastructure that I think a lot of us focus on so much is our schools and our roads. I don't share the traffic concerns that were -- that were shared this evening. I appreciate that on the ground perspective. We are a community that promotes interconnectivity and that means that sometimes your neighbors are going to be walking through your neighborhood or driving their car through your neighborhood and I think our planning department does a good job of flagging make sure there are mitigations in there. But for me and my big concern was the schools and I think this year I think Pleasant View was the most over leveraged elementary, meaning there is more students than space than any other elementary and that's a really big deal to me and it would be a critical issue if this was building tomorrow. But credit West Ada, their efforts to move students

to the new Star elementary and I was not aware they were capping elementary enrollment. I applaud them and I think it's a win for the neighbors that have sent their kids to schools that you know, A, our kids are going to have reasonable class sizes. I have lived here my whole life and I went to three different elementary schools without ever moving where I would have 32, 33, 34 kids in my classroom. I don't want kids to have to ride a bus to go to an elementary school, but even less I don't want 30 plus kids in a classroom. So, that was for me the biggest infrastructure piece that I wasn't sure that I could get over. But based on looking at the trends for the district, the immediate efforts they are putting in place for next fall, I feel that this will be leveled off long before this development, if it's approved tonight, would move forward. So, I showed up this evening in opposition. There are infrastructure needs that are necessary for our community as a whole are being met and to Council Member Whitlock's point, this is some necessary housing in an area that makes a lot of sense. So, it's likely I will be in favor of this request this evening.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor, my colleagues have covered pretty much everything that we have gone over most of my main concerns as well, especially with schools and traffic and I think this area is set, especially with the collectors, to take care of the traffic and I agree with council -- with our president that I was kind of leaning toward -- not with the schools, because that's a critical point. But I didn't realize there was capping until tonight either. But I do appreciate the transition with R-8 onto the northern and the eastern boundaries and I think that it has felt like an in-fill project. I have kind of tried to figure out why this project has felt so different and it's just an odd shape and kind of feels like an in-fill and I think given the circumstances I still have some concerns, but I believe I will be supporting this.

Simison: So, Council, just, you know, a few comments for -- schools are weird. They really are. I mean -- and I say that, you know, we look at -- we do look at them as infrastructure, but there are a point in time in infrastructure in so many -- in such a way. you know, I disagree with Councilman Taylor that there is going to be any schools in West Ada that are going to be closing in the next seven to eight years. I could be wrong, but, you know, if anything maybe the schools get right size back to when they were originally designed for the classrooms, the portables can go away that many of our schools have at them. So, you know, I think -- I think these schools are going to be here for a long time, but, you know, it is true we do get distribution issues with schools. When I moved into -- and it wasn't completely, but when I moved in and bought my house in Tuscany at that point in time it was a Brighton neighborhood, they didn't -- they weren't the original designers or developers, but they finished the last part of it and my kids went to the school that was the most overcrowded in West Ada for quite a few years. I was -- I also went and walked there this week -- or end of last week, last Friday, and now they are 350 kids lower than what they are able to accommodate at that school, while Hillsdale still remains over capacity and -- and so I -- it's just an interesting

dialog. Because sometimes the West Ada will want to move families and sometimes they won't, because a lot of times the families would rather be at an overcrowded school than to change schools, because they like the teachers, they like the atmosphere. It's -- so, they are in a weird place to try to make this work for their infrastructure in a way that make sense for communities who feel the pinch of schools as they come online and go through that process. So, Hillsdale is not their right neighborhood. Part of it it is great places that people want to live in that really, unfortunately, contributes to, you know, families want to move into these areas and it hits the schools and they -- they are impacted, but they also have been a great proponent of it. So, I -- it's not a great issue to try to address for the school district one way or the other or for others, but it is a point in time problem and, really, when we develop communities we do have point-in-time issues, but you are building for the next 50, 100 years about what makes sense beyond that three, five, ten years, but you can't eliminate the impacts. Sometimes it's road impacts that aren't going to be built in time that are going say maybe why you should or shouldn't and sometimes it's schools in this context. We do have at least a little clarity about where the school district is right now and I will -- I will give credit to Miranda. I think Miranda, who used to work here and understood the frustration that Council would have when dealing with issues, is really trying to get West Ada to be more proactive, not only just in the information, but as they try to address these issues to alleviate some of these challenges that she heard here, but she's got a board, she's got people above her that she's also got to work with to help figure that out. So, really, I just want to like partially go on the record say in case West Ada or the media is here, I don't think that we are going to be talking about seeing schools close in our community, but maybe we are going to get them right size moving forward, because the one thing I think that was mentioned by a couple of different industries -- and I know West Ada is seeing more, but we are seeing more kids in our schools that have greater needs, which means you need to have smaller classrooms in order to accommodate those needs, because a lot of -- that's just the reality of what's being put more and more into our schools as more kids have more needs and so less space is better, but at the same time building more schools is not always the best option. Even if you build them doesn't mean they are going to reallocate everything in the way that's supposed -- even for everybody across the district, which is not what they have done. They have not gone through to say, well, we are going to reallocate everyone across the district to spread them out appropriately to every school in the system, which would probably even solve the issue better for everybody, but that's not the approach they have taken and so we have to live within those confines. So, thank you for allowing me get on a soapbox just for a second before you all make your motion.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: It's a debate a second time. To share some additional comments that I wanted to make, too. I think you are right about right sizing the schools. I think -- I think we are going to get there. Just looking at -- again, I like the data. West Ada fifth grade enrollment throughout the whole school district 2,910. First graders 2,250. That's an

entire elementary school fewer kids in first grade than fifth grade. I think it's just telling us where we are going and to your point, you know, areas blossom with growth and we struggle with navigating that, but a little bit later it's no longer the challenge we have. So, I do think you are probably right in that I think, hopefully, what we have is just schools that are appropriately sized and staffed and resourced for the needs that are there. The other comment I wanted to make as I was kind of looking at some of my notes I had down here, I think it's been a long, drawn-out process with multiple public hearings and we appreciate the neighbors who spend a lot of time away from kids and family to do that. That's annoying. I get it. It's challenging. But I would make the comment I think it made the project better. The feedback. It's not where you wanted it to be, but I think it's -- it moved in a better direction from where it was originally. So, I think I will be supporting this tonight.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Not see a sprint for anyone to run to the microphone, so I -- I'm happy to make a motion. After reviewing all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move that we are going to approve Item No. 3, Pollard North Subdivision, H-2024-0037 as presented in the staff report this evening.

Overton: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Item 3. Is there discussion on the motion? If not, clerk call the roll.

Roll Call: Cavener, yea; Strader, absent; Overton, yea; Little Roberts, yea; Taylor, yea; Whitlock, yea.

Simison: All ayes. The motion is agreed to. That's it. Sorry. I didn't do my normal thing. But all ayes. Motion carries. So, thank you.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

PROCLAMATIONS [Action Item]

1. Education and Sharing Day Proclamation

Simison: So, with that we will go back to Item No. 1, Rabbi Lifshitz. If you want to join me at the podium and appreciate you sticking around for this this evening. Council, it's an honor be here to do a proclamation with one of our good community partners. So, I will go ahead and read the proclamation and turn it over to Rabbi Lifshitz for some comments. Whereas in order to achieve its highest goals education must not only impart knowledge, but also teach students some ways to help form and strengthen their moral and ethical character thus making a better life for themselves as individuals and

for society as a whole and whereas focusing on the essence of education can nurture unity of people through encouragement of increased acts of goodness and kindness, imbued with the awareness that even a single positive act in an individual can change the world and usher in an era of global peace and whereas a global spiritual -- spiritual leader, Rabbi -- I hadn't practiced this before -- Menachem Mendel Schneerson, righteous memory, stress that a moral and ethical education empowers every individual to develop their full potential and making the world a better place and whereas April 19 -- April 9, 2025, will mark 123 years since their previous birth and this year marks the seventh anniversary of his leadership of the Chabad Lubavitch -- Lubavitch movement and whereas Education Sharing Day is now observed across the nation each year on the Rabbi's birthday in recognition of his outstanding and lasting contributions toward the improvements of education, morality and acts of charity around the world. Therefore, I, Mayor Robert E. Simison, proclaim April 9, 2024 -- 2025 as Education Sharing Day in the City of Meridian and urge all citizens to work together to create a better, brighter and more promising future of all, dated this 8th day of April 2025. Rabbi, thank you for being here and turn the mic over to you. Thank you.

COMMUNITY INVOCATION

Lifshitz: Yes. Thank you. Anybody give an invocation? Should we do it now? Okay. Let's do that. All right. Thank you. You know, I guess -- I just realized that thanks to the delay, you know, we are arriving at sunset and, you know, in Jewish calendar the day starts at night and our Sabbath begins on Friday night. So, the rabbi's birthday is beginning right now, so it's most appropriate. Okay. Well, join me, please, for a moment of prayer as we thank the City of Meridian for this proclamation. Almighty God, as the trees around us blossom and the flowers bloom, we are reminded of your abundant kindness as the Festival of Passover approaches at the end of this week. We are reminded of your compassion. You transform winter into spring and slaves into free people. As tonight marks the birthday of the Lubavitch, Rabbi Menachem, the leader of our organization Chabad Lubavitch of Idaho, we are reminded that we human beings are created in your image and that we are called upon to partner with your mission of creating a perfect world for all. Following the Rabbi's example we commit ourselves to humbly assist others in bringing peace and sanctity to this world to ensuring that our society is governed by your moral calling. Today we stand in Meridian City Council, a body that ultimately shares the mission of perfecting our city and society and we ask your assistance and guidance for its members and the citizens of this great city. We have chosen and entrusted leaders with making good laws to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. Almighty God, grant them some of your wisdom and insight and your holistic approach that makes the opposing forces of nature work in harmony. Allow them to see the fruits of their labor and may the City of Meridian continue to bloom as you see fit. Let them serve the people faithfully, debate the issues of the day earnestly and civilly and keep their eyes on their common goal of promoting the general welfare of the city. Let them be ruled by mutual respect, collegiality and cooperation and let us all have peace. Amen.

FUTURE MEETING TOPICS

Simison: Council, any future meeting topics?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Move we adjourn the meeting.

Simison: Motion to adjourn. All in favor signify by saying aye -- oh, second?

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Motion and second. All in favor signify by aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it. We are adjourned.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:50 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

_____ MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON	_____ DATE APPROVED
-------------------------------	------------------------

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK