

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Holland, go right ahead.

Holland: Just to put it on the record, I think when Council looks at this, if they decide to go a different route than the denial route from our recommendation, if they were going to consider still approving it, I would say they would need to see a different plat with more significant open space, more centralized, that shows at least that usability and, then, resolve some of these issues that we have been chatting with tonight if they wanted a chance to have Council look at another option there.

Fitzgerald: And I agree. That said, all those in favor of recommending denial of H-2020-0006 say aye. Any opposed? Motion passes. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

4. Public Hearing Continued from June 4, 2020 for Landing South (H-2020-0005) by Jim Jewett, Located at 660 S. Linder Rd.

- A. Request: Rezone of 2.43 acres of land from the R-4 to the R-8 zoning district.
- B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 11 building lots and 2 common lots on 2.27 acres of land in the proposed R-8 zoning district.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, Joe. We appreciate it. Moving on to the next item on our agenda, which is the public hearing for Landing South, file number H-2020-0005, and let's start with the staff report.

Allen: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This application was before you a while back. The Commission continued this project in order for the applicant to work with ACHD to facilitate a construction entrance off of Linder Road until initial occupancy and reconfigure the plans to include a pathway between Lots 58 and 59 that complies with UDC standards and specifically fencing standards, possibly reduce the density or modify the design to improve parking and internal circulation and revise the east lots to more of an R-4 size. So, the plan there on your left is the original plat that was submitted. The applicant has submitted a revised plat shown on the right that depicts two fewer buildable lots for the Commission's consideration in response to their direction at the hearing on June 4th. They plan to retain the existing 50 inch silver maple tree on the site, which will reduce their mitigation requirements to 17 inches and that is in regard to condition number 3-B. ACHD will allow a temporary construction entrance off of Linder Road during development of the subdivision, but not during home construction. There are two on-street parking spaces and two additional spaces at the end of each of the two common driveways for a total of six spaces, in addition to those provided on individual lots and garages and parking pads. Private sidewalks are proposed to each of the lots from the sidewalk along Linder Road. A common lot with a pathway from Spoonbill to Linder Road is not proposed and the lots on the east side of the development were increased to have an R-4 size, 8,000

square feet. The applicant is here tonight and can respond to any questions you have on this revised plan.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, Sonya. Are there any questions for staff?

Grove: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Grove.

Grove: Sonya, I have a question with the preliminary plat that we received this afternoon. I'm having a hard time understanding what I'm looking at. Could you walk me through that a little bit just in terms of Lot 62, 63, 64 and 65? I don't fully understand what --

Allen: Yes. Mr. Chair, Commissioner Grove, Commissioners, they have reduced the plat by two lots on the east side, the two buildable lots. They have created flag lots. So, the original lots, if it helps, are shown in a lighter gray color and, then, the new lot lines are shown in black. So, these are flag lots you are looking at here and they are required to have a minimum 30 feet street frontage. So, that is what they are proposing. This is a common driveway right here for access to these two lots and, then, again, these are the configuration of the new lots. For the record, staff's really not in support of the proposed revised plat.

Grove: Follow up questions?

Fitzgerald: Go right ahead.

Grove: What -- do you -- I guess I'm just struggling. What is the piece for Lot 64 that's in between 65 and 63 on the east side?

Allen: I'm not really sure. Let's have the applicant answer that.

Grove: Okay.

Holland: I had the same question.

Fitzgerald: Any additional comments or questions for the staff? I think the applicant is going to have to walk through that preliminary plat with us -- or for us.

Cassinelli: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Cassinelli.

Cassinelli: Sonya, could you repeat what you said there? I think you said that staff is not in favor of the current layout, is that what you said?

Allen: Yeah. The configuration of the lots are really wonky and -- yeah. Prefer the former plat between the two anyway.

Fitzgerald: Do you have follow up, Bill?

Cassinelli: No. I was looking for more of a reason, but I guess wonky is --

Fitzgerald: It's good enough.

Allen: It's an official term now.

Cassinelli: Yeah. Well -- and you said you prefer the -- you prefer the -- the original. We are talking about those 62, '3, '4, '5 versus the six lots that were over there. Yeah. I think it was six. Okay.

Pogue: Mr. Chair? Sonya or Bill, is there any chance you could use the yellow like crayons to draw each of the lots that are now depicted to make it clear? So, Commissioner Grove, I had the same question earlier and it did help to actually see them drawn out.

Allen: Well, I can -- Bill's the color, I am not, Andrea. If you can see my cursor here I can trace the outline of the lot. Like I said, it's the black line, it's not the gray line, so that's that lot. This is the flag for this lot that comes in. This is that lot. And, then, right here is the flag to this back lot.

Pogue: Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Grove, did that help? Because I think you -- and we will get the applicant to explain it, but I think you're seeing an overlay with the gray behind it with the old layout, so --

Grove: Yeah. It's not that I couldn't see each, but I just don't understand it, I guess, like --

Fitzgerald: I'm with you, man. And I had the same question during our meeting earlier today, so --

Grove: Okay.

Fitzgerald: Is there additional questions for staff? If not, we will have the applicant come up and explain it so we can get a better handle on it, because I'm with you, that's what I want as well.

Jewett: So, it's Jim -- Jim Jewett at 776 East Riverside Drive, Suite 204, Eagle, Idaho. Can everybody hear me okay?

Fitzgerald: Yeah. Go ahead, Mr. Jewett.

Jewett: Thank you. So, at our last hearing there was a lot of discussion about changing the lots to the east to a more R-4. So, I drove my engineers crazy with trying to create an R-4 lot when you had such limited right of way frontage in which to configure and so we had to use these series of flag lots to maintain the minimum frontage on the public right of way and not use a common driveway. So, what you see is -- is the result of that and, for example, that one little panhandle that goes out to the east between -- and -- and I can't look at the lot numbers on my small screen, I'm sorry. That's just what was left over to make the one triangle'ish looking lot 8,000 square feet. That's all it is. This is -- this is what it looks like. I'm not in favor of it at all and the reason we overlaid it over the old plat was to illustrate how it doesn't work and I tried every other avenue, but if I went back to the common driveways it just made sense to stay with our original plat. So, we are here tonight to support our original plat and I believe that the staff is in the same position and, you know, my planner submitted a letter putting in support for why our regional plat extends and with that I will stand for your questions. I'm sure you will have many more for me.

Fitzgerald: Appreciate it. Commissioner Holland, go right ahead.

Holland: So, in the way that you reconfigured the new lot -- I appreciate you trying to meet our request and eliminate a couple of lots to make it fit better. If you went back to your original plat -- and maybe I -- I mean keep the -- you have got your common drive, but still reduce a couple of lots on there and reconfigure how much space they had, was that not something that was a possibility there?

Jewett: And, I'm sorry, I don't know which Commissioner is talking.

Holland: This is Commissioner Holland.

Jewett: Okay. So, Commissioner Holland, without -- not using the common drive, because what I took from the last hearing was to change the flow and not utilize a common drive, you have to maintain frontages and that only exception is when you use common drives. So, we only have so much frontage to use, so unless we simply kept the common drive and just made the lots bigger, that would be the only other option.

Holland: Well, I think that's what my question is, too, is would you be willing to consider maybe eliminating one of those lots to make those bigger, so you have less number of homes off of that common drive. I think that was our challenge before is we just didn't like that there were one, two, three drive aisles off of that one common drive and, then, there were two off of the -- or three off of the other one, because there is just a lot of homes coming off of that hammerhead there and so if there was the ability to keep a similar configuration, but maybe eliminate one or two lots, making less homes off of those access points, that might be more favorable.

Jewett: Commissioner Holland, certainly that -- we can reduce lots. In looking at it I would think that the reduction would probably be off of the public street, not the common drive. The common drive in its configuration and trying to get to those lots to the east are going to mandate that there is three lots on it regardless of what I do. So, if you lose a lot it will most likely be up to the north on the public frontage. So, I don't know how that helps anybody and I will give you the other side of that story and that is the way we configure now with the six slots, we have a similar size that we have in our existing previous phase, which was the Landing Number 13 and we offered product in that phase in the high 200s to the low 300s with an occasional home being larger into the mid 300s and an affordable product in Meridian right now. If I lost a lot I would simply average that value back into the other lots and you would take in that affordability and notch up, so you would have no more homes in the three -- are low two -- high two and low threes and you would start in the mid threes and I just don't know if that's really what's necessarily needed in Meridian right now is to have more expensive homes. I think we need to fill that medium income family and that's what this lot is intended to do. So, the answer to your question is yes and all I would do is change price points and I guess I would ask if that's really what you want us to do.

Fitzgerald: Well, in follow up to that, Mr. Jewett, because I wasn't here for the original hearing for this, but my understanding is you have duplexes on the west side of the road, whichever side you are looking at, and, then, single family homes on the east; is that correct?

Jewett: That's correct.

Fitzgerald: So, I mean we are -- you are putting in quite a bit -- I mean a large amount of homes in a pretty small space and I understand that we are trying to match price point and those kinds of things, but we also need to make sure we are being safe and not causing a little bit of chaos in that area. So, just -- just want to make sure that's on the record and everybody understands it.

Jewett: So, Commissioner Fitzgerald I believe is who --

Fitzgerald: Yes, sir.

Jewett: Yes, to provide a diversity of housing and to provide the -- along Linder Road, other than the back of people's homes, we did design a duplex product that would front face off of Linder and rear access off of this interior road, which is a unique design that I think that the Commission was in favor in our original hearing. I said I'm -- if -- if the desire of the Commission is to lose a lot and that's the recommendation that I can accept, I just want to make sure that everybody is aware that it just is a rebalance of value and from my original submittal to the city the staff asked me to lose a lot and which I did. So, that would be a total of a two lot reduction from my original proposal. You guys only saw the first lot reduction. This would be a second lot reduction.

Fitzgerald: Additional questions for the applicant?

Cassinelli: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Cassinelli, go right ahead.

Cassinelli: Yeah. Can -- correct me if I'm wrong, but the last time that we looked at this wasn't there an issue with -- and I -- and I don't have the street name there, but wasn't there an issue with the width there and access in and out of that? Wasn't that one of the big issues we faced? And if that's correct can you -- can you address that and where we stand, so if the street got wider?

Jewett: Commissioner Cassinelli, I don't believe the street width was an issue, I think that the terminology that we used in the motion was -- or their recommendation was that I tried to improve the flow and I took that to mean that -- to lose the private drive -- the common driveway. I don't recall a discussion specific to width of the street. Our street width is the same width as a street that comes out of the Landing Number 13. We haven't reduced it below that -- that section, which is at 33 foot back to back.

Cassinelli: And maybe I'm thinking of something else. So thank you.

Holland: Mr. Chair, one more quick follow up question. I read in the staff report about the -- the sidewalk that was connected over to the main road, because we had asked for some sort of sidewalk or pathway that would connect between the homes and it didn't meet pathway requirements, but there was going to be some sort of private sidewalk. Can you just expand that for us?

Jewett: Certainly, Commissioner Holland. At the first hearing there was a discussion of making a little bit more interconnectivity to Linder Road from the cul-de-sac and we had talked about potentially putting a pathway between the lower two duplexes and the other duplexes. Sonya pointed out that had to meet the pathway standards if we put any pathway at all. We looked at that and it reduced the lots too greatly that we would end up losing one entire lot and so we opted just to keep that private -- our connectivity from the sidewalk to the front private amongst those duplexes and their lots, not making it public. Still the public pathway exists along the canal, the Kennedy, which I have built from the first phase -- or in the Landing Number 13, just to the north of the subdivision. Interconnectivity to Linder still exists there, second public pathway within a hundred or so feet of the other one and to have to lose a lot for that didn't seem appropriate.

Holland: So, that -- just to clarify, that private -- private sidewalk, is that still something people could use if they were living in this subdivision and wanted to walk to Linder Road?

Jewett: Certainly. If they -- and most specifically is for anybody that's at the cul-de-sac that wants to reach the front door of any of those duplexes, that's their way of accessing to there. So, certainly anybody else would be able to use it as well. It just wouldn't be meeting the public standards for a pathway and open space, which we didn't need the additional open space and since we couldn't encroach anymore on the open space that

we had to our north -- originally I thought I could squeeze up to the north, but I can't. I don't have sufficient room to do that to create that additional path.

Holland: Thank you.

Grove: One question.

Fitzgerald: Yeah. Commissioner Grove, go ahead.

Grove: Jim, question for you on the -- where do we sit with the trash receptacle situation for this project? At one point it was said that there was going to be like a centralized -- is that still the plan and -- or where do we -- which direction are we going in there?

Jewett: Commissioner Grove, yes, staff raised the question of trash early on in our planning process and we had offered to put a centralized trash receptacle -- a dumpster and -- dumpster containers -- I don't know what we call them now. Then we had the fence and -- instead of having individual trash receptacles and that seemed to solve that issue and I believe that is in the staff report that we will put a centralized facility for that trash, instead of the individual cans. The general location -- the general location of that will be between the northerly two duplexes and the southerly duplexes right along the public right of way is where we would locate that. Again, that was conflicting the pathway that we were putting in, too, and where to focus that trash receptacle.

Fitzgerald: Sonya, can you verify that that's in the staff report, because I -- thinking through it I don't recall off the top of my head.

Allen: I'm sorry --

Fitzgerald: Go ahead.

Allen: -- Chair, could you repeat the question?

Fitzgerald: Can you verify that we have -- the requirement in the staff report for a trash receptacle location? Because I -- I'm blanking on the fact if it's in there or not.

Allen: So, an actual trash enclosure, rather than private ones?

Fitzgerald: Yeah. Yes, ma'am.

Allen: No, there is not one.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Would the staff be amenable to that?

Allen: I thought you were asking the applicant if he was amenable to that. Yes, that's an option if you would like it to be.

Fitzgerald: Okay.

Allen: Although I'm not sure where they would put it exactly.

Seal: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: Just a -- I mean if -- if that's something that we condition in here -- I mean the trash enclosure itself has minimums and maximums that it has to be able to fit and I don't know -- with that being a private path already, I don't know that it's going to be there. That would be my -- I kind of share the concern is I don't know where it's going to go in here.

Jewett: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, what our plan was to locate it between the northerly and southerly set of duplex lots along just west of the public right of way. We would make a trash enclosure there that the trash company once a week would come and unloaded it and we would have a stucco facility or a cement block facility there like you see in some of the commercial projects, albeit a little smaller than those, because it's only going to be servicing this many people. So, it doesn't have to be as large.

Grove: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Grove.

Grove: I have a follow up on that. Which preliminary plat are -- are you referencing in regards to that configuration, the original or the one with the long driveway things?

Jewett: Commissioner, Grove, good question. It's the original one. So, if you look at -- as I'm looking at my screen it's the one on the left and it's between Lots 58 and 59, those to sideways. The southerly part of one unit, northerly part of the other. It would be located between those two driveways.

Fitzgerald: Additional questions for the applicant? Commissioner Grove, did you get everything squared? Did you get --

Parsons: Mr. Chair?

Grove: Yes. I think I'm struggling with how that's actually going to work, because there are size requirements that are -- need to be kind of factored in that I don't see, especially right at the end of -- or where the shared driveway is. I just have some concerns without knowing how it's been thought through.

Parsons: Yeah. Mr. Chair, this is -- this is staff. If I could chime in.

Fitzgerald: Go ahead, Bill.

Parsons: If I could chime in on the enclosure. So, I think we really have to think about that and the reason why I'm thinking about it is because I'm a Meridian resident and my bill has my tote service in with my water and sewer. So, how is our utility billing companies going to figure out how to charge the appropriate trash for each one of these individual lot owners or how is the HOA going to set up the payment for that? So, to me that becomes a problematic issue that we are passing on to future homeowners in this subdivision and that's something that we do not want to do or encourage. So, I would really take that into consideration in your deliberation tonight that I wouldn't encourage that. Certainly that could be considered a commercial rate charge to those homeowners that could potentially be a higher rate than what they anticipate paying is -- all of us as Meridian residents enjoy now that are pretty low tote rates. So, again, I haven't seen it in my 13 years with the city where we have required an enclosure in a residential subdivision. That's really meant for a commercial setting. So, again, I guess from my perspective I would not be supporting that request and I would encourage you not to do the same. Thank you.

Holland: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Holland.

Holland: I was going to ask in case the applicant wanted to address it, but my concern is if you put it between Lots 58 and 59 you may have people that are in that neighborhood that take advantage of that trash enclosure and drop things like furniture or bigger parcels that normally wouldn't be collected by trash carts and, then, you have got a bunch of junk sitting between those two lots that is hard to manage and hard to pin on who dropped it where and I share the same concern that staff just represented. It's tough to figure out the fair distribution of that and I think it would be hard to manage how much trash people would be allowed to have per week as well before they need to, you know, take a run to the dump or something. I think you could have a problem with someone dumping three trash can loads worth of stuff there just because they can. I have a lot of concerns about that, too.

Fitzgerald: Thank you for that and I appreciate, Bill, your input. Thank you. Any additional comments or questions for the applicant? Hearing none, Mr. Jewett, we will come back to you after we take public testimony, if there is any, and we will let you close, sir. Madam Clerk, is there anyone who would like to testify on this application?

Weatherly: Mr. Chair, we didn't have anybody signed in, but I do believe Tony Baggio, who is joining us via Zoom, has his hand raised for this. Tony, one moment, please.

Fitzgerald: Thank you, Madam Clerk.

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

Fitzgerald: You can click on the bottom left corner of your screen, there is a mute button on --

Baggio: It does. All right, sir. Let's go.

Fitzgerald: State your name and your address for the record and the floor is yours, sir.

Baggio: All right. Thank you very much. Yeah. It's been a long little thing. So, Anthony Baggio formally. 1414 West Joshua Street, Meridian, Idaho. So, I live in the new development that Jim built and what's being built around the corner is a concern. So, what I would like to understand -- which I didn't get in the conversation -- originally the number a lots for the original preliminary plat was 11, of which there was nine single homes and four duplexes. Now, what's changed is I don't know how many duplexes and single lots, because that was not conferred. So, that's my question, number one.

Fitzgerald: And, Mr. Baggio, we will have Mr. Jewett respond to you when he does his closing, make sure that that's very clear.

Baggio: Okay. Good. Because you have -- okay. So, the reason I bring that up is because the last time we had a TIS done was 2017, before the 28th home was built here. So, the -- the travel and the people getting to Linder have been growing and if we are going to add 60 more cars based on what the Council did with Tanner Creek, which is going to be 550 more cars, we are going to have a big problem. So, I need a TIS. Secondly, I would like to have access -- and I have taught -- I am a director on the HOA for Mallard Landing. We have access for construction, but not for house building. Why can't we have both? That's a request. We have people selling in the original Mallard Landing right across from where I live because of everything happening. They all want to leave, because of the volume of construction traffic. So, what we have here is not a City of Meridian issue, we have an ACHD issue and that -- the Tanner Creek thing and now it's this. So, whoever is running ACHD is not a forward planner. That's second. Then the general trash situation. I wrote down the Council has mentioned their good comments on that and I agree with that. It's ridiculous to have a central dump for duplexes, because Jim Jewett got grant rights for the land that I live on and he got grant rights in the land that he's trying to develop, which is in complete opposition to doing duplexes in Mallard Landing. So, he built his own duplex in our little area and didn't pay the HOA. Now he's going to build four or five -- I don't know how many more, but I'm not very comfortable with somebody who does those types of things. And, then, a central dump site. So, that's it. Thank you very much. I appreciate your time.

Fitzgerald: Thank you, sir. We appreciate you being here tonight. Thanks for participating. If there is anyone else in the public who would like to testify on this application, either via Zoom or in person, please, raise your hand using the Zoom application or raise your hand in the audience, Commissioner Seal will point you out. Not seeing anything on the panelist side or attendee side. Commissioner Seal, we are good in the audience, sir?

Seal: Nobody in the audience.

Fitzgerald: Mr. Jewett, would you like to close. Thank you.

Jewett: Mr. Chairman, it's Jim Jewett again. So, I will answer Mr. Baggio's question. There was a general application and the original proposal that went in front of the neighbors was for seven new residential lots and four duplex lots, totaling 11. After that submittal staff requested that we lose one lot. That resulted in six new residential lots, four duplex lots, and that was the application that came before you in June. So, that is what our request is, is for four duplex lots and six additional residential lots. There was reference to another subdivision. I don't know what that subdivision is, but Mr. Baggio did suggest that we get a TIS. A TIS is -- is not required for an additional traffic count that we have. ACHD has found that all the internal roads meet the requirements of our additional traffic. ACHD and staff are not supportive of any -- putting any additional connections onto Linder Road, so there was no TIS required and there wouldn't be for this many lots. Five hundred lots, yeah, that's -- that's a TSI, but not this. He talked about my grants rights having to do with the subdivision. Yes, I did obtain the grantor's rights for the previous subdivision that will extend to this subdivision. That's a course of business. I don't know if that's really an issue. As I do these annexations I specifically address documents within the HOA documents that provide that I can put a duplex on these additional phases, but not previous phases. Oh. The trash receptacle. I was offering that as a solution to everybody wheeling their trash can to the curb. I wheel my trash cans to the curb. Most of Meridian wheels their trash cans to the curb. There is common driveways all spread out in Meridian and people wheel their trash cans to the curb. So, I'm okay with whichever direction staff and the Council and the Commission wants to go when it comes to trash. I can understand that even in my -- some of my commercial projects I go there and I see trash, but I don't know where it came from and people use them to get rid of stuff. So, I know how trash receptacles can be abused. It was just a way I could offer a solution to what was perceived as a problem having to do with trash receptacles at the curb. Hopefully I would have addressed all of the concerns. With that I would stand for anymore questions.

Fitzgerald: On access, can you address that? That was an ACHD requirement or allowance. Can you talk about that real quick?

Jewett: Yeah. Commissioner Fitzgerald, at the previous hearing it was requested that I inquire. I did inquire and ACHD responded with, yes, during the construction of the subdivision they would allow the temporary access, but not after the road construction was done, because from that point on the -- the individual home construction has to occur through the public streets and I understand their point, they don't have -- no idea the timing of when one home will be built or the next home will be built. In theory we are going to do them all right away, but things happen that change that and they wouldn't want to keep a temporary construction open indefinitely and I get their point and there might be able to be a little room with ACHD if they know that we are going forward with the initial four duplexes right away and allowing that access for those, but I just think that it's not an indefinite thing that ACHD is willing to grant.

Baggio: No. You have to -- no, you have to cut off one of the duplexes to get the rest of the development.

Fitzgerald: Sorry. Mr. Baggio, you had your time. Go ahead, Mr. Jewett. Sorry about that.

Jewett: And so I will continue to work with ACHD and to work with the neighbors. I do understand when the last phase is at the back of any subdivision and all the construction traffic has to go passed the neighbors. I do understand it. I do understand it's an inconvenience. Unfortunately, that's just the way this played out and I will do the best I can in attaining whatever temporary easements I can with ACHD, but I do have to say that construction of the roads and all those dump trucks and cement trucks and grading material won't -- not coming down their street is a great benefit to them, allowing us to utilize our existing access for all that will certainly mitigate a lot of that for the neighbors.

Fitzgerald: Are there any additional questions for Mr. Jewett?

Grove: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Go right ahead, Commissioner Grove.

Grove: All right. I had a question. You had mentioned being able to -- or be amenable to changing some of the lots to be a different size or shape. Which lots were you considering? Are you talking about Lots 65, 66 and 67 on the original preliminary plat?

Jewett: So, the one lot -- it looks like -- unfortunately, my screen is so small, but it's the three lots to the north of the common driveway going to the east. I would reconfigure those into two lots versus the current three.

Grove: And with that -- just as a follow-up question, with those -- would that street, then, where it is or would you make the cul-de-sac bigger? What -- I guess -- and, then, the access with both -- or for both lots are off of Spoonbill, is that kind of the line of thinking?

Jewett: Commissioner Grove, like I testified earlier, I don't think that reduces the amount of lots that would access to common drive, it would certainly allow the common drive to slide north and make the three lots to the south a little larger and, then, just one lot taking access from the public roads versus two lots and I think that to get to that rear lot without creating a flag lot has to be a common drive. If I turn and made them real skinny that really isn't functional. We just have a real limited frontage along the -- the private -- I mean, excuse me, the public roads. So if we were to lose one more I certainly would want to slide the common driveway slightly north, make the three on the -- lots on the bottom a little deeper and, then, just reconfigure -- have one lot taking access off of Spoonbill and, then, the lot in the back would still take its access of the common drive.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner --

Jewett: And that would -- sorry.

Fitzgerald: Sorry. Go ahead.

Jewett: That would provide for a little -- some additional on-street parking along Spoonbill, having one less driveway cut on that street.

Grove: Thank you. I understand what you are saying. I guess I'm just looking at it a little bit differently and thinking that there would be a way to get better parking up front and have longer lots, but if -- if that's not the direction -- or if that's not feasible I understand, so -- thank you.

Jewett: Commissioner Grove and other Commissioners, I don't -- if you have seen the amount of iterations that we have made on this plat, even before submitting it, it's an in-fill. It's problematic. It's difficult. It's not the easiest thing to do. As you can see in my attempt to make R-4 lots, it -- it is really problematic and we struggled to find a plat even that I was comfortable with submitting. So, I would -- I would just ask you to just please consider all the time I put into this and trying to figure out -- I don't know how I can do the common driveway with one less access. Just -- it's frontage that makes it real problematic.

Seal: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Sorry. Go ahead.

Seal: Just -- I mean in looking at this I have -- you know, it seems like we have got -- in the current configuration -- and I like what the applicant's attempting to do with facing the homes towards Linder, but it -- I mean there is only so much creativity you can do. I mean I'm kind of getting to -- it seems like we are trying to put ten pounds of apples into a five pound bag here. So, in -- I mean -- and what I'm looking at -- and let's -- instead of trying to go mixed use in here, I mean wouldn't it be simpler to simply have duplexes on both sides of this road, extend the road down to the bottom, and have the turnaround at the bottom of it and call it a day? I mean maybe I'm oversimplifying it, but to me -- I mean there is -- it's a very very small space. I mean either that or, you know, ditch the idea of duplexes and just, you know, do like the land to the south of it, have -- you know, just basically make it a giant turn around with some houses that spring off of it, so -- and -- and I understand this is probably the thousandth hour you have spent on this in the timing of it, so just -- maybe less creativity is something that can be applied here and you will probably rarely if ever hear me say something like that about this, but -- I mean knowing that this is in-fill, I would like to see it filled in, but having it fit a few more criteria would be nice and to me, you know, I think simplifying the road structure and simplifying the layout of it just overall would probably help everybody. I mean that's going to clear up a lot of issues as far as where the trash cans go, how does the Fire Department turn around, you know, on and on and on. For me anyway.

Jewett: I believe that was Commissioner Neal. My screen just says City of Meridian. The -- the idea of putting duplexes on both sides, obviously, simplifies things and I'm certainly not opposed to that. It provides a diversity. I think that the neighbors would rather have seen some level of residential versus all duplexes and I think the mix was appropriate and that's why I went down that path. Again, I appreciate your comments. I

have put a lot of time into it. It is in-fill. It is problematic. Everything I have done here -- I'm not asking for any exceptions to any UDC rule. I have met every UDC rule. I have met every zoning guideline. I'm -- I'm right in the middle of the density, which is appropriate under the Comprehensive Plan. So, I would like to just have a recommendation based on my current plat and we can just go from there.

Fitzgerald: Additional questions or comments for the applicant? Mr. Jewett, thank you for being here tonight, sir. We will deliberate and see where we go from here.

Jewett: Thank you all.

Fitzgerald: Thank you. Can I get a motion to close public hearing?

Holland: So moved, Mr. Chair.

Seal: Second.

Fitzgerald: I have a motion and a second to close the public hearing on H-2020-0005, Landing South. All those in favor say aye? Any opposed? Motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Fitzgerald: Who wants to lead off? Commissioner Holland, you are unmuted, does that mean you are -- go right ahead, ma'am.

Holland: I suppose I can. I know Commissioner Cassinelli is unmuted, too, but that's all right, I will go first.

Fitzgerald: I saw you first.

Holland: I -- I really struggle with this one and I know we did last time we heard this, too, and we -- I was a little disappointed that the revised plat wasn't more of a significant change that was actually reasonable for consideration, because we had given them some feedback on what we wanted to see differently and what came back to us was not a practical use of the land. So, I was a little disappointed because we -- we didn't really have another option to look at. We basically just rehashed what we saw last time. It was a little bit disappointing there. But I -- I understand that the applicant has worked really hard on this and I certainly appreciate his creativity and trying to bring a different product than Meridian has seen. A couple of comments I had last time, I -- while I like that the -- the units faced Linder Road to kind of give more of that boulevard feel, it almost still feels out of place to me, because you only have a duplex unit facing Linder and everything else was facing internally and so when you are driving it looks a little -- almost out of place versus what you see in like a downtown Boise or you are used to seeing in a downtown Meridian type thing where everything is facing the main road and you have got the access drives on the back. I still struggle with that concept a little bit, even though I understand where they are trying to go with it. If it went for, you know, a quarter mile or a half mile

and had more consistency or was next door to commercial where there was easy walkability and it was nice to have those houses facing Linder, it could be different, but to me it could be a challenge long term, because it might look like it doesn't fit the rest of the neighborhood over there. So, that's one comment I have. Two, I don't like the idea of the shared trash enclosure. I think we have already kind of covered that, though. I think that can be problematic. We talk about shared drives all the time. I -- I hate seeing more than two driveways off of a shared drive, just because it causes challenges for people backing in, people needing to turn around. If someone has a truck, if someone has a motorhome or whatever it is, you are not likely to have a motorhome if you are living in a duplex, but you still might have friends that want to come over and even though there is a few extra parking stalls in there, I don't know that it's sufficient enough if you are going to have someone over for a Super Bowl party or -- or whatnot. So, it's -- it's a small piece of land and a lot of homes in there and not that it's our job to redesign it, but, you know, if I was looking at this with -- if I was a developer, you know, I could consider maybe doing duplexes on the -- where 57 and 58 are and, then, on the right where -- I'm sorry. I can't see the numbers. Where 67 and 66 are, you could do, you know, two sets of duplexes there where you still get your eight units and, then, use the rest of that cul-de-sac just to build out some nicer big lots and maybe -- maybe have a couple shared drives that go two lots in there. That's probably how I would look at configuring it to make it a little bit better. But I think we are still -- we are not where I feel comfortable with this going through. I think it's -- it's a tough layout to me, especially with the way that you get into it is kind of a winding roundabout and I know I heard from a lot of the neighbors last time we heard this application and they wished that they could access Linder directly, but that's just not an option for us, so it is an in-fill parcel. Could it be a little less dense? I would probably be okay saying that because of where it's located. So, that's where I will start off.

Fitzgerald: Thank you, Commissioner Holland. Commissioner Cassinelli, you are unmuted, so I will let you comment next, sir.

Cassinelli: Okay. I'm going to -- mostly I'm going to echo what Commissioner Holland started off with -- with a -- something that's just driving me nuts when I look at this. Why there wasn't a future stub street coming off of either Waltman or Gander to access this and I think, you know, had this been a big loop going into one of those, I don't think we would be having the -- he wouldn't be trying to -- I love Commissioner Seal's analogies tonight -- trying to squeeze ten pounds of apples into a -- into a five pound box. We wouldn't have that problem I don't think, but no on the central trash. As much as I do -- what Commissioner Holland said, as much as I like that idea of the -- of the front of the duplexes facing Linder, but just with -- with just a small number there it doesn't -- it doesn't fit. I understand the applicant wants to maybe try and have a lower price point in there, but it doesn't fit -- even if we did duplexes on both sides, which might make the street -- the layout work a little bit better. It doesn't -- you are putting a product that doesn't fit the surrounding -- surrounding neighborhood I don't think. So, I -- I hate to tell them to go back to the drawing board, since they have already spent so much time on, but it -- I -- and I get it, I mean it gets difficult, this -- what they are trying to -- trying to in-fill this. It's just -- man, it's a hard piece, especially when you can't take access off of Linder or anything, it's difficult. I sympathize with him on that. I just -- it just doesn't seem to fit the

existing neighborhood right now. I don't have a -- I don't have a magic wand that I could make it happen, but it just doesn't fit for me. So, those are my comments. Not -- not that I'm necessarily opposed to it, it just doesn't fit.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner McCarvel.

McCarvel: Yeah. I would -- you know, we have had comments that he's spent a lot of time on it, but I just -- since we made our comments at the last hearing for this, you know, what was brought back was not a lot of time spent. I don't think it's a reasonable layout to even be considered. So, I think, you know, it -- it is, it's just -- it's trying to fit too much in there or just the wrong product mix, because I think it could be real simple just bringing that road in just a little farther and lining things up around a nice big cul-de-sac, instead of trying to put all these little inlets trying to squeeze all that in. Yeah. And here we are again on another application where we have spent a ton of time a second time. Yeah. I don't know that we do another continuance or just recommend denial on this at this point, since this has always been offered.

Fitzgerald: My thoughts on -- just giving my two cents. I -- we are doing our best to get things squared away and help the applicant get down the road and the staff is doing an amazing job of working with them trying to do that, too. If after the first one we can't get it down the road, then, we got to move it forward in a direction that recommends what we think and so I don't want us as -- we are relatively lay people, it's not our job to redesign projects. We can give them our thoughts and give them the aspects that we can provide, but we got to trust our staff and -- and try to figure out how best to do it. But I -- I'm -- I mean I understand that there was an attempt to do a duplex and, then, modulate into a single family residential -- the buffer in between, but I agree with Commissioner McCarvel's comments exactly, you know, bringing a cul-de-sac in and -- finishing it off with a cul-de-sac and making those all lots that were similar even easier, although you do have a -- backing up to Linder Road, which is kind of a white elephant. So, I think per your comments I agree, I think we have got to help -- like we can give a continuance once, that's great. I think last round -- we did give them two rounds, which was -- didn't seem to help either, so -- then we got to do the application that's in front of us and see where we can go from -- go from there. I don't know if we are making progress in some of these where we are continuing with our thoughts and they -- they are coming back without a great deal of additional thought.

Grove: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Grove.

Grove: I will throw my two cents in really quick. I don't have as much issue with the Linder facing fronts. I -- I understand what the other Commissioners have said. I don't have as much problem with that. I was really looking forward to this application coming back, because I thought that we would get a higher -- or a lot -- different creativity with the layout on the east side of this project and I was excited to see what they came up with and the -- the long driveway piece and weird shapes weren't what I thought they were

going to come back with and I'm just really struggling with both of the preliminary plats that they have shown for the reasons that we mentioned last time and all the things that we have said today. So, I don't know what -- where to go with this, but I still have some concerns.

Fitzgerald: Additional comments? Commissioner Seal, did you have thoughts there?

Seal: No, nothing further. Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Well, folks -- Commissioner Holland, go right ahead, ma'am.

Holland: I was just going to say I think everybody's kind of on the same page. I -- I would agree that at this point I don't know that continuing is going to help us that much to get where we want to be, so I would lean -- lean towards recommending denial on this project and if Council decides they want to, you know, reconfigure some things and see if they can make it work -- I know we have made a lot of recommendations to the applicant if they wanted to try and revise something before the Council hearing if they still want to try and move forward with a denial recommendation, but the way that it sits right now I just don't feel like it's a good fit for the -- what the city's Comprehensive Plan has, what the -- with the trash enclosures, with the tightness of turnarounds, all those things, there is a lot of challenges with it to me, so -- so, with that I want to be sure I have the right file number here. Hang on. This is Landing South; right?

Fitzgerald: Yes.

Holland: So, after considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend denial to the City Council for file number H-2020-0005 as presented during the hearing on June -- it's not June 4th, but it is July 16th, 2020, for the following reasons: That it doesn't seem to fit the -- the Comprehensive Plan. There are some challenges with turnarounds and access drives and the revised preliminary plat didn't solve some of the issues that we had discussed as a Commission previously.

Cassinelli: I will second that.

Fitzgerald: Have a motion and a second to recommend denial of file number H-2020-0005, Landing South. Any additional comments before we take a vote? Hearing none, all those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Fitzgerald: Moving on to the next application on the docket --

Parsons: Mr. Chair? Mr. Chair? This is staff.

Fitzgerald: Yes, sir.

Parsons: Before we move on to the next item, could I suggest a five minute break and let staff get re-adjusted so we can start presenting our applications to you?

Fitzgerald: Absolutely. So, let's take a five minute break and go from there.

Parsons: All right. Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Thank you.

(Recess: 8:40 p.m. to 8:45 p.m.)

6. Public Hearing for 2020 Comprehensive Plan Policy Prioritization (H-2020-0073) by City of Meridian Planning Division

- A. Request: To amend the text of the City of Meridian Comprehensive Plan by adding priority levels and assigning responsible department leads to the existing policies of the Plan. This amendment makes no revisions to the text of the Plan, except to add priorities and responsible leads for the policies adopted in December of 2019.

Fitzgerald: So, moving on on the docket, like to open the public hearing for the 2020 Comprehensive Plan Policy Prioritization, H-2020-0073, and we will turn it over to Brian McClure for the staff report. Brian, go ahead, sir.

McClure: Good evening, Commissioners. I'm here tonight to discuss the Comprehensive Plan text amendment with you. Really briefly, though, the current Comprehensive Plan was adopted in December of last year. It's still very shiny. There are 492 policies, 380 which are action items. The plan is really two documents, the regular text policies and, then, the map, of course, which is the Comprehensive Plan and that focuses on the report and, then, the existing conditions report, which is an addendum to the Comprehensive Plan. The report is needed to address some of the state requirements and it's focused on where we have been and where we are today. It's usually updated every few years. Why do we plan and what are the state requirements? In summary, we plan because we are supposed to for the community good and to incorporate the community's vision. The 17 required components of the state enabling legislation, which is on the right, is part of the Local Land Use Planning Act, and which just also note in there that Planning and Zoning is specifically called out in that act. And this is why we are here tonight. This amendment does not change the map and it doesn't revise any of the text in the adopted plan. The purpose of this update is to add priorities and responsibilities to the adopted policies. This is needed for transparency, so the public can understand our priorities and to be efficient. We also said we do it, which is incorporated into the text of the plan. The text on the right here is straight out of Chapter One under the next steps and I have highlighted the relevant sections in red. We can't go through all the policies due to the number of them, but you have the complete information in your packets. On a high level