

Meridian Planning and Zoning Meeting

September 4, 2025.

Meeting of the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission of September 4, 2025, was called to order at 6:02 p.m. by Vice-Chairman Jared Smith.

Members Present: Commissioner Jared Smith, Commissioner Matthew Sandoval, Commissioner Jessica Perreault, and Commissioner Matthew Stoll.

Members Absent: Commissioner Maria Lorcher, Commissioner Brian Garrett and Commissioner Sam Rust.

Others Present: Tina Lomeli, Kurt Starman, Sonya Allen, Linda Ritter and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

_____ Brian Garrett	_____X_____ Jessica Perrault
___X___ Matthew Sandoval	_____X_____ Matthew Stoll
_____ Sam Rust	_____X_____ Jared Smith
_____ Maria Lorcher - Chairman	

Smith: Okay. Good evening. Welcome to the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting for September 4th, 2025. At this time I would like to call the meeting to order. The Commissioners who are present for this evening's meeting are at City Hall. We also have staff from the City Attorney and the City Clerk's Office, as well as the City 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 that we cannot take questions until the public testimony portion. If you have a process question 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 the streaming on the city's YouTube channel. You can access it at meridiancity.org/live. With that let's begin the roll call. Madam Clerk.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Smith: The first item on the agenda is the adoption of the agenda. There are no changes to tonight's agenda. Could I get a motion to adopt tonight's agenda?

Stoll: So moved.

Perreault: Second.

Smith: It has been moved and seconded to adopt the agenda. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

1. **Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for CapEd at Ten Mile (H-2025-0026) by Megan West, Slichter Ugrin Architecture, located at 657 S. Vanguard Way.**

Smith: The next item on the Consent -- the next item on the agenda is the Consent Agenda, which includes Finding of Facts, Conclusions of Law for CapEd at Ten Mile and the approval of the minutes of the August 21st Planning and Zoning meeting.

ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

Stoll: Mr. Chair, I would like to request that Item 2, approval of the minutes from the August 21st meeting, be pulled off to correct some typos and a vote that was there, particularly references you as Simison several times and, then, it references Elaine Clegg in part of the discussion as Wayne Clegg and, then, most substantively the motion to continue the Pine 43 discussion. It was a three-two vote instead of a four-one vote. Commissioner Rust and myself voted no.

Smith: All right. Kurt, just so the -- I imagine one -- one member asked to remove it would remove it. What is the process going forward?

Starman: Mr. Chairman, I guess I would recommend that the -- if the Commission as a whole is amenable to that I would recommend that we just refer the item back to staff for corrections and we can put it back on your next agenda with the corrected material. So, if you can maybe entertain a motion to that effect that would be great.

Smith: All right. Can I get a motion to that effect?

Stoll: I move to remove the minutes from August 21st from the Consent Agenda, remand it back to staff for corrections as discussed.

Perreault: Second.

Smith: It's been moved and seconded. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Smith: Beyond that could I get a motion to adopt the remainder of the Consent Agenda as presented?

Perreault: So moved.

Stoll: Second.

Smith: It's been moved and seconded. Can I -- all those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carried.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Smith: All right. 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 on how the item adheres to our Comprehensive Plan and Unified Development Code. After staff has made their presentation the applicant will come forward to present their case and respond to staff 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 on only once during the public testimony portion. The clerk will call the names individually of those who signed up on our website in advance to testify. You may come to the microphones in Chambers or will be unmuted on Zoom. Please state your name and address for the record and, then, 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 the screen and our clerk will run the presentation. If you have established that you are speaking on behalf of a larger group, like an HOA, where others -- others from that group will allow you to speak on their behalf you will have up to ten minutes. After all of those who have signed up in advance have spoken we will invite any others who may wish to testify. If you wish to speak on the topic you may come forward in Chambers or if on Zoom raise the -- raise your hand and if you are only listening on a phone please 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, be sure to mute those extra devices, so we do not experience feedback and we can hear you clearly. When you are finished if the Commission does not have questions for you you will return to your seat in Chambers or be muted on Zoom and no longer have the ability to speak and, please, remember we will not call on you a second time. After all 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, then, close the public hearing and the Commissioners will have the opportunity to discuss and hopefully be able to make final decisions or recommendations to City Council as needed.

ACTION ITEMS

- 3. Public Hearing for Fairbourne Subdivision No. 4 (H-2025-0036) by Rodney Evans + Partners, LLC., generally located at the northwest corner of W. Chinden Blvd. and N. Black Cat Rd., at 4837 W. Waverton Dr.**
 - A. Request: Combined Preliminary/Final Plat consisting of one (1) buildable lot on 5.2 acres of land in the C-G zoning district.

Smith: All that said, Item No. 3 on the agenda is H-2025-0036 for a preliminary and final plat for the Fairbourne Subdivision on Chinden and Black Cat. We will begin with the staff report.

Allen: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission. The first application before you tonight is a request for a combined preliminary and final plat. This site consists of 5.2 acres of land. It's zoned C-C and it's generally located at the northwest corner of North Black Cat Road and West Chinden Boulevard. In 2018 this property was included in a rezone, preliminary plat and a development agreement modification application for Fairbourne Subdivision, which included the adjacent residential subdivision to the north and west. A new development agreement was approved with the modification, which governs future development of the overall property. Final plat applications were approved for all of the property included in the preliminary plat, except for this last remaining area, which was intended to be included in the last phase. However, a final plat application was never submitted. A time extension was not requested and the preliminary plat has since expired. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation for the property is mixed use community. A combined preliminary and final plat is proposed consisting of one building lot on 5.2 acres of land in the C-C zoning district. A conceptual development plan was submitted as shown there on the left that depicts three commercial building pads for retail office use. The largest Pad A is proposed to be a grocery store at 25,623 square feet. Pad B is 11,234 square feet and Pad C is 4,964 square feet. The proposed development is consistent with the provisions in the development agreement. Access is proposed via one existing access driveway from West Waverton Drive and one access driveway from North Black Cat Road. No access is proposed or allowed via Chinden Boulevard. An emergency access exists to this site through a blanket easement across Lot 17, Block 7, in the abutting Fairbourne Subdivision No. 2. And that is in this location right here where my cursor is. On the west side of the property detached five foot wide sidewalks exist on the side along Waverton and Black Cat. A ten foot wide detached sidewalk and pathway exists in the street buffer along Chinden. ITD submitted a letter requesting the developer contribute a proportionate share toward installation of a westbound right turn lane at Chinden and Black Cat. After a little more investigation on that that area for the right turn lane was off site. It's not part of this. This site is located on the northwest corner of Chinden and Black Cat. Where ITD is talking about is on the -- in front of the property on the northeast corner. So, that would be an off-site improvement and staff is not requesting that be a condition of approval of this application. The street buffers exist on this site along abutting streets that were installed with the adjacent subdivision improvements. Additional landscaping and design features are needed in the buffers to comply with the minimum UDC standards. Conceptual building elevations were submitted as shown for the proposed grocery store. Final design is required to comply with the design standards in the Architectural Standards Manual. Loading docks are prohibited in commercial districts facing collector streets, such as Waverton and Black Cat, or arterial streets, such as Chinden per the Architectural Standards Manual. Written testimony has been received from the applicant's representative Ben Semple. He is in agreement with the conditions in the staff report. Staff is recommending approval. Staff will stand for any questions.

Smith: Would the applicant like to come -- actually, are there any questions for staff? Would the applicant like to come forward? And, then, please state your name and address for the record.

Semple: Good evening, Members of the Commission. Ben Semple with Rodney Evans and Partners. 1450 Bannock Street, Boise, Idaho. 83702. I want to thank Sonya for the presentation. She did a great job encapsulating what this portion of the project is, which is basically cleaning up an original or a previous preliminary plat and a subsequent phase development. The -- as stated the existing preliminary plat has expired. This was always intended to be a single lot for the final phase. A final plat was never filed by the previous developer. My client has since entered into a contract to purchase this property and that's when this came up that effectively it's not a developable parcel until this subdivision is approved. So, this will legalize the parcel for development. There aren't any frontage improvements required with the subdivision itself. We did submit a conceptual development plan for the site. The intent is for a grocery store to be on this site that will go back through a CZC process with the city and at that time the city staff, ACHD and ITD will be able to further evaluate the project based on the intensity of the use or -- so that they can determine what improvements may be required off site, as well as on site and on the adjacent roadways. So, we -- the property itself is within -- sorry, I can't see if my presentation was up. Is that up there?

Allen: I'm sorry. Just a moment.

Semple: No. You're okay.

Allen: You are ready to go.

Semple: It's not on.

Allen: No, it's not.

Semple: Thank you. Didn't realize it was a touch screen. So, yeah, thanks. Again this is Fairbourne Subdivision No. 4. Again, it's the final plat to clean up this final phase of the Fairbourne Subdivision. So, the northwest corner of Chinden and Black Cat. As Sonya stated, here is the vicinity map. The current zoning is C-C. We are not asking to rezone it. The future land use is that MUC and the use of the -- this -- as a commercial lot within that -- or within the subdivision is allowed. We -- this is the original preliminary plat. The lot in question is highlighted in red. We have not proposed any changes to what was originally proposed with this lot. As you can see just reoriented, the current preliminary plat and final plat are in conformance with that. We have reviewed the development agreement that was recorded with the overall subdivision and this does fall within the provisions within that for the use, as well as the proposed subdivision to be a single lot. Here is an aerial photo on the right of the existing frontage improvements. The buffer along Black Cat will be improved with existing -- or additional trees, as well as the frontage along Chinden to ensure -- excuse me -- that the -- those buffers meet the current UDC standards. I believe that they have been updated since 2018, so there

is some additional stuff that needs to go in there. The emergency access will remain an emergency access. That won't be opened to any vehicular traffic. It's currently ballarded. It will remain that way. These are the conceptual building elevations that Sonya showed you. Again, the architect is working on this. They are going back and forth with their client to determine what they want their building to look like. That will come back in with a CZC application. There will be a full landscape plan that is developed with that and is, then, evaluated again by staff. We are in agreement with all the conditions of approval that are in the staff report. As Sonya stated, access to Chinden is prohibited. There was a note on the final plat that stated direct access to Black Cat was prohibited and that was an error that the surveyor had on that plat, so that will get removed. There will be direct access to Black Cat as well. That is in conformance with the provisions within that recorded DA as well. We will add the DA provision -- or the instrument numbers and the license agreements, as well as updating the landscape plan as I stated. I would stand for any additional questions you might have. Thank you.

Smith: Thank you. Commissioners, are there any questions for the applicant or staff? Commissioner Stoll.

Stoll: I do. So, ITD submitted a comment regarding the right turn lane and that there is a previous agreement with the applicant for that to be built prior to occupancy being granted for any of the buildings. Is that tied to the previous phases or this current phase?

Semple: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Stoll, my understanding is that it was a provision in the previous development agreement and that prior to any occupancy within maybe this lot it was supposed to be built. I was not part of and neither was my client currently part of that previous development team. We received the letter yesterday from ITD and in conversations with Sonya it was determined that this development will pay its share of improvements required by ITD for off-site here, including a right turn lane, when they have the opportunity to review a development plan and a use and not just a conceptual plan, because at this point, until the subdivision is recorded, we can't submit any plans for a use and so they can't give us formal feedback or determine what that -- those offset improvements might be, including a right turn lane off Chinden, which we do anticipate.

Smith: Okay. Any other questions?

Stoll: No. That's it.

Smith: All right. Thank you.

Semple: Thank you.

Smith: At this time we will take public testimony. Madam Clerk, is there anyone signed up to testify?

Lomeli: Thank you Mr. Chair. Yes. I have Paul McLaughlin. He has some pictures he is going to share with you as well.

Smith: Thank you. And, please, state your name and address for the record.

McLaughlin: Good evening. Paul McLaughlin. I live at 6811 North Maple Stone, which is in the Fairbourne community. I'm the -- I'm here representing that the HOA as well. Okay. So, several months ago we met with Mr. Semple. He met with a limited group of people that were within the immediate vicinity of the proposed development and he addressed concerns with us and told us what the development was. You know, what they were planning on doing. A lot of the questions that night revolved around three particular areas and that was traffic, noise and lighting. Mr. Semple was able to provide pretty reasonable responses regarding the noise and lighting and what was going to be done to mitigate that and what the requirements of the city were. He could not answer any questions regarding traffic mitigation or roadway improvements, because that didn't fall within his purview and he was deferring us to ACHD, ITD and the city regarding what was going to be done for road improvements. I'm going to say I'm generally not in favor of outright opposing a project that meets the zoning requirements of the land and in this case it's no different. My concern is that we just want to address some of the, you know, problems that are likely to come up as a result of this -- this property, you know, and what's being done. Are we -- is this -- we got the first photo?

Lomeli: Right now it's playing through a slide show, but you can use arrows if you want to reference a certain picture.

McLaughlin: All right. So, is there a way to stop the scrolling, so I can address these?

Lomeli: Try it now.

McLaughlin: Oops. Yeah. That's not doing anything. Anyway. So, Black Cat between Chinden and Waverton, which is the -- the access street that you are going to have to use to get in there, which is this section -- well, it was right there. Currently I heard there was some discussion about whether or not there was going to be access allowed onto Black Cat, which is going to be this driveway to left up here -- right -- right -- well, above that arrow. That's not so much the concern. It can -- you can see that this was developed with the idea of putting in a right turn lane off of southbound Black Cat onto Chinden. The bigger concern for me is the northbound traffic. This section that has the -- the red square around it is a median that's currently in there now and the primary purpose is to prevent people coming out of the modern craftsman development from turning left onto the street because of its proximity I'm assuming to Chinden and the potential traffic concerns, so they have to exit from the next farther north driveway. The -- the issue this proposes, you know, that brings up is that there is not going to be any access off of Black Cat into that development. There will be access out of it, unless they remove this. Both of those alternatives create problems. If they take it out, then, we are going to have big backups along Black Cat going north. If they leave it in, then, I think that's still going to propose, you know, a problem when you get up to Waverton.

Can we go to the next slide? These arrows aren't working. So, if you see where the end of that red box is that starts the left turn lane to get onto Waverton. You have to turn onto Waverton and, then, again, turn left into this property. I have looked all over. I have looked at maps, I have -- it may not be -- I wouldn't say that it's -- it's unprecedented to have -- to access -- to make two left turns on residential collector roads to get into a development -- commercial development, but from what I can see and what I have researched for a project this size and requiring two left turns, which, you know, causes traffic problems more than what a right turn would be, this is rare if not unique. This left turn lane that would allow people to turn on -- onto Waverton at most is going to accommodate about four cars before the -- you start backing up and stopping traffic northbound on -- on Black Cat. The -- if we go to the next photo. Okay. So, this is a photo I took on Sunday, which is pretty much all Rock Harbor Church traffic coming out. I didn't sit around waiting for traffic to get bad. I launched the drone. Took this within three minutes and, you know, it was just what it was and this was a half hour after their -- one of their later morning services let out. They have currently I think five services on Sundays. On holidays they have up to ten services on Saturdays and Sundays and sometimes even on Fridays and there is a great deal of traffic comes out of that and a lot of it comes out from Waverton onto Black Cat -- southbound on Black Cat. Additionally they have a satellite parking a little farther down Black Cat that they are constantly driving people to and from on. As you can see the left turn lane at some point if you are -- you can see that little red car there, I mean he is already maneuvering to get into the left turn lane, that's going to become the left turn lane to go into this development. So, you know, traffic is going to be concerned generally just because of the two left turns on this residential narrow collector road. The other problem is there is no markings or left turn lanes on Waverton right now, which I think would have to be incorporated into this as well. If we -- the -- I'm sorry -- you know -- and as this starts to impact people coming out of there and not being able to turn left and, then, the Rock Harbor traffic going south, what's going to eventually happen here is you are either going to have so much traffic going in and out of there that people are going to resort to going farther down and coming back around off of Chinden farther west and onto Waverton and coming east on Waverton, which we have already got people doing during rush hour. We got people cutting through an undeveloped piece of property, because it's a straight shot and, actually, if -- can you pull up the next photo? Okay. So, you can -- that -- that street -- the main street cutting through there is Waverton. It's going to produce quite a bit of traffic there when people start circumventing the Black Cat access trying to come around from eastbound on Waverton. That circle there is of concern, because we have approximately 60 homes in the southern part of the subdivision and many children living down there and that street -- crossing that street where that circle is is how they get to the park and the pool and it's, you know, already getting to the point where we got people speeding down that street. We talked to Mr. Semple about, you know, what could be done to mitigate that and he did -- we did talk about speed bumps, which apparently is not a real popular thing with the city or the fire department and I get that. The other thing is he brought up -- he said, well, speed bumps statistically, you know, people tend to go -- slow down to go over the bump and, then, they go even faster to get to the next speed bump. So, I don't know what we can do. One of the things that we have talked about since then is possibly up there at the

driveway that exits onto Waverton prohibiting left turns out of there. That might at least affect the egress, but not the ingress. You know, we got some issues here that I'm hoping we can address more than anything the traffic ones I think -- there is -- there is four things that I think need to be done to address future traffic concerns. One of them is, again, prohibiting left turns onto Waverton out of that north driveway. The second one is installing a right turn lane from southbound Black Cat onto westbound Chinden, which I think is a no brainer. I think that's probably going to be incorporated into this. Another right turn lane installed from westbound Chinden to North Black Cat, which is the discussion that we had before and, then, the last one is how do we keep that northbound traffic going up Black Cat from Chinden towards Waverton from backing up or coming to a complete stop, particularly when you have all that southbound traffic coming out of Rock Harbor and out of that -- this subdivision and I'm -- the only thing I could think of -- I try not to come with problems. I want to have solutions if I can. The only thing I can think of would be if we could -- if there is a way to widen that street that would allow for a through lane on Black Cat so that anybody getting to the subdivision is not going to get stuck waiting for people that are backed up in that left turn lane. Again, I think our biggest concern is the speed of traffic on Waverton and I don't know what, if anything, can be done to affect that, but, again, we got a lot of kids that are crossing that street, especially during the summer to get to the park and the pool and, you know, I just -- again, I don't want to say this shouldn't be done, but these are issues that I'm hoping we can address in the planning and perhaps if it's -- if it's feasible the only thing I can think of would be widening Black Cat a little bit more to the point where it would have to encroach on -- on what they have already designed to put in there, because there would have to be at least one more lane going northbound. But that's all I have. Do you have any questions for me?

Smith: Commissioners, are there any questions? I have a question for staff. I'm looking at the site plan and my understanding of the site plan and of the discussion was that the road, which is the emergency access road, is only bollarded off heading into the actual neighborhood. Is that -- is that -- my understanding incorrect? My -- when I looked at this it looks as -- as though they will be able to take access off of Black Cat directly -- not going through Waverton, but directly onto that road into the parking lot. Is that wrong?

McLaughlin: I can tell you there are no bollards there now, but, again, there is that center divider. So, it would only allow for you to exit there, not enter from for the majority of traffic which is going to be coming off of Chinden.

Smith: Is that -- is that -- double checking. Is that kind of --

Allen: I didn't quite catch that. There is no access proposed or approved from Chinden, but there is one access from Waverton and one access from Black Cat.

Smith: Yes, there is one access from Black Cat. It's just constrained by the median.

Allen: Right here is the Black Cat access and, then, right here is the Waverton access.

Smith: Okay. Thank you

McLaughlin: The other thing I would ask is there any reason why you might consider even removing that barrier? Again, that would prove -- you know, it would come up with its own problems, but other than that, like I said, there is no ingress from Black Cat, you would have to go to Waverton.

Smith: Staff can correct me. I think that's -- since that's on Black Cat that's ACHD's purview, is that --

Allen: It is ACHD, yes.

Smith: What I will say is a lot of the times things like this -- I have the fortune of being able to sit on the Transportation Commission as well and a lot of the times things like traffic calming ideas on Waverton or this discussion on Black Cat, a lot of the times ACHD will consider some of these things depending on input from the neighbors and input from the community and so sometimes what they will do is if -- if a certain neighborhood is concerned about speeds they will do a speed study. They can -- they can commission a speed study and, then, determine if it falls within their criteria for ACHD to finance traffic calming. They also have methods for -- if the HOA wants to finance traffic calming and things like that. So, I think those are some things that may not be resolved tonight, but might be avenues to be able to resolve that going forward.

McLaughlin: Well -- and, again, these are kind of unique challenges. You don't see those -- those center barriers frequently around the city and, again, I can't find another example of a project this large that requires you to have two left turns, you know, possibly backing up traffic to get into a property, you know, located where this one is or like this, so -- thank you.

Smith: Thank you very much. Madam Clerk, is there anyone else signed up to testify?

Lomeli: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We have Larry Walker.

Walker: Good evening. My name is Larry Walker. I live at 4569 West Sugar Tree Drive. That's in the Spur Wing Subdivision, which is off of North Black Cat and I -- I would try not to repeat what that gentleman just said, but he gave you a lot of information. Most of it was fairly well done and accurate. I would only give you a little better picture of it. One of the things that I -- that strikes me about the church traffic he spoke about, to let you know they are paying for security in the neighborhood to get the people out of the parking lot there. We get stopped by traffic guards. They are stopping residential traffic to let people out of that parking lot. I understand they are going to move, but I don't know if that's going to happen. That's not going to reduce them much. But they have tremendous amount of traffic in that neighborhood. The other thing that -- so -- so, I would say traffic on Black Cat is -- is the biggest concern, but -- but I have a bigger thought about the intersection of Chinden and Black Cat and that is you need to rebuild the intersection. It's not -- it's not adequate. If you send a traffic engineer out

there to look at it he will tell you that intersection is going to fail the way it is right now and it needs to be rebuilt. For six years we have been driving down Chinden at 55 miles an hour trying to make a right turn with no right turn lane and that -- the northbound traffic lane there on Black Cat is not hardly wide enough to make the turn. Big pickup trucks have a hard time even making that turn and when they have to slow down when traffic is coming up behind you 55 miles an hour, it's -- I'm surprised nobody's gotten killed there yet and I have -- we have worked with Congress -- or Councilman Whitlock and I have told him about this. There is skid marks out there where near collisions have happened. So, I believe the entire intersection needs to be rebuilt. Black Cat needs to be widened. The access to that grocery store on Black Cat is going to do nothing but cause problems, because it's between Waverton and Chinden and there is no room for there to be backup, because traffic going in and out of that grocery store right there is just going to back up the signal light. So, the whole intersection needs to be redone, a right turn lane is installed to get onto Chinden and a right turn lane to get everybody off of Chinden without getting killed coming onto Black Cat. That's what needs to be done. Waverton, you may know, has been put all the way through to the west -- all the way over to Highway 16. Traffic can come from there and there is a signal light down there, I think it's called Levi, and traffic can come in there and come down Waverton onto Black Cat or they can go all the way out Waverton as that development grows west over towards Highway 16, the traffic is just going to get more intense and if you see the room there you know what's going to happen to Waverton Drive at Black Cat. So, those are our concerns and I'm talking on behalf of a lot of people in my neighborhood. So, that's about all I had to clarify some of that for you. Thank you.

Smith: Thank you. Madam Clerk?

Lomeli: Mr. Chair, the next person is Bob Misko. Misko.

Smith: And please state your name and address for the record.

Misko: Hello. I'm Bob Misko. 6548 North Oakstone. Our house backs up to the lot. These previous gentlemen stole a lot of my -- my notes, so I'm going to just abbreviate this if I -- if I may. I guess the first point would be, you know, putting a grocery store -- when -- when -- when we bought our house my wife and I were, you know, looking for a house, the realtor said, oh, this is commercial, but it's 9:00 to 5:00. I said, oh, okay. Well, maybe a dentist office or a nail salon or something like that. That -- I guess that's okay. But, you know, there is nothing -- there is no commercial property within really a -- the closest one is Costco and that's a mile away. This is a residential area, the whole area, and with the new development coming in towards the freeway that's huge. I don't know how many homes are going to go in there, but that -- the traffic on Waverton is going to be insurmountable. I don't know if I'm off base with this, but was talking to a couple of people and they said, well, if -- if you -- if you rezone this back to residential single family, everybody would win. We would have new neighbors to greet and -- and the developer I believe could actually make more money if it was residential, turning it into highest and best use. So, I would suggest that maybe that -- I know we are quite a

ways down the road, but I have seen this happen a couple of times in Arizona where they have had big master plans and, of course, they set aside some property for schools and parks and -- and commercial, but oftentimes that land lays vacant and that eventually is rezoned in a residential one. So, I would -- I would just throw that out for food for thought. Thank you.

Smith: Thank you. Madam Clerk.

Lomeli: Mr. Chair, I have Jessica Pirc.

Smith: Please state your name and address for the record.

Pirc: My name is Jessica Pirc and I'm at 6560 North Oakstone Avenue. I back up to this development. My fence is the backside of this property. My biggest concern is landscaping. Our fence, if we walk out onto our patio we will see a parking lot and so I am wondering what they are going to do to make sure there is not a lot of sound or I feel like I -- when I'm in my backyard that I am sitting inside of a parking lot. I would like to second Paul on traffic. He did an amazing presentation on traffic flow, which is a huge concern. I have an eight year old son that rides the bus to school at Pleasant View and he has to cross Waverton to get to the bus stop. I know when we talked with the lawyer previously at the meeting we talked about maybe putting in a crosswalk in between the neighbor -- in between the two neighborhoods. I don't know if that's something we can do and, obviously, this is an ACHD issue. Noise is a big concern, which I know they kind of have addressed, but that's my two cents and what I'm worried about with that going right behind my house. Any questions?

Smith: Commissioners, any questions?

Pirc: Thank you.

Smith: Thank you very much. Madam Clerk.

Lomeli: Mr. Chair, no one else has indicated they wish to testify.

Smith: Is there anyone in the audience who would like to testify or on Zoom? All right. Would the applicant like to come back forward then?

Semple: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Again, Ben Semple with Rodney Evans and Partners. 1450 West Bannock Street, Boise. 83702. Yeah, to address -- we did discuss -- you know, I think there is -- there is some stuff that does need to be addressed with the future development of this property. A lot of this that the neighbors have concerns about we share concerns about. The traffic, the parking, the speeds on Waverton and that will all be addressed when we have the opportunity to submit a development plan that addresses an actual use. We have talked to ACHD and ITD, they have said, yeah, we will have some improvements that you need to do to submit an application, so we can evaluate the use, because that drives their parking counts and their parking studies.

We anticipate a right turn off of Chinden onto Black Cat as part of the ITD off site and I anticipate that ACHD and ITD could require a right turn off of Black Cat onto Chinden as well. We are very supportive of working with the neighborhood. This is part of the neighborhood to address, you know, speed mitigation, traffic mitigation with the overall neighborhood. I think we are -- we are very supportive of that. We can't really do much about the parking from the church that is, you know, a little ways away. It sounds like there is a lot of people that do park in this area or walk and there is a lot of traffic that comes out of there on Sundays. We will do our part in figuring out how to mitigate traffic, again, after we get through this subdivision process. I want to reinforce this is a conceptual plan right now. We are doing the subdivision. We are not proposing this building or this use, it -- you know, there are two other pads that probably will be something more like an office use that isn't, you know, after hours. This grocery store, the user that my client is working with, they use primarily smaller sprinter van style delivery trucks, so there is not a lot of semis that pull in here. They have also committed to making sure that those delivery hours are midday and not mornings and evenings and, then, as -- as was discussed at the neighborhood meeting all of the lighting will be full cut off shielded that's installed here and they want to be really great neighbors, so enhancing that landscape buffer to prevent sound as much as possible bleeding over into the residential area. This site was planned and is zoned C-C for commercial use. The development agreement includes this type of use as an allowed use with -- on this lot and the land use -- it's my understanding that a single family residential use on here wouldn't be supported by staff. This was planned to be a commercial use. This will help with some trip capture where people could walk to a store. If you live in a large neighborhood that has -- where you have to get in a car to drive, it can be frustrating, because you are dealing with a lot of traffic. If you had that benefit of having a place where you could walk to, I -- we see this as a benefit for the neighborhood in the long run. I would stand for any additional questions.

Smith: Thank you. I have one question and I just want to make sure that I'm clear on this access from Black Cat. Is -- is the intention the staff, applicant -- is the intention for those barriers to be removed, so that access can be taken from Black Cat from northbound drivers, not just southbound?

Semple: Mr. Chair, my understanding from just the standards of ACHD with development like this in proximity to a state highway, that barrier will not be removed. We wouldn't propose that being removed. We would not want traffic backing up to that intersection. But we will work with ACHD and ITD to figure out the solution as much as we can to mitigate what we can here. There aren't any improvements on -- other than the sidewalk and some grass -- kind of a grassy swale on the west side of Black Cat and even a little bit on the east side of Black Cat. So, I do think they are anticipating widening that road in both directions somehow.

Smith: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Mr. Chair, thank you. Will there be traffic estimates put together before the CZC -- before the end user comes in -- the grocery store comes in and they get all of

their conditions of approval, will there be any traffic counts done? I mean I'm assuming that -- that ACHD isn't requiring a traffic impact study, because they would have asked for one, but do you have any idea if there will be any numbers put together on peak hour use?

Semple: Sorry. Mr. Chair, Commissioner Perreault, we have had just some cursory conversations. I think they didn't provide anything this time, because they are looking at a one lot subdivision that's a commercial lot without a use. I don't think they will require a full traffic impact study, but I do think that they will require an analysis of that intersection -- of Waverton and Black Cat, as well as Black Cat and Chinden when we submit an application for this. My client is anticipating that as happening. Part of the development agreement talks about the improvement of this intersection. So, yeah.

Smith: Commissioner Stoll.

Stoll: Mr. Chair, this probably is targeted towards Sonya, maybe the applicant. The existing development agreement has requirements as far as transportation improvements, such as what ITD mentioned in their letter and I assume also ACHD -- ACHD does, too. Those requirements -- or that development agreement is in place until you come in -- until an actual application comes in with a proposed development -- not development, but use at a later date; is that correct?

Semple: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Stoll, yes, that's my understanding of the development agreement is they -- they don't want to require something at this point when they -- it could change -- you know, I mean the client could -- you know, a deal could fall through pretty easily. This has to happen as the subdivision before they can even close on the property at this point. So, they are kind of taking a risk here. But, again, they do -- we will see what has to happen here once we submit an application. We have been told that they are like -- yeah, anticipate road improvements when you apply. We will tell you what your proportionate share is or what you have to build.

Stoll: Appreciate that. Sonya, does that conform with your understanding?

Allen: Yeah. Mr. Chair, Commissioner Stoll, Commissioners, the development agreement that's in effect for the Fairbourne development is this property is also subject to that development agreement. It does not include any requirements from ITD or ACHD, other than dedication of -- preserving right of way for dedication for the widening of Chinden, which has occurred. And just a note. Prohibiting access to Chinden as well. So, there is -- there is nothing else in the development agreement.

Stoll: So, the -- sorry. Mr. Chair. Sonya, the agreement that's referenced by ITD in their letter that they submitted, is that a separate agreement that they have with --

Allen: I believe that's a separate agreement that ITD had with the developer of Fairbourne. It's not a city agreement.

Sandoval: Mr. Chair?

Smith: Commissioner Sandoval.

Sandoval: Yeah. My question is specific to the screening on the west boundary. Now, in your landscape plan it looks like the same as the satellite imagery, which is some shrubbery. Are -- are you going to build a more robust screening system in there or leave the shrubs as is?

Semple: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Sandoval, there is actually a pretty substantial amount of tree cover along that western boundary, both evergreen and deciduous. The southern part, south of the emergency access, actually has almost a solid screen of probably about a 16 foot tall evergreen row, but with the redevelopment when we come back in with CZC we have talked to the client, there is a 25 foot landscape buffer there, we are planning to enhance that buffer by planting, you know, stuff in between the existing plantings, because there is some space there and, again, they really want to be a good neighbor and we anticipate having that be a pretty substantial buffer, along with the fencing that's solid there.

Smith: Any other questions of the applicant or staff? All right. Is there a motion to close the public hearing?

Perreault: Mr. Chair?

Smith: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: I move that we close the public hearing for Fairbourne Subdivision No. 4, H-2025-0036.

Sandoval: Second.

Smith: It's been moved and seconded. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed?

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Smith: All right. Discussion. I think there are two items at play here. One I think is the -- the merits of the application and the merits of the subdivision and, then, two, I think there is the constant kind of reliance on ACHD to move -- or desire for ACHD to move and I think we have to keep those kind of -- not entirely and always, but there has to be some separation between those two. I think what ACHD and what improvements are going to happen on Black Cat and on Waverton and on Cherry on -- going onto Black Cat I think are going to -- it's in the best interest of the applicant to make sure that that traffic pattern makes sense and I know that ACHD has widening Black Cat south of cherry on -- I think it's still on their TBD section of the work plan, but that is -- that is still something that's on their list and so I do see some space, some right of way on the north end. They don't anticipate this being a -- a permanent intractable problem. I think

there, obviously, is always growing pains, especially with something -- I know this isn't residential, but it is still I guess in-fill kind of, but -- so, I think there is that. I think the other thing is -- this is probably the first time I have heard neighbors ask for residential, instead of commercial. Often I hear the inverse and I think there is a lack of commercial in this area. I think there is more commercial slated to be -- you know, if you look at the -- the -- a future land use map west of the subdivision there is intended to be C-G zoned and commercial mixed use zoned areas. So, I think this is this -- this property on its own I think is -- is worth supporting from my perspective, but I also think it is potentially a valuable test case in helping kind of get this -- this conversation going with ACHD prior to some of these other maybe larger plats coming in. Any other -- I mean -- Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Mr. Chair, just stay on the commission long enough and you will see it. We had some folks that shared testimony. Unfortunately, they have left the Council Chambers, but I wanted to say that just for clarification that the Commission's decision this evening is really narrow and it's really just whether we approve this particular set of engineering plans for that specific individual lot and it doesn't include us adding any conditions to -- it doesn't include us adding any conditions that the applicant would have to follow really outside of our decision to approve this particular set of -- of plans. So, as far as traffic goes, as -- as the chair said that's not in our purview and we really can't add anything additional that would be reflective of -- of concerns outside of just really what the landscape buffer is and -- and these engineering plans. So, I just wanted to make that clear, because I -- I understand the -- the neighbors' concerns and I understand coming and hoping that we have the ability to change things that, unfortunately, we don't. So, I just wanted to clarify that, because we -- we really just have a fairly narrow decision to make this evening. So, I have watched the traffic come in and out of the Boise Co-op at The Village often -- been there quite a bit -- not to the Co-op per se, but just that area and it can get a little backed up, but it really isn't an overwhelming amount of -- of traffic coming in there and that's a much heavier commercial use than what will be here and having a second location I think in Meridian will actually probably make the traffic less, because there is two -- two options and so I'm not going to say I'm not concerned, because I do understand where the neighbors are coming from. At the same time the Fairbourne Subdivision was approved in 2018 and the use in the zoning for this lot have been the same since then. It hasn't changed. We are not proposing changing that this is going to be commercial use. So, for all of those who thought that might become residential at some point, I -- I'm very sorry to hear that. I think this is a good use for this. I think the applicant is trying to be aware of all of the different potential challenges and try to -- trying to address those, but we are not here tonight to consider whether a grocery store should go there. It's just whether we can -- we want to approve these set of plans essentially. So, I don't have an issue with it as it sits.

Smith: Other Commissioners?

Sandoval: Mr. Chair?

Smith: Commissioner Sandoval.

Sandoval: Yeah. I think it's a great use for this, whatever it's going to be, any commercial space that's going to mitigate some of the traffic. Hopefully people are using pedestrian pathways, walking; right? That would be -- that would be great to see. But, yeah, no issues with this.

Smith: Commissioners, also take a motion if there is -- Commissioner Stoll, do you have any --

Stoll: No.

Smith: Is there a motion then?

Stoll: Mr. Chair?

Smith: Commissioner Stoll.

Stoll: After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council of File No. H-2025-0036 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of September 4th, 2025.

Perreault: Second.

Smith: Moved and seconded. All those in favor? Any opposed? Motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

4. Public Hearing for Solara Estates Subdivision (H-2025-0013) by Jadon Schneider, Bronze Bow Land, located at 1695 E. Amity Rd. and 4940 and 5060 S. Locust Grove Rd.

- A. Request: Annexation of approximately 15 acres across three (3) parcels of land from Ada County into the City of Meridian with requested zoning of R-8 and R-2 from RUT which includes parcel q numbers S1132223130, S1132223210 and S1132223320.
- B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 14 single-family lots, including one existing home site to remain and five (5) common lots for a total of 19 lots on 9.72 acres of land (parcels S1132223210 and S113223320).
- C. Request: Alternative Compliance to reduce the landscape buffer along the street adjacent to Lot 11, Block 1 by 50%.

Smith: All right. Next item on the agenda Item No. 4 is for H-2025-0013 for an annexation, preliminary plat and alternative compliance for the Solara Estates Subdivision at Amity and Locust Grove Roads. We will begin with the staff report.

Ritter: Good evening, Commissioners. So, again, tonight we are here for Solara Estates Subdivision. So, this site consists of a little over 15 acres of land. It's currently zoned RUT. It's located at 1695 East Amity Road, 4940 and 5050 South Locust Grove Road. So, the annexation -- they are requesting a zoning designation of R-8 and R-2. The church -- the -- the existing Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints would like to be zoned R-8, because churches are not allowed in R-2 and R-4 zones and the preliminary plat -- the subdivision is requesting a zoning of R-2. So, the preliminary plat will consist of 14 building lots and five common lots for a total of 19 lots on approximately 9.72 acres. They are also requesting alternative compliance, which is an administrative process to reduce a portion of the landscape buffer along the street adjacent to Lot 11. So, along this portion. They did submit some building concepts for this and staff is recommending that lots -- the rear and side lots of facing and Locust Grove, that they provide -- incorporate articulation through change into more of the building modulations, recess -- projections, recesses, step-backs, pop-out, bays and porches. So, all of this is for any of the two story lots. Single story homes will be exempt from this. So, these are examples of the homes that they are proposing for this -- for their preliminary plat. These are the amenities. So, R-2, only -- it's only required to have eight percent open space and not the regular 15 percent that's required by most of the zoning and so these are their amenity details. They are proposing a covered shelter and picnic tables. So, there is hard surface here where the pic -- covered sheltered and the picnic table and an open grassy area. This is their open space exhibit. So, the existing home will remain here. So, as part of the alternative compliance as you can see once you put in the requirements from ACHD, which is requiring 50 feet of right of way from the center line to the lot, so there is 17 feet of right of way, plus a three foot wide gravel shoulder and a ten foot wide multi-use pathway, along with the city's 25 foot landscape buffer. So, there is approximately four feet of difference between the house and the landscape buffer. So, what is being requested is that that 25 foot landscape buffer be in an easement instead of a common lot. We will -- the director has agreed to allowing a reduction of the landscape buffer around the area where the -- where the driveway is and, then, the rest of it will be 25 feet, but it will all be within an easement and not within a common lot to help mitigate some of the issues on this lot. Another thing -- so, the church will remain as an existing church. With annexation it will be required to hook up to sewer and water, as well as the existing home. With annexation, as the church is not proposing to do any kind of expansion, alterations, so currently the parking lot and the access do not meet current city standards. If there is any additions or modifications to this they will have to meet the current standards. But staff did propose if the Commission or the Council warranted maybe a temporary five foot sidewalk along Locust Grove and along Amity for the church, but it's not anything that the -- that staff is requiring, is only if the Commission thinks it's warranted and recommends that Council requires it, because at this point the church itself -- it came in -- so, they are not really -- they are not requesting any modification, again, but they agreed to the annexation solely to provide a path of

annexation for the Solara Estates Subdivision, because the properties are under -- and, again, because the properties are under two separate ownerships we are requesting two separate development agreements to govern each property. ACHD has not -- and, again, as this church was approved through a CUP process within Ada county and they have more access points than that would be allowed within the city, unless the Commission recommends removal of some of those access points, staff is not recommending removal. ACHD has not submitted anything requiring them to remove any of the access points. The report from ACHD basically just looked at the annexation and not for any kind of development on this property for the church. So, they did not require any improvements for the church or removal of any access points at this time. If the church comes in for any -- again, if it comes in for any kind of modification it will have to go through the CUP process, because currently it's nonconforming for some of the things and at that time it will be looked at by ACHD for any kind of improvements that would be required along the frontage of this property. So, basically, it's kind of a straightforward development. It's 14 buildable lots and the lots are bigger than what is normally required, because R-2 requires 12,000 plus square feet of land for the lots and they are -- they are proposing around 22,000 square feet of land. So, their density is about 1.44 dwelling units per acre. So, pretty straightforward. So, at this point I would be happy to answer any questions that you guys might have regarding this development proposal.

Smith: Are there any questions for staff?

Perreault: Mr. Chair?

Smith: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Looking at all the drawings I'm trying to understand why the church property needs to be a part of the development. It looks like that this isn't going to, you know, be built onto their parcel. Is that not the case?

Ritter: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Perreault, so the church is not part of the development, it's just annexing in so it can provide a pathway to annexation for the properties to the south. So, without the church annexing in the properties to the south do not have a connection -- a pathway to annexation, because they are not close to any of the properties that are already annexed into the city.

Perreault: I see. Okay. Thank you.

Smith: Any other questions for staff? Would the applicant like to come forward and, please, state your name and address for the record.

Schneider: Good evening. Jadon Schneider. 3770 North Jackie Lane, Boise, with Bronze Bow. I'm the applicant working on behalf of the developer and the owner. First off thank you, Linda, for -- she killed it. I don't have too much more to say, other than I appreciate her saying it's a straightforward development, because we really feel like it

is. Let me try to pull this up here. Yeah. So, Solara Estates Subdivision, as Linda said -- I will try to just kind of briefly go through it. I had a lot more to add to it -- or not a lot more to add to it, because Linda did a great job running through it herself. As Commissioner Perreault asked, there the proposal is for the annexation of the church, because the north property, north of Amity Road, is the area for the southern boundary for the city in this area. So, in order for this project to go forward the church would need to be that path to annexation. As Linda mentioned, there is the three parcels in total, just about 15 acres. The two parcels on the south side are what's proposed as the Solara Estates Subdivision portion and, then, the church parcels to the north is that annexation portion right there. This site is just at the corner of Locust Grove and Amity right here and I will just kind of talk a little bit more specifically about the actual proposal for the subdivision itself. As Linda said it's about ten acres in total. It's a rural-urban transitional area. The proposal is for those two lots. The goal with the subdivision between the owner and the developer is that they wanted to create these nice larger estate lots, because they really feel like this would fit well in this project. As Linda mentioned, they are about 22,000 square feet, so just about half an acre. They are a little bit over half an acre in total for all of that and ACHD reviewed and approved what we have proposed to them so far. So, we are really happy with everything that we have received back at this point and just kind of a few nuances to the project. As Linda mentioned, there is an existing home on the property. That is the owners -- the current owner of the property. Their plan is to stay in that existing home and stay there throughout the development and post-development, too. So, obviously, they want to see a project that comes together and looks nice, because they have to live with it, just like the neighbors, if this group be approved. So, they want to see something nice that comes together quite well. So, just one thing that I wanted to mention about this site that makes it unique and makes it special and why they would like to do some of these larger homes and what would look nice in this area. It's rather elevated in the southwest corner of the site where the existing home is. This is just a Google street view looking from basically the southwest corner out towards the northeast. So, you have this nice view corridor in here in this area. The existing home is about 40 feet higher -- the finish grade is about 40 feet higher than the furthest point at the northeast corner. So, if you go from the southwest and northeast it's trailing down. So, what the goal is with this site is to create lots that provide these nice view corridors, so you can have this view as it's stepping down naturally. So, the benefit of that on top of it all is the fact that the neighbors' homes here that already have nice views, we are hoping to protect those as well. One of the things in the staff report that it mentions is R-2 has a zoning that speaks specifically to height standards of 35 feet. So, with their homes -- them being the neighbors -- and the current owners, their homes being in that highest elevation there, the idea would be they would still have homes that would have that view opportunity and maintain that throughout the development. Just talking about where it's at and just trying to show congruent development with this subdivision, you have Reflections Ridge Subdivision to the north, Paisley Meadows to the north and Southern Highlands Subdivision to the east. So, we are trying to show that this subdivision isn't on an island, it's not way out there in the distance. I know we talked about the path to annexation and sometimes it can get a bit, oh, hey, piecemeal the project together, because you have these weird lots that show this long skinny path to annexation. We

really feel that it is close to the city and it's just in that congruent development growth area. Just talking about the future land use map. This is in that low density residential. So, the development itself with the R-2 -- or when I say the development -- the subdivision portion is in that R-2. So, the goal is to keep that R-2, keep that low density residential, which is in the future land use map itself. Traffic considerations. ACHD in their staff report spoke specifically to a number of the improvements that they are planning on doing in their capital improvement plan and in their five year work plan. Amity Road is proposed to be upgraded to five lanes. Locust Grove is upgraded -- or is proposed to be upgraded to three lanes and, then, the big one is there is going to be a multi-lane roundabout at the intersection of Amity and Locust Grove. Interestingly enough, in that five year work plan it is dedicated to be designed in 23-24, so as I understand it it is either designed or it is in the works of being designed with the idea of it being constructed in the near future and coming online sometime soon, which would be great for this development and, hopefully, great for any sort of traffic concerns that there might be, obviously, of -- well, obviously, but in theory a roundabout intersection is going to work a lot better than a four way stop intersection. As Linda's mentioned open space right here. The idea would be to have plenty of open space for this subdivision, even though it is a smaller subdivision, try to have that amenity space centralized where people can go congregate and something that looks nice for all the residents there. Linda mentioned on it -- and, you know, I will just try to add to it, not -- not that she didn't do a great job, but just try to explain the alternative compliance request. Basically ACHD is asking for a 50 foot right of way on this side of the road. It's a hundred foot total. So, giving up 50 feet to ACHD and, then, following city's code, which would be another 25 feet for a landscape buffer, would mean that this -- the new property line for the existing home, as Linda said, would be about four feet away from that existing portion. So, here is just kind of a quick cross-section of what that would look like. The idea being giving up both 50 feet of right of way and 25 feet for landscape buffer would cause this site -- this home to be, one, within the setback and the existing driveway to basically render it unusable. So, what the developer is requesting is they would like to give up the full 50 feet of right of way to ACHD as they have requested there, but go through the alternative compliance where instead of adding a 25 foot landscape buffer in this area, they would reduce that down to a 12 and a half foot landscape easement with increased number of trees and shrubs and things like that to add that landscaping buffer to meet the intent of the code with still allowing the existing home to, one, not be encroaching on a setback and, two, that driveway to maintain usability through there. So, the idea from the owner and from the developer is still to meet the intent of the code. However, in an alternative way and I'm happy to explain that more in detail if there is any questions about it. I know that the first time I was trying to work through it -- it's a bit tricky. As Linda said, there is some elevations that we wanted to talk about overall, but just as a project in a whole we are really happy with it and I would -- oh, just wanted to mention on the staff report -- the one comment that Linda brought up about the temporary pathway around the church property, the only comment that the developer had was with the roundabout coming in from ACHD the question of is the temporary pathway necessary if ACHD is going to be coming in and putting in their roundabout and their sidewalks in this area. Not so much from a, hey, we are trying to skirt any sort of responsibilities that we are trying to do, but mostly the idea of there is

not a lot of pedestrian traffic in this area at the moment, so it was just a question from the developer on, you know, hey, we understand what the intent was. If there wasn't a roundabout coming in in theory right around the corner is there -- you know, then, yeah, absolutely, makes a lot of sense. But if it is going to be built by ACHD when they come in and they build out their entire thing, that was the only comment from the developer on that. And, then, one other comment that I caught just reading it before the meeting, in the amenity portion in the staff report I think it mentions a fire pit and I don't think -- I don't think we have proposed any fire pit in there. It had the picnic shelter and it had the gazebo or the picnic tables and whatnot. If I'm wrong I'm wrong, but I think I saw it in there. The only thing is I don't think that the developer had originally said we were going to put a fire pit in that community area. So, just -- just -- I -- it may have been -- it may have been in there and I -- or it may have been missing it. But, anyways, I would be happy to stand for any questions and I appreciate your time and especially appreciate Linda's time and all the work she's done on it. Thank you.

Smith: Thank you very much. Commissioners, are there any questions for the applicant at this time? All right. I did have -- sorry. I did have one question.

Schneider: Yeah.

Smith: Knowing that the -- knowing that the area to the east of this development is on the future land use map of medium density residential, rather than low density, without having slightly different height considerations and things like that, has there been any discussion or consideration of that for when those are developed trying to have the -- have your development set up in a way that they are not at odds for view shedding and things like that when those developments go in? Obviously, you can't predict the future, but --

Schneider: Of course. The main comments that we have been having so far with -- with talking with builders and trying to figure out how the developer is putting it together would be to have those homes closer to the higher side of the lots, so that they can maintain their view with that exact idea. If there is a future development that comes by, obviously, it's tough when you say, hey, you know, we are selling you this view, but someone could, obviously, come and develop it. The adage of don't buy a view you don't own, it gets tough. But the idea would be in this one to try to put the homes in a location that would add the most height for them, so that they could continue to see hopefully with the same idea of not blocking views of existing neighbors because of that exact idea. We -- we don't want to be a bad neighbor to anybody and build a house and block their view in any way.

Smith: Thank you.

Perreault: Mr. Chair?

Smith: Mr. Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you for bringing that up. Along those lines I just have a recommendation.

Schneider: Yes.

Perreault: We have another neighborhood west of here where there is large lots. They are still in the county and it bumps up against MDR and there has been a battle on that property for a very very long time and so I would just recommend to your home buyers to let them know that there is going to be a different density and I know that's not ideal to let them know that, you are trying to sell homes. I'm a realtor. I understand. But that has -- just that one thing would have really -- I mean it's been literally development after development -- development that's tried to come into that MDR space and the neighbors have just fought it and fought it. So, you will actually do yourself a favor if you do that.

Schneider: Understood. Thank you.

Smith: Commissioners?

Schneider: Great. Thank you.

Smith: Thanks. Now, move on to public testimony. Madam Clerk, is there anyone signed up to testify?

Lomeli: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have Kathy -- is it Carter? Corter? Okay.

Smith: Is that you? Would you like to come up and speak? Okay.

Lomeli: Next on the list is Codi Bills.

Smith: Just, please, state your name and address for the record.

Bills: Good evening, Mr. Chair and Commissioners in the council. My name is Codi Bills and I reside at 5060 South Locust Grove Road. We are actually the owners of the existing house involved in this project. My husband Curtis and I are Idaho natives and we know how sacred Idaho farmland is. We actually have raised our four sons there and we actually taught them how to farm and we own other farmland in other areas as well. We are in a different stage of life and we are ready to kind of take a break with the farming and we didn't want to move, we could have moved and sold out to a big -- you know, big huge developer and high density and that's not something we wanted to do to ourselves or our neighbors and so we actually interviewed developers and partnered up with these great fellows and we feel like this subdivision will just be an asset to the community. We had a really fabulous neighborhood meeting back in January. Most of the neighborhood -- neighbors were very glad that it wasn't high density. They were happy to see that they were just half acres. There were a little concerns about traffic, but we feel like, you know, with the proposed developments coming up and with it only being 13 homes it shouldn't have an impact on the traffic and with existing construction

that's going on right now is making a big impact on -- on traffic jams on Locust Grove, but that will definitely soften up as those projects get finished up. We love this area. We have no intentions of leaving and so that is why we are in full -- full support of this project and actually have been hands on.

Smith: Thank you. Are there any questions? All right. Thank you very much. Madam Clerk, is there anyone else signed up to testify?

Lomeli: Yes. Mr. Chair, I have Mark Agenbroad.

Smith: And just, please, state your name and address for the record.

Agenbroad: Mark Agenbroad. 1420 East Amity Road. And thank you for your time. We are some of the newer folks in the area. We have been there 32 years and others 50 plus and, obviously, things have been changing and most of -- we are not -- we are all in county, so we maybe don't fit in here very well, but I kind of speak for eight to ten of those folks that have one to 12 acres in this area and nobody is excited about further development. As you can imagine with the Brighton developing a mile off of us and the traffic there, people are just less than excited about more and more. So, our -- you know, if we are going to do a development why not one acre lots that fit in with the surrounding areas and -- and just the impact to existing property owners. We know that the intersection is going to change. ACHD has gone through multiple project managers trying to make something work there and they have kind of shot themselves in the foot a number of times, but, anyway, will there be turn lanes to allow for the increased, you know -- and I -- it's probably not a city issue, but just traffic lanes. It only takes one car to back up a bunch of people trying to turn into or out of a subdivision and so -- and those are just some of our concerns, just the growth in itself and just something that fits in with the existing area and the impact to our properties. Thank you for your time.

Smith: Thank you. Madam Clerk.

Lomeli: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have Mike Homan -- Homad. Okay.

Smith: Anyone else?

Lomeli: Okay. And she hasn't signed up, but the lady in the front aisle here would like to testify.

Smith: Ma'am, would you like to come forward and testify? I said would you like to come up and testify? And, then, just -- you can grab one of those microphones and give us your name and your address for the record.

Capell: My name is Bonnie Capell. I have got a little bit of vertigo, so that's what --

Smith: Okay. All right.

Capell: We live right behind the Bills, kind of, and just a little bit in. We have been there for 50 years and this is a bit of an adjustment, but we like the neighbors --

Smith: Could I -- sorry. Could I bother you? Could you speak into the microphone, so we could hear you. It's totally okay. You can move it.

Capell: This way?

Smith: Yeah. That's totally fine.

Capell: Sorry.

Smith: No worries.

Capell: I wasn't going to do this and I don't think my husband wants me to. But our concern is losing our view, because we are -- if the Bills' house is right there, then, there is another -- this is the lot we are concerned about, because we live -- this other thing here that's been rooted, so it doesn't show all our messes. You know. That was supposed to be a joke. Is where we live and if there was a big two story house there or even one with a real high roof it would cut off our view and I just wondered if there is any way that you can put in a contract or so on that there wouldn't be a real high two story house there. We are trying to cooperate with the rest of us and we want to probably subdivide our property, because we have four plus acres right above it. We used to own the whole thing and gradually as we get older and older -- I'm only 25. It -- it gets more of a concern. Plus we have children that all think they should have a part. Anyway, that's all -- that's all I wanted to do is express that concern, that that lot directly below us could be put in a contract some way that it doesn't spoil our view. Okay. Thank you for letting me break the rules.

Smith: Well, thank you so much. Is there anyone else who would like to -- or, Madam Clerk, is there anyone on Zoom or --

Lomeli: Mr. Chair, yes. There is a Julie on Zoom that's raising her hand.

Smith: All right. Julie, would you like to speak? And, then, can we have your name and address for the record.

Edwards: Sure. My name is Julie Edwards and I'm at 1310 East Mary Lane and the first question I had --

Lomeli: Just one second. We can't hear you very well, so if you can -- I'm going to adjust the microphone volume and if you could speak up.

Edwards: Okay. Can you hear me better?

Smith: That's great.

Edwards: Okay. Holding it close. So, the first question I had was already answered and it was why the church was on the same application as a residential development. So, thank you for answering that. Secondly, traffic. This morning -- it's always a concern most weekdays, as this morning, it was backed up heading northbound from about the library at Locust Grove and Lake Hazel all the way to Amity and, then, another stretch from Amity to the Victory roundabout was just a solid line and I just think that that's going to get worse. Like the gentleman had said, you know, one person turning -- heading southbound turning left into the subdivision will hold up a line and, likewise, somebody exiting that subdivision trying to make a left will not happen in the morning hours or the late evening hours and I just wanted to say also in regards to the traffic that, you know, we have seen so much growth in this part of town specifically and it really sort of boggles my mind. When I saw the Bills' house being built, you know, the neighbors and I were all saying, wow, I can't believe somebody is building that close to the road. It's -- it's awfully close to the road and just with knowing that the road -- Locust Grove in the future would likely be widened, I was just curious and this might not be a question you can answer, why it wouldn't have been suggested to them while they were doing permits and whatnot to set that back further and, then, that would have eliminated the need for the alternative compliance request and that goes along with just -- it seems like the bending of rules happens often and so, therefore, I feel like developers just plan what they want, knowing that there is a good chance they will get the variances they want and that could just be a coincidence that's happened in my neck of the woods. I know Brighton has had a lot of variances and so I just feel like, you know, we have rules, we should stick to the rules as best we can. And, lastly, another question is say down the road the church closes and the lot is up for sale and it's sold to a developer, now is there anything that says that that zoning would go back into R-2 or R-4, because it's no longer a church requiring an R-8 zoning? And, lastly, I'm glad this isn't an apartment building going in, but, again, thank you for your time.

Smith: Thank you very much. Madam Clerk, is there anyone else online?

Lomeli: Thank you, Mr. Chair. There is one more person online, but they are not raising their hand.

Smith: Okay. If you would like to testify if you are online, please, raise your hand. Otherwise, is there anyone else in Chambers who would like to come forward? All right. With that I guess would the applicant like to come back forward?

Schneider: Jadon Schneider. 3770 North Jackie Lane, Boise. First off, yeah, thanks for everybody who spoke and stepped up and I know public speaking isn't always for everybody, so I appreciate when -- when people step in and provide their opinions and their thoughts on it. Just trying to answer as many questions as I can. Mark and Julie both specifically asked about the right of way -- or, sorry, the roadway itself. ACHD hasn't provided any sort of requirements to the developers specifying, you know, an additional turn lane or anything into this one here. Kind of going back to the idea of the capital improvement plan from ACHD, they are planning on widening this road to that five lane portion. The size of the development being 14 building lots didn't require any

sort of traffic impact study, so ACHD did not require that. Obvious -- when that usually is triggered there is around a hundred lots. So, that's -- that's coming back to the traffic portion. One of the comments that the Bills had made -- Codi had mentioned to me was just Eagle Road has been under construction for so long and it's kind of kicked a lot of traffic over here onto Locust Grove. So, it's noticeable that there is traffic on Locust Grove that's backing up, especially when Eagle Road is going through so much construction right there. I don't live in the immediate area, but that's my understanding of -- at the current state what's happening and if you are out there today I'm sure. Julie asked about the location of the existing house and it kind of ties into Bonnie's question about view corridors and everything there. The existing home was placed there when the Bills built it, mostly because they were working with Bonnie and her husband in regard to trying to find a view corridor that didn't block their neighbors. It's kind of interesting on the site itself, if you can see my mouse, the site is highest at that northeast -- or southwest portion -- portion of the site and from the Bills' backyard it drops down about 15 to 20 feet right off of the back of this patio area right here. So, the actual portion of Lot -- I don't have the lot of numbers on here, but the lot that Bonnie was talking about right there is about 20 feet lower already just in this short distance, mostly because there is just a high point in that very corner and it coincidentally worked out well for the Bills to build their house there, which did meet all the setback standards at the time and didn't block any views from Bonnie at the time as well. So, the -- the idea coming forward from them wasn't that they were trying to jam their house into the corner and get away with something later in the development, obviously, that's not what Julie was referencing, but it wasn't -- there wasn't an intent to try to cause some sort of alternative compliance request, but that was kind of the backstory that I was given on -- on what was happening there. The other idea on the alternative -- alternative compliance is the fact that they are trying to comply in an alternative manner. They are not trying to ask for a variance and say, hey, we can't do this and just let us slip away without doing something to try to make this work. So, alternatively they are trying to make something work there. And, then, yeah, just going back to Bonnie's question specific with that view. The whole idea right there is just to try to preserve those views for not just them, but all the homes, especially the Bills and especially anyone who already has those existing homes. That idea being that there is that pretty steep drop off, which allows them to work there. I know that the developer has been talking with Bonnie specifically and asking like, hey, you know, what would work here? So, I believe that they have already been trying to make that happen and there is a good way naturally with the topography to make it happen, where no one's views are blocked. Thanks.

Smith: Thank you very much. Commissioners, are there any questions? I do have one question regarding that southern property and I will try to use my words to describe the specific building or specific location that I'm talking about. The kind of center bottom building right on the left side of the cul-de-sac -- the western side of the cul-de-sac right there --

Schneider: Uh-huh.

Smith: -- how much lower -- like what does that incline render -- I mean I don't need exact numbers, but roughly speaking is that still kind of on a similar plane as that southbound property, because that's -- I'm thinking of the view. That's kind of the building in question.

Schneider: In the preliminary plat we do have the grading -- the existing features plan. Would we be able to pull that up, because it has the topography in there and it would show it. If we don't that was -- sorry. That was kind of what I was referencing to the 15 to 20 feet. That lot is the lot that's about 20 feet lower -- or in the center of that lot. So, that hopefully answers, but there is in the preliminary plat application, there is the existing features, which includes the topographic elevations on there as well to see it.

Smith: That's -- that's fine. I think knowing that general height with also the 30 foot limit for even the two story with the zoning, I think it -- that makes sense to me. Okay. That's the only question I had. Any Commissioners have any other questions? Great. Just double checking. Yep. Okay. Cool. Is there -- can I get a motion to close the public hearing?

Stoll: I move to close the public hearing.

Perreault: Second.

Smith: Moved and seconded. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion passes. I didn't say thank you. Thank you by the way.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Smith: Discussion. Which Commissioner wants to go first?

Perreault: Mr. Chair?

Smith: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Five years ago when the city was doing their Comprehensive Plan, their future land use map, we had a lot of requests to keep the residential out here in R-2 and so I think this is a really good use for this area and of all of the different kind of residential that can go out here and, then, it has gone even further to the south as was mentioned, this will be a much lighter use and so I'm -- I'm in support of this application. I think the applicant has thought this out well and it sounds like they will continue to work with the neighbors to accommodate as best as possible. So, I feel like this is a really good use for this -- for these parcels.

Smith: Thank you. Other Commissioners? Commissioner Sandoval.

Sandoval: Mr. Chair. Yeah, I agree with almost a half an acre per lot, very very low density. Good fit for the area. On that temporary sidewalk portion, you know, I don't

think that we should include something like that, especially with the development of the roundabout and there is no adjacent sidewalks. So, it just doesn't make sense to ask for that.

Smith: Commissioner Stoll, do you have any?

Stoll: I'm supportive of the application, so you get good use for the land, it's within how the area is developing, so --

Smith: Thank you. Yeah. I think this is a good development thing for the R-2 as looking at ACHD's five year work -- work plan and like the applicant was saying, the design phase was 2023-2024, the right of way is slated for -- for -- on Amity Road for 29-30. So, usually, ACHD doesn't like to sit on right of way too much longer after acquiring it. So, I -- you know, hopefully, at some point there should be some easing congestion, at least east-west and, then, you know, Locust Grove I think, you know, the -- south Meridian does need -- need some good attention. I think that's been a focus for a minute. But I think overall these specific properties -- I think the developer is trying to work to be a good neighbor. I can see some ways to -- you know, the right site selection or the right property or housing construction, housing design in the right locations can -- can hopefully abate any concerns about kind of that view and losing that view. Also, hopefully, mitigating those concerns with that eastern medium density residential. That is the one thing that I do want to make clear is -- is the future land use map has some -- some medium density residential to -- you know, to the east and that's what that's planned for; right? And I don't know when that's going to happen. I don't know if it's going to happen anytime soon, but I think this is an area where this development is actually going to be a very valuable transitional space to keep that the rural character on the west and the south, while still allowing for a more natural transition into kind of more suburban Meridian to that northeast. So, I think I'm fully supportive of it. I appreciate the neighbors' concerns in the comments and I understand for a lot of people who have kind of been in this area for a while, I understand that change is hard. Our -- our goal is to identify the -- you know, what is the best and the highest service for the City of Meridian and for its residents as a whole and I think this is some -- something like this could actually do a great job to that end. With that is there a motion?

Perreault: Mr. Chair?

Smith: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Just -- just one more comment. I don't have an issue with the alternative compliance request. I mean ACHD is requesting 50 feet for when they eventually widen the road, so that's going to be there and I mean, obviously, we can't move that existing house. So, I don't think that's -- I think that's going to be a minimal impact. I'm not concerned about it. In light of that, I would like to make a motion. After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council

a File No. H-2025-0013 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of September 4th, 2025, with no modifications.

Sandoval: Second.

Smith: It's been moved and seconded. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries. Oh.

Ritter: I just need you guys to -- I know Commissioner Sandoval had said something about the temporary sidewalk, so that needs to be in the motion, whether or not you are recommending it or not.

Smith: Okay. So, we will rewind about 30 seconds.

Ritter: And you can add the alternative compliance in there also.

Smith: Okay. So, we will need to just make sure I guess for the motion whether we want to allow the alternative compliance and then -- which I think you have covered, but also that temporary sidewalk.

Perreault: Mr. Chair, I apologize. Could you run that by me again? We need to include in the motion the alternative compliance decision and also the temporary sidewalk? Is that right?

Ritter: Yes, please.

Perreault: Okay. Thank you. I will do my best. Mr. Chair, I think you have to ask for a new motion or shall I withdraw my motion?

Smith: Kurt, is there a best way to do this?

Starman: I think a couple choices. One, you can amend your motion with the concurrence of your second or you can withdraw the motion and, then, do a new motion. Either way it works.

Smith: I think -- I think maybe amending the motion might be the simplest.

Perreault: Sounds good. All right. I move to make a new motion. After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council of File No. H-2025-0013 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of September 4th, 2025, with the following modifications: The Commission is in agreement to grant the alternative compliance request to reduce the required landscape buffer along the street frontage of Lot 11, Block 1, to 12 and a half feet and the Commission is not in agreement with staff's recommendation -- excuse me -- the Commission is not in agreement with the need to add a five foot temporary sidewalk within the ACHD right of way on the west and north side of the property.

Smith: So, second concurs? Who was the second on that?

Sandoval: Second.

Smith: Second? Matt, you were, so you could --

Starman: Same -- yeah, if you would concur as -- you know, the same second would be in concurrent, if you can just confirm that's true.

Sandoval: Yes. I second the amendment of the motion.

Smith: Second concurs. All right. With that all those in favor, please, say aye. Any opposed? All right. Are we good? We clear? Cool.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Smith: All right. With that I will take one more motion.

Stoll: Move to adjourn.

Perreault: Second.

Smith: Moved and seconded. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Thank you very much. We are adjourned.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:43 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS.)

APPROVED

JARED SMITH - VICE-CHAIRMAN

_____|_____|_____
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK