

Meridian Planning and Zoning Meeting

November 20, 2025.

Meeting of the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission of November 20, 2025, was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chairman Maria Lorcher.

Members Present: Commissioner Maria Lorcher, Commissioner Jared Smith, Commissioner Brian Garrett, Commissioner Matthew Sandoval, Commissioner Sam Rust and Commissioner Matthew Stoll.

Members Absent: Commissioner Jessica Perreault.

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

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <u> X </u> Brian Garrett | <u> </u> Jessica Perrault |
| <u> X </u> Matthew Sandoval | <u> X </u> Matthew Stoll |
| <u> X </u> Sam Rust | <u> X </u> Jared Smith |
| <u> X </u> Maria Lorcher - Chairman | |

Lorcher: All right. Good evening. Welcome to Planning and Zoning Commission meeting for November 20th, 2025. At this time I would like to call the meeting to order. The Commissioners who are present for this evening's meeting are here at City Hall and also on Zoom. We have staff from the city attorneys and the city clerk's office, as well as the city's planning department. If you are joining us on Zoom this evening we can see that you are here. You may observe the meeting, however, your ability to be seen on screen and talk will be muted. During the public testimony portion of the meeting you will be unmuted and, then, be able to comment. Please note we cannot take questions until the public testimony portion of the meeting. If you have any process questions during the meeting, please, e-mail cityclerk@meridiancity.org and they will reply as quickly as possible. If you simply want to watch the meeting we encourage you to watch this streaming on the city's YouTube channel. You can access it at meridiancity.org/live. With that let us begin with roll call. Madam Clerk.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Lorcher: The next item on the agenda is the adoption of the agenda. There are no changes to tonight's agenda, but please note that Item No. 2, 3780 Overland, has requested a continuance. So, if anybody is here tonight to testify on this application we will not be taking public testimony this evening. Could I get a motion to adopt tonight's agenda?

Stoll: So moved.

Smith: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

1. Approve Minutes of the November 6, 2025 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting

Lorcher: Next item on the agenda is the Consent Agenda, which includes to approve the minutes of the November 6th meeting. Could I get a motion to accept the Consent Agenda as presented?

Smith: So moved.

Stoll: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

Lorcher: At this time I would like to briefly explain the public hearing process. We will open each item individually and begin with the staff report. Staff will report their findings and how the item adheres to our Comprehensive Plan and our Unified Development Code. After staff has made their presentation the applicant will come forward and present their case and respond to staff's comments. They will have 15 minutes to do so. After the applicant has finished we will open the floor to public testimony. Each person will be called only once during public testimony. The clerk will call names individually of those who have signed up on our website in advance to testify. You may come to the microphones in Chambers or you will be unmuted on Zoom. Please state your name and address for the record and you will have three minutes to address the Commission. If you have previously sent pictures or a presentation for the meeting it will be displayed on screen and our clerk will help you run the presentation. If you have established that you are speaking on behalf of a larger group, like an HOA where others from that group will allow you to speak on their behalf, you will have up to ten minutes. After all those who have signed up in advance have spoken we will invite anybody else in Chambers or on Zoom to testify. If you wish to speak on a topic you may come forward in Chambers or if on Zoom press the -- press the raise hand button in the Zoom app and if you are only listening on a telephone 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 don't 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, 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 close the public hearing and the Commissioners will have the opportunity to discuss and hopefully make final decisions or recommendations to City Council as needed.

2. Public Hearing for 3780 Overland (H-2025-0038) by Jesus Madrigal, located at 3780 E. Overland Rd.

- A. Request: Annexation of 0.91 acres of land with the R-2 zoning district for the purpose of complying with the terms outlined in the consent to annex agreement for the existing home that is already connected to City utilities.

Lorcher: The first item on the agenda is Item No. 2, H-2025-0038, for 3780 Overland. We are opening it for the purpose of continuance. Madam Clerk, do we have a date in mind for a continuance for this application?

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

Lorcher: Can I get a motion to approve the continuance for December 4th?

Smith: So moved.

Stoll: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded -- second to approve file H-2025-0038, 3780 Overland, for continuance. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

ACTION ITEMS

3. Public Hearing continued from October 16, 2025 for Borough Village (H-2025-0037) by Engineering Solutions, LLP., located at 1250 E. Everest St.

- A. Request: Modified Development Agreement to the existing development agreement (Inst. #105152707 Westborough Square) to update the use (from office to residential) and development plan for the site and enter into a new agreement for the subject property.
- B. Request: Rezone of 3.04 acres of land from the L-O to the R-15 zoning district

- C. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of three (3) buildable lots and three (3) common/other lots on 2.81 acres of land.
- D. Request: Planned Unit Modification to the approved PUD (CUP-05-027) to update the development plan for the site from six (6) office buildings to 18 multi-family residential dwelling units and two (2) single-family residential dwelling units.
- E. Request: Director Approval of alternative compliance to UDC 11-3B-7C.1c to not provide street buffer landscaping along E. Chinden Blvd., adjacent to the site due to the location of the 10-foot wall constructed by ITD with the roadway expansion.

Lorcher: Item 3 on the agenda is H-2025-0037 is to continue Borough Village Subdivision at 1250 East Everest Street from the October 16th Planning and Zoning meeting for modified development agreement, rezone, preliminary plat and a planned unit modification. We will begin with the staff report.

Allen: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. This site consists of approximately three acres of land. It's zoned L-O, limited office, and it's located at 1250 East Everest Street. This property was originally platted in Ada county back in 2003 and later annexed into the city in 2005 with an L-L zoning district as part of a larger development area. A development agreement was required as a provision of annexation for the overall annexation area. A planned unit development was also approved for the development of six professional office buildings on the subject property and ten multi-family residential buildings with 40 dwelling units on the adjacent property to the east. The multi-family residential portion of the development was constructed, but only the site improvements associated with the office portion of the development were constructed, consisting of sewer and water main lines, pressure irrigation, asphalt drives and parking areas, street buffer and parking lot landscaping. Further development was delayed due to the bank foreclosing on the property during the recession in 2008. Before you here are some photos of the site and the improvements that exist on the property that I mentioned. In 2015 applications were submitted for a rezone to R-15 and a modification to the planned unit development to change the use and site layout from office to multi-family residential for the development of 34 townhome style units at a gross density of 12.55 units per acre, which was denied by Council due to the opinion the R-15 zone was not in the best interest of the city at that time. Reasons cited were that the density of the development proposed with the planned development was too high and the entitled office uses would access the multi-family residential use approved in phase one. Other relevant testimony included preference for uses allowed in the L-O district, such as professional office uses, a daycare facility and/or a fitness facility, rather than more multi-family residential units in this area. In 2016 a short plat application was submitted and approved for the subject property and the adjacent property to the east, which included the eastern portion of the vacated right of way from Jericho Road, which was vacated by ACHD after ITD decided to eliminate the collector street connection to Chinden Boulevard and that was right along the west boundary of this property here. A

35 foot wide landscape street buffer with irrigation, a ten foot wide multi-use pathway and a ten foot tall berm and wall was constructed along Chinden Boulevard, State Highway 20-26 with the subdivision improvements as required by the development agreement, but was later removed by the Idaho Transportation Department with the road widening project. ITD acquired an additional ten feet of right of way from the subject property and installed a ten foot tall concrete wall for buffering, along with decorative rock on the south side of Chinden Boulevard in this area. Utilities were installed, which included a large transformer, underground power, and a natural gas line between the back of sidewalk and the wall. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation for this property is mixed use community. Integrated community serving employment and residential uses are desired in this designation. Residential uses are expected to comprise between 20 percent and 50 percent of the overall MUC development area, with gross densities ranging from six to 15 units per acre of the residential area. The applicant is proposing a modification to the existing development agreement and planned unit development for Westborough Square to update the use from office to residential and concept development plan from six office buildings to 18 multi-family residential units in single family residential attached style structures and two single family residential dwelling units for the site and a new development agreement for the subject property. A variety of community serving uses exist in the overall mixed use community designated area and residential uses comprise less than 50 percent of the development area as desired. A rezone of 3.04 acres of land is proposed from the L-O to the R-15 zoning district. Reasons cited in the applicant's narrative supporting the proposed rezone and change of use include the lack of a collector street, which is Jericho Road, access to Chinden Boulevard, State Highway 20-26. The nearest access is circuitous via North Saguario Hills Avenue to Everest Street to the west, over one thousand feet to the west and north and lack of visibility from the highway with ITD's construction of a ten foot tall wall between the property and the highway, which created an isolated office zone parcel without potential for development. The property has sat vacant and underutilized since 2008. A preliminary plat is proposed as shown to develop in one phase, consisting of three buildable lots containing one multi-family residential building lot and two single family residential building lots and three common and other lots, consisting of an access drive, a parking lot and a common lot on 2.81 acres of land. The single family lots range in size from 4,176 square feet to 4,228 square feet, with an average lot size of 4,202 square feet. The multi-family lot will contain nine structures, with 18 single family residential attached style dwellings. The gross density is 6.58 units per acre, which is consistent with the density desired in the mixed use community designated area. It's actually at the low range of what's desired in that area of six to 15 units per acre. No deviations are proposed to UDC standards with the modification to the planned unit development. Multi-family residential developments are allowed as principal permitted uses through the PUD. If the amendment to the PUD is approved a conditional use permit would not be required. Private usable open space consisting of patios are proposed for each unit in excess of the 80 square foot minimum requirement. A minimum of 4,500 square feet or a tenth of an acre of common open space is required for the development. The applicant is providing open space exceeding the standard by more than double the amount. A minimum of two site amenities are required from two separate categories. A sports

court, horseshoe pit is proposed from the recreation category. A fenced dog park with a waste station is proposed from the quality of life category and a picnic area with a shade structure is proposed from the open space category, exceeding UDC standards. Off-street parking is proposed in excess of the minimum standard. Fifty-one spaces are provided over the required amount, with another 16 spaces provided in an overflow parking lot along the southern boundary of the site for use by guests and residents of Borough Subdivision, the multi-family development to the east, to alleviate existing parking issues in this area. A 35 foot wide street buffer is required along Chinden Boulevard, an entryway corridor, with noise abatement for residential uses adjoining a state highway. As previously noted, ITD removed the previously installed buffer wall and irrigation with the road widening project and constructed a ten foot tall concrete wall at the back edge of the ten foot wide sidewalk along Chinden, leaving little area for a landscape buffer and no irrigation to the north side of the wall. Alternative compliance was requested and approved by the director to the street buffer standards in the UDC due to existing conflicts with utilities, which prevent installation of irrigation facilities under the footings of the wall. There is no break in the wall, so maintenance of the limited area of landscaping on the north side of the wall would have to take place from Chinden, which the applicant felt would be hazardous. The subject property is also considerably lower than Chinden, with a significant slope into the property from the ten foot tall wall -- excuse me -- and a three foot tall retaining wall. As alternative compliance the developer is required to install nine trees north of the retaining wall, with shrubs, decorative boulders and rock mulch and four additional trees on the south of the retaining wall as proposed. As noted additional common open space and amenities are provided above and beyond the minimum standards, with a landscaped area behind the proposed units connecting to a pocket park with a picnic shelter and trees as an alternative means of compliance, which provides an equal or superior means for meeting the requirement. Conceptual building elevations were submitted as shown for the proposed single story homes in the development. No two stories are proposed. Written testimony has been received from Becky McKay, the applicant's representative. She is in agreement with the staff report recommendation. Public testimony has been received from Melissa Chandler, Melinda and Ray Akhbari, Ginne Hostvedt and John Elliott. Just a summary of those concerns were for children and pedestrians with the increased traffic. Inadequate parking. Increased traffic volume on surrounding roads. Increase in noise in the quiet neighborhood. Incompatibility with surrounding land uses and strain on city services and infrastructure. The entirety of those letters are included in the public record. I'm sure you have seen those before the hearing tonight. Staff is recommending approval with the conditions in the staff report, as staff finds the proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Staff will stand for any questions.

Lorcher: Would the applicant like to come forward?

McKay: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. I'm Becky McKay with Engineering Solutions. Business address 1029 North Rosario in Meridian. I'm representing the applicant on this particular project. Sonya, are you keying me up? My screen is blank. Is it me or -- there we go. Thank you very much. I guess it just -- just takes a special touch, which I don't have when it comes to technology. So, as -- as

Sonya indicated, this property adjoins State Highway 20-26 right here at this location. We have Locust Grove just to the east and, then, the means of access is the Saguaro Way collector -- oops -- that comes down through here. This kind of gives you an aerial look of what adjoins us. You can see that the parking lot is all improved. All the parking islands have trees. The common drive comes through. There is sewer, water, pressure irrigation, storm drainage, everything -- all infrastructure was installed many many years ago back in 2008. To the west of us is Hightower Subdivision. These are on individual lots, but they are attached product. These lot sizes are 3,200 square feet and, then, they are larger when you get to the kind of pie shaped lots. To the east of us we have what was part of the Westborough development. These are four-plex three-plex and the way they were built they had parallel parking, regular parking and, then, they had parking garages and what has been told to me is the garages are so small that you can -- if you park a car in there you can barely get the doors open. So, what transpired is, then, these people started parking over here in this vacant parking lot that is the project before you this evening. Not only did they park their cars, they parked their boats, they parked their beat up motor homes, they parked junk cars -- everything. So, it became a very -- a big nuisance. The city informed my client we need you to sign it, that this is private property, no parking. Well, then, what transpired was due to the lack of parking in this eastern portion, then people started parking along here and along Jericho and along Everest. So, it just kind of snowballed. So, part of our application is we want to allocate this southern parking lot here, which has 16 existing spaces for their overflow parking, so they don't park on the public right of way. They don't obstruct the bus stop that is at Jericho and Everest. This is -- it's kind of a unique project, because it's something that they -- obviously in 2005 made sense and Jericho Street was in existence and it was designated as a collector roadway along our western boundary, connected to Chinden and I did Jericho Subdivision just to the southwest and -- and this was called a neighborhood center and so they wanted a variety of uses under the comp plan. They wanted, you know, a mixture of office, maybe some neighborhood commercial. They wanted a mixture of, you know, some lower density multi-family, alley load, single family, so we worked when I did Jericho Subdivision with the residents along the east side of Jericho, just south of this project, because they came in under the county and they were more estate lots and so we needed to be compatible with them. So, we ended up having larger lots. Is that me?

Lorcher: No. You're good.

McKay: Okay. So, we ended up having larger lots front on Jericho Street as a transition to the alley load and the more, you know, urban type development they wanted in the neighborhood center. Over time they eliminated that neighborhood center, because when Jericho was determined by ITD that it was a hazard to have Jericho intersecting as a collector at this location with 20-26, ACHD and ITD eliminated Jericho and vacated it all the way down to this location. So, here we had an office park with all the utilities, no buildings, that had no direct access or any visibility to Chinden. So, kind of to give you the history -- I will zip through this, because Sonya kind of -- kind of indicated. This property started its development history in 2003. 2005 -- so, 20 years ago it was -- it was a mixed use development, with 40 multi-family units on the east, six

office lots. They annexed it. They had L-O, R-15. Infrastructure was installed in '07. Then the recession hit. The project goes back to the bank. My client purchased it from the bank and, then, in '08 ITD and ACHD decided we are going to tear out Jericho Street and vacate the right of way. So, then, my client hired a consultant to come in and -- ten years ago in 2015 and they were wanting to convert those office areas to 34 townhomes. They were all two story, a density of 12.55 dwelling units per acre. The Council looked at that and said, you know, we just don't feel that that's compatible with the single story duets that are to the west and the low density residential that was done in the county to the south and they denied it. So, this -- this is what is intact right now, this Westborough Square and you can see that they had six office buildings that was 22,000 square feet of office and, then, they had the 40 units over here to the east. So, we came in and we looked at it, we met with the neighbors. I met individually with the neighbor to the south, since they have a large estate lot, a tennis court, and I said, you know, what would you like to see and they said, well, we definitely don't want anything. that's two story. We would like to see the density come down from what was proposed in 2015. So, in my plan I have two single story, single family dwellings on individual lots that back up and that's their driveway and, then, we went through and came up with a duet plan for like seniors. So, these are like 772 square feet, one bedroom, one bath, because there is a big need right now for senior rental housing. You know, a lot of seniors will lose a spouse, they -- they -- all their -- all of their wealth is in their house, they sell their home and want to move into something that's easy for -- you know, they don't have to maintain and this is all common area around them. This is the plat. So, the plat basically encompasses the two single family lots, which could be sold. The parking lot, which will be allowed to be used for the overflow for the Westborough multi-family and, then, we have the access drive and the -- the one lot with -- that -- that will have the 18 duets. We incorporated the -- the vacated right of way. My client -- I don't know if he purchased it or if -- if Hightower gave it to him, they didn't want their -- their vacated right of way, so we have incorporated that vacated right of way into the project. It's not wanting to go. Come on you little -- dang it. Gets excited. So, as far as the amenities, this is, obviously, a smaller project. We came up with a horseshoe pit, a pocket park with a picnic shelter, trees around it. A fenced dog park with benches. Waste station. I read the letters of opposition. They -- they indicated that we don't have adequate parking. There are 78 parking spaces that are existing and six ADA spaces. The requirement for my 18 duets is 36. So, we are horribly over parked, but there is really nothing I can do about that. Like I said, we are allowing the 16 spaces to the south to be overflow parking. This is what the two single family dwellings will look like. They will be what we call the Harlow and we have like a farmhouse or a modern -- probably they will lean towards the modern, since our duets are more modern style, so that it is cohesive in design, color, schemes, et cetera. This is -- these are the duets. So, we will have duets. We will have to go in and that parking is open parking, because it was intended for office, so we will have to put in parking structures, because 50 percent of our required parking has to be parking structures. So, these would be the single story duets. This -- you can see this is on the Hightower side, so you can see that Hightower has a site obscuring fence and, then, that's the ten foot wall and the berm that was installed by ITD with the Chinden expansion. All of these projects had very nice landscaping and fencing along that Chinden Boulevard corridor. ITD came in,

they bought right of way and their plan was -- we are going to build this ten foot concrete wall. We are going to put a three foot retaining wall on the other side, because we are lower and, then, they put in that pea gravel. So, we had to apply for what we call an alternative compliance, because the code stipulates if you adjoin a state highway you need to landscape 35 feet. Well, there is no -- it's not possible. They have -- they have -- they have cut off our irrigation. There is utilities there. It's just not viable any longer. So, we had to mitigate for that as far as adding additional landscaping internally that will, then, benefit the development itself. This is the north boundary of this property. You can see the parking lot. You can see the three foot retaining wall, then, the ten foot and, then, the berm. So, we are going to go in there, we are going to plant trees, we are going to plant shrubs, we are going to have some -- a mixture of xeriscape and, then, also turf and trees. This is the colored landscape plan. So, you can see that we have a grassy area here. We wanted to do a horseshoe pit. Then here we have what we call a pocket park with a picnic shelter and trees and, then, we have a little fenced-in dog park here with benches and a waste -- a waste station. This area that you see to the west right here was intended to be the collector buffer for Hightower to Jericho, but when -- they never installed any landscaping and they just installed a six foot vinyl fence there. I did talk with the Hightower HOA representative. We talked about maybe doing something together utilizing all of that space and at first I got positive feedback and, then, I was told are these -- are duets going to be sold? And I said, no, they will be rentals to like seniors. Then they said if they are rentals we don't want to have anything to do with it. So, I said, okay, okay, we are on our own. I get it. Oops. So, as far as the density that was denied, I think Sonya indicated it was like 12.55 dwelling units per acre. You know, we are significantly less than that. I think our gross density is like around seven. The R -- where it's R-15 to the west of us, the vacated right of way is R-15, that's why the legal description for the rezone is not the same as the legal description for the preliminary plat. When you are coming in to try to retrofit a project it's always the hardest thing to do. We have a lot of sewer and water easements. We have storm drain easements. We have irrigation easements. All of these buildings are outside those easements. But what it did do is it allowed us to kind of modulate the buildings so they are not all in alignment and, like I indicated, we are trying to create a nice senior development that is affordable that, obviously, is in a good location with access to existing commercial, et cetera. I would ask that the Commission support this. This project's been underutilized, under taxed for 20 years.

Lorcher: Thank you very much. A couple questions.

McKay: Yes, ma'am.

Lorcher: So, since -- did you say the subdivision to your west is Hillside? Is that correct?

McKay: No. Hightower.

Lorcher: Hightower. Sorry. Heard an H. So, since they no longer wish to participate in sharing landscaping, what were you kind of thinking between you and that vinyl fence?

McKay: That's -- I can't -- I can't do anything. It's their -- it's a common lot that their HOA owns.

Lorcher: Oh, they own it.

McKay: It's just dirt. It's just dirt. It's probably going to stay dirt. So, let me see -- I have a picture. So, right now -- oh, there it is. So, right now it's just unimproved. So, you can see their fence right here and, then, that dirt area is on the other side. It's their property. I -- I can't -- I can't control it.

Lorcher: And so you said these are going to be rentals and are they -- they are going to be age specific? You are only going to allow seniors.

McKay: We want to market it to 55 and older, because they are only one bedroom, one bath and they are 700 -- I think they are 772 square feet I think is what it is -- 772 square feet. So, they are not -- they are not designed for families. No.

Lorcher: Not to make you commit, but what kind of price point were you looking at?

McKay: I don't -- I don't know. It's hard to say. We have to go in and any services that we are not going to utilize we have to remove them from the main and, then, we have to go in and patch up and, then, put in new services. We share a pressurized irrigation system with Hightower, which -- so, we don't have to put in a new pressure irrigation system. Our intent is by retrofitting this that we can make it affordable. That is our intent. Versus tearing everything out and starting from scratch.

Lorcher: Right. One last question from me. The multi-family to the east where you are offering the overflow parking --

McKay: Yes.

Lorcher: -- does that belong to the -- your developer as well or is that a completely different company that --

McKay: I -- Madam -- Madam Chairman, I did ask that question and he indicated that he had sold it, but he agreed to allow them to -- and I don't know if we are going to deed them that lot, so that they -- they own it and are responsible for it, you know, from a liability perspective. What if somebody slips on the ice and breaks -- breaks an arm. But it will be made available to them for their overflow parking, so we can stop this on-street parking.

Lorcher: Commissioners, do we have any other questions for Becky?

Stoll: I do actually -- follow-up question.

Lorcher: Commissioner Stoll.

Stoll: Follow-up question on what you are asking. So, just clarification. You said he sold it. Your client sold it to somebody or --

McKay: Yes. That's what he indicated to me.

Stoll: Sold it to the Westborough development or --

McKay: He sold it to some other -- I don't know -- developer that owns rentals, because they are -- I believe those are rentals.

Stoll: Right. So, I'm just trying to figure out if the parking lot was sold to --

McKay: No. The parking lot we still own.

Stoll: Okay. I'm sorry.

McKay: Yes, sir. I'm just saying I'm not sure what his long range plan is, if he ends up deeding that parking lot to that owner, so they own it in fee simple or we just give them an easement and the right to utilize it for overflow. It doesn't do us any good, because it's -- it's separated from our duets, it's next to the single family and we are over parked as it is.

Stoll: Okay. And I appreciate that clarification. So, my main question -- I drove out there early this afternoon just to check it out and so there is two cars that were parked in the common driveway going into Westborough. They weren't parked in the parking lot area. That's a very narrow common driveway that you have there. Is there any plans to widen that or is that going to be just left as is?

McKay: It will remain as is. It meets standards. It has sidewalks. I would like to sign it no parking so then -- and, then, obviously, sign that overflow parking for Hightower -- or not Hightower, but Westborough Subdivision and direct those people into there.

Stoll: So, what is the planned enforcement mechanism? And maybe that's something for the city. I don't know. Is that something that's going to be handled by your client as far as the parking and -- or is that something that's left to the city?

McKay: You -- this body could, obviously, include a condition of approval that we install no parking signs there along that private drive, so -- because of the width and because of now we are providing overflow parking, because it's been signed that private property no parking in those parking lots, because it became such a nuisance. So, I would like to rectify that and, obviously, help this neighborhood with their parking issue.

Lorcher: With the multi-family like that will hire a private company to either patrol or put towing signs up?

McKay: Yes.

Lorcher: So, that --

Stoll: Is that your plan? That's what I was trying to get at. Is that --

McKay: Yes. We -- they can put no parking and, then, if they put a towing company -- if they list the towing company and a phone number, then, they can have those cars towed.

Stoll: So, that's your -- that's your client's plan?

McKay: If -- if the Commission thinks that is the most prudent way to go we would prefer that -- that not -- there be no parking there, too. Yes, sir.

Stoll: Okay. Thank you.

Lorcher: All right. Thank you very much.

McKay: Thank you.

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

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. Yes, we have Drew Robert and he indicated he is representing an HOA.

Lorcher: Okay. Hi, if you can state your name and address for the record that would be great.

Robert: Hi, there. Drew Robert. Located at 6040 North Jericho Road. So, we are south of that. And, then, I'm representing the subdivision that's south, so that Westborough Subdivision that's just south of them on the right side of Jericho.

Lorcher: Okay. And is that single family homes? Are you part of a duet or multi-family?

Robert: Single handed homes to the estates properties that they are mentioning that on the right side.

Lorcher: Yes.

Robert: So, I'm here in opposition of the proposed plan. So, to your point, you were there earlier today, I think a lot of the concerns -- a lot of it's around traffic. So, with getting heavy conditions already there, having a lot of challenges with traffic as they were talking about more of traffic flow, I think ability to actually turn onto Chinden is very challenging. So, again, today most of that has to funnel south through Jericho and, then, through outlying streets. So, I think we are seeing adding more congestion to that is going to continue to escalate that issue that we have today. So, that's a common concern that we have. I think if we were to get into -- they know parking. Today there is

over 20 cars that continue to park down that road. So, even with that parking to be provided if they had no parking is going to outflow somewhere within the division for people to, then, get back to their apartments. So, we see that as a concern if they don't have enough parking to begin with there. They were sitting on -- again, like the R-15 where I think when you look around for the current situation of what we have, most of it, again, is single family homes. So, I think having more high density there really doesn't flow into the rest of the neighborhoods, some of the focus that they have from that perspective. I think last time we had was more on -- again there is -- going back to earlier precedence where for this particular case, again, it was denied at that point in time. It's not easy to access. It's really hard to get into that area. So, again, adding more and more into that again kind of falls into what was that first -- or easier -- earlier precedence that you all had kind of recommended for that point. So, that was kind of a lot of our notes from our neighborhood. Any questions?

Lorcher: No. I think we are good. Thank you very much.

Robert: Thank you.

Lorcher: Madam Clerk?

Lomeli: Madam Chair, the next person that signed up was Forrest Spencer.

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

Spencer: My name is Forrest Spencer. I live at 1288 East Everest Street, Apartment H101, one of those renters to the east. I just want to express I do not support this proposed housing project at the end of our street. This location is a dead end, which already limits residents, visitors and emergency vehicles. Adding more units would only increase traffic and the road is not designed to handle that kind of volume. Also for safety for pedestrians who walk pets, like me and my wife, children, et cetera, the in-and-out congestion could delay emergency vehicle response times. I'm not opposed to growth. In fact, I heard her talking about tons of growth out in Star, but not the best location at the current time. I believe a light at that Chinden and Sagarra Hills before more growth in that area, a lot of near miss collisions I have seen. I Door Dash for a living, so I use the roads all day every day with people trying to turn west onto Chinden. I think to ensure safety in that area I ask the board to respectfully reconsider this project and explore alternatives to not put added pressure on a dead end and the overall safety for the area. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Lorcher: Thank you very much.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, the next person is Jack Harris.

Lorcher: Good evening.

Harris: Good evening. My name is Jack Harris. I live at 6274 North Maximus Place, which backs up to Jericho and looks at this property kitty corner. I have lived there for four years. Contrary to the opinions I have just heard I actually support this project for a number of reasons. One, first of all, I am tired of looking at weed fields and dirt. It blows across there in the hot dry summer. I'm tired of all the cars that park along the street because of the lack of parking in that Westborough division. It wasn't always that way. Something changed and all of a sudden all the people started parking on the street and lately it hasn't been as bad. But I also support the idea of the affordable housing. That is an issue. And I don't really understand the issue of the traffic. I live there. I sit out front a lot. I sit out back a lot. There really isn't that much traffic along there. I know that a lot of people have to go in and out Commander, but that's a function of many neighborhoods that are using that egress. It's not just this little area over here. I do completely agree that ever since Chinden was widened out to five lanes there is a huge access to Chinden problem during certain times of the day when it's just bumper to bumper traffic and because of the number of seniors that do live in that area, having a traffic light installed there would help that problem greatly. I understand that the -- the Department of Transportation has expressed opposition to that because of the traffic light a half a mile to the east and a half a mile to the west, but it is an access problem. I am concerned. But I don't believe that a few more residents are going to make that huge of a difference to that particular issue. So, anything that we can do to get that property developed and cleaned up for the benefit of the entire neighborhood would be beneficial. I'm here representing myself as a resident, but I will admit I am on the board of the HOA for Hightower. I'm not really here doing that, but I do want to make one clarification about that strip of land that is adjacent. The only discussion that I remember having about that land is there was a proposal that we would join that land with this project to put a sports court in there and the greatest objection was having a pickleball court immediately behind that six foot fence by those units that are there. There was not interest in having a noisy pickleball court right in the backyard and that was really the issue. If there were other plausible ways to use that space and turn it into a green space I don't believe there would be an objection to that. It was mostly about the idea of a sports court right there and they have removed that from their -- their project. Thank you.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, the next person is Tyler Rountree.

Rountree: May I approach and hand you these handouts to be distributed? Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, my name is Tyler Rountree. I reside at 1098 East Pasacana. Inasmuch as I hate to admit this, I have been there since '07 and have been actively involved in a couple segments and iterations of this project. In front of you I have a packet, which is kind of representational of the PowerPoint. I'm also at a point now where it's a little harder for me to see, so I thought it might be easier to have something right in front of you. The proposed on the layout there talks about the existing apartment complex that's to the east and I have got a couple of pictures as it relates to the parking. So, a couple of snapshots on the parking on the approach street.

That one was October 1st. You can kind of see what's been talked about. This is basically just from the other end of the street looking back and if you look kind of down into this picture you can see where the proposed 16 space adjacent parking lot is and there is another picture that was taken the 4th of October. So, there is considerable overflow from the apartment complex that's existing, because there is nowhere to park. Unfortunately, even though there are requirements that you guys have to adhere to when an apartment complex comes in, if you put a two bedroom apartment that doesn't mean you are going to get a car or two cars. Typically what I see is -- because of affordability problems you are going to get four or five or six cars and that's kind of what happens in some of these areas and there really isn't anywhere in that development to park. Here is a poll from code enforcement for parking violations. There is 50 right there in front of you that they had to go out and deal with. I have also attached in your packet the public records request, the letter back from PD, and something that's a little easier to see than what was in the PowerPoint. As you can see they have proposed two dwellings to the south of that, which is right along that corridor that I showed you that the parking that is existing is a problem. As far as the landscape piece goes, this -- this area that was donated however somebody wants to look at it, has been presented to -- to landscape all the way over to the outer dashed line, which is the fence and here is a picture -- I believe this is kind of what we were talking about earlier of the dirt that goes all the way back. Ultimately for me and looking at the projects that have been presented, I think we are so close in making something better happen. My ask would be that the landscape be revisited. We push something with green grass -- the picnic structures all the way back to the retaining wall, something farther back there, so we don't end up with what's proposed. The weeds are going to get into that. It's going to be a maintenance piece. If these are going to be rental units my assumption is they are going to have an HOA that is going to handle some of the maintenance that goes on in this area. So, I would like to see that we are. Lastly, wrapping up, this is being presented as a concept. So, what's important to me is as it's presented there are some pieces of improvement. The single stories that they presented, the single bedroom residential units I think is totally fine, but I want to make sure that we stay within the concept, so we are not back here looking at two story units, density increased, those are my concerns.

Lorcher: Thank you very much.

Rountree: No questions?

Lorcher: Think we are good. Thank you for the packet.

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

Lorcher: Is there anybody else in Chambers or on Zoom that would like to speak on this subject? Becky, would you like to come back up and address some of the concerns?

McKay: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. Becky McKay. So, obviously, as I indicated to you and as you can see from the photographs, parking has

been an absolute nuisance in this area. We have 76 spaces. We have one bedroom, one bath, which means you are going to have at the most two cars if you had a husband and wife or if you had a single one car. So, technically, we need 36 spaces. So, we have in excess of 42 spaces. That will not be utilized by our residents. We are allocating the 16 on the south, but we could allocate some additional spaces in the northern area if need be. As far as the traffic is concerned, I did calculate the traffic with the 22,000 square foot of office -- office generates 17.7 vehicle trips per day per thousand square feet. So, if this were to build out as office, which I don't believe it will, because there is no visibility. It's a very circuitous way to get to it. Nobody would know you were even there. It would generate 389 new trips per day in this area. With the 20 dwelling units that I'm proposing we generate 140 trips total. That's at build out. That is only 36 percent of what it is already entitled to right now. That's basically a reduction of 64 percent in traffic based on the use and that number of trips would probably be lower, because seniors -- I calculated ten trips per day for the two single family dwellings, 6.57 trips per day for the duets. But senior housing is -- some of it's even below four. Seniors just don't drive as much as families and single families. The question arose about the drive aisle safety. That common drive is 28 feet in width. It does dead end, but we are, obviously, on the end that adjoins Everest and Jericho on the western end. It transitions down to 25 feet as it goes into that multi-family area. By having a low traffic generator, by signing that no parking, by opening up parking overflow areas for the existing multi-family, I think that is going to alleviate a lot of the problems and the concerns. This definitely is not high density residential at 7.12 dwelling units per acre -- I mean R-15 allows you to have 15. I'm at 7.12 and when I met with staff I said, you know, we have wrecked our brains trying to come up with the lowest traffic generator, the least impact, the best fit and this was it and at my pre-app with the staff they said, you know, we can't think of -- I said if you have got a better idea I'm open, but they said, you know, this -- I think this is it. You have hit on the right use. This property has been underutilized, under taxed for so many years and we need -- I mean instead of going out into the green field, we need to -- these in-fill projects to add some housing, added at affordable rates, added where we have existing utilities, existing commercial, medical, fire, et cetera. Police protection. So, you know, it kind of checks all those boxes as -- as a good project in a good area and -- and Jack made a good comment. Yeah, there has been weeds out there. There has been kids partying out there. Dumping trash. People dumping couches. I mean -- because there is nobody there and it becomes an attractive nuisance and until we get homes and people there that stops. Mr. Rountree talked about the -- the parking issues and, like I said, I have already addressed those. He is concerned about, you know, is this a switch and bait deal? No. The staff is going to be writing up a new development agreement solely for the project that's before you. Limiting us to single story. Limiting us to 20 dwelling units. Requiring that we allocate the overflow parking. If you guys see fit that we put no parking signs, I think that's a great idea. Maintenance would be under a maintenance company, because those would be rentals. A lot of elderly people they don't have the physical capability to maintain. That's why a management company would come in and mow all of that area at once. As far as the strip there, I dealt with Terry Easley at the Hightower -- she's a member of the board. We did talk about doing a pickleball. She said, no, I don't want a pickleball. So, we bagged the pickleball. And, then, she said,

well, you know, if we could come up with some uses, then, you know, maybe you guys install it and we share the maintenance cost and I said that would be great. I would love to do that. And, then, she said are these going to be owner occupied. I said, well, the two single family dwellings could be, but, no, the -- the senior part would be rentals and she said, oh, if that's rentals, then, we are not interested and she sent me an e-mail to that effect and that was end of story. So, I mean the burden would be on their part. You know, if they want to put in grass I think it would be -- it would look lovely. Their 20 foot wide dirt strip doesn't make a lot of sense to me and I'm not sure why they didn't meet their conditions of approval, because they were conditioned to install a landscape buffer there at Jericho and it never happened. So, I'm not sure -- I mean they are basically not in compliance with their conditions of approval. Because I did Jericho Subdivision south of them. I had the same condition. We put in our landscape buffer accordingly. I think we got a good project. I think we have met the neighbors in the middle. They have seen some -- some options that, obviously, were not a good fit density wise, height wise, but right now I think this is a darn good project and I ask that you support it. Thank you.

Lorcher: Any questions for Becky? All right. Thank you very much.

McKay: Thank you.

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

Smith: So moved.

Stoll: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Lorcher: Well, I think the bad behavior of the multi-family should not inhibit this developer to put in some single family residences, especially for seniors. With respect to Mr. Robert with the HOA and Mr. Spencer, who is in the duets to the east of -- I think you said to the east of that, it sounds to me like a lot of the people who are in your area right now are taking advantage of open space that doesn't belong to them and, you know, multi-family or groups, you know, should have a parking agreement and I will tell you right now, since I used to own a tow truck company, if you are towed off because of bad parking it's going to cost you at least 300 dollars to get your car back and that's just a start. So, usually, it's kind of a one and done and they stop doing it. So, you know, I know change is hard, but with less than 20 units with, you know, less than 20 parking spaces going to be utilized for these seniors, one bedroom, one bath, and, you know, extra overflow, which that developer does not have to do at all, I think it's actually a good fit and especially since ITD took away the land and took away the connectivity.

So, a business wouldn't make sense here, because they would have to go through your neighborhood to get there anyway. So, I'm in support of this project.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: I likewise am in support of this. I would like to see some signage along the common drive to the effect of not allowing or disallowing parking on the common drive and I know we can't hold the applicant to what another HOA decides to do. It would -- maybe recommend it before Council, you know, seeking to address that and seek progress there. At the end of the day, though, I think that's -- they can't -- we can't force them to build -- to put something on someone else's property. So, I mean I would like to see just some landscaping or green space in that area in that strip just to, you know, ensure that we are doing a complete project. So, I would -- I don't think there is anything we can condition on that. I just want to kind of voice that and that encourage -- encouragement to I guess both the applicant and the HOA. But, yeah, I think with the condition to sign no parking, whether the Commission wants to append the towing or not I will leave that to the applicant's enforcement decisions. I think that's what it would take for me to approve.

Stoll: Madam Chair, I struggle with this one in the sense of -- we really can't do anything regarding the commercial development. It's -- that opportunity is lost. It's unfortunate, but it's the nature of a major arterial like Chinden Boulevard and what ITD is trying to do. The key concern for me is on the parking and that's so constrained with that narrow shared driveway. I could support the project if we do have that signage and also some sort of enforcement mechanism that's there, because you can have the signage, but if they know nobody is going to enforce it, nothing's going to -- nothing's going to change.

Lorcher: Right. The challenge I have, though, is that the parking that they are suggesting is not for the seniors, it's for the multi-family next door and they have no -- Becky said that that developer sold it to another company. So, there is really no enforcement for this particular developer to do it. It would have to be the -- it would have to be their organization having the sign of saying, you know, no parking or you are limited from certain hours or that type of thing and if they take advantage of it that's when you put a tow company in and a private security company. I will tell you they typically only get paid when a vehicle is towed. It usually doesn't cost money to have that signage. Maybe 15, 20 bucks to put the sign up, but there is no like financial contract there. Does that make sense? So, it's hard because the bad behavior is not coming from what is going to be these 20 tenants, it's the multi-family that is spreading out.

Stoll: Yeah. I'm just talking about the signage on the roadway, not --

Lorcher: Right. Got you.

Garrett: Yeah. Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Yeah. I'm in -- I'm in favor of this. This is a tough in-fill project. It might have been a commercial, but that train left the station. Now, it's for retired -- since I'm retired I probably drive ten percent of the time I used to. So, I don't see traffic being a major consideration. Parking I think you are just going to have to leave it to the people that are there to solve it and based on -- I think they -- they have made the efforts and now it's just -- what happens now is -- they have to decide on.

Lorcher: Okay. Commissioner Rust, Commissioner Sandoval, do you want to add anything or I will take a motion. No?

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: After hearing -- after considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council of File No. H-2025-0037 as presented in the staff report with a modification to require signage and enforcement of no parking along the common driveway.

Stoll: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to approve File No. H -- what number are we on again? I'm sorry. H-2025-0037 with the following modification -- with the modifications that Commissioner Smith indicated. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

- 4. Public Hearing continued from November 6, 2025 for Apex Cadence (H-2024-0061) by Brighton Corporation, generally located south of E. Lake Hazel Rd. and west of S. Locust Grove Rd., including 6575 S. Locust Grove Rd.**
 - A. Request: Modification to the existing Development Agreement (Inst. #2020-178120) to replace it with a new agreement for the subject property and to include specific design requirements.
 - B. Request: Annexation of 0.86 acres of land with an R-15 zoning district.
 - C. Request: De-Annexation of 0.52 acres of land from the City to Ada County.

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

Lorcher: Give me a moment to get my notes together here. All right. The next item on the agenda is to continue H-2024-0061, Apex Cadence from the November 6th Planning and Zoning meeting. We are not going to revisit everything, but we will have an amended staff report just to get everybody up to speed.

Allen: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission --

Starman: Sonya, before we do that, Madam Chair, with your indulgence we have two Commissioners here this evening that did not participate in the first and just like for the -- I know that they have told me individually that they have reviewed the record, including the video, but if I can just have both of them affirm that they have reviewed the record and are prepared to participate in tonight's deliberations.

Garrett: I --

Stoll: I -- go ahead.

Garrett: I have reviewed and I feel comfortable.

Stoll: I have watched the video. I have reviewed the packet. I am comfortable moving forward.

Lorcher: Okay. We also have Commissioner Sandoval and Commissioner Rust online. Did -- we are both -- I can't remember what happened two weeks ago. Were you both present for the meeting?

Sandoval: Madam Chair, yes.

Lorcher: Okay.

Rust: Madam Chair, I was present as well.

Lorcher: Okay. All right. Just make sure we are all on the same page. Okay. Sonya.

Allen: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. Again, this project was continued to tonight's meeting from November 6th due to there not being enough commissioners present to break a tie vote. The applicant submitted a response to the staff report requesting some changes to conditions. Staff has provided a response to the applicant's request that's included in the public record and you also have a hard copy before you tonight. I'm happy to answer any questions that you might have on that or clarifications.

Lorcher: Okay. Would the applicant like to come forward to give any additional comments?

McNutt: Good evening. Amanda McNutt. 2921 -- sorry. 2929 West Navigator. Just getting joined in so I can share. So, hopefully, you all had a chance to read my response that I sent. So, I'm not going to beat you over the head too much with this. My presentation doesn't want to work for some reason. But, essentially, I went back through the comp plan and did some analysis to see how we did or did not comply with the Comprehensive Plan and as I went through that I feel that we are very in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan for that mixed use residential area -- or, sorry, the medium density residential area. Obviously we talked about this last time. We are in compliance with 4.6 units per acre. As far as mixed use, I kind of pulled out some quotes from the comp plan and -- and how we were meeting those. So, one of those is, you know, a combination of compatible land uses, which I feel we do meet and this would provide another living option for that area. We need between 20 and 50 percent of the development area to be residential in this designation. We have a lot of the area that is existing C-C zone. With that we are about 50-50. So, we are in compliance in that respect as well. One thing that did come up last time was, you know, how are we connecting vehicularly. With the Rawson Canal it does limit the connections that can happen in the long run here. The one connection that will eventually happen is Via Roberto, which will have some kind of a bridge over the canal. But, essentially, everything is going to filter down and be a collector street through there. Oh, is my presentation not showing at all for you guys? Oh, I'm sorry. I do have a presentation.

Starman: Madam Chair, as Ms. McNutt is working on her presentation, I want to just -- just curious how we are going to do this tonight. So, you know, if we were simply going to -- we had a tie last time, we are suddenly going to have some clarifying questions and, then, call for the vote, I think that's sort of one path. If we are going down a different path, we are allowing the applicant to kind of revisit topics and kind of reframe, which is fine and that's the chair's prerogative, but with that I think I would recommend that you allow public testimony if there is additional public testimony tonight, since we are kind of reopening some issues that were previously already testified to. So, that would be my recommendation.

Lorcher: Okay. Yeah. I was hoping you could just -- if you had anything else to add, but keep going, we will --

McNutt: Okay.

Lorcher: -- we will take public testimony. We are fine.

McNutt: So, I apologize, I didn't realize this wasn't showing. But this is kind of a graphic that shows that 50-50 mix here and, then, this is the -- the street connections through here. So, the Rawson Canal kind of breaks this area up quite a bit and, then, everything's going to be filtering to the future collect -- collector roads and, then, out to the arterials. In my opinion there is not going to be much traffic that can go through Cadence and so those gates, again, in my opinion don't substantially affect the traffic in this location from getting to the mixed use center. Additionally, we do have quite a bit of open space, our ten foot sidewalks, pathways and micro paths that connect through here. One thing I wanted to show was kind of a bigger graphic of the area in -- in whole. There are ten foot sidewalks throughout the entire area that connect everything back to this center. So, not only is Cadence open to the public for pedestrian activity, but the rest of the area is as well and everything can filter through for pedestrian access to that point. One thing that I found was very interesting in the Comprehensive Plan is that it specifically calls out primary access as pedestrian access. So, it's this kind of blue arrow that goes north to south in this graphic is specifically calling out the pedestrian access. I feel that we do meet that designation that we are providing those pedestrian access points. The secondary access is also fully a pedestrian access. It actually does not talk about the vehicular access in this graphic, other than there are streets there. I kind of put a side by side to just show the commercial is in the corner just like it is in the graphic. The multi-family or medium density -- medium high density is kind of abutting that and, then, the single family is outside of that. So, when I look at the graphic I feel like I don't know how we can comply any more than we do. I'm -- I'm not going to go over these again, because they haven't changed, but I still do believe that we should be able to change some of these conditions as written, specifically the sidewalk and the multi-pathway. I know that that was a question last time. But, again, it just -- it makes more sense to do it as it progresses through the project, rather than all at once in the beginning. But I will stand for any questions.

Lorcher: Commissioners, do we have questions?

Stoll: Madam Chair, if I may.

Lorcher: Commissioner Stoll.

Stoll: Ms. McNutt, just a question regarding the gated communities. When I have checked out some other ones around the area that are 55 plus, in addition to the Cadence property that's near Costco, Chinden Boulevard, it didn't seem like the gates were closed, that they were open for people to drive into. Is there timing that like certain times of the day that the gates are down or is it just --

McNutt: I don't know the answer to that question. This is Jon Wardle. I will let him answer.

Wardle: For the record Jon Wardle. 2929 West Navigator. Generally the gates are closed. There may be times when they are open, but the residents typically, once the community has been built out and sold out, they -- they do keep their gates closed. So, if you drove by and they were open that's probably more of an anomaly than the standard.

Stoll: Okay.

Lorcher: I think some of the -- the response that you had given to Sonya for the items that had come through were -- were some of the things that we had concerns with. For example, A-1-C with Murgoitio property --

McNutt: Uh-huh.

Lorcher: -- understanding that, you know, you don't own that, but if you were -- the way it is right now there is -- nothing can happen with it. So, I think there is some concerns from the city's perspective that that needs to be kind of cleaned up.

McNutt: Yeah. So, this graphic here does show that we can extend a roadway through. We haven't had our engineers fully vet that out or complete those changes, but looking at it and -- and working with the site a little bit, that's doable and something that we are -- we are able to confirm we can do.

Lorcher: To do that in time for City Council?

McNutt: Yes.

Stoll: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Stoll.

Stoll: Sorry, this question just follows up on your question, but I -- I'm a little confused on -- is the Murgoitio property -- is it part of your plan or you guys have no agreement with the family to develop it? They may develop it at a later time and bring that to us for a proposal? So, the -- I think the only issue is whether it's stubbed and there is access provided at some point in time if they develop it.

Lorcher: Sonya, do you want to comment on that?

Allen: So, we want to plan for future development of that property, so we want the collector street to align with the collector street on the east side of the road. The whole issue with staff's condition that it be in the -- in the development agreement -- in the existing development agreement, that it be included in a future subdivision, is that if we don't it's going to create a parcel -- the Murgoitio parcel will not be a legal parcel for development purposes, meaning they can't get a building permit. If -- if they sell the property and somebody wants to redevelop or if the Murgoitios want to build a shed on

their property, for instance, they wouldn't be able to get a building permit. We asked the applicant quite some time ago to submit documentation if they felt that it was -- that was not accurate and we haven't seen any documentation. I'm not sure if they researched that or not.

Stoll: But the primary issue is whether they stub the road to the property lines. You are not asking them to incorporate the actual property into their plans are you?

Allen: Not the current plans, no. We are asking with future subdivision of the property to the north that that property be included in a subdivision.

Stoll: Okay.

Allen: So, it -- the applicant is contesting that provision in the proposed development agreement. So, two different issues. Staff has asked for that connectivity with the collector street to that property and, then, also that it be included in a future subdivision with the property to the north. The rezone area that's part of this application on the north end is not part of the proposed subdivision. So, when that property comes in with the subdivision we wanted all of that area to come in, including the Murgoitio parcel. Does that make sense?

Stoll: Just trying to figure out how they do that if they don't own it. I'm struggling with that same -- that concept.

Allen: I believe -- did -- did Brighton purchase -- I -- a question maybe for the Commission, for the applicant is I believe Brighton purchased this property from the Murgoitios and -- I'm not sure when the part -- if that -- that's when the parcel got created or if it was before that.

McNutt: And, Madam Commissioner, I -- I'm not sure when the timing of that was either, but we don't own it now and -- and don't control it.

Lorcher: Okay. So, does anybody have any other questions? Okay. Thank you very much.

McNutt: Thank you.

Lorcher: Madam Clerk, is there anybody here to testify on Apex Cadance?

Lomeli: Madam Chair, no one has signed up.

Lorcher: Is there anybody on Zoom?

Lomeli: Yes. There is one person raising their hand.

Lorcher: Julie, if you can state your name and address for the record you can go ahead and start.

Edwards: Sure. My name is Julie Edwards. Address is 1310 East Mary Lane in Meridian. And so I mentioned this at the last meeting and my issue that I would love to hear somebody talk about is the quantity of homes, because if the city code states that the gated communities are restricted to a hundred homes, how is it possible that they are asking for more than double in that area? And that's -- and why that would be approved? That's really all -- the only question I have.

Lorcher: Would the applicant like to come back up and make final comments before we close the public hearing?

McNutt: Thank you. Amanda McNutt, 2929. So, yeah, to Julie's question, we talked about that last time for those who weren't here. It's not substantially more than what we have done and it is another gate that we would be providing for this property that we did not provide in other developments that are very similar to this. No one who lives in these developments I think is feeling the struggle of only having two gates, so having a third gate and overall only I think 20 or so more homes, I don't feel like that's going to be a problem for them.

Lorcher: Okay.

McNutt: Thank you.

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

Smith: So moved.

Stoll: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Lorcher: So, last time we were here two weeks ago we were tied for -- for you, Brian, and Matt. Half of us liked it and half of us thought it needs some improvement. So, we thought we would have a few more Commissioners here to have some insights, so that we can make a recommendation to City Council. So, I was one of the ones who said it should go forward. I do have some concerns about the timing of amenities. You know, the city would really like to see a lot of those done in phase one. The developer is proposing as those phases come on board, but I wasn't going to hold that up as a condition of approval to pass it on to City Council. That was my opinion. And I also understand that there was some swapping of Ada county land and City of Meridian land and those are items that are out of the developer's control, because it's in the county's

hands to be able to get that paperwork done and it's in the city's hands to do that and it could happen quickly and it may take a long time and so to hold up a project for something that they can control, including the Murgoitio property I didn't think was -- was fair, that they should be able to continue to work with the city to be able to develop the subdivision. So, I was in favor of the project and I would like to hear from anyone else and, then, we can take a vote.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Yeah. Before I -- I worry this might sound too critical, so I want to -- I want to say two things. First off, I will waive the IMBY flag night and day. I think it's important that we build more housing in Meridian. And, two, I think Brighton tends to build very nice homes and decent communities. That being said I -- this -- again, to me, this isn't mixed use. I know there are some -- some definitions or some mentions that were brought up and I have actually -- my wife can complain about how much of a nerd I am. I actually spent some time in the Comprehensive Plan, especially about mixed use, because I'm a big fan and some other things that kind of pop out to me are sentences that say mixed use areas tend to have higher floor area ratios, integral shared open space and interconnected vehicular and pedestrian networks. Further down it says residential and nonresidential areas feel cohesive as one neighborhood even when developed across multiple properties, over multiple years or by different developers. And, lastly, specific to mixed use community one sentence says the intent is to integrate a variety of uses, including residential and to avoid mainly single use and strip commercial type buildings. I think this development -- and, again, we don't know exactly what type of commercial is going in here, but I think this development kind of fails on all three of those issues. I think the gating of the community -- I think when you get a community, even if it is accessible by some pedestrians, I think that fundamentally limits the integrated nature that the mixed use community and the mixed use development comprehensive plan is trying to promote of interconnection and invited interconnection between the two by vehicle and pedestrian. I think those uses are supposed to be integrated and the Comprehensive Plan seems to me and to my eyes very clear on that and I think this fails on those merits. I understand there is a broader project that has some community features. Has a library and those things are commendable, but I think that where this project as proposed -- or this specific application kind of cuts this portion of the development off fundamentally from some of those amenities and from some of that -- that nature. So, for that reason I'm in opposition. I think additionally the -- regarding the Murgoitio property and regarding some of these other things I think while -- I appreciate the desire to be fair, I think ultimately the priority should be given to what is in the best interest of the city and its residents and I think that this has the risk of creating an issue where, you know, this property doesn't get developed, which is not in the best interest of the city and while it might not be inherently fair to -- to one's maybe morals or to one's, you know, personal beliefs, I think it is in the best interest of the city of ensuring that we don't accidentally cut off development in this area and so to that end I -- you know, I -- I appreciate the developer for trying and for putting in a good effort on

this, I just don't think that this is what benefits the city under the Comprehensive Plan and under the spirit of the direction that the comprehensive plan lays out.

Lorcher: So, that's where we stand. Sam, are you still here? I think he left.

Rust: Madam Chair, I'm here.

Lorcher: Oh, you are there. Did you have any comments in regard to this application?

Rust: Yeah. I will summarize briefly. I think that this is a good application. I take the -- the mixed use probably quite a bit more liberally than Commissioner Smith does. I like the -- the similar communities that Brighton has done and I don't think that a true mixed use, the way that Commissioner Smith may define it, is probably in the best interest of that area. It's on the outer lying edge. And so for all those reasons I'm in favor of this project.

Lorcher: Thank you. Commissioner Sandoval.

Sandoval: Madam Chair, so, again, I don't want to sound critical either, but in looking at this in depth and reviewing it initially and, then, coming back to it, again, I truly feel like it does fall short on integration, mix of uses, connectivity, the public realm elements that are really central to this designation. Here the homes are positioned with their backs and side towards the collector roadway that separates the site from the commercial and medium high residential should that get developed in that way suggested. Instead it -- it should create, you know, that seamless, walkable transition between those uses. That's my interpretation. With the current layout that turns those out and the gated elements, you know, creates a pretty hard divide. Yeah. And for that the integration just isn't there. The shared circulation and blended residential and community environment I feel like it falls short on this.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much. So -- so we were tied, so two and two. So, we were the four there. So, do you want to make a motion or do you want me to?

Smith: Well, I mean --

Lorcher: Or would you like to --

Smith: -- I would like to hear maybe if they are open --

Stoll: I just would like to point out we have six people now. But I like the development and I tend to be a little bit more flexible regarding the mixed use development interpretation. In terms of the gated community, it doesn't bother me. My mother-in-law has a gated community. It works fine. It's just the various phases when you have gates they tend to bicker -- anyway. But from a code standpoint my understanding is that the code -- Meridian code allows for it up to 120 some odd people or residences and anything exceeding that is subject to approval by the Council. So, it's not prohibited.

It's allowed if it's approved by the Council and so if we make the recommendation to approve it and the Council decides to approve it, then, it's okay. I personally think having the limitation to whatever hundred and some odd is too limiting for the types of developments they are going to want. So, I'm in favor of the proposal. I do have a -- I share the concern regarding the Murgoitio property and trying to tie that in. I'm still struggling on whether I am understanding that we are just talking about where they have their house, that small property. If we are just talking about making sure that stubs off there, then, just say that. I don't think we should limit them and tie it into their development agreement for Brighton, so -- and turn it over to you.

Garrett: Yeah. I actually live less than a mile from this and I'm -- I'm in favor of it. I have seen the other development, I have seen the -- what's gone on with the library. I moved in there when it was open fields, so I'm happy to see the growth and I'm happy with the development and everything that's laid out here and what you have done to date in the surrounding area. So, I have no problems.

Smith: Madam Chair, it sounds like you are the one making the motion right now.

Lorcher: All right. Considering all staff and applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend to City Council File No. H-2025-0061 for Apex Cadence on the hearing date of November 20th with the following modifications: That the developer continues to work with the city on the timing of the phasing of the amenities. That there is good faith to be able to work with the county and the city to get all permitting correct and -- wait. One more note here. And to provide an updated plat for City Council in regard to the stub street for the Murgoitio property to be incorporated at a later date, if at all.

Stoll: Is that it?

Lorcher: That's it.

Stoll: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to approve Apex Cadence. All those in favor say aye. And those opposed?

Smith: Nay.

Sandoval: Nay.

Lorcher: So, we have four ayes and two nays. Motion -- motion passes.

Allen: Madam Chair, may I ask for clarification of the motion, please.

Lorcher: Sure.

Allen: Are you actually asking for any changes to the staff recommendation? And, if so, can you please state which conditions and what exact changes you are asking for?

Lorcher: I didn't ask any -- for thing specific. I did ask that the developer work with staff on the timing of the phases for the amenities. That the developer works with goodwill with the county and the city for all proper permitting. And that the streets align with the Murgoitio property before City Council.

Allen: Yeah. I heard your motion, but I just -- I don't know if that's -- if you are actually making changes to the conditions or not. I'm hearing you aren't.

Lorcher: No.

Allen: Okay. Thank you.

Lorcher: Okay. All right. We good, Kurt? All right. Motion passes. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO NAYS. ONE ABSENT.

Lorcher: The next one on the -- on the agenda is -- I'm out of sorts here. Number five.

Rust: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Rust.

Rust: I am going to have to depart, but just wanted to let you know.

5. Public Hearing for Apex Zenith (H-2025-0041) by Brighton Corporation, generally located at the southeast corner of Meridian Rd. and Lake Hazel Rd., in a portion of Lot 4 Section 6, T.2N., R.1E.

- A. Request: Preliminary Plat to subdivide two (2) existing parcels into seven (7) buildable lots across 11.549 acres of land in the C-G zoning district.
- B. Request: Private Street application that is naming the drive aisles.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much. Do we need a break or can we carry on? Everybody good. All right. So, we are going to go with Item No. 5 H-2025-0041 for Apex Zenith at Meridian and Lake Hazel Road and we will start with the staff report.

Napoli: Good evening, Madam Chair and Members of the Commission. Next item on the agenda is the preliminary plat for Apex Zenith Subdivision. The applicant requests the preliminary -- preliminary plat to subdivide two existing parcels into seven buildable

lots across 11.065 acres of land in the C-G zoning district. The plat excludes the parcels containing the Costco site and the larger development, including commercial and residential to the south as a part of phase two. I show on the screen the existing -- the existing zoning is C-G and the FLUM designation is mixed use regional and medium to high density residential. So, the subject -- the subject parcels were annexed in 2015 with the South Meridian annexation. These properties were given the placeholder zoning of R-4 until future development and last year in 2024 the property was rezoned to C-G -- the C-G zoning district as a part of the larger mixed use project called Apex Zenith. After the rezone application last year and the Apex -- the larger Apex Zenith project, the applicant did submit a property boundary adjustment to reconfigure the properties to allow for legal parcels for development, which is this is the reason why the Costco site is not included in this subdivision. As a part of the larger project the north-south collector known as South Optimum Avenue and the east-west collector is known as East Spire and Aristocrat are required to be constructed prior to first occupancy within the larger development. In addition to this within the preliminary plat the two private streets that are proposed in the form of East Tower Lane and South Momentum Lane are also required to be constructed. To add, the applicant has entered into a STARS agreement with ITD for improvements to Meridian Road, which include deceleration lanes, the proposed access off Meridian Road. You can see that a little bit on this exhibit. While not directly related to the preliminary plat, it will have impact on the access point that was previously approved by Council. These two access points for the private streets would typically require Council waiver. However, Council already granted those waivers with the previous application. The applicant will be providing five foot sidewalk on both sides of the proposed private streets that connect to the ten foot multi-use pathways along Meridian Road, Lake Hazel Road and Optimum Avenue and staff is recommending approval with conditions and has not received any public testimony, but did receive a letter from the applicant in agreement with the staff report and I will stand for any questions.

Lorcher: Would the applicant like to come forward?

McNutt: You will see a lot of me tonight. Amanda McNutt. 2929 West Navigator. This time I will remember to share. All right. So, this is, essentially, Phase 1-A of Apex Zenith. We will be coming out with phase two in hopefully short order. But, essentially, this is 11 acres of property on the southwest corner of Meridian and Lake Hazel Roads. We did the rezone. We have done the development agreement, property boundary adjustment and we have submitted and gotten approval for our roadway and utility construction plans and now roadways are in construction. Those are in progress as we speak. The STAR agreement with ITD is also in place and the design guidelines, which will kind of oversee the design of this entire area and make it cohesive -- if you know the Ten Mile interchange area we did something similar with that and we are planning kind of a similar situation for these buildings here. That's -- that's in progress as well. Other things -- just kind of to note in the area, we are a little bit west of some of our main improvements that you have seen over the last couple of years, but this is going to be kind of the commercial center that serves that residential area. Again, there are seven lots here. They are commercial, so we are not needing any kind of amenities or

anything like that. It is a mixed use regional center and we are not proposing any changes to the future land use map. It is currently zoned C-G and no zoning changes are proposed with this either. Nick did talk about this already. We have the private streets with this application, but they are actually, again, already under construction. The blue street will be a public street with ten foot detached pathways on each side and the orange is also public with sidewalks and pathways. That's scheduled to be done in about August and, then, we have a couple of signal locations as well. We don't control when the signals go up, but we have been told estimated completion of October of next year. Again, we do concur with the staff report, so hopefully this is a little one.

Lorcher: All right. Thank you very much.

McNutt: Thank you.

Lorcher: Madam Clerk, do we have anyone to testify on this application?

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

Lorcher: That's Amanda. Her hand is up. Did you want to -- are you good? Any other comments before we close the public hearing? Is there anybody on Zoom? I guess I should ask that before we -- okay. Can I get a motion to close the public hearing, please?

Stoll: Move to close the public hearing.

Smith: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Lorcher: This is pretty straightforward. I mean it definitely goes into the bigger plan that they are doing with Pinnacle and Costco. You know, the -- they are providing all the landscaping and the infrastructure and to add some more small businesses where we can add more commercial for this area is a positive thing.

Stoll: I concur. Ready to make the motion if --

Lorcher: You want to make it?

Stoll: Sure.

Lorcher: Okay.

Stoll: After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council of File No. H-2025-0041 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of November 20th, 2025.

Smith: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to approve -- or recommend Apex Zenith to City Council. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

6. Public Hearing for Hill's Century Farm Townhomes (H-2024-0072) by Brighton Corporation, generally located at the corner of S. Tavistock Ave. and E. Hill Park Street with the inclusion of the following parcels: R3636090060, R3636090040, R363080240, S1133212576 and R3636080110.

- A. Request: Rezone of 5.45 acres of land from the C-N zoning district to the R-15 zoning district.
- B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 70 homes and 18 common lots spanning across 9.126 acres.
- C. Request: Development Agreement

Lorcher: All right. The next item on the agenda is H-2024-0072 for Hills Century Farm Townhomes and we will start with the staff report.

Napoli: Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, the next item agenda is the preliminary plat, development agreement modification and a rezone for Hill Century Farm Townhomes. The applicant requests a rezone of 5.45 acres from the C-N zoning district to the R-15 zoning district, a preliminary plat consisting of 70 homes, 18 common lots spanning across 9.1 acres and a new development agreement to supersede the existing development agreement. As shown on the screen the existing zoning is C-N and R-15 and the FLUM designation is mixed use neighborhood. This broader mixed use neighborhood designation was established through a Comprehensive Plan map amendment in 2015 allowing for a diverse mix of uses. The existing C-N zoning was originally part of the concept plan that envisioned three commercial pad sites -- and this is that original concept plan -- broader concept plan. Three commercial pad sites on the north, which would be these three indicated where my cursor is at on the north side of the proposed development and 76 units of assisted living on the east side, which would be the other C-N portion that's under consideration for rezone tonight. The R-15 portion was envisioned to be independent living. In addition, the mixed use neighborhood designation requires residential uses between 30 and 60 percent of the overall larger area which, this is the larger mixed use neighborhood area here in the grayish brown.

The applicant provided a calculation showing the residential percentages would be -- would be brought to 59.2 percent. So, on the higher end, but still within the 30 to 60 percent with this proposed development. Staff confirmed these calculations and concurs it meets the percentage requirements for the mixed use neighborhood designation. In addition, the subject development is proposed to be 7.8 dwelling units per acre, which is within the six to 12 units per acre desired in the mixed use neighborhood designation. The applicant cites a change in market demand as the -- as a basic -- as a basis for the requested rezoning and development agreement modification. While the staff is generally supportive of the overall concept plan, there are concerns regarding the continued reduction of commercial pad sites in south Meridian where neighborhood serving uses and opportunities are already limited currently. It should also be noted that much of the property proposed for rezone was previously approved with a concept plan for assisted living as I previously showed on the last slide. A residential use within a commercial zone. So, staff is asking the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council to carefully consider whether rezoning commercial pad sites is appropriate in this instance. In addition, according to the student generation rates, the development will create 43 school age children. Currently three schools -- the three -- the three schools in West Ada School District that will serve this development are Hillsdale Elementary School, Lake Hazel Middle School and Mountain View High School. Both Hillsdale Elementary and Mountain View High Schools are over capacity for the 24-25 enrollment data that we had. Staff asks that the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council carefully consider whether this rezone and development is appropriate considering the capacity of the nearby schools. A total of 1.76 acres or 19.3 percent of open space is proposed, consisting of linear open space, parkways and shared open space greater than 5,000 square feet. In addition, Hillsdale Park is directly south across East Hill Park Street, which this does exceed the UDC requirements of 15 percent open space. In addition, the applicant is proposing a picnic area site greater than 5,000 square feet for a total of two points, meeting the UDC requirements for amenity points. So, access is proposed off of South Tavistock Avenue and East Hill Park Street, both local streets. These connections are made through five proposed private street -- streets, which meet the UDC requirements. So, there is a private street application that's running concurrently with this, but that is at the administrative level. In addition, the applicant is proposing to complete the extension of East Hill Park Street from South Tavistock. So, this portion right here, if you can see the black hashed line, currently is not constructed. With this development the applicant will be completing that. So, East Hill Park Street will connect Tavistock with Hillsdale Avenue, which is a collector roadway. According to ACHD's staff report 502 vehicle trips per day are expected to be generated by this development, which was deemed under the acceptable level of service to accommodate these additional trips. ACHD also noted that traffic impact study was not required for this development due to being below the threshold to trigger that requirement. The applicant has submitted conceptual building elevations that include a variety of materials, including stone, brick veneer, EIFS, board and bat, and metal accents. Staff is recommending approval with conditions and a new development agreement and has received written testimony from three citizens with concerns regarding school capacities, traffic and safety, parking ratios, utility capacities, the density of the proposed development and consistency with

the Comprehensive Plan. As noted above or previously Hillsdale Elementary and Mountain View High Schools currently are over capacity according to West Ada School District. In this case we got our long range planning staff generated using West Ada's data and the citizens described, you know, the traffic in the area as gridlocked at peak hours of the day and with unsafe -- with safety concerns due to some reckless maneuvers that cause, you know, that people do when streets are busy and there is cut-through traffic, so -- in addition the citizens were concerned with the data used by ACHD as it dates back to 2019. Staff has talked with ACHD. This is obviously from 2024 is when this application was submitted. It was put on hold for a little bit. The applicant requested to be put on hold and we -- I have talked with ACHD I didn't get necessarily a clear answer from them on the 2019 data, so I can't speak directly to that. I know that will be something that will come up in the public testimony that you guys have probably seen, but that will be something that we will make sure we get sorted out before City Council if they do have more up to date data and I will stand for any questions at this time.

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

McNutt: Thank you. Amanda McNutt, 2929 West Navigator. All right. So, this is Hill Century Town -- Hill Century Farm Townhomes. We are requesting a pre-plat, rezone and a DA mod. Generally speaking it is near Amity and Eagle Road. The current zoning is C-N and R-15 and we are requesting to rezone the entire thing to R-15 and the future land use designation as mentioned is the mixed use neighborhood. Couple things that I wanted to show here is in this case we, again, very much align with what the mixed use designation shows. The streets are connected directly to the commercial drive aisles and sidewalks are provided throughout. We do align with the comp plan be -- being between 30 and 60 percent of the residential area here where -- I think Nick said 59, but what we had calculated was 57. Either way we are in compliance. This was how we got to that calculation. So, ours might have just been a little bit different. I also wanted to just mention that between when this was originally put through and now the YMCA and Hill Center -- or sorry. Hillsdale Park were also in the MUN and now they are not. So, we actually would be well under the required residential if those were still in there. But, basically, the city did a mass update and that got changed over to civic, which makes sense, because it is, but, again, that was kind of the plan from the beginning was that those were under the same designation and now those have switched over. You know, something that we have heard a lot of is that there is not enough commercial or diversity in commercial in this area. The MUN designation says mostly single family, alley loaded townhouses and small scale multi-family is kind of the primary uses for that designation, but some other designated uses are grocery stores, which there is one, a drugstore, which is also there within the grocery. Coffee, which is in the grocery store as well. A sandwich shop is there, along with a couple of other uses. A dry cleaner. A salon daycare. Professional office, schools, parks and public uses. So, I do feel like in this quarter mile or half mile radius here there -- there are a lot of uses that are commercial already and while I understand that there is always a desire for more commercial closer, so you can walk to it and things like that, the MUN designation is actually not meant for higher intensity uses. It is primarily a

neighborhood residential area with small supporting commercial uses. We are proposing 64 attached carriage -- carriage lane homes or alley loaded homes and four detached. Again, we are going to be directly adjacent to commercial serving uses that can be walked to and directly adjacent to Hillsdale Park and the YMCA. I won't cover that again, but we will be served by Hillsdale Elementary School, Lake Hazel Middle School and Mountain View High School. Brighton is working actively with the West Ada School District to provide another school in south Meridian to serve this in other areas. And one thing that I don't think was necessarily covered in the data that was presented is that over the last ten years enrollment in this area has actually not significantly changed. There is about 59 more students over the course of several schools than there were ten years ago. There have been ebbs and flows certainly and Hillsdale is over capacity and there is no denying that, but West Ada School District is in the process of doing boundary adjustments in the north half -- half of the city and, then, they are going to start doing that in the south half of the city as well. While there is stress and pressure right now, that's not going to happen forever and overall the student capacity really hasn't shifted that much over the course of ten years. The other thing I want to mention -- and I don't know if all Commissioners and the public are aware of it, but Brighton is extremely committed to the education and well-being of students. As part of that commitment we have donated the land and completed off-site infrastructure for the construction of Hillsdale Element -- Elementary School, as well as the Gem Prep. We are actively working with West Ada to ready an additional school site to serve south Meridian and we are also actively working with another charter school that serves 6th through 12th graders in south Meridian. As far as connectivity, we did ask for private streets in this development, primarily because ACHD requested that we do private streets. Basically they connect to commercial drive aisles and we -- we couldn't do public streets here because of that. You may hear some testimony from people who don't like the fact that people are working on the street. There is nothing we can do about that there. There is some public streets there where parking is permitted and so that is just permitted. There will be some places where it's not permitted and they will be marked as such. So, I kind of just put that together as far as where you could park and where you couldn't park. Essentially there is -- there is just those changes there. Also each home here is going to have a total of four parking spaces. They will have two garage spaces and two parking pad spaces off the alley. As far as amenities, it is a small site. We are providing a picnic shelter with some landscaping and we will have detached sidewalks with trees throughout. Nick already provided these, but just wanted to show some renderings. The top right picture there is actually a picture from another development that we have done, just to give you an idea of how these actually build out. In conclusion, we do concur with the staff's recommendations and I will stand for any questions.

Lorcher: Do we have any questions for Amanda?

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: I'm curious why this wasn't age restricted. Is there -- was there any consideration for age restricting? There is proximity -- proximity to an age restricted area, impact on schools, the existing kind of -- or the original plan.

McNutt: I don't know why we didn't consider age restricted specifically. If I'm honest I think that probably older folks will end up here, but they are two story. So, I think that's going to limit some of the older population. I think it comes down to what's needed there, to be honest. What people are looking for. Cadence is already active there on the east side and there actually is an assisted living home across the street off Amity, so directly across from this development there is already an assisted living facility as well. So, I think we probably have enough here. I'm -- you know, you might be able to add some more and have it successful, but I'm not sure.

Smith: Thank you. And, then, I do have a question for staff, Madam Chair. So, there was some discussion about some of that mixed use neighborhood land being redesignated as civic. Was -- just trying to understand staff's intent during that. Was that -- was the intent of staff -- did we account for the change in ratios, if you will, of residential, et cetera? Do we say, hey, we are -- this is going to no longer count in that mixed use neighborhood and they should still account for elsewhere or does the proximity to that -- that civic -- was that contemplated as maybe counting toward the intentions in the design of the mixed use neighborhood? Hopefully that made sense.

Napoli: Madam Chair, Commissioner Smith, no, it is -- it makes sense. So, predates me a little bit, but I did have some conversations with the team -- and, Bill, feel free to jump in if you -- I'm going down the wrong path, but -- so, yes, it was included as a mixed use neighborhood as Amanda mentioned. I can even go back to that slide and it might be easy to show kind of a change. As far as with this I calculated and looked at this project not including that civic use in the mixed use neighborhood designation. Obviously, the YMCA, the school there, that is what -- some of the elements you definitely want to see in a mixed use neighborhood with the integration and all of that. Yes. So, when this project was first done back in 2015 this is how it looked. Correct. It was the original mixed use. They included that civic section of the development. But as you can see when the civic area was -- or when the civic area was -- when it was turned into civic I should say, actually on the west side further east I should say we actually expanded the mixed use neighborhood a little bit over there as well, which was a previous development that was approved that is a mixture of commercial and I believe townhomes as well. So, for Commissioner Smith I guess I would say for this purpose when we looked at it I did not include that civic section as part of the mixed use neighborhood. I think when the original concept plan did come in it was definitely contemplated in that mixed use neighborhood and those are elements that we did want to see, but it ultimately was designated as civic and it was not included in any of the calculations for this development.

Smith: Thank you.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much.

McNutt: Thank you.

Lorcher: Madam Clerk, do we have anyone to testify?

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. Yes, we have James Phillips.

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

Phillips: James Phillips. 4140 East Rockhampton Street. I live in the neighborhood across the street in Hillsdale -- Hillsdale Creek. I'm here tonight to oppose the request to rezone the last acres of that C-N neighborhood commercial to R-15. Looking at this first shout out to the staff, did a good job of weighing -- laying out what you guys have. Looking at public comments, the messages from residents are overwhelmingly -- overwhelmingly consistent. This rezone removes the final neighborhood serving commercial parcel and pushes the mixed use residential share to the maximum allowed. I know the little debate between the original plan versus updated plan on civic. If you look at what mixed use residential were back in 2015, if we are bringing that up, it's out of compliance. It's above. So, just FYI if you are trying to -- that felt a little disingenuous, but -- okay. While that may technically fall in the mixed use range in practice it eliminates the function -- functional balance. This designation was created to protect -- commercial uses are most viable where schools, families, activity naturally cluster. Here we have the YMCA, Hillsdale Elementary, sports fields, density around the neighborhood, all which create exactly the environment where neighborhood commercial succeeds. Removing this final parcel foreclose -- forecloses future walkable services permanently and undermines the long term mixed use vision for the area. It's also important to note that I was here three years ago talking about making sure we had -- advocating for more commercial in the mixed use across the street. At the time the applicant justified higher density instead of in lieu of commercial because of the -- Brighton's commercial across the street. Ultimately, P&Z did approve that plan. Obviously, now to go back and change the zoning will break that public trust of -- of that expectation that there would be more commercial to help provide that more mixed use expectation there in the area. Second, the traffic evaluation relies entirely on that 2019 counts -- six years old data. Since, then, there is -- every year there has been more and more residential build out. Really need to have an updated study done to inform -- to have more informed decisions. Third, converting mixed use commercial to R-15 residential significantly increases peak water system demands, fire flow needs and localized pressure issues. Dense housing produces much higher morning and evening peaks than neighborhood commercial and that raises a critical question around if water infrastructure -- the cost, who is going to pay for that? Can we get growth pay for growth, please? Or will utility and taxpayers pay for it? Finally, nearly every public comment raise concerns about the school overcrowding. Hillsdale Elementary is already using portables and Mountain View High School is at capacity with traveling teachers. Adding additional density units will exasperate that. In summary, residents here are not opposed to growth, we are opposing imbalanced growth that removes the last commercial opportunity in mixed use, relies on outdated traffic data, increases

water infrastructure strain, worsens school overcrowding, undermines Comprehensive Plan. I respectfully ask the Commission to deny the rezoning and retain the C-N zoning as originally planned to complete the mixed use vision and in using analogy of Commissioner Garrett, please, don't let this commercial train prematurely leave the station. Thanks.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much.

Phillips: Any questions?

Lorcher: No. We are good.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, we have Chris Johnson.

Lorcher: Good evening.

Johnson: Good evening. Chris Johnson. 4069 East Tenant Drive, Meridian. I will be brief. I know you guys have been here for a while and really appreciate you give me an opportunity to testify. I don't have a problem with growth at all. I don't have a problem with the develop -- any development occurring in on this property. My concern is really with the rezoning. So, it was zoned commercial for a reason. There are -- there is a grocery store nearby and a few other amenities, but it's pretty sparse in that area down there. We don't have a lot of restaurants and things like that. You have to drive quite a ways -- all the way up north on Eagle near The Village to find a significant amount of restaurants that kind of thing and I am really concerned about the school overcrowding issue. I think that's something that you really need to take under serious consideration here. Otherwise, you know, I think -- I like Brighton a lot. I have no problem at all with Brighton. We almost purchased a Brighton home in Century Farm, but I just feel like this is just a little too much density, especially when the CBH property was approved a couple of years back, the whole thought was, hey, we can have more density here with homes, but there will be a commercial to balance that across the street and now we are taking that opportunity away. So, thank you.

Lorcher: Thank you very much. Good evening. If you can state your name and address for the record.

Harris: Alan Harris. 4066 East Tenant Drive. Thank you for having us here. My main concern is Centerville isn't even built out yet by CBH and, you know, we went through this three years ago, as James said, and with the school and the traffic it's just crazy right now. Absolutely nuts. The YMCA every hour there is usually a shift change of people coming back and forth and it's just a cluster. Trying to get the kids to stay on the sidewalk, they have put stop signs now at the -- about a year or so ago by the school, which did help out immensely with cars, but there, again, is still not marked properly I don't think and people just run them anyway. But to build out more residential right now to get -- to get honest figures with traffic and school -- I believe it was said that 43 new students or something through the homes that would be built. I don't see seniors buying

two story homes as they said, so it's going to be mostly family homes and you are going to have a lot more children at that point. There, again, as it's already been said with the lack of commercial property and restaurants and things and what they are -- at least within walking distance from the communities there. So, these guys have pretty much giving you the figures they have got, but I just wanted to voice my opinion.

Lorcher: Very good. Thank you very much.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, no one else has signed up and no one online is raising their hand.

Lorcher: Amanda, would you like to come back up and have some closing comments.

McNutt: Yes. Thank you. So, coming in I basically knew what people's concerns were going to be as there was a lot of public testimony, which is kind of appreciated, honestly, because it helps us to understand what people in the area want. Again, I do feel like there is quite a bit of commercial out here. This is the -- one of the lower intensity mixed use areas. It, again, isn't really meant for high intensity uses. So, as you move up in those mixed use types you will see restaurants and higher intensity uses listed. In this particular case they are not listed, because they are not intended to be those types of services. Frankly, there is probably not going to be people who want to put their businesses there either. Although, there are a lot of people out here, you need a very high amount of traffic to sustain businesses like that. The types of uses that are there, the salon, bank, things like that -- I'm actually surprised the Albertsons is doing so well, but I think it's because people are traveling to that one, rather than it's just Hill Century Farm going to that one. I think it's a much wider net that's kind of being cast for that particular use. The other thing I wanted to talk about is this was -- this was kind of just talking about, you know, it -- we are at the max end of the residential right now, but if we were to kind of talk about what we had planned in the beginning we are not at the max residential if you include the civic area. But either way we are in compliance with the comp plan. It was just, you know, with Hillsdale Park and the YMCA originally we had kind of planned on those being in the mixed use area and, then, they -- they got taken out. The other thing I wanted to mention -- and it was talked about heavily in the public testimony -- was that the CBH development was allowed to happen because we would be providing commercial for them. I think it's been pretty obvious and evident that it's not expected that we provide everything for everybody, although we kind of do. And, then, lastly, ACHD did recommend approval of this. You know, I -- I think that they are probably looking at more than just our TIS, because there has been several TISes in this area over the course of the last five years. So, I imagine they are not just looking at this under one scope and only looking at what we provided, but they are looking at a much grander scale as they have a ton of data to support different things and, again, to the school overcrowding, I think as soon as those boundaries are redrawn it's -- it's going to help a lot in south Meridian and, again, I do understand that that's needed.

Lorcher: Does your project -- is it on Amity Road or is it in a little bit?

McNutt: It is slightly in. Let me see if I can find a better -- so, here is Amity Road up here. So, we are -- we are down just a little ways from that. There is still some commercial pads up there.

Lorcher: Okay. So -- and do you -- are you the developer of those commercial pads as well?

McNutt: Yes.

Lorcher: Okay. So, if I was a business I would not have any street view from Amity, because the businesses are in front of it; is that correct?

McNutt: So, you are saying if -- if this were to develop commercially would you --

Lorcher: Correct.

McNutt: -- have -- yeah, you would not have a view from Amity.

Lorcher: So, the only place that I would have to market my business -- I don't -- I can't read that street that goes north-south, but --

McNutt: Tavistock.

Lorcher: Tavistar. So, I would have to know that that was there for this to be more commercial --

McNutt: Yes.

Lorcher: -- as these pads are really blocking everything that's there; is that correct?

McNutt: Yes.

Lorcher: Okay. Any questions for Amanda? Okay.

McNutt: All right. Thank you.

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

Smith: So moved.

Stoll: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Yeah. I am torn here. South Meridian has an increasingly shrinking amount of mixed use, an increasingly shrinking amount of commercial opportunities. This application on its own I think doesn't significantly, you know, accelerate that in a super meaningful manner, but -- but I think part of the issue and part of the concern I have broadly when it comes to mixed use is this sort of salami slicing that's happening. I don't think it's malicious or intentional at all, but I think a lot of the time what we see is a project that on its own kind of makes sense to reduce some of the commercial and over here there is a project that kind of makes sense to reduce the commercial a little bit and over time you end up with south Meridian that has very limited commercial to the point where, honestly, if I'm looking at that low desert -- low density residential on the southwest corner I'm thinking, hey, do we try to reclassify that as -- as mixed use commercial or something in the FLUM and what other areas that we can -- or mixed use community. Yeah. What other areas can we provide more -- more commercial opportunity and more mixed use opportunities down here. So, I do have issues with that larger conversation and that is the main cause of my concern. I think that is a larger conversation that needs to happen possibly at a potential upcoming meeting with the City Council. But for this application I think I'm supportive. I would love to hear what the rest of the Commission says on that.

Lorcher: Okay.

Sandoval: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Sandoval.

Sandoval: Yeah. This actually makes quite a bit of sense to me for a couple reasons, primarily that integration that I was so adamant about earlier, it really seems to be here. We have commercial, we have the civic to the south; right? I feel like it's really well integrated and there is no major barriers; right? So, you could walk from your house down to the school or down to some commercial spots and it just seems to make a lot of sense to me. I'm not really opposed to this at all. In fact, I think it's a good development.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you. I am going to give a different opinion to actually address one of the concerns from Mr. Phillips. One of the things that we like about this process is that every application is evaluated by itself or at least we try to at the time. So, if you were here three years ago and we had talked about a commercial corridor to be applicable at that point in time. The world around it has changed, including the schools, including the roads, including the accessibility and so to be held accountable for something that maybe we said three years ago and the world has changed around that is just very hard to do, because south Meridian has continued to evolve and change. But with that in mind you have -- Brighton has a wonderful opportunity here, because

you have the YMCA, you have the school and you have a park and you are building these skinny two story houses with incredible density into a space that in my opinion would be more suited for single family homes with families to take advantage of the YMCA, the school and the park. The West Ada School District is currently doing boundary changes in the north with Star Elementary, Pleasant View, Eagle, Ponderosa, Hunter, Meridian and Chaparral. They don't currently have any plans for the south and -- and if you do -- are able to work with the West Ada School District to bring another elementary school it takes about three years for all that to happen. So, we are looking at closer to 2029 before any relief would come to these schools and I understand that parents are doing other things with students to keep the numbers kind of flat. There is more homeschooling. There is more online schools. There is charter schools. There is other things. The fact that there is commercial on Amity and if I was a restaurant, if I was a retail center, I can't market my product because you can't see me, because I'm not on the main road. So, in this particular case I don't have a problem with it no longer being commercial, because it's not visible, but I do have a problem with your density. I know it fits and I know you hit the numbers that you have to, but you put a lot of strain on this particular corner by filling that density at the highest level you possibly could. With that -- and considering that there were so many comments coming in I can't ignore the community speaking about such things. I am not in favor of this project the way it stands, because of the density and that there should be more of an opportunity for more single family homes, maybe, and wider parcels. I know maybe the market doesn't bear that right now, so that becomes difficult to kind of manage at the same time. But I'm not comfortable with this design of this project based on this density. Like to make any comments or -- we can make a motion.

Garrett: Yeah. I will comment. I happen to be a member that Y, so I go by there on a fairly frequent basis and I don't have any opposition to this application as it's -- I, too, don't see commercial going in there given the location and that it's not on Amity and I just kept wondering when something was going to be developed there as I drove by it. But I think that -- is the density a factor of cost and affordability or are you looking at density for other reasons?

Lorcher: He can't answer the question without public testimony, so it's rhetorical at this point.

Garrett: Yeah. Well, that's my only concern is there are plenty of single family detached homes in the area --

Lorcher: Yeah.

Garrett: -- and now is it -- because we hear everywhere affordability, affordability.

Lorcher: Right.

Garrett: So, it's easier to build these and make them affordable than putting something on a quarter acre lot.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much. Would you like to make a comment or a motion?

Stoll: I did not have any preconceived notion as far as a decision and I'm still struggling with it. The commercial doesn't work as you pointed out, because of how it's set up. It makes sense as far as putting a different product type in the area from my viewpoint. Schools are -- from what we have heard from the testimony -- are struggling with the capacity. The problem is I didn't see any testimony -- any comment provided by West Ada regarding this project to us when I looked through the packet. I may have missed something, but I did not see --

Lorcher: Nick -- Nick can comment on that.

Napoli: Madam Chair, Commissioner Stoll, so correct. This is actually below West Ada's threshold for what they typically provide a letter to us, which is why we -- we have their data, we generate our own numbers and we -- there is a report in there. It would just be under -- it wouldn't be called the West Ada School District, it would be under long range planning staff here with the City of Meridian that would have generated that.

Stoll: Yep. I was just looking for West Ada's comments, but -- I mean it's a similar issue with ACHD that they don't provide comments on -- as far as the traffic analysis being required for a certain threshold. There is updated data out there. Just need to know the right people to talk to. So, I am ready to make a motion.

Lorcher: Okay.

Stoll: Five hundred and two additional vehicle trips. It's -- once we get the improvements completed there is going to be ongoing construction that's going to cause problem. It's going to make it less than enjoyable, but you won't have cars going through your development once Eagle and Lake Hazel is done.

Lorcher: Okay.

Stoll: So, with that said, after considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council of File No. H-2024-0072 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of November 20th, 2025.

Sandoval: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved in seconded to approve Hill Century Farmhouse -- Farm Townhouses. All those in favor say aye. And those nay, which is me. Nay. Motion passes. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. ONE NAY. TWO ABSENT.

Lorcher: Bill would like to address the Commission.

Parsons: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. I just had a -- trying to take a tally from the Commission this evening. Caleb and I are trying to coordinate on a joint meeting between the Commission and City Council and we are targeting December 16th. So, if you guys wouldn't mind looking at your calendars and, then, reaching back out -- you don't have to have an answer tonight, but certainly reach out to either me, Caleb, or even Kurt. He is part of that as well. But any of us can help -- help you with that or at least make sure that you can be part of that and, then, we can go ahead and work with our City Council president and get you on the agenda on the 16th.

Lorcher: Could we -- not to give Tina extra work, but can you send an e-mail out to the Commission and just have everybody confirm that they are available, so that you can make a good decision?

Lomeli: Madam Chair, yes.

Lorcher: Okay.

Parsons: Thank you.

Lorcher: All right. I will take one more motion.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Move to adjourn.

Stoll: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and second to adjourn. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries. Happy Thanksgiving, everyone. See you next time.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:25 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS.)
APPROVED

MARIA LORCHER - CHAIRMAN

_____|_____|_____
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK