

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Motion, if I may. I move that we continue Item 24, the public hearing for Ambles Run Subdivision, H-2020-0124, to April 20th to allow the applicant to meet with the president of the homeowners association to discuss concerns and potential mitigation and to allow the applicant to provide a legal analysis or legal basis for the subdivision and for their proposed project.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, I second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, all in favor signify by -- or do we need a voice vote for that, Mr. Nary? Or roll call vote?

Nary: Voice vote is fine.

Simison: Okay. All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it and the item is continued.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor --

Simison: Thank you very much. Council, shall we take a 15 minute break and reconvene at 8:30?

Hoaglund: Yes, please.

Simison: Okay. We will take a 15 minute recess and start up at 8:30.

(Recess: 8:16 p.m. to 8:31 p.m.)

25. Public Hearing for Compass Pointe Subdivision (H-2020-0100) by A-Team Land Consultants, Located at the Southwest Corner of E. Victory Rd. and S. Locust Grove Rd.

- A. Annexation and Zoning of 7.69 acres of land with a request for the R-15 zoning district.
- B. A Preliminary Plat consisting of 38 residential building lots and 10 common lots on approximately 4.69 acres of land in the R-15 zoning district.

Simison: Okay. Council, are you ready to come back in? Excellent. Then we will move on to our next item on the agenda, which is a public -- just want to make sure I got the right one. Public hearing for Compass Pointe Subdivision, H-2020-0100. We will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Dodson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. The subject site before you consists of --

Hoaglund: Joe? Mr. Mayor? I'm sorry to interrupt real quick. Just for the record, Jessica -- Council Woman Perreault has -- has had to leave the meeting, so she's no longer with us, so I wanted to get that on the record, so -- thank you, Joe.

Simison: Thank you, Councilman Hoaglund.

Dodson: Thank you. The subject site before you consists of 7.69 acres of land, currently zoned RUT, rural urban transition, within the county. It is located at the southwest corner of Victory and Locust Grove intersection. There is county residential to the north that I believe did receive approval or is in the process of receiving approval as noted in the plan development map on the far right for a lower density subdivision and there is single family residential and R-8 zoning in all other directions. The project was heard -- this project was heard by the Planning and Zoning Commission on December 3rd. The Commission recommended denial of the project to the Meridian City Council. Following this recommendation the applicant made a request to the Council to be remanded back to P&Z with a revised plat and open space pursuant to the comments within the staff report and by the Commissioners. City Council agreed with those requests and remanded the project back. The main changes made by the applicant following this recommendation of denial are related to the number of residential units proposed, the road layout, the amount of usable open space, and the applicant is no longer requesting a PUD, a planned unit development. Therefore, the applications before you are for annexation and zoning of 7.69 acres of land, with a request for the R-15 zoning district, a preliminary plat consisting of 37 residential building lots and ten common lots on approximately 4.69 acres of land and, then, a request for private streets throughout the development and alternative compliance to connect a private street directly to an arterial street. Private streets and alternative compliance are handled at the administrative level. The proposed uses are all single family residential, but in multiple forms. Attached townhomes, which are triplexes and attached duplexes, and there are detached single family homes. Approximately four. The project is proposed with a gross density of 4.94 dwelling units per acre and a net density of 9.8, which is lower than the previous proposal. The applicant is proposing to construct private streets that are 24 feet wide, with five foot attached sidewalk on at least one side of the street throughout the project. In most cases on both sides of the street. The north end of the main street within the development, which is shown as Compass Lane on the landscape plans, the applicant is proposing an emergency only access out to Locust -- or, sorry, out to Victory Road. This access is required if more than 30 homes are to be constructed. The proposed access for this development is to South Locust Grove and lines up with East Coastline Street on the east side of Locust Grove, which is the access into Tradewinds and the future Teakwood Subdivision further to the east. The access point into the development does not meet ACHD district policy, but they are modifying the policy to accommodate this access because this is the best place for the access, because it is the furthest point away from the Locust Grove-Victory intersection, period, for this obtuse triangle or acute triangle. I don't remember fourth grade. This is largely because of the site constraints that do exist for the parcel. The site is a triangle

shape as noted, bordered on two sides by arterials and on one side by the Ten Mile Creek. There is no opportunity for public road connectivity or any road connectivity to any adjacent site. Therefore, ACHD recommended and prefers private streets. The city requires that private streets are to be used in either a MEW or a gated community. A MEW would be a vista or paseo if you are from the west coast. This applicant has proposed a gate meeting these code requirements, which is approximately here just for reference. Sorry. I lost my place. They are proposing a gate meeting the code requirements. Staff did recommend removing the parking spaces that are shown before the gate to ensure there is an area for vehicles to turn around should they enter on this private street on accident. The applicant is showing that revision on these plans. The proposed private streets are not wide enough to accommodate any on-street parking, so the applicant is proposing to construct extra off-street parking spaces along the main street as seen on the plat. There are no multi-use pathways proposed or required for the development. However, the applicant is proposing five -- a five foot wide pathway on this side -- this project side of the creek and behind the proposed homes. This pathway connects to the private streets at the southern end of the project and through the common open space a lot located mid block. The pathway also continues north and connects to the required sidewalk along Victory Road. In addition, staff recommended an additional pedestrian connection to the sidewalk along Locust Grove from the revised layout, which is this pedestrian connection here and the five foot pathway I'm referring to is this one for reference. The applicant did submit revised plans showing compliance with this recommendation. There is no existing sidewalk along Victory or Locust Grove, with both arterial streets are scheduled to be widened as part of the ACHD roundabout project scheduled in 2021, 2022 according to ACHD. With the roundabout project the applicant is required to dedicate additional right of way for the intersection and future widening of Victory and Locust Grove. To be clear, the proposed plat does show the accommodated additional right of way. ACHD is requiring that the applicant enter into a road trust for the arterial sidewalk improvements, instead of constructing them, since they will be constructed with the roundabout project. A minimum of ten percent qualified open space is required for this project, because it is over five acres in size. With the size of the plat the applicant should supply at least .77 acres of qualified open space or approximately 33,500 square feet. The applicant is proposing 3.9 acres of open space, of which 3.4 is qual -- is shown as qualifying, which is vastly more than the minimum. However, some of the area listed as qualified does not meet UDC standards due to their size not being at least 5,000 square feet or being near the dimensions of 50 by 100. Once this area is removed the qualified open space is proposed as just under three acres. More importantly, the open space for this development is largely made up of the Ten Mile Creek, which includes approximately 2.1 acres and, then, the arterial street buffers, which are approximately 19,000 square feet. All of this area is qualifying, but the creek will be left natural as is required by code and it will be a buffer and more of a visual amenity than usable open space. Abutting the creek and generally mid block with a pathway in it, the applicant is proposing an open space lot that is approximately 5,700 square feet. This open space lot contains one of the amenities and a micro path that connects to the private street and to the pathway along the creek. This open space lot and micro path offers a clear connection to the attached sidewalks throughout the development and to the additional open space a lot more centrally located within the development. This 5,700

square foot open space lot is the most active and usable open space lot within the development. In general the applicant -- in general the applicant has increased the usable open space throughout the site following the Commission's recommendation of denial and other comments made by them and staff. With the reduction in unit count and additional centralized open space, staff finds the proposed open space not only in excess of code requirements, but also an improvement from previous layouts. The applicant submitted conceptual elevations for the proposed attached single family homes, both duplexes and the triplexes. The submitted elevation show all two story structures with the two car garages and finishing materials of wood and stone. In addition, the elevations show modern architecture designs with shed roofs, second story patios with glass railings, and stone accents that go from grade to the full height of the homes. Attached single family homes require design review prior to submitting for building permit and at that point staff will ensure full compliance with the architectural standards manual. Commission did recommend approval of the subject applications following the remand. There was a number of public testimony provided at the hearing. The key issues -- the key issues were the density of the project and the additional traffic that would be added to the adjacent intersection. Streets. There was discussion on whether the project complies with the Comprehensive Plan and in that it is a different type of residential than the surrounding neighborhood and that the proposed density is high density residential when adjacent neighborhoods are not. This was a sticking point where I had to do a zoning 101 conference with the hearing just to discuss that the zoning is not tied to the density ratio. So, the density is not tied to the zoning, it's tied to the future land use. And it is, in fact, in compliance with the density requirements within the Comprehensive Plan for the medium density residential designation. The Commission discussed all these issues, as well as the density with the revised plat following the loss of 11 total lots, showing this latest revision and they reviewed the changes that have occurred following. The only outstanding issues for Council are some conditions of approval regarding the plat and the landscape plan were not revised. However, those issues can be handled at the final plat stage. They are minuscule and administrative points largely. There were two pieces of testimony provided following the Commission hearing. One from a Kristen Thompson. She opposes the project based on the density and that it does not match the surrounding development and I believe a neighbor to the west, but a Ms. Patricia Johnson, who had concerns over the existing trees that are within the irrigation easement and abutting the Ten Mile Creek and noting overall safety concerns of within the creek should any changes occur to the site regarding landscaping. Following that I will stand for any questions by Council.

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

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Joe, do you know the distance from the entrance to the neighborhood to -- like the center point of that proposed roundabout? And if you don't -- I don't expect you to

know off the top of your head, but maybe to get that piece of information either for you, potentially for the applicant, potentially later.

Dodson: Councilman Cavener, I do not have that off the top of my head. The applicant might know. He -- he took the underlying CAD drawing from ACHD in order to design the plat, so he would probably have that answer for you.

Cavener: Okay. Thank you.

Hoaglund: And Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: And, Joe, along those same lines, I was just curious in looking at your -- your PowerPoint you had up there, when -- when you talked about the widening of both Locust Grove and Victory happening '21, '22 and where their entrance and exit would be it didn't -- it -- it was narrow at that time, but showing the roundabout. Is that part of that expansion or is it just the roundabout?

Dodson: Councilman Hoaglund, that's a great question and that was brought up in the previous Commission hearing as well. So, to -- I clarified with ACHD that the roundabout project will go all the way to the end of their property, which includes the little bridge over the creek and all of that area is supposed to be widened, which will greatly help with pedestrian safety in that area.

Hoaglund: Okay. Thank you.

Simison: Council, any further questions? Okay. Then I will ask the applicant to, please, come forward and state their name and address and be recognized for 15 minutes.

Arnold: Mayor, Members of the City Council, for the record my name is Steve Arnold with A-Team Land Consultants. Business address is 1785 Whisper Cove, Boise. 83709. And just to preface my -- my presentation, I did have computer issues earlier with my internet going down. If for any reason it does go down again I will call in and, Joe, I e-mailed you a copy of my presentation. So, with that said I will share my screen. Joe pretty much explained the site layout. I -- I will add to that. I do have some renderings of the type of buildings. One of the reasons that we are doing the buildings that we are is we are trying to get some diversity of housing types out in the area. So, Joe kind of went over all of this. I will go over kind of our old layout. This is what the City Planning and Zoning Commission denied and one of the reasons there was the massing along here was more than they liked. They also didn't like this long straight street and these two dead end roads. So, we ended up modifying the -- something like this with what I call is a lollipop, instead of two dead-end streets. This just gives you kind of an idea of the view. This is looking from Locust Grove north at our entrance. As you can see along here there is some bending of the roads and we did break up some -- a lot of the facade and the walls along there. This is from the north looking south. Again, just another -- different angle

that you can see that the -- the undulation of the roadway. This would be a view looking at our central park here, looking north and west and, then, this is a view from that park looking at the other little pocket park on the east side of the road and, again, you can see kind of the buildings and the different masses that we are proposing to -- to help break out a lot of the general massing along the road that we previously had when the Commission denied. I don't know -- and maybe, Joe, you can answer this -- do we need to go back into the changes in the draft DA that we -- we had approved at Planning and Zoning Commission? If we don't I will just move along.

Dodson: Steve, no. If Council makes a recommendation -- or when they make a recommendation it will include those changes.

Arnold: Okay. So, I will just go simply through the modifications that we did from the time we were denied by the Planning and Zoning to the time they approved it. So, we went from 48 building lots down to 37 and as, again, Joe noted, our density went from 6.24 lots per acre down to 4.81 and, then, we -- by doing so we also complied with the setbacks. Before we were asking for some relief of the setbacks, so -- which in turn eliminated the need for the PUD. We increased also the housing variety. We decreased the number of triplexes. Increase in single family and townhomes in there to get a greater mix and, then, we had some -- in the previous layout some odd shaped lots, which also, then, created some odd shaped housing and we eliminated that completely. And, again, as Joseph noted, we went from roughly 3.2 acres of open space to 3.7, a 35 to 44 percent increase. With the increase of open space we also added the addition of a dog park. I don't know that that was brought up in the -- the discussion, but up north along here we have created an additional park. It's just, I believe, under 6,000 square feet. So, the roadways, again, we eliminated the two dead ends. Created a lollipop, which eliminated the need for a fire turnaround. And, again, as noted we -- we put some S turns in the north-south lane to help break up massing and also create some different undulations with the building. We added the gated entry and we added pedestrian crossings along with a turnaround. So, there -- we did -- at staff's recommendation we eliminated some off-street parking right south of the gate and -- and provided that, so that cars entering weren't -- by mistake they can at least turn around fairly easily. I put this together just to give you an idea. The -- this property currently utilizes all of the city services, you know, school, police, fire, emergency services, et cetera, and this just kind of gives you an idea that -- what this site and its development will generate for the fees and taxes. Roughly the one time fees up front will be in that 560,000 range and, then, the taxes annually will be the -- roughly the 157 and all these numbers here are the current levy rates that are within the city. Basically -- and I will keep my end short, but we are asking for approval of the project, because we have complied with all of city code. We have met the comp plan and we have made all the staff recommendations. You know, we have been working with Joe on this for about ten months, that we have had a lot of his time and we appreciate all of the city's comments and input. We have also taken in all the neighborhood concerns about the density and have greatly reduced it. We took all of the Commission's recommendations or reasons for our previous denial and have made those changes and now we do have their approval. We -- I don't think I have ever worked on such a small subdivision that we have provided as much open space as we did, but it -- we do have quite a bit. Not to mention the -- the

amenities that we are putting within those open spaces. I think we have exceeded any kind of requirement for the city. You know, we are -- we are in this for the long haul. We are -- the developer is also the builder. So, it's -- you know, his reason for doing a nice project is not just to blow and go through the lots, but he is going to be building these things, so, you know, it would behoove him to, you know, spend the money up front and get higher returns on his homes that he builds, you know, and, then, us, we are continued to commitment to providing quality neighborhoods. I have done quite a bit of work with Meridian and I don't think that there is any one subdivision that can be I guess downplayed or that I regret doing. I think we have done good work within the city. The housing type, you know, I can go into the real estate market here, which is crazy stupid. We also market subdivisions. We are fully aware of the demand and our pricing, as brought up earlier, you know, lumber prices are through the roof. So, I think we are -- we are providing a product type that is in demand and will help out some of the housing demands. The site is in-fill. I mean, you know, it's currently using the city services. You know, by developing it we are going to be able to bring in some fees and funds that will help finance those. Annexing the property, frankly, will financially help pay existing service in the immediate area. Based on that we are asking for your approval and I appreciate your time and I will stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Mr. Hoaglund.

Cavener: It was Mr. Cavener.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Sorry, Mr. Mayor. Thanks, Mr. Mayor. Steve, thanks for your presentation. I will ask you the same question I asked staff. What's the distance between the entrance to your proposed neighborhood and that roundabout?

Arnold: If I can share another screen -- if I can figure that out I will get you that answer. I lost it.

Johnson: Sorry. I stopped that one. If you could start a new.

Arnold: Oh. Got you. Do you see this?

Cavener: Uh-huh.

Arnold: Okay. I will measure it. I don't fully know right off the top of my head. So, if you go -- 765 feet.

Cavener: Okay. Thank you.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Hoaglun: It's Councilman Hoaglun.

Simison: Well, you guys -- I can't see your faces.

Hoaglun: Oh for two.

Simison: This at home is for the birds, I'm just going to be honest with you. Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: Mr. Arnold, question about the timing of your project. If this were to be approved what -- when is your start date, when do you plan on finishing up all those plans that you have?

Arnold: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Hoaglun, following -- assuming we get approval, we would immediately turn around and start engineering drawings. Typically it takes between two to four months from the time you start to the time that you complete. We will be coordinating with ACHD -- I believe they start the roundabout this summer. I anticipate a, oh, five to six month construction window and our proposal is to build -- build the entire thing in one phase.

Hoaglun: So, Mr. Mayor, follow up?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: Mr. Arnold, the homes would be up for sale January of next year. What -- what -- what is that time frame and when is the completion of the roundabout scheduled?

Arnold: The -- the completion of the roundabout I believe is in November, December. I don't think it's a very large project for ACHD. But I do believe it was going to be completed either at or around the time that we would start construction. But the -- the -- if the question is will the -- when the housing starts will the roundabout be done and, yes, I fully envision that.

Hoaglun: Okay. Thank you.

Simison: Council, any further questions for the applicant? Okay. Thank you. Mr. Clerk, do we have anybody signed up to provide testimony on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, in sign-ups no one indicated they wished to testify, but there are people present and I will call up Mr. John Buckner.

Simison: Okay. And if there is anybody who is on the Zoom call and you would like to provide testimony, please, use the raise your hand feature and we can bring you in for -- to testify.

Buckner: Thank you. I'm sorry.

Simison: State your name and address for the record, please.

Buckner: John Buckner. I live on 3877 South Picasso Avenue in Meridian. I'm right down the street from this intersection. I want to thank the Council, Mayor Simison, for the opportunity to speak. I want to say that I love Meridian and I'm for development, I'm for growth, I'm just for growth that makes sense and that really isn't inappropriate. For example, sticking an R-15 zone right in the middle of an area that consists primarily of R-8s and R-4s just really doesn't make sense. I would like to see a revised plan with no more than an R-8 and a reduction of a minimum of about ten units to the design and just to add onto what Planner Dodson said, there were about 50 entries in the website, just to let you know, voicing contest of the plan. The application does not comply with many of the city's standards or the Comprehensive Plan, besides those that were gone over. For example, the subdivision design and improvement standards, UDC 11-3C-6 requires that off-street parking is provided. The application did not comply with these standards according to this staff report. The private roads and available spaces don't accommodate this requirement. The staff recommended the developer require -- and bylaws the garages be forbidden use as storage, which Commissioner Seal in a previous hearing already said is a very likelihood, so that whatever space is available in the parking spaces and on the pads is probably not going to be efficiently used and cars are going to be spilling over causing congestion and potential safety hazards for the neighborhood. Also the -- it doesn't comply with many action items of the Comprehensive Plan. For example, 5.01.00, which requires a sustain entrance promote -- sustain, enhance, promote and protect elements and contribute to the livelihood and quality of life for the residents. Adding 37 units is about two cars each. That's about 74 units. The density is really going to make things not -- not a high quality of life for the existing residents or even new ones for that matter. According to the December staff report there were 30 crashes in the past year within one mile of the intersection. I have had the opportunity to witness two of them after the fact. So, jamming in 74 vehicles in this area is not really going to help that situation. Also according to 5.01.02E, the Comprehensive Plan requires to support and protect the identity of existing residential neighborhoods. As you have seen in the photos and also on this plan, the houses take a drastic deviation from the identity and the character of the rest of the neighborhood, which does not really comply with that. The homes are very townhome and modern styled, not like the homes that already pose some diversity. For example, I live in Green Valley, which is right across the street from Tuscany. A very beautiful development to Steve Arnold's credit. However, there is much diversity in that neighborhood without going to the drastic effect of making our nice committee to look like an urban city, a very modern city, and I don't think that's a necessary step in order to add diversity to our city. Anyway, I would like to thank you for the opportunity and please consider what we -- how we feel, because you do represent us. Thank you.

Simison: Council, any questions?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, nobody -- excuse me. Nobody online. Looking in the room. Anyone else? Okay. I believe everyone has testified, Mr. Mayor.

Simison: Would the applicant like to make any final comments?

Arnold: Yes, I would. Can I also share my screen again and I will -- I will just go through some of his highlights. I guess Joe could probably do this better than me, but given the R-15 discussion about zoning, you know, we are not going in R-15 so that we can bump the density up and if we did the R-10 I -- there is not an R-10, but the R-8, the dimensional standards don't work for the product type that we are trying to do. So, that's the only reason we are going for R-15 is not density, but dimensional standards. It was brought up that the garages not be used for storage. We fully intend to do that through our CC&Rs. I know the city through previous hearing, you -- you guys don't enforce CC&Rs, nor do most other cities, but that's something that we also want and we are -- we have done it in other subdivisions that we have worked in and it's worked. So, our plan is to do it in this one. But regardless of the -- the -- the parking, we are -- there is a place on Lot 1, Block 4, that we are adding additional parking on. Our concern is also parking. We don't want to have parking be an issue. The garage -- so, assuming -- we will put those in the CC&Rs. Also -- we also have two parking stalls outside of the garage and some of these units are two bed, two and a half bath. So, we are exceeding parking quite a bit. There was a statement about additional traffic and accidents. I -- the traffic out there, as the intersection currently sits, is a problem. ACHD recognized that in their analysis, but they also recognize that it is a short term issue and by the time that our traffic hits the road we will have a fully improved intersection with a roundabout that has significant less accident rates than a stop controlled -- or a stoplight control signal. So, that problem all goes away. I chose the modern design out there, because I didn't see anything out in that area and our plan is to market the subdivision. So, I think it would be a product type that would meet a demand that's not in the area. If it's the direction of the Council that you want us to do a different design type, we can certainly do that. And as Joe stated, this project goes through a design review. So, this is not the last time that the city will see this. You know. And, again, we are not tied in any way to the specific design. I just personally thought it would be a good fit out there. But we will do whatever the city wants us to on that. And that's all the follow up I had. So, I will stand for questions.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any additional questions?

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: You're going to have to --

Hoaglund: Councilman Hoaglund here.

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglun: Just to kind of ask Mr. Arnold a question about -- are you aware that in the past we have had some annexations if they are above five acres that we have continued them to a date certain beyond the -- what we think would be the end of the legislative session due to some of the legislation that's been proposed regarding property taxes and the impact it would have to our city budgets? I don't know if you are aware of that or not.

Arnold: Mayor, Councilman Hoaglun, yeah, I was given that heads up by the -- the staff. Joe gave us a heads up and he wasn't sure and at the time I asked, you know, do we ask for a continuation and just not, you know, I guess present it tonight and it was recommended that we do that. One of my reasons for putting together that financial analysis was that, you know, as it currently sits I think that the city's better off, you know, annexing this property than not, although I'm not that familiar with the legislature. I did see some dates in there that -- that it was going to affect properties annexed after July of 2021 and I didn't fully understand that. So, I have been made aware that this was a concern by the city.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor, follow up.

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: Yeah. And you are correct. And one particular piece of legislation that we were following did -- did lose in the state senate by one vote. However, the session is not over. It's been made very clear by certain members of the house that it is a top priority for them to -- to reduce city budgets, which for a growing community like Meridian impacts our ability to pay for services that growth requires and I guess that's a question for Council at this point in time. Do we want to have a further discussion about this now that we have gone through the testimony or do we wish to pause and -- and move it to a date certain until after the legislature adjourns. This is 7.69 acres. Kind of somewhat qualifies for in-fill, but I would think based on our previous conversation that we had kind of decided anything about five acres due to the impacts we would wait until we know -- we have some certainty about what the legislature is going to do. So, what's the desire of the Council when it comes to that?

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: I'm glad you brought that up, Councilman Hoaglun. I think it's most prudent to stay the course. I think our cautious continuances to see what the financial landscape is is still the right way to go for the exact reasons we stated earlier and I think that applies to this project. Just defers a decision until we have got the legislation and the session completed.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I think consistency in how we treat applications is really important right now, so that we are not creating an atmosphere of winners and losers. We are treating each one -- sticking to our guidelines that we laid out. I do want to state that I think some of the changes that the applicant made I really applaud and think some of these changes have been really positive overall for the project. I think it's headed in the right direction. But I do agree that probably continuing this until after the legislature hopefully is done and we will all breathe a sigh of relief and we will be able to go about our business at that point.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, this is Council Member Cavener.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I agree with my fellow Council Members. I will be real frank, I have got some real concerns about this project and will welcome the opportunity to address those with the -- with the applicant at a later point in time. I would just maybe urge the Council as we think about this -- I know we have been continuing them with the hope of having those continuances begin in -- in mid to late April. With -- with the legislature taking a two week pause, it sounds like that they are not going to be wrapped up for the end of the year until probably the end of April. So, as we contemplate when we want to continue this project to, I think it's important that we don't schedule it so quickly that we, then, are kind of recontinuing it at a later point in time. So, we might want to be looking towards maybe a Council meeting in mid to late May.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Hoaglund here.

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Yeah. And that is something we are looking at. They would like to get wrapped up within two weeks after going back in, but as you know that oftentimes is not achieved. But I think if -- if -- looking at the schedule and consulting with the city clerk, April 27th is -- is a possibility that they could be done and we do have an opening there without having stacks of hearings that night. Mr. Arnold, is that something that's workable for you?

Arnold: Say again. The time was late April?

Hoaglund: April 27th.

Arnold: It is doable for my schedule. I can make that work. And one of my thoughts is if this new legislature only affects properties greater than five acres, we can -- I mean the -- the -- the channel or the Ten Mile Creek there, we could split that off and we could just annex the development ground, because we don't need that property to develop.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.