

Meridian Planning and Zoning Meeting

November 6, 2025.

Meeting of the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission of November 6, 2025, was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chairman Maria Lorcher.

Members Present: Commissioner Maria Lorcher, Commissioner Jared Smith, Commissioner Matthew Sandoval, Commissioner Jessica Perreault and Commissioner Sam Rust.

Members Absent: Commissioner Matthew Stoll and Commissioner Brian Garrett.

Others Present: Tina Lomeli, Kurt Starman, Bill Parsons, Sonya Allen, Nick Napoli and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

<input type="checkbox"/> Brian Garrett	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jessica Perreault
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Matthew Sandoval	<input type="checkbox"/> Matthew Stoll
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sam Rust	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jared Smith
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Maria Lorcher - Chairman	

Lorcher: All right. Good evening. Welcome to Planning and Zoning Commission meeting for November 6th, 2025. At this time I would like to call the meeting to order. The Commissioners who are present for this evening's meeting are here at City Hall and also on Zoom. We have staff from the city attorneys and the city clerk's office, as well as the city's planning department. If you are joining us on Zoom this evening we can see that you are here. You may observe the meeting, however, your ability to be seen on screen and talk will be muted. During the public testimony portion of the meeting you will be unmuted and, then, be able to comment. Please note we cannot take questions until the public testimony portion of the meeting. If you have any process questions during the meeting, please, e-mail cityclerk@meridiancity.org and they will reply as quickly as possible. If you simply want to watch the meeting we encourage you to watch this streaming on the city's YouTube channel. You can access it at meridiancity.org/live. With that let us begin with roll call. Madam Clerk.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Lorcher: The next item on the agenda is the adoption of the agenda. There are no changes to tonight's agenda, but please note that Item No. 3, Farrington Heights Subdivision has requested a continuance. So, if anybody is here tonight to testify on this application we will not be taking public testimony this evening. Could I get a motion to adopt tonight's agenda?

Rust: So moved.

Smith: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to adopt tonight's agenda. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

1. **Approve Minutes of the October 16, 2025 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting**
2. **Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for Ada County Sheriff's Office Training Center by Ada County Sheriff's Office/Training Center, located at 2568 E. Lenark St.**

Lorcher: Next item on the agenda is the Consent Agenda, which include to approve the minutes of the October 16th meeting. I didn't write down anything else. I think that was it. Is that correct? I just have the minutes, so --

Lomeli: Madam Chair, there is a findings of facts --

Lorcher: Oh. Facts and findings --

Lomeli: That's for the Ada County Sheriff's Office training --

Lorcher: Oh, the Ada County Sheriff's Training Office. Could I get a motion to accept the Consent Agenda as presented?

Smith: So moved.

Rust: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to approve the Consent Agenda. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

Lorcher: At this time I would like to briefly explain the public hearing process. We will open each item individually and begin with the staff report. Staff will report their findings and how the item adheres to our Comprehensive Plan and our Unified Development Code. After staff has made their presentation the applicant will come forward and present their case and respond to staff's comments. They will have 15 minutes to do so. After the applicant has finished we will open the floor to public testimony. Each person will be called only once during public testimony. The clerk will call names individually of those who have signed up on our website in advance to testify. You may

come to the microphones in Chambers or you will be unmuted on Zoom. Please state your name and address for the record and you will have three minutes to address the Commission. If you have previously sent pictures or a presentation for the meeting it will be displayed on screen and our clerk will help you run the presentation. If you have established that you are speaking on behalf of a larger group, like an HOA where others from that group will allow you to speak on their behalf, you will have up to ten minutes. After all those who have signed up in advance have spoken we will invite any others in Chambers who wish to testify. If you wish to speak on a topic you may come forward in Chambers or if on Zoom hit the raise hand button or if you are listening on the phone you may press star nine and wait for your name to be called. If you are listening on multiple devices, such as a computer and a phone, please -- please be sure to mute those extra devices so we don't experience feedback and we can hear you clearly. When you are finished, if the Commission does not have any questions for you, you will return to your seat in Chambers or be muted on Zoom and you will no longer have the ability to speak and, please, remember we will not call on you a second time. After testimony has been heard, the applicant will be given another ten minutes to come back and respond. When the applicant has finished responding to questions and concerns we will close the public hearing and the Commissioners will have an opportunity to discuss, hopefully make final decisions or recommendations to City Council as needed.

ACTION ITEMS

- 3. Public Hearing for Farrington Heights Subdivision RZ, PP, MDA (H-2025-0016) by Studio H Architects, generally located at the NW corner of E. Pine Ave. and N. Adkins Ave.**
 - A. Request: Rezone of 2.9 acres of land from the R-4 to the R-15 zoning district.**
 - B. Request: Preliminary Plat on 4.68 acres of land consisting of 25 building lots and 6 common lots.**
 - C. Request: Development Agreement Modification to terminate the existing development agreement and establish a new one.**

Lorcher: The first item -- or the next item on the agenda is Item 3, H-2025-0016 for Farrington Heights Subdivision -- has requested a continuance. Madam Clerk, do we have a date in mind for this continuance?

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. We have December 4th.

Lorcher: May I get a motion to continue Farrington Heights Subdivision?

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Thank you. I move we continue Item H-2025-0016 to the date of December 4th.

Rust: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to continue Farrington Heights Subdivision to December 4th. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

4. Public Hearing continued from September 18, 2025 for Cherry Blossom East Subdivision (H-2025-0030) by Breckon Land Design, located at 523 W. Cedarbug Dr. and the 0.67 acre property to the east, located in the NE 1/4 of Section 12, T.3N., R.1W.

- A. Request: Combined Preliminary and Final Plat consisting of three (3) building lots and one (1) common lot on 0.79 acres of land in the R-8 zoning district.

Lorcher: Item 4 on the agenda is H-2025-0030 is to continue the Cherry Blossom East Subdivision from the August 21st Planning and Zoning meeting for a combined preliminary and final plat. I would just like to say for the record I did not attend the meeting on August 24 -- 21st. Excuse me. I was not in Chambers. But I have reviewed the testimony and the notes and I feel confident I can guide this -- this presentation, as well as vote on it. With that we will begin with the staff report.

Allen: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. The Commission continued this project from the last two hearings in order for the applicant to obtain an assessment of the existing irrigation system to determine if it's adequate to serve the proposed development in addition to the existing Cherry Blossom Place Subdivision and to meet with the neighbors to work out outstanding issues, including obtaining an easement to extend water service to the property. I will just let the applicant give an update on that to you. Written testimony has been received since the last hearing from Margie Williams, Shawn Freeman and Kimberly Laukala and it is included in the public record. At the applicant's request staff is recommending Condition No. 11 is modified to read the developer shall pave the existing driveway via Northwest 4th Street on the adjacent property to the east at 1303 Northwest 4th Street with a surface capable of supporting fire vehicles and equipment. That red-lined version of that condition is included in your hearing outline tonight as stated. Staff will stand for any questions.

Lorcher: Would the applicant like to come forward? Good evening.

Breckon: Good evening, Madam Commission -- Commissioners. Jon Breckon. 6661 North Glenwood Street, Garden City.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Breckon: And I have got a few -- a bit of a presentation here. Just kind of reiterate where we left off and so forth. So, there is -- there is three building lots and two common lots on .79 acres and zoned R-8 and, then, just kind of summary of the -- some of the follow-up items where we had left off last time. There was some question about the easement for water main extension on the previous plan and it was determined that that existing access easement did not cover utility extensions or was not a utility easement per se and so we worked with staff and the fire department and figured out we could -- instead of extending out water main onto the property and having services off of it for the three lots, that we would extend water services to the lots and, then, sprinkle the furthest lot, so that we don't need a water main basically. Here is a -- here is a graphic that kind of shows that. Shows a fire -- fire service line to that lot -- to the furthest one to the west and where those service lines would come in and, then, one of the items was a request for a qualified consultant to review the plans of the existing irrigation system and, you know, particularly the pump station and that whole delivery for pressurized irrigation. So, we -- we had Precision Pump -- Precision Pump did the installation on that pump and has been maintaining it. Steve went out and checked it out and said that it is providing the 80 gallons per minute, a hundred psi as was designed and, then, additionally, we went back and looked at all the old calculations and tried to figure out what the issue was, because there is some -- something was not working right and running the pump dry and so forth. Went and looked at -- analyzed the water rights again and just went through all of the data from -- that we had from Cherry -- from the Cherry Blossom Subdivision. These three lots were originally supposed to be part of that, because -- but because of the access they were removed from the final -- final plat. Anyway, we found out that -- or just verified that there is -- there is plenty of water available, it's just not getting where it's supposed to be to the pump and so, you know, as part of this project is -- he is adding these three lots. We need to pipe -- there is another -- another ditch that goes north. We need to pipe that ditch around and I need to fix this issue, so that they don't have issues with the pump and so that's -- we have got that figured out. We are going to add some boxes there and so that we get the water that we are supposed to out of the ditch and so that that wet well doesn't run dry. As part of that also we will put a -- we will add a float valve to the wet well, so that just in case the water does go low that pump will automatically shut off and alert someone to, you know, go check it out. Other item was -- well, since we were here last we had two neighborhood meetings and just trying to iron out these items and see if we could figure things out with the neighbors. You know, Cherry Blossom Subdivision has had a lot of issues with the water supply and so irrigation maintenance as an HOA and so they would -- they would prefer to have that HOA signed over to them, instead of the developer being in charge of it, which I can understand, because, then, they can, you know, manage their own pump station and hire whatever landscaper they want for maintenance and that sort of thing and so one of the things that we have -- we have is we have got a letter from the developer that says he will sign that over as soon as we can get this project approved and -- and -- anyway. So, that was -- I thought that was a positive item. The -- the age, the -- the -- the other thing to note was, you know, as part of this whole pump station thing, which I can understand, they are very -- very very frustrated about it. They wanted to -- this new -- the Cherry Blossom East to have their own pump station and I guess it would be one way to do it, but, then,

you would have two pump stations right next to each other and so forth. After verifying all the water rights and seeing what's going on there with that pump station it just seems very inefficient. I mean the thing was -- that pump station is designed to provide plenty of water for these -- for the subdivision that's there, as well as these three lots. I mean that's how it was originally designed. So, we are -- we would like to -- you know, as part of this, you know, the pump station will get signed over to the HOA. They will manage it. They will maintain it. And, then, they will just bill these three folks for their portion of maintenance of the pump. That's what we are proposing there. One of the things that came up at the last hearing was -- there are some questions about access -- emergency access, how is this going to function and so forth. Yeah. That's it. Okay. And so, you know, what we are proposing is this hammerhead turn around meets all city requirements. Worked with fire department in particular to make sure we had -- we were okay there with -- with the widths and that functionality. And so -- because we have got a -- we have got a power pole that needs -- it's kind of sticking out and it's just very -- it's right on the edge there and so he was -- he was gracious enough to allow us to where you see the dimensional -- how that kind of works out. There is a little bit of a jog around that power pole.

Lorcher: Based on this picture that you had right there --

Breckon: Yes.

Lorcher: -- go back to the -- I don't know if you can use the arrows to go back. Five feet. Two, three and five. Where is the power pole exactly?

Breckon: Yeah. So, on -- see if I can point it out here. There is a power pole right --

Lorcher: Oh, I see it. Okay.

Breckon: -- at this point.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Breckon: You can see a little bit of a jog here. This is a roll -- rolled curb is what we are -- would like to do there. And, then, the rest of it would be -- would be asphalt.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you.

Breckon: Okay. And, then, the other thing that we were supposed to check on was the access. So, fire and garbage truck access, what that looks like. So, we put together a little graphic here that shows -- this is existing conditions essentially that -- you know, the undeveloped area and, then, the neighbors have a driveway and so, you know, there is really not a real good way to turn around, other than driving around on that lot and somehow turning around there and, then, you can see by putting this in we get a nice all weather hammerhead turnaround with proper widths that will allow any of those large vehicles to come in, access, pick up the trash, access for fire and so forth. Okay.

And, then, we had our first neighborhood meeting September 10th. Some of the specific requests were to convert to two buildable lots and to build a park on the -- on the west side. The developer would like to maintain the three lots if at all possible like we were presenting it. Other item was that neighbors didn't want the new lots to be part of Cherry Blossom Place HOA or to have access to Cherry Blossom Place amenities and don't want to be responsible for maintenance of the proposed common drive, which I understand. And so, you know, we explained that this is a whole new subdivision. They will not be part of the HOA. They won't have access to their amenities and -- and they don't need to worry about maintenance -- maintenance of the driveway. That will be on these three -- these three lots. Some other items were -- I think I mentioned that already, but they would like the HOA turned over to the neighborhood as soon as possible, so they can address their landscape issues and, yeah, like I said, the developers agreed, turn -- turn it over to the HOA soon as we can get the project approved and we have a letter stating as much. Neighbors asked about existing trees, power pole, guy wire that could block vehicle access to the pump station. So, where the existing pump station is there is power coming to it via overhead on a power pole and there is a guy wire that kind of stretches across and so we checked on that, talked to Idaho Power, and we -- Idaho Power -- we are going to have Idaho Power move that pole and fix the guy wire so they have good access to the pump so it's not an issue. Also there was a question about some existing trees on the site. The city arborist will go verify that all these tree -- the existing trees on site do not require mitigation. They are just considered weed trees and so those will be removed. There was a request for a new cedar fence on the north property line of the proposed project and the developer is glad to split the cost of that to put a new fence in. Okay. Here is the gravity -- I think that's -- that's -- I'm probably getting close to my ten minutes. I can go into further details and stand for questions. I have got a graphic here that shows detail of the pump station area and those connections, as well as some setbacks and those sorts of things. So, if we need to get any specifics there should be able to answer any of those questions. This is -- oh, this was the other -- that we -- so, we had another neighborhood meeting on October 8th. Probably better mention that. And what came out of that was they would like -- they want -- the neighbors would like to have written confirmation that the Cherry Blossom Place HOA would be turned over to them and -- at the time that this is approved and so this is the letter that the developer signed. Other items on that second neighborhood meeting. The neighbors requested the narrative, submitted that the city be updated with changes since its initial submittal and that's -- yeah, that's not a problem, that -- city and staff has -- has addressed that to update. One of the things that's referring to is initially we had different lot numbers and realized during the course of the project that they need to be sequential for code and so we have changed those and there were lots that were being referenced in some of the comments and so we just want to make sure that nothing was confused there. Access easement. So, this one -- there is the access -- there is -- there is the access easement that gets us to these three lots on the -- on the east side and it references Lot 16, 17 and 19, because of when it was written and -- which is not accurate and should be updated and MSO, we -- we talked to city attorney and staff and figure out, you know, how do we go about doing that and I think we have got that worked out at this point. The agreement's still -- still valid. The access is needed to the irrigation pump power box to Cherry

Blossom Place for maintenance. So, that was one of the other things that maybe I will go back to this graphic here. There is a couple other things that kind of came up. Here is -- on this west side there is a transformer here. It's right on the property line and so, you know, fencing will need to jog around that. The other -- there is a power switch box or meter box in the back corner that provides power to the -- to the pump station, which is right here and so one of the concerns was with -- especially with the -- issues with the pump to be able to go and shut off that pump if it runs dry. Neighbors wanted to have access through this driveway, so they get down here to that shut off and we asked staff about it. Staff didn't really support it. And so we left that off after we figured out that we will have -- that we are going to fix the pump and make sure that that works and so they shouldn't need to be running over there all the time to -- to shut it off. And I guess we can -- we can address that a little bit more through questions.

Lorcher: Okay. Commissioners, do we have any questions for John at this moment?

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: I do have one question just regarding the HOA. So, there is the three plats on the north side. The two that are on the south side taking access from this drive, are they already part of the existing HOA subdivision -- Cherry Blossom Place or are they -- do they have -- would they be absorbed into this new HOA?

Breckon: Mr. Smith, that's a great question, because there -- there is really -- there is two things we have kind of been addressing here and that's the -- you know, the neighbors to the south of the drive, they are -- they were there before Cherry Blossom Place went in and -- and as well as their drive and access, which is right along that property line south side of the proposed driveway and -- and so -- yeah. So, that -- that's -- no, to answer your question directly. They are not part of Cherry Blossom Place and they will not be part of this subdivision. They are just totally separate.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: And, then, just to follow up on that, so the -- my understanding is -- so, I guess a yes or no, is this correct. That would mean these three homeowners and not the neighbors would be responsible for the maintenance of this common drive and the neighbors would not be responsible under the agreement?

Breckon: Correct. Commissioner Smith, they would not be responsible for maintenance of this proposed -- any of these proposed improvements, because they -- all their improvements are already in. They are on their own property. All the proposed improvements we are making are on -- are north of the property line. We would just be

abutting driveways essentially and there would be some inherent benefit to that for access, but, yeah, maintenance and all that would not be on them.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much.

Breckon: Thank you.

Lorcher: Madam Clerk, do we have anybody signed up to testify for Cherry Blossom?

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. The first person that signed up is Gloria Swihart. She has indicated she is -- okay.

Lorcher: Okay.

Lomeli: Karen Blanton, would you like to? Okay. Working my way down the list. Jack Harp.

Lorcher: No? You are good. No? Okay.

Lomeli: Kimberly Laukala.

Lorcher: Good evening. Thank you for being here. If you can state your name and address for the record it would be appreciated.

Laukala: Yes. It's Kimberly Laukala. My address is 1435 North Parkshire Way. I'm commenting because I don't feel that the pump survey that was done was adequate to what we were concerned about. They came out and certified that the pump was built to spec. We already knew that. The issues we are having is that there is not enough water. There is no water pressure. There is sporadic times when places just won't water, because there is too many people doing it at the same time and they didn't do testing until after the canals were dry, so there was no way that they could run a full test of our system. So, we are still concerned that it is not adequate, that it will not support three more houses, because it doesn't currently support what we have. The other issue we have is no winterization has been done to the pump this year. Period. And the last scheduled winterization done to the pump, which would be maintenance, which is our concern, was in February of 2022. So, our pump has not been maintained. So, there is another issue. Who is going to maintain it? Who is going to pay to bring it back up to where it's supposed to be? Because we don't feel that the homeowner should have to pay for that, because we have not been in charge and my third point is we feel we are being held hostage. The developer has said he will turn over the HOA when the new property is approved. That could take seven years. Ten years. May never be approved. What happens then? Do we end up with no HOA representation until that point? If it's -- if he means to turn it over to us, the homeowners, then, do a good faith and do it now, instead of waiting and holding us hostage. It's just -- it doesn't seem right, so -- and -- oh. My last thing before my time is up. The October 16th letter that was written by the developer, it says that it was submitted to the HOA president, who is

the developer as the declarant. So, it was really submitted to himself. I don't know how that's even legal that you can do that, you know, play both sides. So, those are my concerns.

Lorcher: Okay. Quick question.

Laukala: Uh-huh.

Lorcher: You said that your pump hasn't been winterized since 2022.

Laukala: Correct.

Lorcher: And so who do you feel is in charge of doing that?

Laukala: That would be the developer, because he is the one that's been in charge of the pump.

Lorcher: This entire time.

Laukala: This entire time.

Lorcher: Okay. And I believe the October 16th letter, regardless of who it was sent to, was -- was -- the purpose was to have it on record for this meeting.

Laukala: I think so.

Lorcher: So, if he wrote it to himself because he is the president and the developer, it -- it really doesn't matter. It's a matter of public record; correct?

Laukala: Correct.

Lorcher: Okay. And, then, has your community, including back to 2022 addressed these water pressure issues with your HOA developer?

Laukala: We have been complaining and addressing it with him since we moved in in 2023 and there has been nothing. The only time --

Lorcher: No communication?

Laukala: No. No communication. And we had -- in August '23 we were turned over to a management company and so we have addressed it with them and they are trying their best, but they can't do anything, because it all goes back to the developer and nothing's happening. The only time I saw movement was when we started having these meetings and I brought up the issues.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much.

Laukala: Uh-huh. Thank you.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, the next person is Bob Flaten.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you.

Lomeli: And, then, the last person that signed up is Todd Hanson.

Lorcher: And before we go further, Bob, you know Farrington Heights we are not taking public testimony this evening; right?

Hanson: Yes, ma'am.

Lorcher: Okay. Just want to make sure you weren't -- I mean please enjoy the meeting. So, thank you for being here. All right. And if you can state your name and address for the record.

Hanson: My name is Todd Hanson. My address is 1247 Northwest 4th Street. I own the driveway -- the easement on the south side of the Cherry Blossom Subdivision, which is being proposed. At this point we have no interest in granting the applicant an easement to the property, knowing that we have an existing fire access road that is abutting my driveway to the -- which would be the north of that driveway. Last -- or last meeting my driveway was so far to a 12 foot -- or 11 foot driveway and I have a 30 foot easement to the -- to the south, which for whatever reason became kind of a comical thing. So, I do believe that having a 30 foot easement, as well as my -- my driveway there is -- there should be a barrier between the subdivision and myself, as well as having -- abstaining -- keeping my fire access or you know -- right now I was told I would lose the fire access. I would lose my trash pickup. My access, basically, to my subpar driveway, which was established 25 years ago. Can't find record of what those codes were 25 years ago. Why my -- why -- well, you know, it was approved. I have been living there this long. So, to have someone to come in and say I'm lose -- I'm going to lose this, we are going to -- we are going to have to give -- give into this subdivision is -- it's not right in my eyes. We stand -- we -- we haven't established everything as it is and I think it should stand as it is. Now, I heard tonight that possibly we would be had -- we would have access to the new -- or the new --

Lorcher: Okay. Three houses. Yes.

Hanson: That -- that has never been told to us that we would -- we would have that. I talked to Breckon about combining the driveway. He said I would have to get an easement from the applicant. Therefore, I'm not doing that. The other issue is the power poles. There are two power poles. One at 4th Street and one halfway up my driveway sitting 19 feet in -- or 19 feet in that 20 foot easement and now I see that it's pulled back to 18 feet. So, between the fire department and you folks and, you know, we have got -- I think you have more of an issue than just okaying this subdivision with

the HOAs and the pump issues. Last meeting with all HOAs and pump. I appreciate you.

Lorcher: Before you take off. So, in regard to the driveway easement, is it your choice, then, to have a fence divide your driveway -- drive aisle portion to the other side?

Hanson: That or the five foot barrier. It was -- it has been drawn with the five foot landscape berm --

Lorcher: Uh-huh.

Hanson: -- and/or -- and, then, it was changed to -- to a fence -- an open iron fence and I think that that fence needs to go the full length of Doug's property or the applicant's property to my pin at 4th Street if there is a fence to be built.

Lorcher: Do you have --

Hanson: And -- but the -- at the same point I don't -- I'm not -- the city or someone is going to be responsible if my 30 foot easement needs to turn into a 20 foot fire easement at that point. I mean -- because that's where it was addressed that I have 30 feet. I have room to go the south to build a new driveway, therefore, I don't think my house is sitting in the right spot. But, again, that's -- that's on -- it's on the city and the developer to correct these issues.

Lorcher: Are you in the City of Meridian or Ada county?

Hanson: I'm in -- I'm --

Lorcher: City of Meridian?

Hanson: -- 4th Street. Yeah. City of Meridian.

Lorcher: Well, there is parcels all over the city that belong -- that are islands in Ada county.

Hanson: I could be -- yeah.

Lorcher: We are the City of Meridian and, then, is it your preference to have a fence?

Hanson: My preference is to have a berm, but --

Lorcher: Berm.

Hanson: -- at the same point --

Lorcher: Okay.

Hanson: -- there are -- there are some other issues there.

Lorcher: Okay.

Hanson: Because I do have trailers. I have used -- I have used that fire access road to pull in and out, bigger -- you know, my -- my -- my camp trailer.

Lorcher: Right.

Hanson: But yet at the same point I can stay on my 11 feet driveway.

Lorcher: Okay. All right. Thank you very much.

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: I have a question for Mr. Hanson.

Lorcher: Don, can you come back, please?

Perreault: Good evening.

Hanson: Who is speaking?

Perreault: So, I have read through all the testimony and I'm just not a hundred percent clear on what the downside would be to share -- from your perspective to share a common drive to the north.

Hanson: I think -- I think the main thing is -- I have got a 25 year old concrete driveway. You know. And I have talked to -- you know, it's not just that and it's not that I'm totally against -- against it. I think -- I think from the beginning when this process started with the land developer we were going to lose our -- our -- our fire -- our access to that -- not just the fire, but this -- the garbage pickup. You know, that was written out that if we don't grant them easement that we would -- we would have to -- we would be on our own -- we would be on our own island. We would have to get our private access. We would have to get our own trash pickup. Fire -- fire access -- I think if -- you know, the City of Meridian could get a fire hose to my house and I don't care about pulling the trash cans out either. But the lot -- the biggest thing is the expense where you are going to be part of the HOAs of the new subdivision or are you going to -- or you are going to maintain your own driveway and try to police who is going to drive in and out and -- and maintain that when a concrete truck or an excavator -- now especially when -- when they are going to build a new road in, who is going to repair my driveway during this construction time and how am I going to keep them off of it by not -- not giving them an easement? So, you know, there is -- there is all kinds of variable things that we have -- we have talked about. Obviously it would be great if it was the same. I could roll my

trailer in and out of that nice fire turnaround and drive it into my yard. I would -- that would be fine, too. But it's -- I think it's more the -- more my -- my personal property rights to have somebody come in and say, hey, you know, give me this and now -- or if you don't you are going to lose all this or all the -- you know, all the things that the city has provided me over the 25 years. I mean that's kind of -- kind of the -- where I stand and even now it's like, okay, you got 18 feet to pull your -- to build a new road without moving the power poles. To me that is -- that's a code violation there without act -- you know, with where my driveway sits and, really, the -- where my driveway sits the concrete line, I do have more than the 11 foot there to the north. So anyway --

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you. Madam Clerk.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, no one else has signed up.

Lorcher: Is there anybody in Chambers that would like to speak? I looked at this gal first and, then, the one in the middle.

Williams: Good evening. So, my name is Marjorie Williams. I live at 1251 Northwest 4th Street. Just to add on to a couple of things Todd spoke about, why do we care if the driveways are combined? I had an appraisal done by a realtor and it would decrease the property value of our house by at least ten percent. People don't like sharing driveway -- buying houses on driveways I guess with six houses. So, approximately a million dollar home, that's at least a hundred thousand dollars. So, that's why this is worthwhile to me. Also -- okay. Let's see here. So -- and the issue I -- and, then, one of the major issues is the geometry of the turn off 4th Street onto the 20 foot common driveway of the new development. Fire trucks can't make that turn. They need at least 24 feet, possibly more when you look at the auto turn format that they put out there. Garbage trucks need more than that, too. So, yeah, when you apply the standard auditor and fire truck template, the rear -- rear wheels and overhang of a ladder truck cannot stay inside the 20 foot easement. Power poles at the corner restricting the turning radius and the city's own staff report states that the open vision fence has been removed to allow more room for emergency vehicle maneuverability on the abutting southern properties. That means the city is assigning a public safety function to land the applicant doesn't own and for which has no cross-access, easement. This fails to demonstrate compliance with Idaho Fire Code 503.2.4, turning radius must be provided within the property served and UDC 11-6C-3-E4, which requires emergency access to be located within the development or a recorded easement. Approving a layout that depends on neighboring private property conflicts with Idaho Code 67-6511 and amounts to a taking under Article 1 and 14 of the Idaho Constitution and the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. The staff report also says the Cherry Blossom East access easement is separate from the southern easement, yet the design functions as one continuous corridor. Same pavement, same alignment and the same turning path. If the easements are truly separate the fire access isn't met. If they are combined our property has been incorporated into a new plat without consent. Either way the findings before you violate UDC 11-6C-3-E4 and Idaho Code 67-6511, because they rely on an access arrangement that is neither legally granted, nor consistent with

the record. And, then, finally, the development continues to own the pump house parcel that supplies with irrigation for both subdivisions, while claiming there are two independent HOAs conflicts with UDC 11-3A-5A and Idaho Code 55-3206(2)(4) which -- okay. To close I would ask the developer to address the code violations detailed in the written comments I submitted.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Williams: Thank you. Any questions?

Lorcher: Nope.

Williams: Okay.

Lorcher: Thank you. Ma'am, if you would come up. Oh, you are good. Good evening.

Reese: Good evening. I'm Janet Reese and I live at 1384 North Parkshire Way. I have a few comments regarding the October 29th project manager memo and this project manager submitted the application. He claimed that a separate Cherry Blossom East HOA will be created. That HOA, the east one, will be comprised of three homes. In Idaho generally HOAs must have more than 20 lots or units to register with the Idaho Secretary of State. So, these proposed three new homes will be dubious -- dubiously referred to as another HOA? The memo further states an agreement between the two HOAs will be created for the new homes use of the existing irrigation pump currently serving the 47 Cherry Blossom Place HOA homes. That's also dubious considering there are no existing legal HOA documents which would facilitate any such agreement. The developer controls the existing HOA, as Kimberly pointed out, and will control the other three homes as well. I'm going to amplify on the current condition and capacity of the existing pump. A system that exhibited pressure problems this summer. It's questionable whether the system efficiently supports the 47 homes on it now. An assessment of the pump station was supposed to be done before this meeting by a professional engineer qualified to certify in writing the condition and capacity of the pump station. But this wasn't done. Instead a Precision Pumping systems service engineer came out and took a look. He could not confirm or certify in writing how many properties the output performance would accommodate according to his October 10th memo that's posted. The additional homes in another HOA should have its own separate pump. This project should not progress until the issues regarding the capacity and condition of the existing pump system is resolved. Additionally, legal documents that certify the new homes will be in a separate HOA should be required before this project is approved. Thank you.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: I do have a question.

Lorcher: Ms. Reese, can you come back?

Smith: So, I just want to clarify what your preference is. So, you identify that you are opposed -- and correct me if I'm misunderstanding -- it seems you are opposed to these three homes being in their own HOA. Would you prefer that they join the existing HOA or is there some other --

Reese: Absolutely not.

Smith: Is there some other --

Reese: Well, first of all the issue is the pump. Is it going to -- is it going to work for three more houses? And the other issue is we don't -- we don't want them on the HOA. They -- they are not our locale and, really, the HOA should be turned over right now before anything else goes on so homeowners have a say in this matter.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: So, is there another configuration I guess -- and not to dig into legal weeds or anything like that. I'm just trying to understand to make sure -- is there a different configuration that you would prefer if not -- a new HOA, not the existing HOA? Is there some other preference that you have?

Reese: Well, if they are going to call three homes Cherry Blossom Place East, they ought to have their own pump system. Why would they annex the one we are using and we don't even know if it's efficiently serving the 47 homes on it. It has problems now and we have no say.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: So, if they have their own pump station -- or if you were confident that the property could be adequately served is -- your issue is not with that -- they would be their own HOA, it's specifically with the pumping.

Reese: We don't -- we don't want another group of homes using the pump that is not certified as far as how many homes it can serve. I really -- it really needs to be checked out by an outside professional that can give an objective view point on -- is this going to work or not.

Smith: Okay.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Reese: Thank you.

Lorcher: Anybody else in Chambers that would like to speak? I looked at this gentleman in the hat first and, then, sir.

J.Williams: Good evening, everybody.

Lorcher: Hi.

J.Williams: Justin Williams. 1251 Northwest 4th Street. Mine's super easy and small. I don't think there is adequate parking for the three houses that are going in. So, if those three houses have anybody come over or they have a child in house and they have more than two cars there is no parking. So, everybody's going to be parking to the south on our property. So, the third house is almost not possible to drive into the driveway without backing onto our property. So, if I happen to put a trailer there or a fence there, it's almost impossible for somebody to back out, because it's less than 20 feet. So, nobody addresses that. Also back to Todd's point. The problem is is that our driveway is crumbling. They are not offering to rebuild it. They are not offering to share an easement. They are not offering to buy our property. They are just expecting that it's going to be okay for people to drive up and down the property. As soon as those houses are built and they have a small party at one house, it will not be legal for any police officer or fire department or fat or trash to be able to drive down the driveway, because right now you can barely drive two cars down as it is. So, if any party parks on the curb -- this should be redone and there should be more parking. I believe there should be more parking -- they should have to have more parking. There is no street parking.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much.

J.Williams: Thank you.

Lorcher: Sir.

D.Laukala: I'm Daniel Laukala. 1435 Parkshire Way. I just want to touch on the pump. The pump, they -- Steven looked at it as an engineer sitting at his desk. Ran the numbers. The pump is adequate. The pump should be able to run a golf course. Our problem is Doug Jayo as the declarant of our subdivision has abandoned us. He has abandoned maintaining that pump. He has abandoned making sure that it's up kept. That's our biggest investment in our neighborhood. That's our only asset. If we have got a low ditch -- and I have talked to Precision Pumping. I have talked to one of their service guys that came out. Number one, '22 was the last winterization. February of '22. So, after winter. They have came out and replaced motherboards on it every year. They have came out, replaced valves, but it's never been serviced. When they do a winterization they check the valves, they unhook the bolt on the bottom, let the water

drain out. Right now we had to shut the pump off ourselves. We had to walk to the breaker box, flip it off, because the owner next to that pump could hear it screaming dry when the irrigation ditch dried out. Why do we have to do that? If it was serviced and they did an assessment like they were supposed to they would have seen that the float wasn't working. There is another valve that must not be working, because there are two fail safes to shut that pump off when the water is dry. So, what is the health of our pump? Why didn't they run a wet assessment? They waited until the ditches were dry. Sonya sent a letter to them saying, hey, the ditches are going to dry out this next Wednesday next week, you need to go out and do an assessment. An assessment isn't done at a desk. That pump will do it if it's maintained and right now I have pictures the pump is still energized. It is still set to auto. All somebody has to do is walk over to that breaker box and flip the breaker box and the pump will burn up again. I asked Rob that turned it off -- and I said, no, you did the right thing, because I got my butt chewed by the HOA for touching it. So, Rob did the right thing. If your car is on fire do you want me to call the fire department or do you want me to use a fire extinguisher to put it out while the fire department is coming? Precision Pumping said, no, you did the right thing, turn it off, de-energize it. It hasn't been winterized. There is still two inches of mud in the ditch. I have got pictures of vegetation in the pipes. I'm just very unhappy.

Lorcher: Thank you very much.

D.Laukala: Questions?

Lorcher: No. I think we are good. Is there anybody else in Chambers that would like to speak? Madam Clerk, do we have anybody online?

Lomeli: Madam Chair, no.

Lorcher: Would the applicant like to come forward and address some of the concerns of the neighbors?

Breckon: Jon Breckon. 6661 North Glenwood Street.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Breckon: I'm not sure where to start. I can't speak to the winterization as I have not been involved in that -- that piece of it or the maintenance thus far. The -- regarding the letter to the HOA -- that turns over the HOA, that letter was sent to Tammy Riddle, who is the -- the president of the HOA. She is part of the property management group and so that was to be dispersed from her. I clarify that item. As far as, you know, turning over the HOA I think everybody would like to turn it over. I will speak to that. One of the reasons for not turning it over is that part of Lot 2 is still part of Cherry Blossom and that's owned by the developer and so as part of this plat that lot will be combined and make Lot 2 and allow us to do these lots.

Lorcher: Quick question. In regard to the lots that are in the vicinity of this Cherry Blossom Subdivision, historically developers turn over once a hundred percent of lots are developed. After this east project are there any other undeveloped lots within this -- or this vicinity that that developer owns that would prohibit him from extending the HOA to the community?

Breckon: Madam Chair, no. There is -- yeah. And I think that's why, you know, he said in the letter that he would be willing to sign it over as soon as we get this approved. That's kind of the first time that it really makes sense is, then, that -- that lot can go -- can be combined and complete this other subdivision.

Lorcher: Okay.

Breckon: I understand the frustrations about the pump. Was obviously spoken to. I guess I would fall back to what I was saying before in that we did do a full assessment of it. Precision Pump went out there while the water was still on and when they did their inspection. As engineers we look at the numbers. That's how we did our assessment of the water rights and so forth. Check the calculations and it just all checks out.

Lorcher: I don't think the community is objecting that the size of the pump or not ability to be able to do it, as the neglect of the developer -- or the homeowners association to maintain it. So, is the developer willing -- the new develop -- developer willing with these three new parcels to put in a separate pump for these three parcels or are they going to be able to fix the one that they have so that the community has the water that they need?

Breckon: What we are -- Madam Chair, what we are proposing is to fix the one that we have, because we are only at -- you know, there is 47 lots. We are only adding three more to it. The pump is well capable of servicing those three lots and so, you know, we need to -- we need to do some additional piping there. We need to -- we need to make some improvements to make sure the water is getting into the wet well. I mean that's what we determined out of our assessment is that water is just not getting into the -- to where it needs to for the pump. That's why it's running dry. And so we need to make those upgrades. That's in the plans that we submitted to staff. Yeah. It just needs to be fixed and so that's what we are proposing is to fix those things, so this thing runs like a Swiss watch --

Lorcher: Right.

Breckon: -- I mean which -- which it should.

Lorcher: One gentleman mentioned some parking.

Breckon: Yes. The parking -- I mean these are single family homes. They have got two car garages, as well as a 20 foot driveway. That's -- that's what we are relying on for -- for parking. The -- one thing I would like to speak to is -- is the barrier between the

properties. We -- you know, maybe I should go back when we initially presented the project to the first neighborhood meeting we brought two concepts. They were both drawn up per city code, which stated that there should be a five foot buffer and/or a fence to separate and that's what we showed. We also presented an option to work through a cross-access agreement so that -- and rebuild their side of the driveway, so that everybody could share this new driveway and everybody would have access down and through the whole thing. What came out of that is the neighbors did not want the barrier between and I think that was worked through with staff and that requirement by the -- for the five foot buffer was removed and -- and that's how we came to where we are today. So, there is some misunderstanding there. We are not asking for an easement -- additional easement for the neighbors. We are not asking for them to share the drive. You know, it's separate. I guess, you know, if they want a fence we are okay with that as well. That's what we had back in previous concepts. So, we feel confident we can make that work if that's the preference. I think that answers that area there. There was a question about turning radii and access. I'm quite familiar with the IFC, International Fire Code, and those turning radii. Inside turning radius for a fire truck is 28 feet as a minimum and I guess I just disagree, I mean we have run this by the fire department and staff and we have looked at it ourselves. We have got a program that does these training radii. I think we are good. So, I would be glad to look up any additional code and see where -- if we are missing something there, but to the best of my knowledge we are in compliance.

Lorcher: Okay. Commissioners, do we have any questions for the applicant?

Rust: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Rust.

Rust: Thank you. I would just like to clarify what you are saying to make sure that I understand it properly. You are saying the HOA was not turned over because currently the lot that the pump house sits on is incorporated into -- into Lot 2 and so to get this plat approved allows you to split off that lot and, then, give that to the HOA. So, that's why the developer has not turned over to the HOA yet. Is that -- am I understanding that correctly?

Breckon: Madam Chair, Commissioner Rust, yes. That is correct.

Rust: Okay. Excellent.

Breckon: It's kind of a -- not typical situation.

Rust: Okay. Thank you.

Breckon: Yes. And that's why we wrote the letter to show that -- glad to do that.

Lorcher: Okay. I think that's it. Thank you very much.

Breckon: Thank you.

Lorcher: Can I get a motion to close the public hearing?

Smith: So moved.

Rust: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing for Cherry Blossom East. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Lorcher: I struggle with this on a couple different levels. I am not an HOA expert. I lived in a Corey Barton subdivision. I was the 12th of 62 houses that was built. So, we were right in the middle. The HOA was not turned over to our community to a property management company until a hundred percent of the buildable lots were completed. I think that is usual and customary in communities. I don't know if there is a law or a code or a -- or whatever, but that's been my experience. So, the fact that that hasn't been turned over is not surprising. It is extremely disappointing that this particular development has not -- developer has not taken care of its community before it chooses to build something new. So, there definitely is some neglect there of being able to provide the water pressure needed for this community. But on the second hand it sounds like there is a commitment to not only fix the pump to improve it, as well as turn the HOA, so, then, the developer is no longer involved, but you can work with the property management company that's been hired or you, as a community, you can elect a president and take matters in your own hands so you are not listening to grinding gears or things of that nature. The developer has a right to develop undeveloped land and if it's been used as a convenience for this community it has been at the graciousness of the developer. It is not your land. It belongs to future development and because it's been used as fire truck turnaround or garbage truck turnaround has been more of a convenience than a rule. But with that said making sure that there is proper access and accessibility is also important. So, you know, it's like this weighing thing; right? We have got this open lot. Nobody wants to see it developed, maybe a park, but the developer doesn't make any money on a park, he makes money by selling homes and having three homes on .79 acres is not considered unreasonable. It's unreasonable that three houses have to be part of their own HOA because this community won't welcome these houses in there, but it all goes back to the pump; right? So, if the developer -- the developer needs to be faithful to the commitments that are made not only here tonight, but at City Council. The pump needs to be fixed. The roads need to be maintained. The HOA needs to be turned over and those houses to be welcomed into your community.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: I agree with you. I think by and large a lot of the issues that I heard raised tonight and that I have seen raised aren't necessarily about the development itself. It's about the fact that this community just plain doesn't trust the developer. I think there are certain standards with it. When you look at the actual development itself what is on paper, what the developer is legally going to be held to, I think the project is a good one. As our former chair and colleague Andy Seal would say in-fill is just hard and this is a really difficult piece of land and I think with all of that said this is -- this is a good project. Now, regarding the developer's long-term maintenance commitments to the community, I agree, I think that the community has -- maybe it sounds like been underserved by the developer and I think the best way to ameliorate that problem, in addition to requiring the pump station be serviced and fixed as part of this -- this existing development is to get this HOA in the hands of the community as soon as possible. I think that is by approving this project. So, that's where I stand. Yeah. It's a weird project. There are a lot of things that are not done how we are used to or not -- the configuration of the existing property given access it's not standard and that's kind of what you get with in-fill sometimes, but I think with what cards were being dealt and the developer's been dealt they have done a good job on this specific project.

Lorcher: Any other comments from Commission or a motion?

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: After hearing all applicant, staff and public testimony, I move to recommend approval of File No. H-2025-0030 to City Council with a modification of Condition 11 being modified to read that the developer shall pave the existing driveway via Northwest 4th Street on the adjacent property to the east at 1303 Northwest 4th Street with a service -- surface capable of supporting fire vehicles and equipment.

Rust: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to approve Cherry Blossom East. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

5. Public Hearing continued from October 2, 2025 for Apex Cadence (H-2024-0061) by Brighton Corporation, generally located south of E. Lake Hazel Rd. and west of S. Locust Grove Rd., including 6575 S. Locust Grove Rd.

- A. Request: Modification to the existing Development Agreement (Inst. #2020-178120) to replace it with a new agreement for the subject property and to include specific design requirements.

- B. Request: Annexation of 0.86 acres of land with an R-15 zoning district.
- C. Request: De-Annexation of 0.52 acres of land from the City to Ada County.
- D. Request: Rezone of 56.11 acres of land from the R-8 to the R-15 zoning district.
- E. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 228 single-family residential building lots, 41 common lots and 16 other lots on 51.50 acres of land in the proposed R-15 zoning district with private streets in the gated portion of the development.
- F. Request: Planned Unit Development with a request for deviations to certain street, side, and rear yard building setbacks and to allow more than 100 dwelling units in a gated community.

Lorcher: This will go in front of City Council, so those of you who have additional comments will be able to comment again. The next item on the agenda is H-2024-0061 for Apex Cadence Subdivision near Lake Hazel and Locust Grove -- Grove, for a modification to the development agreement, an annexation, a rezone, a preliminary plat and a planned unit development and we will start with the staff report.

Allen: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. You already went through the list of applications, so I won't go through that again. This site consists of 51.5 acres of land. It's zoned R-8 and located at 6575 South Locust Grove Road, south of East Lake Hazel Road, on the west side of South Locust Grove Road. I will go through a little history on this property. It was originally annexed with the development agreement as part of the larger south Meridian annexation in 2015 and assigned a placeholder zoning district of R-4. The development agreement requires a modification of the agreement prior to the -- to development of the mixed use community designated area to include a conceptual development plan that demonstrates consistency with the general guidelines for mixed use developments and specifically the mixed use community designation. The development agreement was amended in 2020 and the property was rezoned to R-8, but a development plan was not submitted at that time for this portion of the property. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation for the property is medium density residential, which is 40.5 acres of the site and that is the lighter area here -- yellow area right here and the brown area is designated mixed use community and that is 10.9 acres. The applicant is requesting a modification to the existing development agreement to include a conceptual development plan for the subject property as required. The new development agreement will pertain only to the subject property and not the larger Apex development. The proposed concept plan on the right there depicts a mix of single family residential detached and attached homes on the portion of the site proposed to be included in the preliminary plat and future collector streets and future land use map designations on the property to the north that

is outside the boundary of the plat. The medium density residential designation calls for a gross density of three to eight dwelling units per acre. The proposed density is 4.1 units per acre. In the MUC designation residential uses are expected to comprise between 20 percent and 50 percent of the development area at gross densities ranging from six to 15 units per acre. Approximately 50 percent of the overall MUC designated area is proposed to develop with residential uses at a gross density of six units per acre as desired in the Comprehensive Plan. The concept locations of the collector street on the property to the north of the proposed subdivision do not align with the master street map. Therefore, staff recommends the concept plan is revised prior to the Council hearing to include at least half of the north-south collector street on the subject property, rather than on the property to the west in alignment with South Apex Avenue on the north side of Lake Hazel and the east-west collector street should stub to Murgoitio property to the east in alignment with East Tower Street on the east side of Locust Grove and that -- this right here is the Murgoitio property that I was referring to. So, half of the collector street should run down here and, then, the east-west street should stub to the Murgoitio property and align with Tower on the east side here. Although the residential density is consistent with that desired in the Comprehensive Plan for the MUC designation, the proposed development is not consistent with other MUC design elements that pertain to integration of uses and vehicular interconnectivity between developments due to the orientation of their proposed development in relation to the future nonresidential uses to the north. Basically the backs of the residential homes are facing the future commercial area and the gated development, which restricts access and hinders integration of uses as desired in mixed use designated areas. The Commission and Council should determine if the proposed development plan should be modified to be more consistent with the general mixed use and MUC development guidelines in the Comprehensive Plan as required by the development agreement. A rezone of 56.11 acres of land from the R-8 to the R-15 zoning district is proposed for the area proposed to be platted, as well as for the future development area to the north and that is this little section that's outside of the subdivision area. Annexation of .86 of an acre of land with an R-15 zoning district for a strip of land located along the west boundary of the property adjacent to the Rawson Canal that was inadvertently left out of the original annexation boundary that is part of the subject parcel and de-annexation of a strip of land consisting of .52 of an acre from the city to Ada county located along the west boundary of the site on the north and south sides of Roberto Street is requested that was inadvertently included in the original annexation. This area was previously included in a record of survey to adjust the property line between the two properties and the abutting property to the west, the Bruno property, but was never recorded, so it's still part of the original parcels. Before a new property boundary adjustment record of survey can be approved and recorded between the properties to rectify the issue, the property needs to be in the county and zoned accordingly. A preliminary plat is proposed consisting of 228 single family residential building lots, 41 common lots and 16 other lots on 51.5 acres of land in the proposed R-15 district and is proposed to develop in five phases as shown on the phasing plan there in the middle. The overall gross density is 4.43 units per acre. Based on 51.5 acres of development area, a minimum of 15 percent or 7.73 acres of qualified open space is required to be provided. A total of 9.75 acres or 19 percent is proposed consisting of several open grassy areas

exceeding 5,000 square feet in area, linear open space, 50 percent of the street buffer along Locust Grove Road, an arterial street, and one hundred percent of the street buffer along Via Roberto Street, a collector street. A protective buffer dedicated for active access along the Rawson Canal and parkways along local residential streets as shown on the open space exhibit before you, which exceeds UDC standards. A minimum of ten site amenity points are required to be provided. Site amenities totaling 22 points are proposed consisting of a clubhouse greater than 5,000 square feet in size, paved sports courts, multi-use pathways and a pedestrian circulation system aligned with linear open space, which exceeds UDC standards. A planned unit development is proposed for a mostly gated residential development consisting of a mix of single family residential attached and detached homes, front loaded and alley loaded, with a variety of lot sizes, setbacks and home designs. Except for the 16 homes at the southwest corner of the development, which have public street access, the other 212 homes are within a gated community accessed via private streets, with alleys and common driveways off of the private streets. The gated portion of the development will be restricted to residents 55 years of age and older. The average residential lot size in the gated portion of the development is 4,665 square feet. The average residential lot size in the non-gated portion of the development is 7,233 square feet. The planned unit development includes requests for deviations from certain UDC standards as follows: The UDC restricts gated developments to no more than one hundred dwelling units. A greater number of units may be approved with a planned unit development. A total of 212 units are proposed and a reduction in the local street setback to living area from ten feet to five feet is proposed for alley loaded units and those are what they are referring to as the Carriage Lane and those are the orange lots right there. Several conceptual building elevations were submitted as shown for single story and two-story detached and attached single family homes. A variety of materials are proposed, including vertical and horizontal lap siding, board and batten siding, fenestration with stone and brick veneer accents in a variety of colors and design elements and features, with varying roof profiles and wall modulation that demonstrates the high quality of development proposed. The applicant is requesting the following approvals from City Council. Approval of a private street, i.e., East Bingley Lane. Connection to an arterial street, Locust Grove Road. The UDC prohibits private street connections to an arterial street, unless otherwise allowed by the decision making body as part of a concurrent hearing level application and approved by the transportation authority and approval to exceed the maximum block face standards in the UDC of one thousand feet with a pedestrian connection and that is for Block 1 and that -- that is the -- Block 1 is the pink lot right here along the edge of the Rawson Canal. Written testimony has been received from the applicant in response to the staff report, which is included in the public record and from Joann Tima, Holly Myers and Shawn Freeman, all are against the proposed rezone from R-8 to R-15 due to the increase in housing density and associated impacts and those letters are included in the public record if you want more information on those. Staff is recommending approval with the conditions in the staff report. Staff will stand for any questions.

Lorcher: Would the applicant like to come forward? Before you get started, Commissioner Perreault does need to leave, but we still have quorum, so you are still good to go.

McNutt: Okay. Thank you. All right. I'm Amanda McNutt, 2929 West Navigator Drive. This is Apex Cadence. Obviously, there is a lot of associated things going on with this one, but, essentially, it's a preliminary plat and PUD. I just want to kind of highlight some of the things that have happened at Pinnacle, kind of where we are at with this development as a whole. So, the amphitheater opened this summer. If you haven't had a chance to be out there it's pretty cool. Meridian library is open and active as well. This is essentially an extension of that development, but it will be serving primarily our 55 and older community, with the exception of those 16 lots. Again, it does include a mix of single family detached, attached and carriage lane or otherwise referred to as alley loaded homes and, then, there are 16 conventional single family homes. Those 16 homes are the non-age restricted homes. There is some future development to the north. That small area there is rezone only and, then, on the north end of that will come in with a future development completely. You know, Sonya already mentioned this, but no future land use map amendment is requested for this. We feel like we comply with the densities in the future land use map. We are asking for a rezone from R-8 to R-15. That's primarily due to just less complicated setback restrictions. Technically with a PUD we could just ask for a bunch of setback changes, but it's just a little bit less complicated to do it this way. A small portion of the lot was, as Sonya mentioned, included with an original annexation or should have been included with the original annexation that wasn't and, then, there was a small piece that was included that shouldn't have been. This particular piece, I do want to mention, there is multiple actions that need to take place and this comes down to a condition as written in the staff report that we don't fully agree with. Essentially, the first action is to de-annex from Meridian. The next action is that the county will rezone the parcel and that is something we have no control over and, then, finally, the owner or the rightful owner of that piece will, then, incorporate that sliver into their existing parcel, which we also don't have control over. So, while we understand that at some point this needs to be completed, we just have no control over when it gets done and so we will get that -- we will get to the condition later on, but I just kind of wanted to bring that up. This is a graphic just showing the only setback that we are asking for a change on is the local five foot front setback. Again, if we were to stay R-8 there would just be a lot of other asks for those. It's just a little cleaner to do it this way. I think our amenity points -- Sonya said 24 and I believe that is because our multi-use pathway -- she wasn't counting it, but we realized we needed a ten foot pathway and, then, a ten foot strip between the open ditch to have that counted, which we are able to do, it's just we need to update our plan to actually show that that's going to be done that way. So, we plan to update that prior to City Council, but we looked at it and we know that can fit and we know that that can work. So, we should have 28 points at the end of the day. Just an example of some of the amenities that we plan here. It's very very similar to our other Cadence communities, which have been active for several years now, but we will have a bocce ball court, a pickle ball court and, then, obviously, the clubhouse and pool. These do have an indoor pool for those residents. And, then, we will have three gated accesses. That's more

access points than we have done traditionally in our other Cadence communities, but we felt like this did need some more accesses due to the number of lots that will be in here, which is 212. Again, we will be asking for a variance on this one to allow a private street off of the arterial we have somewhere between 190 and 200 feet of stacking there. So, we feel like we have more than adequate stacking off of Locust Grove. There is also a turnaround there. ACHD has approved that layout and didn't seem to have any concerns or they had no comment on it. The other --

Lorcher: Before you go forward -- so, you are saying that the private access street has been approved by ACHD?

McNutt: Yeah. They have already reviewed it and they didn't have any comment on it.

Lorcher: Okay.

McNutt: It's private, so they don't approve private streets, but they had no issue with that connection to Locust Grove.

Lorcher: Okay. Go ahead.

McNutt: And, then, we will ask for a block length waiver as well. It's mostly due to the Rawson Canal being just the shape that it is and it's kind of awkward on that side of the lot. We will do some traffic calming through there, although the traffic in this particular development is probably not going to be very much. But we will still have some traffic calming measures in there as highlighted in blue. Again, this is a little bit more updated than what Sonya showed, just because after we were looking at it we realized, oh, yeah, we needed to make a couple of changes to these. So, we will have a ten foot pathway that is a multi-use pathway on the west side of the development with connections through to the main development. We will have a ten foot sidewalk along Via Roberto and along South Locust Grove and, then, we will have a multitude of micro paths throughout the development, as well as detached sidewalks which are everywhere else that's not highlighted. Again we will have some conventional homes. These are shown in blue on the west side. These are, you know, traditional detached like you would normally think of as a regular home. These are some of our paired Cadence. It's a little hard to see, but you -- you can tell that they are actually a paired product. We do try to do a variety of colors and different finishes and stuff, so when you are driving past them they don't necessarily look paired and here are Carriage Lane product or otherwise known as an alley loaded lot. These are the ones that are shown in orange there. These are very very popular product and something that we have done a lot of in our Cadence communities. Just talking briefly about some agency comments that were received. West Ada School District stated that about 112 students would be added to the district with this development, but I don't know that they understood that this is primarily a 55 and over community. So, with that 16 count maybe seven or eight students based off of how they do their calculations. Boise Board of Control has control over the Rawson Court -- sorry -- Rawson Canal. They just said no landscaping would be allowed within their easement, which is typical and we understand that. ITD had,

you know, no comment really. There is nothing in ITD over here and, then, ACHD, all of the -- all of the roadways are operating at an acceptable level. We did have quite a bit of community feedback as well, including the public testimony you have now and through our neighborhood meetings. There was some concerns about the increase in density. For this future land use map area we are allowed to develop up to eight units an acre and we are well below that. So, I think whether this was the development that happened or another, it's kind of -- kind of be a wash if it's this or something else. Someone had said that with an increase in density there is an increase in absentee ownership, which we were just not able to find any research to support. There were concerns about traffic. I think for this particular community it is gated. It's age restricted and, frankly, these don't develop a ton of traffic. There was a concern about decreased property values. Our other Cadence communities have been seeing a very healthy and steady increase in their value as well as the adjacent properties to those projects. So, I have no concerns about property values with this development. There was a concern that rezoning would allow commercial or multi-family and that is true, we are going to be required to add some commercial in the north part of this due to the Comprehensive Plan. So, I -- I understand the concern, but at the same time that is what the city will require us to do. And, then, there was a desire to keep a quiet lifestyle with better walking paths and big yards and, you know, I think we are providing a lot of walking paths and opportunities. This isn't going to be closed off to pedestrians, so it is able to be used by everybody. There are several conditions that we didn't fully agree with. Again, the first portion of that is we have a small piece of property called the Murgoitio piece -- or that's what Sonya referred to it as -- that they would like us to include as part of the future development application. We don't own that property and it doesn't seem like we should be forced to incorporate it into a design when we don't have that property in our control. We could design certainly access to that and make sure that something can function later on, but we cannot include that in a future application, because we don't control the property. This goes for the -- the ability to get permit applications prior to subdivision. We would like the ability to get permits for our community amenities ahead of the final plat. This helps us to actually have those amenities open and available when residents move in and they are occupying, so it just kind of helps with the timing of things. And, then, with that de-annexation it was requested that we have that completed prior to the first final plat application being submitted and we feel that that is a little bit unfair, because we don't have control of that and so we thought -- I said phase six here, but it will actually be phase five -- prior to the signature of phase five of final plat that we would need to have that completed. That is the phase that it actually is against. So, it just seems fair that that's the phase that it would be tied to. And, then, there are two pathway comments. The sidewalk on Locust Grove and Via Roberto and the pathway along the Rawson, staff asked that we complete those in entirety with the first phase of development, which we would understand if it were going anywhere. However, these basically will serve this development and we would rather complete those at the time of construction of the adjacent phase, rather than complete a bunch of stuff that isn't going to be used and also may need to be re-engineered as we are grading through the entire development. Other than that we do concur with staff's recommendation for approval with those requested modifications and I will stand for any questions.

Lorcher: In regard to the West Ada comment and you mentioned that the majority of this application is for 55 and older, are children under the age of 18 allowed to live in the 55 and under -- under, because there is parents that have old -- you know, I'm an older parent, so I was 55 and still had school age children and grandparents sometimes take care of -- or raise their own -- their own grandchildren.

McNutt: Yeah. It's 19 and over.

Lorcher: So, if I'm a 55 year old and I have a 14 year old, I will be discouraged to buy this product?

McNutt: Yes.

Lorcher: Okay. Any questions for the applicant?

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Yeah. So, one thing that stood out to me was the over double amount of what is allowed in the UDC of homes in a gated community and I'm curious as to how we got -- kind of got here. If you could speak to the process, the decision to make this a gated community -- decision to make it a gated community at this density as well as how that might be influenced or buy or influence any of the mixed use discussions --

McNutt: Yeah.

Smith: -- with the neighboring property.

McNutt: So, I think the development as a whole, meaning Pinnacle as a whole, is what drove this to be the density that it's at and the number of units that it's at. We have a lot of single family residential homes that are targeted toward families already in Pinnacle and we didn't have anything yet that was dedicated for 55 and older. These have also been extremely successful in other areas and we have already heard from existing residents that they would like to be able to live near where their grandchildren and their children live. So, we felt like there is a demand for this type of development out there and -- a relatively high demand. I will go ahead and show some -- some of our other developments. So, relatively speaking we are not that much higher density than some of our other Cadence products. So, this is Paramount. There is 192 dwellings with two entry gates. Bainbridge had 165 with two entry gates. This -- Century Farm was our smallest, 124 dwellings and, then, this is our proposed. So, realistically it's not that much different than our other Cadence products. But, again, I do feel like there is still a higher demand out here, because there is already so many single family that people are wanting to be near -- near their family. I don't know if I answered that question fully. Did I miss something?

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: I think one of the things I'm specifically curious about is the gated component, not necessarily the age restriction, which I can understand, but specifically the gated component and, then, also these other examples. I don't know if you can speak to whether they are in mixed use, but that's kind of the other component of -- if you have residential gated next to mixed use you just kind of -- you don't really have -- you have residential gated next to commercial. You don't really have a mixed use there. You just have residential next to commercial. So, I'm curious as to how that kind of came about in this specific context.

McNutt: So, gated -- it's typical of our 55 and over to be gated. That's what we like to design, because it's what people want. We hear all the time actually -- we want our sidewalks to also be gated and we want those to be locked. We don't want people to be able to walk through here. We don't do that, but there is a sense of security and there is a sense of, yeah, that they feel like nothing bad can happen if their community is gated. I don't necessarily agree with that, but there is a sense that that's the case. As far as the mixed use development, I can see vehicularly why there may seem like there is not a mix of use if you are gating it. However, the -- the sidewalks and pathways are open and, you know, the mix of uses can be pedestrian friendly as well. The other part of that is that mixed use area is -- is serving a much larger portion of the area. So, it's kind of this black circle here. This whole area is the mixed use area. Lots of people are going to be using this. Lots of pedestrian activity is going to be here. Again that is where the amphitheater is. That's where the library is. There is going to be some other small commercial uses out here and most likely an elementary school as well in addition to the charter. So, I think there is going to be a lot of pedestrian activity out here. I think those uses can mix really well and, frankly, it's not necessarily about how convenient it is for a car to get someplace, but how convenient it is for a person to get someplace.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: I think looking at this image though -- and I -- correct me if I'm wrong -- this whole project that's kind of in this area is this -- is this -- this is part of the same development. It kind of speaks to my issue that I'm having, though, is if I were to zone the four corners of this intersection to be commercial and everything else residential, it almost feels like there wouldn't be a difference versus zoning this whole area as mixed use. All the -- it appears as though all the commercial is getting funneled into these -- these intersections and all the non-residential intersections specifically just as close as possible, rather than being integrated into the projects next to them and I think that is what's giving me pause of speaking specifically to the integration. Not saying it needs to be marbled like a stake, like where there is -- it's dotted everywhere, but there is -- it seems like there is no -- and maybe this isn't a question and maybe I'm pontificating too

early, but I guess I don't know if you are able to speak to in the planning and envisioning of this whole development why is it that we kind of push everything toward the intersection as if it was just commercial development next to residential?

McNutt: That's a fair question and I think it is market driven. Businesses don't want to be on something that's not a corner and businesses fail when they are not on a corner, because they don't have the visibility to maintain viability. Whether or not we like it or not, if there is a commercial piece that's in the center of a subdivision no one knows it's there except the subdivision and even in this case 212 houses is not enough to sustain even a -- like small coffee shop. It's just frankly not enough traffic for them and we -- we do see this. We sell those lots and we market those lots, you know, we don't sell these out to somebody else. We are doing that and it -- it would be extremely difficult for us to get something like that. So, that's why they are kind of pushed to the corners.

Smith: Thank you.

Lorcher: Thank you very much.

McNutt: Thank you.

Lorcher: Madam Clerk, do we have anybody signed up to testify?

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. No one has signed up.

Lorcher: Is there anybody in Chambers that would like to testify?

Lomeli: Madam Chair, I apologize. I do have one person online raising their hand.

Lorcher: Oh. All right. Hi. If you can state your name and address for the record that would be great.

Edwards: Sure. Hello. My name is Julie Edwards and I am at 1310 East Mary Lane and I just wanted to say I have -- I have looked over the documents submitted and I do think that an over 55 community is a great idea, mostly because it wouldn't impact the schools as much or at -- maybe at all. The part that I am opposed to is the density and, you know, the future land use map or comprehensive map shows that area they want to rezone as medium density and so if they change it to R-15 that's raising the density on the -- you know, the potential density, whereas just to the south of it is low density. So, there is really no transition there going from medium, you know, high, medium high, and going down to the low density, so just something to look at there. And, then, I just feel like time and time again that this developer asks for numerous special accommodations and I feel like this is not different. If the city code states that a gated development is restricted to a hundred homes that's what should be approved. Otherwise, the codes mean nothing and maybe a reasonable request would be an addition of ten units, but by asking to more than double the amount to 212 units within that gated community I think is ridiculous and, then, they wouldn't have to ask for, you know, changes in setbacks

and using the awful common driveways and -- I can't remember what the other thing was called where you have the stretch of road that's divided by an intersecting road, but if you had more space within there, then, you wouldn't have to have all these other restrictions. So, I just think they should follow the codes while they are drawing up their plans. To me it looks like tightly packed sardine homes, which is not what we want in south Meridian. For instance, in one of the images, the overview, there are homes along just to the -- let's say west of the clubhouse and those people, you know, eventually they will probably pay -- I don't know what these will go for -- half a million dollars or something -- four hundred thousand dollars and they don't even have a place where people can come pull up to the front of their house, because you would have to walk through the clubhouse lawn or the bocce ball lawn to get to their front door, because it's alley loaded and, then, just, lastly, the woman who just spoke mentioned an elementary school. Now, is that the same elementary school that was supposed to be built or potentially to be built on the north side of Lake Hazel or is this a totally different elementary school altogether? That's all.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Edwards: Thank you. Appreciate it.

Lorcher: Madam Clerk?

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. I don't believe anybody else is online, unless someone in Chambers would like to speak?

Lorcher: Okay. Would the applicant like to come forward?

Wardle: Madam Chair, Commission Members, Mike Wardle, director of planning for Brighton, 2929 West Navigator in Meridian and I'm here because I'm the creator of the project originally. Put it together in 2020 when it was approved and some of the concerns and questions you have are legitimate, but this whole project is in -- is a significant context issue. I just want to cover first some of the comments that Ms. Edwards just made and Julie's participated in all of our hearings and she's been a participant in our neighborhood meetings and so forth, so we have a long opportunity to communicate. When we talk about 212, it's not much more than the 192, which were first approved in our Paramount project. Certainly it's a few more than we have in Bainbridge at 165. It's definitely more than the 124 in our Century Farm project. Not all of these units face the streets, as Ms. Edwards also noted. However, all of the units that have -- I will call them new access or open space access, every project that we have done, including our Bainbridge specifically, if you would go back to Bainbridge for just a moment, we have the same situation there in the center of that project. There is a -- clubhouse is right there in the front with units that face toward it and those units went very very well. All of the streets actually have on-street parking. It's only on one side. You have garages and so forth at the back, but we have a lot of parking in these projects and there is on-street parking provided specifically around the community center that's also accessible for the folks that live in adjacent areas to that. So, back to

some of your comments, Mr. Smith, about the original context. It's -- Amanda noted that we have done some significant facility improvements out there. We have a -- the amphitheater, which is part of what we call the SoMe community or South Meridian and when it was approved by the City Council in 2020 it was noted that that corner area would be a community center, basically a town center. We also -- we already have -- and it's not shown on here, but we have a Gem Prep Charter School that was opened within a year of the time we started the project. So, a lot of elements that are not just commercial, but they are part of the community fabric. So, we don't believe that the 212 is extraordinary. We have included, then, a third access where the two for all of the others has been very very adequate. The other thing that I would note that about 60 percent of our demographic are single occupancy. We have a lot of single individuals, retired widowed -- widowered that live in our gated communities and they like the security that Amanda has talked about. So, this is not just something that we have tossed into the mix. We are giving a lot more diversity and opportunity for people to live in a different type of lifestyle within that South Meridian SoMe center and as also noted by Amanda, the commercial that's just immediately to the north on the southeast corner -- or southwest corner, excuse me, of Lake Hazel and Locust Grove will be accessible to these folks. Yes, there will be a gate there, but they will have access to -- as Sonya noted the collectors that have to be constructed in that next or future phase. So, this is not just isolated or separated or totally distinct, it's part of a broader community and you have -- if you have been out there you have noted that we have a lot of alley loaded products, smaller lot components to the northwest of that Lake Hazel, Locust Grove intersection. We believe that the request is compliant with not only the Comprehensive Plan, but also the original concept of the project. So, I would just like to provide to you the same items that Amanda noted and that Sonya did as well, the changes that we proposed to the condition, so you have got a hard copy. To restate what Amanda said that we concur with staff's recommendation for approval with just these modifications and the one, of course, is that we can't control what Murgoitio chooses to do, but we certainly can provide in the future development application the necessary and required access points to their property if and when they decide to do something different. I don't think it's really out of the question, because in all of our projects before we have started our amenities in advance of the residential components, simply so that they have something to go to when they move in. That would be the second item, A-1E-2O relative to those annexation and de-annexation parcels once we have included those in the application. Dealing with that de-annexation parcel is simply out of our control and it will happen, but -- so we are looking simply for signature on the final plat, rather than submittal of the first final plat, because that could be a long time and that would be, again, out of our control. On the second page, the pathways and sidewalks, we, again, propose that those be constructed at the time of the adjacent development. If we go out in advance, for instance, along the highway or along the -- the collector on the south Via Roberto or Locust Grove and you build those facilities in advance of the adjacent development, it becomes a problem of integrating those and making sure that everything happened originally fits. So, these are not major items, but we do request your approval of them. I would answer your questions as well.

Lorcher: I did have one. In regard to the multi-pathway that the city is requesting that you do in phase one and Amanda mentioned it kind of goes to nowhere, your development needs to -- somebody needs to connect to it eventually, even if you are the first one to do it, so the way this is set up here is it designed so that -- and the next developer, whether it's you or someone else, has the ability to do that?

Wardle: Madam Chair, yes. When the project is completed all of these connections will be there for that future connection to whoever develops adjacent to us, yes.

Lorcher: The only thing that kind of stood out to me as a red flag are the parcels on the furthest northern that -- that will abut the Mурgoitio parcel and the future commercial. The commercial -- their backyards are going to face whatever that commercial is going to be. Is there going to be a road between that and the commercial or is somebody's -- is somebody's loading dock going to be like right there --

Wardle: No. We are going to get to -- if you note on this -- unfortunately, the little tag rezone only kind of covers over that collector -- or connection that Sonya noted Tower Drive --

Lorcher: Uh-huh.

Wardle: -- so, that like the -- when we deal with the -- that future development phase may be extended to the back of the Mурgoitio property, but it would be -- there would be a landscape buffer along there just as it would be along either Locust Grove or Via Roberto in the south regardless. It would be the same.

Lorcher: Right. And, then, before City Council will you consider adjusting this presentation to have it stubbed in, knowing that you don't own that parcel, but for future land use type of thing for connectivity?

Wardle: We will. We will -- and we will communicate with staff on these issues just to make sure that we are all on the same page.

Lorcher: Okay. That's the only questions I had. Commissioners? All right. Thank you very much.

Wardle: Thank you.

Lorcher: May I get a motion to close the public hearing, please?

Rust: So moved.

Smith: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing for Cadence with Apex. All those in favor say. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Mr. Smith.

Smith: Yeah. I have some thoughts on this. I -- I want to say at the top is I understand the larger context of the larger project. Where I disagree and where I kind of sit opposed to this is I don't think you get to claim the larger context of the community while walling yourself off from it and I understand there is some -- there is pedestrian connectivity, et cetera, but the idea that we are creating this thing that's interconnected with the community while having perhaps the most explicit imagery of separating yourself from that community, I don't think those two work together and so I'm not -- I'm not opposed to this area being gated or to it maybe having less integration between the residential and non-residential or it being R-15, I'm opposed to all three at the same time and I think that there is an issue here of not really aligning with what the purpose of a mixed development -- a mixed use development is and the kind of live-work-play approach that is prevalent throughout the code and throughout the city's kind of, you know, planning documents. I think this is just -- I think for maybe too long we have accepted and given the mouse a cookie on this development can be -- kind of have the residential and the non-residential separate, because of this reason and that development have that reason, et cetera, and I think we are at the point where the -- it's -- it's getting to be too much that we are building on top of this structure of we have to understand the broader context around it. I don't think that's the case here. I think we have kind of gone a bridge too far here and I think this -- I understand, I'm not asking necessarily for us to only approve things where there is a store in the center of a residential development, but I have seen plenty of mixed use developments that integrate their uses much better and I guess all I'm asking for is either reworking this to better suit the context of the community or being more creative in how we do this, because I don't think as it is this meets the -- this rises to the spirit of what a mixed use development is. So, for those reasons I'm opposed to it. If the rest of the Commission disagrees with me and is supportive I think the one condition of approval that I think is -- I think to what you were kind of intimating is 2B and 2C, I think those connected -- those connections need to be established earlier, sooner rather than later. That's my only ask if the rest of the Commission disagrees with my opposition.

Lorcher: Commissioner Rust, I'm interested in hearing your opinion, since you live in this area.

Rust: Yeah. I think just digesting all of this, but we have got a -- roughly a 51 acre parcel and 40 acres of it is listed as MDR, which is medium density residential. So, only ten acres of this is falling into the MUC and I think the -- most of that is being shown actually as mixed use. So, I -- I think I understand where you are coming from, Commissioner Smith. I disagree and I particularly disagree because of this area. This is south Meridian, Lake Hazel and Locust Grove, it's a growing area and Highway 69, Meridian Road there is -- there is going to be a lot more commercial up and down that

corridor, but I think kind of that live-work-play -- that sounds good and I think of other past applications that were more off of Pine and central to the City of Meridian, but this area is heavily residential. You have got Discovery Park that's right there. This area also has pretty heavy load on the school districts and so the fact that this is 55 plus, it's near a lot of housing that's going in, I -- I think that it will be really well received by the community. There is going to be a lot of grandparents that live in this area or would want to live in this area close to their -- their kids and their grandkids. So, I'm in favor of this. I'm in favor of the conditions that they have put forward. I'm probably ambivalent on the connections. I understand why they are asking for that, it would make construction a little easier, but I also think that you can anticipate your elevations and just grade it out as you go and do the entire thing at once, so I would probably ask for it, too, if I were putting this project together, but I -- I don't know that we have to go one way or another. I do resonate with the first three on the first page of the handout that they gave us. I think those are all fair requests. So, in general I think this is a well designed project. I am in favor of it

Lorcher: Okay.

Sandoval: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Sandoval.

Sandoval: Yeah. I just don't think that this aligns with mixed use. I'm -- I'm in alignment with you here, Jared, and the transitions just aren't there between the commercial. So, lack of integration, transitions, you know, those are a huge issue. I don't think I can be in favor of this as presented.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you. Usually live, work and play is an important component of connectivity in the City of Meridian, but if this is 55 and over it's more of like live and play and less work; right? The connectivity to the commercial -- maybe I'm not seeing it, but it really doesn't bother me. You know, at the -- the people who live there want a home to live in with not much to take care of. They want access to stores that are convenient, services that are convenient, which this does. I do like the connectivity that Meridian offers. So, you know, gated communities aren't my favorite, because now we are all turning around and -- and we can't kind of work our way through different places to be able to get to point A and to point B. I do agree with the applicant that the items that without -- without their control Ada county, the Mурготио property, they shouldn't be responsible for their timeline. I do agree that the amenities should be built, but I also believe that the pathway should be built as well. I live in the Highway 16 impact area. I have a sidewalk in front of my house that goes nowhere right now and we see anywhere between five and ten people just walking that strip every day, because it's there. So, I probably would not hold this -- I would not hold this up to City Council based on what we have. Based on our last application I never do like your common driveways. It feels like you are kind of really pushing people in where there should be a little bit more space and based on the last application for Cherry Blossom we can see that private driveways now cause a lot of problems, because they are just not there.

But, again, I'm not going to hold this up to City Council because of that, because if somebody doesn't like it they don't have to buy it; right? So, that's kind of how that goes. So --

Allen: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner -- Sonya. Yes. Excuse me.

Allen: When you are done talking I --

Lorcher: I am done.

Allen: I just wanted to make a note real quick. The reason for some of staff's recommendations on requiring the subdivision of the property A-1-C, A-1-E, 2-O is because the -- the property isn't a legal parcel for development purposes, that A -- A-1-C is a requirement out of the existing development agreement with the Murgoitio property. If they can establish that the Murgoitio property was -- is an original parcel of record, then, that would be fine. They don't have to include it. But that's -- that's the reason for it and it is an existing DA provision right now. So, I just wanted you to be aware of that if you do choose to change those provisions, that's -- just wanted to explain the reasoning for those.

Lorcher: Got you. And A-1-E and 2.0?

Allen: Yes. They -- so, let me explain further. The preliminary plat boundary as it's proposed excludes the portion of the property that has been transferred already to the Brunos to the west and that's that de-annexation area. But it hasn't been legally transferred, so --

Lorcher: Right.

Allen: -- technically the city really shouldn't be acting on a preliminary plat that doesn't include the legal boundary of the property and it probably really should be held up until that boundary is done, but the problem is is it's that chicken and the egg thing --

Lorcher: Right.

Allen: -- we can't -- can't de-annex the property, you know, it's -- it's that phase. So, anyway, just wanted to explain that.

Lorcher: Have we had as a city good luck work -- working with Ada county to be able to annex and de-annex in a timely fashion?

Allen: Well, we are de-annexing and, then, they will assign a zoning district compatible in the county once it's de-annexed, but that -- those property owners have to complete that property boundary adjustment and record that record of survey. I mean --

Lorcher: Oh. Okay.

Allen: -- that's the biggest thing. And that's up to them timing wise to do.

Lorcher: Right.

Allen: So --

Lorcher: That's a tough one. Okay.

Rust: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Rust.

Rust: Give this a stab. After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony I move to recommend approval to the City Council of File No. H-2024-0061 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of November 6th, with the following modifications: That we would grant the applicant's request to change on point A-1-C, A-1-E and 2-O.

Lorcher: Before I say anything, I'm -- the thing that's holding me up is -- as Sonya mentioned, nobody has control over the homeowners in Ada county and what they are going to do for the annexation and the de-annexation and, basically, if they start, then, they are building on land that they don't own and vice-versa; right? Because it's annexed or not annexed; is that correct?

Rust: Madam Chair, I believe that we were just moving it out and allowing them to start construction on phases one through four, which aren't affected by this and they are asking that they just have to get that issue resolved before they start phase five, which is the 16 single family homes that borders that parcel and I'm willing to grant them that leeway.

Lorcher: Kurt, can he adjust his motion to include what he just said?

Rust: It is included. That's what they are asking for. Yeah.

Starman: Madam Chair, actually, just -- I will use the opportunity to interject real quick. So, I agree with Commissioner Rust's comment. I think it was implicit in his motion by referencing this, the applicant's request. I would say just as -- you know, as the chair you have a lot of discretion how you would like to run the meeting, but I will say that there is a motion on the table, but no second yet, so you probably ought to refrain from anymore deliberation to get a second, otherwise, the motion dies.

Lorcher: Okay. I just need a clarification on what the motion was. So, I will second your motion to include A.1-C, A.1-E and 2.O. I just seconded. So, it's been moved and seconded to approve Apex Cadence Subdivision. All those in favor say aye. And those not in favor?

Smith: Nay.

Sandoval: Nay.

MOTION FAILED: TWO AYES. TWO NAY. THREE ABSENT.

Lorcher: All right. Kurt.

Allen: Madam Chair, can I ask for a clarification on the motion, please.

Lorcher: Sure.

Allen: Did -- is -- does the motion include the applicant's request for the changes to A-1-C, E, and 2-O, even though the parcels are not illegal parcels for development purposes?

Rust: That's correct.

Allen: Okay.

Starman: The motion, Madam Chair, so the vote was two-two, that -- so, that motion fails, so you can solicit or ask for another motion if you like or we can talk about other approaches.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Yes, I will talk to the elephant in the room and ask Kurt if a motion to recommend denial were to fail two-two what would the reasonable set of next steps be if we can't pass a motion tonight?

Starman: So, Madam Chair and Commissioner Smith, I think I would encourage you to actually exhaust those options first. I probably would encourage you to make that motion if that's your inclination. But to answer your question, I will try to answer it directly as well. I think you have at least a couple choices at that point in time. One is you can reopen the public hearing and continue it and wait until you get some other commissioners present. They would have to review this record and the minutes from tonight and, then, be prepared to vote, but you can -- you can table it so to speak until you have a tie breaker. That would probably be my recommendation. The second possibility would be -- I -- I haven't seen us do this in recent memory, but potentially you could entertain a whole different motion, which would be to forward it to the Council without a recommendation and note that you were split two-two and that you are not prepared to make a recommendation. That might be an option as well. I don't know if, Mr. Parsons, you ever encounter something like that before? Any other bright ideas?

Parsons: Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, I have not heard that one, Kurt. So, I would prefer the first option, go through it and, then, see where we land on a potential continuance to get more --

Smith: Madam Chair, I guess with that being said, I would like to make a motion. After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend denial to the City Council for File No. H-2024-0061 as presented during the hearing November 6, 2025, for the following reasons: The confluence of the increased density, the gated nature of the community and the lack of integration of uses is out of line with the spirit of the UDC and the Comprehensive Plan, as well as the number of required changes, conditions or alternative compliances render it untenable.

Lorcher: Do I have a second?

Sandoval: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to deny Apex Cadence for the aforementioned reasons. All those in favor say aye. Those opposed.

Rust: Nay.

Lorcher: Nay.

MOTION FAILED: TWO AYES. TWO NAYS. THREE ABSENT.

Lorcher: So, at this point I think we should reopen the public hearing to have a continuance so we can have some more Commissioners here and revisit this again. May I have a motion to reopen the public hearing for Apex Cadence Subdivision?

Smith: So moved.

Rust: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to reopen Apex Cadence to establish a continuance. All those in favor say aye.

Smith: Madam Chair, do we have a date I guess is the --

Lorcher: Well, we will check with the city clerk in a moment.

Smith: Sorry. We are still reopening. Yes. Aye. Apologize.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Lorcher: Okay. So, we are all in favor to reopen the public hearing. We are officially open. Madam Clerk, do we have a date that we can reopen this public hearing, please.

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. The next --

Lorcher: Or continuance I should say.

Lomeli: The next Planning and Zoning date is November 20th. We already have four hearings on that evening. After that would be December 4th. The challenge we have is that we cannot guarantee as many -- or more Commissioners on either, but November 20th or December 4th. Do you have a preference? May I get a motion to continue application H-2024-0061 to November 24th.

Smith: So moved.

Rust: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to continue Apex Cadence for November 24th. All those in favor say aye. Sorry. 20th. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Lorcher: Do I need to close the public hearing? I'm done. Okay. All right. That takes care of that one. Do we need a small break before we do the last one or are we ready to go?

Rust: I'm good to go.

Lorcher: You're good to go.

Smith: Madam Chair, I'm good to go.

6. Public Hearing continued from October 2, 2025 for St. George (H-2025-0004) by Shaun Wardle and Jason St. George, located at 3870 E. Overland Rd. and 1545 S. Topaz Ave.

- A. Request: Annexation of 2.0 acres with the R-15 zoning district to construct nineteen (19) multi-family units, 7,987 Sq. ft. of commercial space and four (4) vertically integrated residential units.
- B. Request: Two Conditional Use Permits, one for the multi-family residential and one for the vertically integrated residential project in the R-15 zoning district.

Lorcher: All right. We are going to keep on going. All right. Last item on the agenda is H-2025-0004 for annexation and two conditional use permits for St. George located at Overland Road and Topaz Avenue. We will start with the staff report.

Napoli: Good evening, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. The next item on the agenda is the annexation and conditional use permits for St. George. So, the applicant is -- requests annexation of two acres of land with the R-15 zoning district to construct 19 multi-family units and one vertically integrated residential building consisting of 7,987 square feet of commercial space and four residential units. Both uses require a conditional use permit in the proposed R-15 zoning district. The site is located at 3850 East Overland Road and 1545 South Topaz Avenue. As shown on the screen the existing zoning is R-1 on both properties and the FLUM designation is mixed use regional. There is the annexation exhibit. So, the mixed use regional designation is intended to encourage a balanced blend of employment opportunities, retail, residential dwellings and public uses, particularly -- particularly in areas near major intersections. This designation supports a diverse and integrated community where friends can work, live and shop without needing to travel far. An important component of the MUR designation is to avoid predominantly single use developments. So, the site -- let's see. Out of order. There we go. So, the site is currently surrounded by R-1 residential properties to the north and the west, with an annexed residential property to the east -- or I should say to the west. I apologize. And a mixed use commercial multi-family in the surrounding area. Additionally commercial space is located at the north end of Silverstone Way, including a Top Golf facility, commercial office, restaurants and Eagle View Apartments, comprising of 396 units. To the south across Overland Road are the Silverstone Apartments, consisting of 112 residential units and the Movado Village Apartments, consisting of 60 residential units. The property across the street on South Topaz Avenue was recently approved as a multi-tenant building with a restaurant located within that building in the C-G zoning district. So, the concept plan -- go with this one. Concept plan -- the concept plan depicts -- depicts 19 multi-family residential units, four vertically integrated residential units and 7,987 square feet of commercial space across two acres of land. So, the vertically integrated building is proposed fronting on Overland Road. The applicant states that the development is providing a mix of housing types, promoting connectivity and encouraging walkability and efficiency throughout the vertically -- through the vertically integrated uses. In addition the applicant has provided 8,330 square feet of open space and amenities in the form of a barbecue grill, pet waste station and bike repair station. So, staff has concerns regarding the location, the functionality of the proposed open space. The proximity of Five Mile Creek and the northernmost drive aisle creates conflict -- potential conflicts that could limit residents' ability to effectively use this area. The specific use standards for multi-family development emphasizes that open space should be integrated as a central design element, rather than designated only after the other components have been planned. Based on the current layout staff finds the proposed open space does not meet this intent. Additionally, the site plan indicates a proposed pedestrian bridge crossing Five Mile Creek. If this feature is not permitted by Nampa Meridian Irrigation District, the usability and connectivity of the open space would be further reduced. Furthermore, the nearest park, Gordon Harris Park, is located just over a mile away and would require residents to cross a major arterial -- arterial road to access it south of Overland. So, the Public Works Department has also raised concerns about the site being able to move forward with the next steps in the process, as are several issues with landscaping, separation and easement issues. When easements encumber a

large portion of the site it affects the type of landscaping that can be planted, which impacts the quality of life for residents and meeting UDC requirements. The applicant has provided parking that meets the minimum standards for the UDC, but any overflow parking will likely be pushed on to Topaz Avenue. A one full access is proposed on the south portion of the site via South Topaz Avenue. Additionally, a one way access is proposed on the north portion of the site for the multi-family residents use. According to ACHD staff report the applicant would construct Topaz as a half collector roadway with a five foot sidewalk and eight foot parkway. In addition, ACHD is asking the applicant to dedicate a total of 62 feet from the center line of Overland Road on their frontage. The applicant has provided a stub street for a cross-access drive with an easement to the property to the west, as this property is anticipated to use this access in the future when it redevelops. Staff is recommending denial of this application due to the applicant not complying with the following. Non-compliant landscape buffers along street frontages along Overland. Open space does not meet the specific use standards for multi-family developments. Concerns with the functionality of the open space and whether the proposed pedestrian bridge will be allowed by the irrigation district. Requesting alternative compliance to accommodate drive aisles. Not meeting the private usable open space requirement. Not -- not complying with the separational requirements for infiltration trenches and curbing. And in addition the Comprehensive Plan elements, such as holistic design and functional integration are not fully incorporated throughout the site. I would like to note that after receiving the staff report the applicant did reach out this week saying that they do have revised plans meeting the private usable open space on the balconies up the 80 square feet. Currently the -- the plans that I saw before I wrote my staff report were 68 square feet, but they did revise that. So, I just want to put down on the record.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Napoli: So, no written testimony has been received on this application and I will stand for any questions at this time.

Lorcher: Would the applicant like to come forward? Hi. If you can state your name and address for the record that would be great.

S.Wardle: Thank you. Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, Shaun Wardle. 2239 East Griner Street. Here on behalf of the applicant Jason and Jackie St. George, who both grew up in -- in Idaho. In fact, Jason and I went to elementary school right across Meridian Road here. So, they are Idaho real estate investors and they currently reside in Donnelly, but they are actually going to be residing in one of these vertically integrated units above the commercial and I mention that for two reasons. One of those is the new code doesn't require the owners to actually occupy that, but -- but they are going to take advantage of it and, secondly, we are not proposing an on-site management area, but the owners will be there. So, appreciate staff's review of the -- of the application. We have got two acres on the corner of Overland and Topaz. We have got a couple of site constraints that have been pretty significant. The first of which is Five Mile Creek, which affects not only our property, but -- but a lot of the property in

that area. And, then, the second is we are not allowed access to Overland, which we currently have on one of the properties, but ACHD is not allowing that access based on their -- their criteria. So, our Comprehensive Plan designation is mixed use community. We feel that we are meeting that goal by integrating neighborhood with housing, employment and services, that we have got an efficient in-fill utilizing existing infrastructure and that we are also diversifying housing and business opportunities within -- within this area. So, our application is seeking zoning of R-15 and, then, the conditional use permit, 8,000 square foot of commercial building with four integrated units there. We are also seeking conditional use permit for 19 multi-family residential units. In the commercial area we are anticipating a lot of private services, professional office, consumer services, physical therapists, insurance, wealth management. We feel that -- that that would be a good mix, as well as neighboring properties that -- that we have in the area. Is my site plan -- oh, there we go.

Lorcher: Try the arrows.

S.Wardle: Sorry. I'm getting technical difficulty here. Our proposed site amenities are a pedestrian pathway along Five Mile Creek, an outdoor barbecue area, bike repair station and, then, one of the -- one of the things that the owners would like to do is -- is they are allowing each unit to have a garage and they are -- they feel that that's an amenity for the site. They are going to have electric charging stations within those garages and they feel that that will help the project, both in leasing as well as in value. On the screen here we have got -- we have got our buildings proposed, Building A, and I appreciate Nick mentioned we are going to comply with the -- with the private -- private living space requirements there. Here is our Building B, C and, then, our vertically integrated with the floor plans there. Just to point out a couple of areas -- couple of -- we have got Eagle View Landing here, the Top Golf Center, some large multi-family. Well, we feel that our impact here on the neighborhood is -- is certainly much -- much less dense than some of our neighbors to the north and even our neighbors here to the -- to the south, but we feel it offers an additional option for housing and as well as an additional option for people to be able to live and work and, then, along the Overland frontage we are familiar with Silverstone. We have got some new multi-family stations there and some professional medical office. In addition to that we have had our engineering team take a look at what -- what could happen with integration. I know that as part of another application the restaurant to the east of us, the question for the Commission was what does an overall site plan look like? What could happen in here? And even though we don't control these parcels we have put together our project and we are -- as noted providing access to the west for this property. They won't be allowed access to Overland either and so we will have that connectivity through here. We wanted to keep that up towards the commercial area, so that any traffic that flowed through would -- was not impacting our multi-family development there.

Lorcher: Before you go on what am I looking at here? Yours is to the right?

S.Wardle: Yes. So, we are -- we are -- Topaz to the very west, Overland to the south and so you will see our development notated here and, then, again, this is a -- a schematic --

Lorcher: For them?

S.Wardle: Sorry.

Lorcher: Okay.

S.Wardle: We are right here.

Lorcher: So, that's your commercial and your commercial of 8,000 commercial, you are -- you are saying it's going to be subdivided into smaller businesses, not one big thing.

S.Wardle: So -- so, the -- we don't control the properties to the west here. We --

Lorcher: No. I'm talking about yours.

S.Wardle: Yes. Yes. So, the 8,000 square foot we are anticipating 1,500 square foot bays. We think that Farmers Insurance, Edward Jones agents, people like that. Physical therapists. Those are the types of services that we will be marketing to.

Lorcher: Got you.

S.Wardle: I'm going to turn it over to my design professionals for just a minute to answer some technical questions. I know that staff had some -- some specific questions. So, I'm going to introduce our project architect Jim Escobar.

Lorcher: Okay.

Escobar: Madam Chair, Commissioners.

Lorcher: If you can just state your address.

Escobar: Yes. 127 -- P.O. Box 1277 in Eagle, Idaho.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Escobar: I don't really have much to address, other than we do have the private usable open space and with a lot of the -- the items that are identified on this list I think they are all items that could be conditions of approval or amended to it that -- I don't know that we oppose much of what's happening on -- on their staff report. So, I just would -- would like to recommend that you consider -- staff's recommending denial, but we feel like there is all sorts of things in here that we comply with and would -- would happily satisfy -- or maybe or even misunderstandings. So, I -- I -- I don't know that I really

have anything else to speak to, because most of the items are site development related items. So, invite the civil engineer up.

Lorcher: Okay. Come on up. If you can state your name and address for the record that would be great.

Christensen: Jesse Christensen. 5700 East Franklin Avenue, Nampa. Working as the site engineer. Thank you, Madam Chair and Commissioners, for having us out here today. I'm here to talk about some of the site specific conditions that are listed in the staff report and go over what we can do or address during design review to adjust them. So, the water main was listed as too close to the curb and gutter on the west side of the property. It's actually the north side of the property. And it is. It's about two and a half feet from the curb. It can be moved. There is plenty of room in the street to move it. That would mean it's less than 25 feet from the storm water basin, but there is also room to move the storm water basin as well or if there was no room there are other engineering ways to get DEQ approval on that. A curtain between the two to -- to make sure that separation is -- is contained. So, that -- that's just one of the things listed on there. We don't have fire hydrants on our site plan right now. It's listed as a -- as a concern. You know, we did talk to Fire and we worked with Fire to create a pass through for the two buildings on the east side. So, you know, Fire has not been ignored. There is plenty of flow through the subdivision. There is plenty of flow in the area. Fire hydrants can be added -- added to there. There is a concern about the easement between the two buildings. I'm going to move the mouse around so you can see. Maybe I'm going to move the mouse around. So, there is a -- we have -- right now we have listed a sewer line through that area there in the center, which will mean that you can't landscape it. There is an easement through there. But, realistically, the -- you know, the -- the final sewer design coming out of the buildings is not complete, so the sewer -- the sewer main can change. We can make that connection to the south, therefore, just negating that access point and needing that easement through there for sewer, so that can come back as landscape. These are all -- you know, everything that's listed engineering wise can be adjusted in design review with the city. So, I don't think there is anything outstanding that -- that doesn't work. You know, we were gifted a great corner up there to put something that's going to be separated by a stream if we can get the bridge approved there as future development around this continues to develop. There is room to make that -- that open space bigger for everybody. You know, everybody has got a kind of central location for this open space of this commercial, live -- commercially integrated, you know, live-work-play stuff. So, I don't think it's a hindrance to have it up there. I think it works. We brought in early on this -- there is this floodway on Five Mile Creek. We brought in a floodplain engineer to meet with the city's floodplain administrator and talk through what we can do to make that work. We don't have any of our structures right now within that floodway, but the open space area kind of is covered there. We are working to remodel lots of portions of this through some other development, too, to try to get this floodway under control, because right now some of it's a little old. I can't really talk too much about floodway. I'm not a floodway engineer, but, you know, we are working on that as well. So, we are not -- we are not ignoring the challenges of the site, we are trying to work with what we have

here. The reduced -- there is a reduced setback listed for water wise planting on the front along Overland and, you know, really, the problem -- and I think the landscape architect has addressed it. He can make the change. He had six percent too much of the water wise grass in there. We needed 50 percent. He added about 56 percent. So, we can reduce that and make that work. So, I don't think -- a lot of these concerns are things that, you know, once we have approval can be worked through during design review. It's not -- they are easy fixes to make and they are not huge challenges as I kind of see it written here. So, I can stand for questions. I can bring Shaun back up to finish his presentation.

Lorcher: I do have a couple questions.

Christensen: Yes.

Lorcher: Do you have approval from the irrigation company to allow a bridge to go over the canal?

Christensen: We do not have approval from the irrigation company for the bridge yet. It seems premature to do final design on stuff like that when we don't even know if we are going to have an annexation. You know, if we -- if we lose this annexation the bridge doesn't matter anymore. So, final design on some of this stuff, without annexation and approvals, is kind of difficult to get.

Lorcher: Okay. And, then, working with ACHD with the storm water basin will -- are they amiable? Have you talked to them at all about amiable about moving things around?

Christensen: Our storm water basins all on site. So, all of our storm water is --

Lorcher: So, your storm water basin is not --

Christensen: Our storm water -- yeah. We don't have any ACHD storm water to take care of. Everything's already got its inlets and -- and basins.

Lorcher: Okay. I guess my biggest question to you is, you know, all of these things -- why weren't these addressed during planning with the city planners?

Christensen: Some of these comments -- you know, we did address a lot of comments with the city planners and we went back and forth and we had several meetings with the planners. These last few items that are noted here were noted as just notations on their -- on their notes, on their responses to us. They weren't as -- responded as we need to fix this right now. You know, the fire hydrants were listed as just not on here. There were water meters that were listed as the water meter location. They are just listed as comments for now. They weren't listed as fix this before we go to -- to the hearing.

Lorcher: Okay.

Christensen: Yeah.

Lorcher: You would like to finish up on your comments?

S.Wardle: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. Just a clarification. We have talked to Nampa-Meridian Irrigation District. They are allowing the bridge. We have to get an easement and go through that process as well as with the Parks Department for the pathway and so -- that is in the works. Just to address a couple final issues -- and Jesse talked a little bit about -- we are going to -- we are going to meet the -- the water conservation section of the landscape. Talked to the landscape architect. He can make those changes. And, then, just the -- the last real issue is our -- our alternative compliance of five foot versus two foot on the western edge and -- and, frankly, that was a -- you know, when -- in talking with staff it was a -- sort of a standard procedure that we would ask for approval on this particular site plan and, then, they would approve that at a staff level review of the alternative compliance and so with that I would stand for any questions.

Lorcher: Commissioners, do we have any questions?

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: I think one thing that we didn't really talk about that I think is maybe the biggest issue is just the open space integration function, et cetera. Can you speak to that at all? It seems like that's a concern that staff rose -- that raised about the lack of like central open space or integrated use open space, rather it being kind of just set on the border and not contemplated -- not appearing to be contemplated as part of the design, but an afterthought.

S.Wardle: If I might address that. So -- and I think we might have a little bit of a miscommunication with the staff, but my landscape architect is telling me there were at 23 percent open space and that the minimum requirement is 15 percent and so, again, we attempted to over comply with that particular issue. If -- I have talked with our engineer. We could potentially add some central open space where we have got some bollard -- bollards as well as moving some of the sewer lines where we couldn't have landscape before. There is a way that we can work around that. We didn't -- I didn't hear what the specific issue was from staff prior to the staff report.

Lorcher: Yeah. I think before you go to City Council the open space is going to be an issue and if the sewer line doesn't -- that runs through the two buildings is something that you can't do any landscaping with, whereas the buildings are either facing them or can enjoy that open space, it seems like it should be someplace else. So, the -- this graphic's pretty good. The other two were very hard to read, so that might be something before you do City Council as well. Any other comments? Okay. Thank you very much.

S.Wardle: Thank you.

Lorcher: Madam Clerk, do we have anybody to testify -- signed up to testify?

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. Yes. First person is Anita Gallagher. Gallagher.

Lorcher: Hi. Thanks for coming. If you can state your name and address for the record that would be great.

Gallagher: Anita Gallagher. 3825 Onyx Street, Meridian, Idaho.

Lorcher: Okay.

Gallagher: I do not agree with what they have here proposed at all. I live about a half an acre way. Number one, the parking -- their overflow is going to go onto Topaz. There is already kids living in the neighborhood that the people are going to be driving around -- it's a U-shaped neighborhood. They are going to be driving around our neighborhood to get out probably over on Jade, instead of Topaz. The kids right now have to walk around, because there is a handicapped kid, so that just means more kids are going to be walking. There is no sidewalks. We are county, you know, so it's very -- very dangerous. I think it's too many units. Shouldn't be -- I don't think it should be two stories. I like to go out in my backyard, look up at the stars. Lighting that they are going to have is going to ruin my -- my view. When they had the neighborhood meeting the owner stated they are only going to be renting to business people to live there. Nobody -- they don't think they will have kids and all that type stuff. So, they are -- they are saying they are going to be very picky on who they rent to, which they can't be. That's illegal. That's pretty much most of my --

Lorcher: Thank you very much. Madam Clerk.

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. The next person is Robert Taylor.

Lorcher: Okay. If you can state your --

Taylor: Robert Taylor. Can you hear me okay?

Lorcher: Yeah.

R.Taylor: Robert Taylor. 3840 East Overland Road.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you.

R.Taylor: So, I'm right next to this.

Lorcher: East or west?

R.Taylor: East -- west.

Lorcher: West. Okay.

R.Taylor: Right. Yeah. Right there. We have got a skinny acre. This will run right down my backyard.

Lorcher: Okay.

R.Taylor: My paradise. My sanctuary.

Lorcher: Uh-huh.

R.Taylor: Anyway, I had like a five minute speech, but I have trimmed it down, so I can get the three minutes in.

Lorcher: Thank you.

R.Taylor: But it's already a hassle getting in and out of my property, especially during peak driving hours. I encourage all of you to come see for yourself, Monday through Friday, from 4:00 to 6:00. You will experience two lanes of bottleneck cars on Overland right in front of this proposed development. I can't imagine the frustration folks will have trying to enter and exit off of Topaz, because they won't be able to enter and exit off Overland obviously if this development is approved. So, the center turn lane, which also feeds cars to all the businesses at Silverstone, will soon turn into a -- just a mess. If you step back and were only to consider the current road system, with just a center turn lane and no traffic light at Topaz, this proposed development fails on all accounts. With a new restaurant coming on the other corner across the street from this development, coupled with all the new and future development near Top Golf, this small stretch of Overland Road from beyond Topaz to Eagle Road is going to be a nightmare and it's only going to get worse and more dangerous. Back in 2007 all of the property owners on the frontage of Overland were part of a proposed multi-million dollar development, a package deal of around 23 properties in the valley. Because of the banking crisis this deal fell through. At that time all of us living on the frontage were in agreement to sell our properties and the surrounding neighbors were okay with this. This current moment, however, only encompasses two out of the seven properties and we are not all in agreement. In fact, at the required neighborhood meeting put on by the development team several months back, it was standing room only and I don't recall anyone saying anything positive about this development and we are all pretty much against it. I feel another business only development along this Overland frontage would be more prudent and beneficial to the area and I think the surrounding neighbors again would be okay with this versus the current piecemeal proposal. Not sure how this works, but perhaps changing the zoning to encourage investors to develop business only structures would be a good start. We all have had neighbors --

Lorcher: Go on.

R.Taylor: You know, when -- when we get home -- we can hear when they get home. We can hear when they leave. We hear their car doors or revving engines. The dogs barking. Deal with occasional loud party or celebration. You deal with these sounds and annoyances. Please put yourself in my shoes going to -- going from having one neighbor to having 23, not to mention two commercial businesses next door. That is a lot of neighbors that are now two stories tall with a bird's eye view into your backyard. We have a beautiful seven year old daughter who just got to swim in her first big girl pool this summer. She had privacy. We have privacy. In conclusion, consider the impact not only to me and my family, but to the folks in this neighborhood. Think about the safety concerns and difficulty to everyone that will need to enter and exit off of Overland Road. Our only sanctuary is our backyard. Besides the roar of the freeway we are at least -- we at least have privacy and a buffer from the noise and eyeballs from Overland Road. If approved the privacy and peace me and my family have will be gone. Don't take that away from us. Please vote no on this proposal.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Taylor: Thank you.

Lorcher: Madam Clerk.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, I have Sherry Manning. Debbie Fulton.

Lorcher: No? You are good?

Lomeli: Jason Massey.

Lorcher: You are good?

Lomeli: And Lynette -- I don't know how to pronounce that. I apologize.

Lorcher: You can tell us when you get up here.

Adsitt: Good evening, Madam Chair and Chairman -- or chair people. My name is Lynette Adsitt. I live at 1360 South Topaz, which is just north and kitty corner to this place.

Lorcher: Uh-huh.

Adsitt: So, I would definitely see this place from my place. I'm -- I'm not happy with this proposal. I understand we live in an area that's going to be developed. We all understand that. As homeowners all our neighbors, you know, we are disheartened by it, because we have a little -- little wonderful rural community back here. I have a show horse. I ride my horse on my property. Trying to get my horse trailer in and out on Topaz to Overland is a nightmare right now. If they add traffic going through there,

especially if they park there, trying to get my big horse trailer through there is going to be a nightmare. I also reached out to ACHD -- sorry, I'm a little nervous.

Lorcher: It's okay.

Adsitt: And in January -- and I asked them to address this traffic problem, because I almost got in a wreck getting out onto Overland turning east -- you just can't, because cars are going into Silverstone. So, I asked them what -- what can be done and he said -- let me get to it here. He said -- because I asked him about the traffic from Topaz to Eagle Road and he said on this 2,000 foot segment of Overload -- Overland Road, 67 crashes were reported east of Overland Road in the intersection to Topaz Avenue intersection in a five year span, which, unfortunately, is greater frequency than monthly. Additionally 25 of those 67 crashes occur during Ada county -- Ada county's typical peak travel period between 4:00 to 6:00 p.m. It's proven that the traffic is horrible. Why add more headache to it? More traffic? A figure of 46 cars. That's two cars per residence, plus that doesn't include for the commercial property will be coming out onto Topaz Avenue. There is no room. So, I, please, ask that you consider the people that live in this area, the people that have family in this area, that have raised a horse, have -- have a rural life. We enjoy a really rural life and we just ask that you consider that when you look at this monstrosity that's coming into our neighborhood.

Lorcher: Did ACHD have any comments as far as if they were going to do anything or they felt that was within their acceptable usage levels?

Adsitt: They said that -- and I don't know that they knew it was coming out onto Topaz, because they said they hadn't seen it yet. This was back in January.

Lorcher: Uh-huh.

Adsitt: They said that according to our policy a development may start to be considered for a traffic impact study if the development generates a hundred new external peak hour trips beyond the extent -- existing land use or a ten percent contribution to the major street roadway traffic. He said Overland in this case. So, I don't know if he was considering that they were going out onto Topaz --

Lorcher: Right.

Adsitt: -- which you can only turn right onto Topaz. You can't even turn left. I -- during the winter from November to February I am hauling my horse out that -- that road three nights a week to go right in an arena from -- I'm out there from 5:00 to 6:00. That's usually my time that I'm heading out to get on to that and it's a nightmare to get out. ACHD did put in no blocking the -- the intersection. They did put signs up --

Lorcher: Okay.

Adsitt: -- which is wonderful and people sometimes adhere to that. But, again, you cannot turn left coming out of Topaz. There is no -- with my horse trailer I wouldn't even dream of doing that.

Lorcher: Right.

Adsitt: It's just not safe. And I think this is too -- too much population for our little area.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much.

Adsitt: Thank you.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, no one else has signed up.

Lorcher: Would anybody else like to comment on this? Come on up.

Holyoke: Good evening. My name is Lyman Holyoke. My address is 1275 Jade Avenue. So, like the others I'm up around the corner in the rural side of the U-shape. At first glance I -- I was okay with this. I'm like -- I'm kind of intrigued, you know, like okay, multi-family. All right. And that's all around us. I see the vertically integrated. I love that, because in my mind I would like to do something like that on my property on the backside, but, then, I'm like, yeah, but I'm okay with this, because it's not my property. But that's beside the point. We have raised the issue of traffic and that is a huge issue. City of Meridian did a huge disservice to our neighborhood by approving that huge traffic nightmare back going to Top Golf off Silverstone. This morning I noted that when I was coming back from dropping my kids off at school I barely got across Eagle Road and I was -- we weren't even -- the road is trapped -- the road is blocked. You couldn't even -- they couldn't even get to the turn lane to turn into their business. So, that -- we are not even talking about this -- this development itself. You know, when I was looking at the applicant's paperwork they -- I looked for the ACHD comments. They didn't even mention that there is a plan to widen Overland Road to three lanes each way with a turn lane. I think that goes at least to Jade, maybe to Topaz, but it's basically to turn our neighborhoods into a right-hand turn only situation. I -- I think there needs to be greater integration with our neighborhoods before you consider anything -- the traffic's -- basically in my mind put a stop to all of this. But, otherwise, I do like seeing the businesses up on Overland. I think that's a great idea, especially the vertical integration. I love that idea. But, yeah, I think -- I think there needs to be greater consultation with ACHD before their -- for their decision on this. Thanks.

Lorcher: Thanks. Anybody else in Chambers? Madam Clerk, do we have anybody online?

Lomeli: Madam Chair, no.

Lorcher: Would the applicant like to come back and give some comments based on public testimony, please.

S.Wardle: Thank you, Madam Chair, Commissioners. Appreciate comments from the neighbors. We heard a lot about backyards today and I understand that and I can sympathize. I grew up in a Meridian with a population of 2,000 people. So, we understand growth and development. We understand that -- that the large lot rural culture and subdivision that used to be at Eagle and Overland, that there are still some people that are there, that are -- that purchased those properties. However, many of those are being redeveloped and -- and our -- our applicant has put together two parcels. We are not bringing you one acre, we put two acres on the corner together with what we feel is not just an economically viable project, but one that meets the -- the -- the need -- the needs and the goals of the Comprehensive Plan and so we didn't hear a lot of talk about density. We didn't hear talk about uses and commercial and so one of the things that I would -- I would ask of you is this. If you feel that this application has some technical issues in terms of open space or engineering or things, we can work those out either with a continuation or a condition. We are happy to do that. I have got the design professionals that have committed to me to make that happen and so if you have any issues with that we can find a way to work through it. If you have an issue with us not meeting the Comprehensive Plan or some other type of issue, then, I would like to have that discussion today, but, otherwise, we appreciate your time and would ask for approval.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much. Can I get a motion to close the public hearing?

Rust: So moved.

Smith: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Rust: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Rust.

Rust: I -- this is not the first application in this area that I have sat here for. I'm starting to recognize this. In fact, I think my only no vote as a Commissioner was for something right on this Overland stretch. Everybody recognizes, even a lot of public testimony, that this is a changing area. It's unfortunate, but it is happening. I appreciate the fact that this seems to be a local investor, somebody who is trying to make the community better. They want to live in this area. I think you can tell in the design elements that there is -- I do like the design just generally speaking. It seems to be attractive. I appreciate that there is two acres here. This is a longer list than we normally see and I -- I appreciate the fact that there is a lot of what I would view is more minutia, but there is a lot of minutia here that needs to be worked through. I read through the applicant's response. It seems like at least half of the items noted in the staff report can be fixed

and so kind of at the beginning of the staff report they contend that proposed development cannot be supported by staff because the site isn't large enough to accommodate the proposed use and meet all the dimensional development regulations in the district. It seems to me that the applicant is contending that they can fit it and so if that's the issue I would be in favor of a continuance to give them a chance to go and do the work and come back with a more developed proposal. I think that would -- we would be doing our job as Commissioners in kind of that gatekeeper in front of City Council. So, I'm not in favor of pushing this forward. I would be open to a continuance. I think some of this is just going to come down to a beauty in the eyes of the beholder for us on the Commission. I really fail to see how a regional park is ever going to go into this area, just with the -- the fact that the lots are so small, the cost of land is going to be so high, that ship has probably already sailed. This isn't south Meridian. This last one that we were looking at where you can get 60 acres from a farmer, these -- this is going to be small assemblages and that's going to make function -- functional integration much more challenging as this area changes. Somebody has to go first and if we turn this down, do we -- do we want as a city just only commercial businesses on those frontage lot? There is seven two acre -- one acre lots there. Is that what we want? I think that's what some people in the community want. I'm not sure that that's best. I like the mixed use component. I'm kind of curious to hear Commissioner Smith after the last one. This might be hitting you a little bit closer to the heart at least on that issue. Yeah. So, I will conclude here. I guess I would be in favor of a continuance personally. I would like to hear from the rest of the Commission on the application as a whole. I don't view these technical issues as a reason for denial. It seems to me that this application was maybe a little bit rushed, maybe there was a little bit of disconnect between staff and applicant and the applicant certainly has made it clear they are willing to go back and rectify those -- those technical issues.

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Madam Chair. Yeah. I'm -- to be candid I'm a little frustrated, because on one hand this is everything that I'm asking for a mixed use development to be. On the other hand, as Commissioner Rust said, there are a lot of issues here and in terms of being rushed, I mean I do want to note this is 2025-0004. That's the item. So, it's been in the pipeline for a minute; right? For reference the other one that we just -- some of the others that we heard tonight were 0061 -- or sorry. That's a 2024 number. 0030 I think. And so there -- there has been time on this and I think where I'm a little -- I will step back from frustrated, because I don't want to be unkind. I'm a little concerned is it almost feels like the Commission and/or Council are being treated as part of the ideation process, rather than deliberative bodies and for that reason I -- it seems like a lot of the work that has -- has -- should have been done by now has not been done and I know with a lot of things when we face developers and developers come to us and we say, hey, why isn't this this way and, you know, it's because if we did this and this other thing would be out of compliance and et cetera. There are a lot of moving parts here and I fear that if we say, hey, you know, all this can be reviewed in design and I'm not saying anyone's saying to approve this tonight, but if we can fix this in design we can do all this other stuff, well, what about when you change the easement for sewage, what

problems might that create and how are you going to address those? How are those going to be in compliance? I don't love -- even if NMID grants access I don't love that bridge over an unpiped NMID easement being kind of counted as this -- this open space. I don't really -- really understand it necessarily. There are a lot of issues here. I am tempted to want to vote to deny. I do know the applicant and the team are professionals and have come before this body many times and so I do tend to give some credence to if they say they can figure it out I will give them a shot. I'm happy to give them a shot at figuring it out. That being said, I do -- I do worry that there are some larger issues here than are solvable with a simple maybe two week continuance or something like that. So, to that end I'm happy to do a continuance. I would prefer if there may be a longer continuance, because it seems like there are more than just some quick issues to sort out. I do want to speak to the larger issue of development in this area. This area is currently zoned R-1 and in the FLUM -- in the future land use map it's -- I mean it's -- it's mixed use regional, which depending on the development is entitled to up to 40 residential units an acre. So, I want to be very clear there is density coming to this area. There is development coming to this area. And so some of the things -- like view sheds and light pollution and things like that, they are regrettable parts of development, but this is kind of within it's -- it's on a major transit corridor. We need to be encouraging density in these areas. I mean that's where density is best. I just think there is too many issues right now with this for me to support a short continuance and I would prefer a long continuance. I don't know what that looks like. I don't know if staff has any guidelines for maybe how long they think this might take to continue if it's possible with a continuance. I think there is a lot of questions there that -- that's kind of where I'm at and a little bit word vomiting, I'm thinking -- I think speaking as I'm thinking, but it's just -- I'm a little frustrated.

Lorcher: Okay. Commissioner Sandoval, do you have any comments?

Sandoval: Yeah, Madam Chair. I agree. I think there is just too many issues as presented to go on -- now an outright rejection or recommendation to reject -- I don't know that I'm necessarily in favor of that either, given that the applicant seems very willing to work out these details. So, I'm absolutely in favor of a continuance here.

Lorcher: Okay. Kurt, do we make a motion or reopen the public hearing at this point?

Starman: So, two thoughts. I think you can reopen the public hearing and discuss a continuance to a date certain and, then, that would also be an opportunity, once you reopen the hearing, you could ask the applicant if they have thoughts on a reasonable timeline and you can factor them to your deliberations.

Lorcher: Okay. So, in that case I motion to open the -- reopen the public hearing for H-2025-0004 for the St. George.

Rust: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to reopen the public hearing for St. George. Would the applicant come forward, please.

Smith: After second we need to vote.

Lorcher: Oh. Hold on. You can stand there. It's been moved and seconded. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? All right. Now we are good.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Lorcher: Okay. Continuance. So, you mentioned that you were -- you were open to that and the Commission is as well. So, what kind of time frame do you think you and your team would like to look at in order to come up with some -- address some of the issues in the staff report?

S.Wardle: Sure. Thank you, Madam Chair. I guess the question would be how -- how soon can we get in to staff to discuss this? We are going to need probably 30 days on the design team --

Lorcher: Okay. The challenge is it's November 6th and we have got the holidays coming in and not to say that we are not going to be here. I do know -- I do believe the first of the month of January is a holiday, so there most likely will not be a hearing that day. So, do you want to go into January or do you still think you want to be in December?

S.Wardle: We would like December. I don't know what your schedule looks like for the -- for the Commission.

Lorcher: So, the two dates in December are the 4th and the 18th and we need to check with the clerk to see what the docket looks like currently.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, we currently will have two scheduled for December 4th, so that would -- this hearing would put it at three.

Lorcher: And for December 18th?

Lomeli: There is nothing scheduled yet for the 18th.

Lorcher: So, the choice is yours. The 18th gives you a little bit more wiggle room. The 4th would be 30 days from -- give -- you know, just less than the 30 days.

S.Wardle: 4th, please.

Napoli: Madam Chair, if I can interject. I think the 4th is probably not going to be the best. I would say for staff's perspective, you know, we have gone back and forth on this application over nine months, six revisions, cycles, a lot of this was asked for, you know,

I would say the 18th would be at the earliest. I know the workload that my colleagues have and that I have. I have 13 other applications in the queue. Then we keep getting more. I know there is going to be some scheduled on the 4th additional, some more on the 18th and, quite frankly, I don't know how quickly -- if they need 30 days to turn around on the design team that means I need at least ten days to probably review it. I need to probably change some things in my staff report -- at least write a memo to you guys. I would say at the earliest January 18th, but probably -- or December 18th, but I think January 15th would probably be more appropriate.

Lorcher: So, we -- because of staff's workload would you consider December 18?

S.Wardle: Yes.

Lorcher: And if you get to that point where things aren't meshing, then, we will have to extend that out, you know, further and you can work through that with staff.

S.Wardle: We will do that at staff's discretion.

Lorcher: Okay. Where am I at?

Smith: Madam Chair, just to clarify that -- that --

Lorcher: December 18th.

Smith: But to clarify with saying push that out, do you mean continuance prior to the hearing? We would -- you intend on hearing that and, then, continuing further, because I know that has different implications for what staff would plan for.

Lorcher: I would say at this point we would have -- have it on the 18th and if staff and the applicant aren't ready --

Smith: Okay.

Lorcher: -- we can push it out again. Correct?

Smith: Yeah. I just wanted to confirm that was the plan and we weren't intending on actually guaranteeing hearing on the 18th if staff wasn't --

Lorcher: Correct.

Smith: -- ready. Okay.

Lorcher: Correct. Okay. With that in mind -- thank you very much.

S.Wardle: Thank you.

Lorcher: We are good. May I get a motion to close the public hearing?

Rust: So moved.

Smith: Madam Chair, we need to leave it open.

Lorcher: We are not doing that? What are we doing?

Starman: So, if you take -- if you would entertain a motion to continue -- continue the hearing to December 18th that would be my --

Lorcher: All right. Let's try this again. I motion to continue application 2025-0004 for the St. George for the date of December 18th.

Rust: Second. It's been moved and seconded to continue the St. George to December 18. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Lorcher: Okay. We are good. Then with that in mind, I will take one more motion.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Move to adjourn.

Rust: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to adjourn. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:07 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS.)
APPROVED

MARIA LORCHER - CHAIRMAN

DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK