

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:06 p.m. Tuesday, July 14, 2026, by Mayor Robert Simison.

Members Present: Robert Simison, Luke Cavener, Liz Strader, John Overton, Doug Taylor, Anne Little Roberts and Brian Whitlock.

Other Present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Bill Parsons, Sonya Allen, Linda Ritter, Brandon Frasier and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

☒ Liz Strader	☒ Brian Whitlock
☒ Anne Little Roberts	☒ John Overton
☒ Doug Taylor	☒ Luke Cavener
☒ Mayor Robert E. Simison	

Simison: Council, we will call the meeting to order. For the record it is July 14th, 2026, at 6:06 p.m. We will begin this afternoon's -- or this evening's City Council meeting with roll call attendance.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Simison: Next item is the Pledge of Allegiance. If you would all, please, rise and join us in the pledge.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

COMMUNITY INVOCATION

Simison: Okay. Next up is our community invocation, which tonight will be delivered by Sandra Ramirez. If you would all, please, join us in the invocation or take this as a moment of silence and reflection. Hello, Sandra.

Ramirez: Well, good evening, Mayor and Members of the Council. Once again it's great standing before you and just delivering this prayer and I just ask that you join me in prayer and bow our heads and close our eyes if you wish. Father God, we just thank you for today, God, thank you, God, for your mercy, your grace, Lord. Thank you, Lord, for each one of these Council Members and Mayor, God, that you have appointed to be in these seats, Lord God. And, Lord, I just pray, God, that you would show them favor tonight as they make hard decisions, Father, and decisions, God, that some may agree with and some may not, Lord, but, God, you, Father, have appointed them in their positions and in these roles, so I just ask for favor over them, protection over them, Lord, and, God, may they just continue to serve this community, Lord God, in such a wonderful way that they already have, Lord. Bless them. Bless the decisions that will

come out of tonight's meeting and we just thank you and praise you, in Jesus' name, amen. Thank you.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Simison: Thank you, Sandra. Okay. Next up is adoption of the agenda.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: There are no changes to tonight's agenda. I move that we adopt it as published.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to adopt the agenda. Is there any discussion? If not all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? Ayes have it and the agenda is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND RECOGNITION

Simison: Council, anything under announcements and recognition?

PUBLIC FORUM

Simison: Okay. Mr. Clerk, anyone sign up under Public Forum?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, nobody signed up.

1. Public Hearing for Vanguard Village No. 1 (H-2026-0021) by Ahlquist, generally located on the south side of W. Grand Mogul Dr., midway between S. Black Cat Rd. and S. Ten Mile Rd.

- A. Request: Vacation to vacate the southerly 5 feet of the 26-foot-wide landscape buffer easement along the south side of W. Grand Mogul Dr. on Lot 6, Block 1, Vanguard Village Subdivision No. 1.

Simison: Okay. Well, with that we will move on to our public hearings for this evening. First item up is Item 1, public hearing for Vanguard Village North, No. H-2026-0021. We will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Allen: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. The first application before you tonight is a request for a vacation of easement. This site is located on the south side of

West Grand Mogul Drive, midway between South Ten Mile Road and South Black Cat Road. The applicant requests City Council approval to vacate the southerly five feet of the 26 foot wide street buffer landscape easement along the south side of West Grand Mogul Drive on Lot 6, Block 1, Vanguard Village Subdivision No. 1. The easement is graphically depicted on the plat and described in Plat Note No. 18. A 20 foot wide street buffer is typically required along collector streets, planted with trees and other landscaping as required by the UDC. Due to the location of utility easement within the required street buffer area that prohibits trees, an additional five feet was provided outside the easement to plant the required trees. After the plat was recorded it was discovered that the required trees could be accommodated in the parkway, the area between the curb and the sidewalk, which lies outside of the easement area. Therefore, the additional five feet of the recorded easement isn't needed and the property owner would like to vacate the easement, so that the area can be utilized for development of their site. A legal description and exhibit map of the portion of the easement proposed to be vacated is included in the staff report. The area shown in red here on the plat is the easement location that's proposed to be vacated. There has been no written testimony received on the application and staff is recommending approval. Staff will stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions for staff? Okay. Would the applicant like to come forward. Good evening.

Fredin: Good evening, Mr. Mayor, Members of the City Council. I'm Justin Fredin, F-r-e-d-i-n, with Ahlquist. 1144 South Silverstone Way, Suite 500, here in Meridian. Here representing the applicant, as well as the property owner. Staff has -- has done an excellent job of laying this out for you and I don't want to belabor the point at all. We appreciate all the work that they have done and feel that this is a fairly straightforward matter hopefully. There will still be enough room remaining where there will still be in excess of 20 feet of landscape buffer. So, it's not as if we are looking to reduce the size of the buffer in any way. I will run through a few slides here, if I can get the mouse to cooperate. Or maybe, Sonya, if you are able to -- yeah, you are able to cue it up. Okay. Again, you have seen this depiction already. There are other portions of this easement that have already been reduced in width as well, so we are bringing this -- seeking to bring this portion in line with those that were previously approved through separate applications for reduction. Here is an aerial view to the extent that's useful for you. Again, just to quickly run through the background on this. Twenty feet is required and that is what we are going to maintain. At the time of platting it was believed that due to a utility easement we needed to go to up to 26 feet to avoid any conflicts between trees and utilities. However, it was subsequently determined that that's not an issue and so we are just requesting the vacation of that southerly five feet of the easement along the south side of Grand Mogul Drive on Lot 6 and if you are familiar with it this will be the lifetime fitness facility and they are just seeking to use that additional five feet for their parking lot and pickleball courts and here is -- just for your benefit, an approved landscape plan showing the location of those trees that they can, in fact, as Sonya said, be fit into the parkway and with that I'm happy to stand for any questions you may have.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions for the applicant? Okay.

Fredin: Thank you very much.

Simison: Thank you. Mr. Clerk, anyone signed up on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, there are no sign ups.

Simison: Okay. Is there anybody present who would like to provide testimony on this item, either if you are online raise your hand or if you are in the audience go ahead and come forward. Seeing no one coming forward and no one raising their hand, does the applicant have any final comments? Applicant waives any final comments.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I move that we close the public hearing on this item.

Cavener: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to close the public hearing. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: It's pretty straightforward. After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to approve File No. H-2026-0021 as presented in the staff report for today's hearing date.

Cavener: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Item 1. Is there any discussion? If not, clerk call the roll.

Roll Call: Cavener, yea; Strader, yea; Overton, yea; Little Roberts, yea; Taylor, yea; Whitlock, yea.

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries and the item is agreed to. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

2. Public Hearing for Treviso Subdivision (SHP-2026-0006) by McCarter-Moorhouse, located at 1788 W. McMillan Rd.

- A. Request: Short Plat consisting of a re-subdivision of 0.98 acres of land (i.e. Lot 2, Block 1 of Northpointe Commercial Subdivision) into two (2) building lots in the C-G zoning district.

Simison: Next item up is Item 2, public hearing for Treviso Subdivision, SHP-2026-0006. We will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Allen: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. The next application before you is a request for a short plat. This site consists of .98 acres of land. It's zoned C-G and it's located at 1788 West McMillan Road. This property was previously platted as Lot 2, Block 1, Northpointe Commercial Subdivision. The future land use map designation is commercial. A short plat is proposed to subdivide Lot 2, Block 1, Northpointe Commercial Subdivision, which consists of .98 acres of land into two building lots. The two building lots are proposed to develop with two commercial office buildings consisting of a total of approximately 5,850 square feet as shown on the concept plan on the right. Access is provided to this site through a cross-access ingress-egress easement via South Abruzzo Way at the north boundary, with a driveway extending along the west and south boundaries of the site providing access to the properties to the south. A 25 foot wide buffer to adjoining residential uses is required in the C-G district along the west and north boundaries of the site adjacent to existing residential uses. A 15 foot wide landscape buffer exists along the west boundary. The applicant is requesting Council approval of a reduced buffer of 25 feet to 15 feet along the west boundary and eight feet along the north property line west of the access road and that is in this area right here, if you can see my pointer, and, then, along the -- the west boundary there. The proposed structure will be 76 feet away from the west property line providing a large separation between it and the back fence of the residential lots. The reason for the request is that due to the configuration of this lot and the S turn access road that runs through it, they are unable to meet the minimum 25 foot wide buffer requirement in those areas. Additionally, there is an eight foot -- eight -- excuse me -- eight inch sewer main that runs along the 25 foot mark, which would put a curb over the sewer main. The UDC allows the buffer width to be modified by City Council at a public hearing with notice to surrounding property owners if deemed appropriate. A reduction to the buffer width doesn't affect building setbacks. All structures are required to be set back from the property line a minimum of 25 feet. As a provision of granting a reduced buffer width, if determined appropriate by City Council, staff recommends additional landscaping is provided in the buffer if necessary to result in a barrier that allows trees to touch within five years of planting in accord with UDC standards. A 25 foot wide landscape buffer should be provided along the northern boundary east of the access road and landscaped in accord with UDC standards. Written testimony has been received from Travis Butterfield -- Butterfield, Moorhouse Commercial, the applicant's representative. He is in agreement with the staff report and staff is recommending approval. Staff will stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions for staff?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Sonya, thanks. These other I guess adjacent lots, have they been developed and do they have the same reduced landscaped buffer? Have they not been developed? I had some concern about this one and so I just -- I want to get a flavor about -- if we are being consistent.

Allen: I believe they have developed. I'm not sure about the buffer. If you will give me a moment I will check on that. The applicant is here to present tonight, so I can check on that in the meantime.

Cavener: Thank you.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Really quick. Is that -- that roadway, kind of the funny S looking, is that a private road in the applicant -- right there on the left side.

Allen: The access road right here?

Taylor: Is that --

Allen: Yeah. It's --

Taylor: Is it a private road? What is that?

Allen: It has a public street name. It is in a lot owned by the HOA with an access easement to this -- to these lots, these commercial lots. So, yes, it's private to answer your question. But it wasn't necessarily approved as a private street so far as the city standards. It's -- it's an odd deal. It was part of the previous subdivision.

Taylor: And it exists?

Allen: It does exist, yes.

Taylor: It was already -- okay.

Simison: Any additional questions for staff? Okay. Would you like to come forward?

Butterfield: Good evening. My name is Travis Butterfield at 17438 North Newell Avenue, Nampa, Idaho. 83687.

Allen: Did you have a presentation, Travis?

Butterfield: I did not.

Allen: Okay. Just go ahead.

Butterfield: I'm just available to answer any questions you guys might have.

Simison: Do you want to start with the questions Council had that -- do you know about the adjacent properties' setback? Are you matching --

Butterfield: Yes. So, the property to the south is already developed. It's a Tin Roof Tacos and a whole strip right there. They do have the wider landscape buffer, but where this lot to the north takes over the landscape buffer has been reduced from 25 feet down to 15 feet and right at 25 feet they put utilities underground and so if we did the 25 feet we would have a curb right over those utilities, which is not ideal. Additionally, that S turn is different, but it's working for the people that are using it and if we were to put in a 25 -- 25 foot landscape buffer either on the west and/or on that northwest corner, it would cut that off. We are not totally opposed to cutting that off, but we would kind of like to leave access for the neighbors, so that they can come and enjoy and do -- use the facility -- the commercial development that's there.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Are you in agreement -- if there was a condition for enhanced landscaping are you in agreement with that condition?

Butterfield: We are okay with enhancing landscaping. If that -- we, obviously, want to be good neighbors and if that makes them happy, then, we are happy to do that.

Strader: Okay.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: So, you kind of already answered my question a little bit with that sort of S-shaped road, but it looks like you are trying not to disrupt that and so it's kind of giving you an awkward property to work within, which is partially why you are asking for the --

Butterfield: That is correct. Yes. And we are just trying to work with what's already there and so we are just asking if we can just leave it as is. It's working.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for the applicant at this time? Okay. Thank you.

Butterfield: Thank you.

Simison: Mr. Clerk, anyone signed up under this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, no.

Simison: Okay. Is there anybody present who would like to provide testimony on this item? Either come forward now or use the raise your hand feature online. Seeing no one coming forward, does the applicant waive any final comments? Okay. Council?

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: I would move that we close the public hearing on this agenda item.

Cavener: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to close the public hearing. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Again, this one seems pretty straightforward. I don't know that we have required many people to put a curb over an eight inch sewer main. So, I think also with the applicant agreeing with the recommendation to enhance the landscaping that we have found the best solution that we possibly can for this parcel. So, after considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move that we approve File No. SHP-2026-0006, with the added requirement to enhance the additional landscaping as presented in the staff report for today's hearing date.

Strader: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second. Is there a discussion on the motion? If not, clerk call the roll.

Roll Call: Cavener, yea; Strader, yea; Overton, yea; Little Roberts, yea; Taylor, yea; Whitlock, yea.

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries and the item is agreed to. Good luck.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

3. Public Hearing for 2026 City Initiated Future Land Use Map Amendment (H-2026-0006) by City of Meridian Planning Division, located City Wide

- A. Request: Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment (CPAM) to redesignate four (4) West Ada School District properties from Mixed-Use Community, Industrial, Old Town, and Medium Density Residential to Civic and three (3) City of Meridian properties from Low and Medium Density Residential to Civic for the purpose of reflecting existing and anticipated uses.

Simison: Okay. Next item up is Item 3, a public hearing for 2026 City-Initiated Future Land Use Map Amendment, H-2026-0006. We will open this public hearing with staff comments from Carl.

Anderson: Good evening, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. My name is Carl Anderson, long range associate planner here at the city. Tonight I'm going to present the city's city-initiated Comprehensive Plan future land use map amendment, Case File H-2026-0006. Tonight's request is intended to reflect two primary tasks here. The first is to reflect existing and anticipated West Ada School District's school sites by amending the -- to reflect civic land use designation -- redesignation -- as well as redesignate multiple City of Meridian owned properties to a civic land use. There are some minor associated amendments with this request, which I will detail during my presentation. The total area included in this request is 77.1 acres more or less. The first site is located at 335 Locust Grove. Is owned by West Ada School District and is anticipated to be a West Ada School District CTE center. It's anticipated that the applicant will be submitting the necessary applications to establish the use at this location during which time all necessary standards and requirements will be evaluated. This designation is modifying the plan from industrial and mixed use community to civic. The next site is West -- excuse me -- Meridian Elementary School. The modification here is from Old Town to Civic and the next site that we have here is located on Linder and is the Meridian -- West Ada School District's future site for Blue Valley Elementary School, modifying the high density and medium high density future land uses that are there currently to a civic designation. Next we have property owned by West Ada School District located south and west of Chinden and Black Cat in modifying the future land use map from medium density residential to civic future land use designation. Now, we are getting to the City of Meridian properties. This one is a cleanup of the Bear -- Bear Creek Park and the modification here is to align the Meridian properties from the -- to follow the boundaries of Meridian properties from the low density residential to civic land

use including the Meridian owned pathways into the neighborhood and there are some minor clean up here where there is civic designation that encroaches upon the residential neighborhood lots there and modifying them to all be a low density residential as well. Next we have property on Owyhee Street. It's a Meridian Fire Station and Northwest Meridian Police Station. Fire Station No. 8, I believe, modifying the designation from medium density residential to civic as well and the last one that we have is the Fire Station No. 7, modifying the designation from medium density residential to civic. And all notification requirements for this application have been met and no public comments have been received. All agency comments are included in the record and no agency responding has indicated opposition to the request. This application was heard by the Planning and Zoning Commission on May 7th, 2026, and they have forwarded a recommendation to City Council for approval and with that I would be happy to answer any questions that the Council may have.

Simison: Thank you, Carl. Council, any questions for staff?

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Thank you, Carl. I noticed there -- or at least I didn't see a comment from West Ada School District. Are they fine with the -- the changes that are being proposed?

Anderson: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Council Member Whitlock. We have not received a comment from West Ada School District on the request. We have reached out, but we do not have a comment in the record.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: I can't imagine that they would have a problem with moving it from industrial to civic, but surprised that they didn't comment.

Simison: And correct me if I'm wrong, I think that's an important move for -- that is actually important for them for what they want to do on that property.

Anderson: Yes, Mr. Mayor, I believe that's correct. Yes.

Simison: Okay. Any other questions for staff? All right. Thank you. Mr. Clerk, anyone signed up on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, there were no sign-ups.

Simison: Is there anybody present that would like to provide testimony on this item, either online raise your hand or you can come forward? Seeing no one coming forward, no one raising their hand, Council, what's your direction?

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: I move that we close the public hearing on Agenda Item No. 3.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to close the public hearing on Item H-2026-0006. Is there discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to approve File No. H-2026-0006 as presented during today's hearing date.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Item H-2026-0006. Is there discussion? If not, Clerk call the roll.

Roll Call: Cavener, yea; Strader, yea; Overton, yea; Little Roberts, yea; Taylor, yea; Whitlock, yea.

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries and the item is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

4. Public Hearing for Durango Subdivision (H-2025-0017) by KM Engineering, LLP, generally located off the northeast corner of the N. McDermott Rd. Bypass and W. Ustick Rd.

- A. Request: Annexation of 37.08 acres of land with R-8 (29.53 acres) and L-O (7.55 acres) zoning.

- B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 127 residential lots and 6 commercial building lots and 14 common lots on 35.88 acres of land in the proposed R-8 and L-O zoning districts.

Simison: Next item up is Item 4, which is a public hearing for Durango Subdivision, H-2025-0017. We will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Allen: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. The next applications before you are a request for annexation and zoning and a preliminary plat. This site consists of 35.88 acres of land. It's zoned RUT in Ada county and is located at 5630 West Ustick Road, off the northeast corner of West Ustick Road and the McDermott Road bypass. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation for this property is Medium density residential, which calls for three to eight dwelling units per acre and office along the frontage. This is -- this shows a future land use map and the current designations I just outlined. The applicant is requesting annexation of 37.08 acres of land with R-8, which is 29.53 acres and L-O, which is 7.55 acres zoning for the development of 127 single family residential detached homes at a gross density of 4.48 dwelling units per acre. Six office buildings and associated common area. A conceptual development plan was submitted as shown depicting the residential development and anticipated site layout for the office portion of the development along the frontage adjacent to Ustick Road, consisting of approximately 51,255 square feet of office uses. The Comprehensive Plan states future land use map designations are not parcel specific and that an adjacent abutting designation, when appropriate and approved as part of a public hearing with a land development application, may be used, but may not apply to more than 50 percent of the land being developed. The applicant proposes to extend the office designation at the southeast corner of the site further to the west along the frontage of Ustick Road for an additional approximate 3.24 acres or 16 percent of the development area and, again, I will go back to that so you can see what they are requesting. So, this is the boundary of the Durango property and they are just asking to shift that over to this area right here. Staff is supportive of this request, as approximately half an acre of the site designated office is encompassed by the Sky Pilot Drain easement and cannot be developed and an additional 1.7 acres of office designated land to the east will not develop as such with Spring Day Subdivision due to the location of the collector street and remaining area not being large enough to develop with office uses and that is this area right here. So, they are just essentially asking to shift this area here to the other end. The proposed density, housing types and office use is consistent with the medium density residential and the office future land use map designations for the property. A preliminary plat is proposed consisting of 127 residential lots, six commercial building lots and 14 common lots on 35.87 acres of land. A minimum lot size of 5,547 square feet is proposed, with a maximum lot size of 8,687 square feet and an average lot size of 5,864 square feet. The plat is proposed to develop in three final plat phases as shown. There is an existing home and accessory structures on the site that will be removed prior to redevelopment of the property. Access is proposed via West Ustick Road and North McDermott Road bypass. Cross-access is proposed to the adjacent properties to the west and east. Cross-access easements are required to be granted to these properties and internally within the L-O

zoned lots. Direct lot access via Ustick Road is prohibited by the lots. Landscape street buffers are required along internal and adjacent streets in accord with UDC standards. A minimum of 15 percent or 4.4 acres of the residential area is required to consist of qualified open space. A total of 7.63 acres is provided, which is 25.41 percent, exceeding the minimum standard by 3.23 acres. Site amenities are required totaling a minimum of six points. A dog waste station, open space commons and pathways are proposed, for a total of 11 points. Although amenities exceed the minimum standard staff is recommending an additional amenity, such as a covered shelter, is provided in Lot 9, Block 3, for the open play areas as a provision of annexation. The Eight Mile Lateral runs along the northern boundary of the site in a 50 foot wide easement and is proposed to remain open. The Sky Pilot Drain also runs through the site and is proposed to be rerouted and piped. The one hundred foot wide easement for the drain will provide a separation between residential and commercial land uses. The Eight Mile Lateral that I mentioned that's proposing to remain open will require a waiver from Council for that to remain open. So, please, include that in your motion tonight. Sewer service is not yet available to this property. A cooperative agreement exists between the city and the developer of Spring Day and Dayspring Subdivisions to the east and south to extend the McDermott trunk line south down McDermott Road to Ustick Road and east to serve these subdivisions, which will also provide service to this site. Development is not allowed to commence until sewer service is readily available to the site. The development is subject to The Oaks lift station and West Ada School District reimbursement agreements. Water service exists in Ustick Road, which can provide service for up to 50 lots and beyond that a second water connection is required. Conceptual building elevations were submitted as shown that demonstrate the quality of development proposed in the residential and the office portions of the development. Final design of the office buildings is required to comply with the design standards in the Architectural Standards Manual. I will go through a summary of the Commission hearing. Connor Lindstrom, KM Engineering, testified in favor. There was -- no one testified in opposition. Greg Larsen and Cory Thacker did comment on the application. key issues of public testimony. Mr. Larsen had concerns pertaining to the location of the proposed access driveway via North McDermott Road bypass and site distance with the curve of the bypass to the north. Request for the access to be shifted further to the south near the Sky Pilot Drain and his north property boundary. Mr. Thacker had concerns pertaining to water rights, eminent domain and desire for cross-access to be provided to his property for redevelopment purposes through the subject property. The applicant is in agreement with staff's recommendation to provide a shelter on Lot 9, Block 3, but not in favor of extending North Del Norte Avenue as a stub street to the out parcel to the south, since access is proposed via a cross-access easement from North Dayspring Way. Staff agreed and retracted the recommendation for the stub street to be provided. Key issues of discussion by the Commission were as follows: The provision of a stub street, Del Norte, to the out parcel of the southwest corner of the site. The provision of a shelter is an additional amenity on Lot 9, Block 3, as recommended by staff. And the request for the office designation to be extended further to the west along the frontage of Ustick Road to allow for additional office use. The Commission modified condition number 1-A to specify cross -- cross-access ingress-egress easements are required between all commercial lots as requested by the applicant and

agreed upon by staff. No additional written testimony has been received since the Commission hearing and the Commission did recommend approval of this development with the requirement of a development agreement. Staff will stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you, Sonya. Council, any questions for staff? Okay. Would you like to come forward?

Lindstrom: Thank you, Mayor, Council. My name is Connor Lindstrom with KM Engineering, 5725 North Discovery Way, Boise. 83713. Here representing the property owner on this application. Thank you to Sonya. We have worked with her on this application for quite some time now, so it's great to finally be here before you. Sonya did a great job of presenting. I will try to be fairly brief and, then, you know, stand for questions. Here is just kind of our -- our main, you know, request here is to -- to plat this property. So, with that we have our R-8 zone, you know, within the medium density residential area. We have 127 residential lots. Then we have our six commercial lots along the frontage of Ustick. Working with the adjacent property owners has been -- it's gone very well. We have come to an agreement with Hawkins at the southwest corner there, which you will hear next after my presentation, the McUstick Subdivision. We worked with them very closely to make sure that we are providing each other cross-access with the service drive coming off of Dayspring as it runs west, which is this guy right here and in doing so and working with Hawkins we also had to work closely with the Nampa-Meridian Irrigation District, because of that Sky Pilot drain currently, you know, transects the site kind of at a diagonal and it made it very difficult to develop that area without rerouting and piping that drain. So, they allowed us to travel north with that drain before going west and they were -- they are allowing the service drives and some parking to be within that -- that easement. We also work with ACHD to get their permission to cross Dayspring Way as it goes west. So, a lot of moving parts here. We are also working with Toll. The property owner has come to an agreement with Toll Brothers to, you know, get sewer service to the site, because they need that sewer extension to happen. Hence why this project has been on hold. We were waiting for that to get approved and, obviously, it did go through the Council and, then, lastly kind of the last property owner that we've worked with, would be Mr. Larsen, who was here at the last hearing with Planning and Zoning. He owns the property to the west. So, we wanted to make sure that our access point with the line with his property and also meet ACHD and ITD standards, which everybody seems to be on board with and at the end of the day it's a -- I think it will be a great project. It melds well with the Comprehensive Plan. Here is that conceptual building layout just for the office area. I would like to speak to, you know, the additional condition about the open space amenity. We are in agreement with that, along with any other conditions that were approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission and the removal of that Del Norte Way connection, which was right here. That was that original condition to have a vehicular access, which is not necessary just given, you know, the Dayspring Way with the future service drive to the west will provide enough connectivity. We are trying to limit the amount of traffic right through those -- those residential lots. I'm thinking that's all at this point. If you have any specific questions you would like to ask I'm happy to answer them at this time. Thank you.

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

Lindstrom: Great. Thank you. Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone signed up on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we did not.

Simison: Is there anybody present that would like to provide testimony on this item, either in the room or online? You can raise your hand. Seeing no one raising their hand or coming forward, does the applicant waive any final comments at this time? Okay.

Lindstrom: Carl Lindstrom again. KM Engineering. I just wanted to make it clear to you that we are in support of the McUstick commercial development at the southwest corner. I know -- I said we have been working together, but they will be before you next and I would rather not sit through their hearing, so I would like to just state that now that we are in support. That's all I have. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I just had a question for Sonya. You were mentioning to, please, include something in a motion. Was it the elimination of the connection to North Del Norte? Sorry, I don't know if I caught that.

Allen: It was the waiver for the Eight Mile Lateral to remain open along the northern boundary. The other Del Norte connection was not included as a condition. Thank you.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Sorry. A follow-up question on that. And I just don't recall from the application, but will there be fencing, then, along that lateral? Is it one of the ones that's pretty deep and regularly flowing? Give me a sense for that. If we have to we can call the applicant up, but --

Allen: I need to double check that or the applicant may be able to answer that real quick. I'm not sure if you closed the public hearing already.

Strader: I don't think we closed it.

Simison: It's still open.

Lindstrom: Connor Lindstrom, here as the applicant. Yes. There will be fencing along the lateral. There will also be a multi-use pathway that's required there. There is a fencing plan that Sonya had up earlier. I don't think I have one in my presentation, but that might show it.

Strader: Thank you.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Sonya mentioned in her report that you can't begin until sewer comes to the property. Do you have a timeline on when that will happen?

Lindstrom: You know, I don't think we do, Councilman Whitlock, you know, at this time. It is a phased project, so we have three phases. You know, in working with Toll there is an agreement that has been signed between the property owner and Toll when that sewer is available. I think that's probably the soonest we could develop, obviously, I -- my understanding is it's not going to be until next year at the earliest that the sewer would be available to even start development. So, that would be the soonest. But I don't have a crystal ball, unfortunately. Sorry. Yeah.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I move that we close the public hearing on this item.

Whitlock: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and second to close the public hearing. All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it. The public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I will go ahead and make a motion, but I wanted to add that I think eliminating the connection to North Del Norte makes a lot of sense. You could see that that would have easily become a shortcut for people trying to get into the bypass. So, I really applaud the applicant and staff pointing that out and removing that condition. So, with that, after considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to approve File No. H-2025-0017 as presented in the staff report for today's hearing date with the following modifications -- and just including the elimination of the requirement to connect

to North Del Norte and also allowing for the Eight Mile Lateral to remain open with the fencing and multi-use pathway.

Whitlock: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second. Is there a discussion? If not, Clerk call the roll.

Roll Call: Cavener, yea; Strader, yea; Overton, yea; Little Roberts, yea; Taylor, yea; Whitlock, yea.

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries and the item is agreed to. Have a good evening.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

5. Public Hearing for Ustick Commercial (H-2025-0059 & H-2026-0007) by Hawkins Companies, located at 5900 W. Ustick Rd.

- A. Request: Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment to change the Future Land Use Map designation on 4 acres of land from Medium Density Residential to Commercial (H-2025-0059).
- B. Request: Annexation of 4.31 acres of land with a C-C zoning district. (H-2026-0007).
- C. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of four (4) building lots on 4 acres of land in the C-C zoning district for McUstick Subdivision (H-2026-0007).

Simison: Next item up is Item 5, public hearing for Ustick Commercial, H-2025-0059 and H-2026-0007. We will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Allen: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. The next applications before you are a request for a Comprehensive Plan map amendment, annexation and zoning and a preliminary plat. This site consists of 4.31 acres of land. It's zoned RUT in Ada county and is located at 5900 West Ustick Road. The Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map designation is medium density residential. The applicant is requesting approval of a Comprehensive Plan map amendment to change the Future Land Use Map designation on approximately four acres of land from medium density residential to commercial. The existing Future Land Use map is shown on the upper -- on the top and, then, the proposed land use designation is on the south there on the bottom. South. Oh, let's see here. So, a traffic impact study was submitted to ACHD for this development at the request of the city that includes trip generation information for the current MDR designation and the proposed commercial designation as shown there on the right. The average daily trips for residential use is 467, compared to 3,703 for commercial, which is an increase of 3,236 trips daily. Staff was not in support of the proposed map amendment for the reasons listed in the report. However, the

Commission was supportive of the amendment and recommended approval of the request to City Council. A concurrent annexation request was submitted to annex 4.31 acres of land into the city with a C-C zoning district, consistent with the proposed commercial Future Land Use Map designation. A conceptual development plan was submitted that shows how the property is proposed to develop with primarily auto-oriented uses, including a convenience store and fuel facility, coffee shop with a drive through and an oil change facility. A preliminary plat application was also submitted as shown consisting of four commercial lots on four acres of land in the C-C zoning district. Access is proposed via one full access from North McDermott Road bypass at the north end of the west side of the property and one temporary right-in, right-out access is proposed via Ustick Road at the southeast corner of the site. The McDermott Road bypass is currently under ITD's jurisdiction, but is anticipated to transfer to ACHD in the future. ITD has stated that they will not support access via the McDermott Road bypass. Staff is not supportive of the proposed access from Ustick Road. ACHD stated that the traffic impact study did not demonstrate a need for the driveway. Additionally, ACHD, consistent with city policy, requires access to be taken from lesser classified roadways, which would be the McDermott bypass once under ACHD jurisdiction as a collector roadway. Drive aisle stubs are proposed to the property to the east. No vehicular connectivity is proposed or required to the future residential development to the north. Conceptual building elevations were submitted as shown for the proposed convenience store, fuel canopy, coffee shop and the oil change facility. All structures are proposed to be a single story in height. And I will go through a summary of the Commission hearing. Ethan Mansfield, the applicant's representative, testified in favor. There was no one in opposition. Connor Lindstrom, Cory and Rachel Thacker commented on the application. There was no written testimony. Key issues of public testimony were as follows: The impacts current road improvements have on surrounding residents and traffic congestion in the area. Key issues of discussion by the Commission were as follows: Hours of operation for the proposed commercial development. The number and types of drive throughs proposed for the -- proposed for the -- excuse me -- commercial development. Temporary access to Ustick Road and landscape improvements within and adjacent to the Sky Pilot Drain easement. Commission made the following changes to staff recommendation. The Commission overturned staff's recommendation of denial. Staff prepared a memo for the Commission that addressed development agreement provisions and conditions of approval, which were included in the staff report. There are no outstanding issues for City Council tonight and no written testimony has been received since the Commission hearing. The Commission recommended approval of the -- with the requirement of a development agreement. Staff will stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions for staff?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I'm just interested in some context around our Comprehensive Plan and how things have kind of evolved. So, when we originally did our Comprehensive Plan we understand the extension and kind of huge changes with Highway 16 and how -- have we adjusted our land uses around these kinds of interchange areas as we went along? I mean it's been a while since that plan was approved. So, I just kind of wanted some context for -- if we are -- if we have been keeping up with those plans and modifying as we go or if this is a departure -- just help me understand that.

Allen: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, Council, yes, the Comprehensive -- Comprehensive Plan has been amended. As you see here we do have the mixed use interchange area now and that was based on the -- the changes to State Highway 16 and the interchange planned in that area. We are trying to keep uses that have a lot of trips per day away from that interchange area.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Help me understand that a little bit more. What -- you know, what is driving that thought process? And I get it that this is a pretty residential area. How much of it's really built out? Is it concern for existing uses and residents being disrupted by really auto oriented -- I mean I read the application, so I understand that that was part of your opposition, but I'm also trying to be realistic about -- we also have a giant interchange here now and those -- so those facts have changed a bit. So, just give me a little more flavor for that.

Allen: Yeah. There are existing residential uses. If you look at this map right here to the north this area here is all developed with residential uses, as is this area here. There are multi-family residential uses in the development process on the west side of the State Highway 16 and, then, more commercial uses going in here. I will let Bill maybe chime in on that a little more and see if he has anything to add on that, but --

Parsons: Mayor, Members of the Council, I think -- Council Woman Strader, I think you brought up some -- some key elements here. So, when we update the Comprehensive Plan in 2019 one of those developers were in front of you on the other side next to -- other side of State Highway 16 and they asked you to change the future land use map to mixed use regional and that application was annexed and I think you guys acted on that application in '20 or '21 and they got commercial approved with some multi-family and, then, on the other side of the interchange -- in Sonya's exhibit here you will see some mixed employment and some more residential. So, the reason why we put mixed use interchange around this area is because we knew it would be highly visible, but we knew at the same time, because this is the interchange and this is where people are going to get on -- enter and exit, we knew there was going to have a lot of trip generation and you will hear from the applicant tonight that you usually want commercial where you are going to have a lot of traffic. But at the same time we recognize that that's going to be a highly congested area and to try to minimize those

impacts as best we could we felt that we could still allow for some commercial in the area, which is allowed in the mixed use interchange, but it would have a lesser impact on the transportation network based on the uses and the -- described in the plan for the mixed use interchange. So, the applicant's right -- right out of that sphere of that impact. The other piece that we -- we took under consideration during our review of this application was the fact that we have some commercial planned for the area, but it's still vacant, so with the Dayspring Subdivision, which is just across the street, the south side of Ustick, there is a commercial node there that has not even developed yet and I think the Council understands the reason why it isn't developed is because it's waiting on sewer and the sewer is coming, because ACHD is going to widen Ustick and you got to get the infrastructure in, so that you can be -- so, the road can get built to its ultimate location. So, that's where really staff's position was on the recommendation for denial. It wasn't the fact that -- the primary concern was we are already adding to an overly congested area. We know it's going to get busier. We felt like the plan set it up properly and so it was on the applicant to justify why they thought commercial made some sense here and so that was our difficulty was -- well, we have vacant commercial. It hasn't been realized yet. You have another application after this that has commercial component that has to develop as well. So, we are starting to get some of those -- those pieces in place, but at the time that this came before you mixed use interchange was there, but nothing else was contemplated, other than the medium density residential. So, that's why the applicant -- usually these things happen after their things are -- as they start -- no one realized when state highway was going to happen. It actually got expedited a lot quicker, so I think the development community is trying to respond to that and that's why they are here tonight.

Strader: Thank you.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Bill, as I kind of taken it -- what I think staff is trying to avoid is like what we see on the northwest corner of Meridian Road and Overland, like where there is the -- the gas station and the restaurant right -- that is -- with the right-in, right-out -- and, again, they were there before the interchange occurred, but I think what I -- what I'm trying to take is that you are trying to avoid those types of situations where the development kind of locks in the access in and out of these types of businesses. Is that kind of what you are trying to avoid?

Parsons: Mayor, Members of the Council, that's -- that's part of it, yes. You can see when it gets -- those peak hours -- you can even see it on Ten Mile.

Cavener: Yeah.

Parsons: -- on the interstate cars are backing up and that's an interstate coming off onto an already over congested arterial, so that's what -- that's why we tried to plan

these less impactful land uses around those interchanges, so we don't replicate those types of situations.

Cavener: Okay. Thanks.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: So, just a -- just a quick question about the access to make sure I'm understanding it. So, the access onto McDermott -- what do we call that? The bypass. ITD originally wasn't supportive of that, but have we worked through where access onto that road is acceptable by ACHD, when at some point they take jurisdiction over that. I just want to make sure I'm understanding the access point. And, then, while you are talking about it could you just re-comment about why the right-in, right-out is -- does that -- why that's not acceptable from staff's point of view? And I understand Councilman Cavener kind of addressed that, but could you just clarify a few of those points?

Allen: Yes. Mr. Mayor, Councilman Taylor, Council, so as I mentioned that McDermott Road bypass is currently under jurisdiction by ITD. They -- they are not going to approve the access. ACHD will approve the access once they take over, because that will be a collector street, which is a lesser designated street than Ustick Road which is an arterial. So, we believe that ACHD will approve that access eventually. We are not -- staff and ACHD is not in favor of the access via Ustick. They will have cross-access to the east for access from Dayspring to the east through the adjacent commercial property.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor, a quick follow up.

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Do we have any sense of timing when ACHD will take over jurisdiction over that?

Allen: I do not.

Parsons: Mayor, Council, if I can just elaborate a little bit more on that -- that specific topic. So, the reason why the applicant -- I think they are going to ask for a temporary right-in, right-out access to use this evening, at least that's been their intent when we have had our conversations. The reason is is ITD still controls the McDermott bypass right of way. You heard from Durango. Don't know when they are going to develop. So, technically, this property doesn't have access at this moment and so if they -- the commercial were to go first they would need to have access to a roadway and so the applicant is going to at least propose if they get a temporary right-in, right-out and, then, when they get access to bypass or cross-access with the adjacent property owner, then, they would close that access, put in their landscaping and the sidewalk -- the ten foot

multi-use pathway and remediate that and remove that from being part of it. So, I think that's part of the discussion and the reason why we are adamant against the access is just because -- as what Sonya mentioned, it's -- our UDC requires that they take access from the lesser classified roadway and we require cross-access and so that's why it was important for you to see Durango first this evening, so you can see how this related to that particular project, so you could see how that -- that backage road to Ustick is going to function and funnel out not only to a local street that Durango will build, but also the McDermott bypass, which is that future collector.

Simison: So, Bill, maybe to follow up on that. How common is it for a parcel to not have any established access that we would develop? If it like -- because everything else could go away. Everything else could never ever, ever, ever, ever, ever happen. So, how common would this be to approve something that doesn't have any access?

Parsons: Mayor, Members of the Council, it's not very common. It's just in this particular case it's -- it's a timing issue. Like I said, state highway is expedited. The road's built. ITD does not build complete streets. They build the 30 foot pavement section and, then, at some point they turn it over to ACHD and in my conversations with the highway district it could be quite a while before that is turned over and accepted by them.

Simison: So, maybe a different question. Where is existing access on this property -- property currently? Does it have access currently?

Parsons: Mayor, it does. To Ustick. That is correct. The -- the property owner testified at the hearing how it's very difficult to get out of the site when school is in session. So, I do remember that -- that conversation very clearly at the Commission hearing. So, cars do back up quite a bit in front of their driveway.

Simison: So, maybe just one more question down that road literally. How often is it that you would take away an access point for development?

Parsons: Mayor, Council, with annexation we typically bookend that and -- and put parameters around that. In this particular case we do have a DA provision that says no access to Ustick currently. So, this is our time to make sure that we address that and -- address that -- at least the access with the -- whether it's -- you can ask something today, but in the future it goes away or Council on occasion has said, no, you get to have that in perpetuity. There has been instances -- I worked on a subdivision off of Black Cat where ACHD and the city did grant a temporary access to Black Cat and it was remediated -- I don't know, oh, three or four years later it was removed and converted to fire access only when another road happened. So, it's not very common, but it has happened on occasion.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I just have one more and I just don't remember -- with the McDermott bypass is that a two way street or is it a one way street going on to Highway 16?

Parsons: Mayor, Members of the Council, that is -- it's a two way. That was some of the question that the Planning and Zoning Commission had as to how that intersection would be reconfigured to and I believe the applicant may have some of that details in their presentation to show you how that will be reconfigured in the future.

Strader: Thank you.

Simison: Council, anything further for staff at this time? Okay. Would the applicant like to come forward?

Mansfield: Good evening, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. My name is Ethan Mansfield, representing Hawkins Companies. 855 West Broad Street. 83702. Boise, Idaho. And it looks like Sonya's going to pull up my PowerPoint. Before we get there I just want to be very clear about access. You know, we weren't even going to ask for a temporary right-in, right-out at this hearing. The only reason we would is because we were concerned about the delay between ITD transferring it to ACHD. We have spoken with both -- both agencies extensively and feel very comfortable that that transfer is going to occur before we develop the property. When I spoke with Kendra at ITD she mentioned a three to four month process and that was a month and a half ago. I'm happy to check back in with her, but we have great relationships with both ITD and ACHD here and a great relationship with Mark Hess, the developer of Durango Subdivision and KM Engineering, who is actually working on our plan, too. So, you know, we feel extremely comfortable we have -- I mean it's a condition of Durango to provide cross-access and ACHD has very clearly stated that when it becomes theirs they will, you know, give it to us -- give us access there. We would, of course, love temporary right-in, right-out access, but we don't feel we really need it. We are -- we are comfortable with our access and they have written a letter saying they will approve it. In ACHD's staff report it is stated they will approve it. So, just to clarify before we move too deeply into this. So, I would like to just start, you know, by talking a little bit about why Commission recommended approval, because I feel like there might be a little confusion there. There was a lot of discussion about why staff didn't want it. I feel like we should talk a little bit about why Commission did want it. So, on May 28th Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval with updated development approval conditions one, five, nine and ten and the removal of Condition 2.2. We will talk about those in a second. You know, as Sonya mentioned this is -- this represents the most likely scenario for the tenants that would be on this parcel. We actually have interest from many more commercial users than we can fit on the parcel. There is a bunch of interest on this corner and so this represents kind of the most likely mix here. I should mention it was interesting -- not in staff's presentation, but we are proposing a landscape buffer per the UDC along the north side of this. So, we are not asking for any waivers here and, of course, the request before you is a Comprehensive Plan amendment to commercial annexation and zoning to community commercial and a preliminary plat for four lots. We have also coordinated significantly with the Nampa-

Meridian Irrigation District and KM Engineering and Mark Hess to the east to, you know, identify a location to underground the Sky Pilot Drain and this access drive would actually replace the current access road for that canal. That was a big point of coordination and I think that actually is a great use of -- a really efficient use of space. So, let's talk a little bit about this auto centric use concept here. I like to think about it like this. We just spent over 600 million dollars of public money to create a thoroughfare that delivers up to 110,000 vehicles from the north side of the valley to the south side of the valley and back again every day. ITD kind of narrowed that down for us. That's about 76,000 at the Ustick Road interchange. Similarly, Ustick Road is undergoing a transformation to five lanes with a signal at Ustick and McDermott -- a larger signal. That represents -- just that section is a ten million dollar investment in widening roads, so that more vehicles can get from Point A to Point B. That's expected to be up to 35,000 vehicles per day past this site. So, really quickly I like to think about it as like -- if we invested 600 million dollars in infrastructure for an office park, we would expect office uses there. We wouldn't expect other -- we wouldn't expect residential uses there. We would expect office uses. So, similarly, we have invested 700, 600, 57 hundred thousand dollar -- 700 million dollars in transportation infrastructure we would expect vehicles to go past the site and thus auto oriented uses to occur here. Interestingly, neither ACHD nor ITD actually requested a traffic study for this project. The City of Meridian did. So, we, obviously, provided one. ACHD approved this project with standard conditions. We are paying for frontage improvements through ACHD. Those will be constructed concurrently with the Ustick widening to match the, you know, planned improvements on Ustick and ACHD also said no mitigation is required and no alternative mitigation is required and we agree to all of ACHD's conditions of approval. Let's talk about why these sorts of sites are actually great places to put auto-oriented uses. Because for two-thirds of the customers visiting this site these uses will actually reduce vehicle miles traveled across the network, because they are pass-by trips. They are already traveling along the corridor and, then, stopping here -- actually just prevents them from stopping on another -- in another location on their trip and if there is not another location on their trip to stop they go somewhere else farther away from their planned trip. Only 33 percent of these trips are either diverted trips -- that means they are on their way somewhere, they go a block off, come a block back, continue on their way or truly new trips that are actually getting generated just to go to the gas station; right? So, the grand total new trips onto the system is just over a thousand. It's a third of what -- so, that's the real impact to the network and we can kind of prove that out by looking at the impact fees that ACHD charges for these sorts of developments. So, an impact fee is a one-time charge, assessed on new developments to fund the construction of a new or expanded roadway infrastructure needed to accommodate the new traffic; right? Impact fees measure the proportional cost of the roadway capacity that a new development is expected to consume and they do this by removing the pass-by and the capture trips and they only count new and diverted trips. So, you are not double counting trips that already are happening on the roadway. So, let's take a look at how our proposal actually stacks up per acre to the Durango commercial, which is a shopping center use, no drive-throughs specifically mentioned here, no auto centric uses and Dayspring commercial, again, shopping center use, no drive-through uses. Per acre our impact on the transportation network in Ada county is half of what those

others are. Half of what those other centers are per acre. So, what that means is from a network perspective this is the absolute right place to put a gas station; right? I mean that's -- it's math that ACHD is doing for us. Similarly, we can compare our proposal to the existing medium density residential land use designation. So, you could put 32 single family homes -- that's eight units per acre on that and you have roughly the same impact on the network as our proposal. Sure, there is more cars going in the driveway for sure, but those -- those cars are passing that site anyway. So, what that means is within this box any resident living in this box and trying to get on to Highway 16 to travel on Highway 16 would have to drive farther -- add vehicle miles traveled to the network to access any of these commercial uses than if we had something right here. So, everybody in this box is going to have increased vehicle miles traveled as they go to Highway 16 and that's because there is not a gas station within this box. There is very few, if any, drive-throughs within this box; right? So, if you are getting on the Highway 16 you are going past our site, which means the network has reduced vehicle miles traveled, reduced impact. That's just what all this pass-by stuff is kind of all about. So, let's talk about like the specific impacts of residential development on a corner here. So, there is -- you know, there is -- there is a concern noted in the staff report that there is a negative impact that, you know, commercial uses along Ustick could have on the residential uses to the north. Think about if residential uses were right on Ustick, 35,000 vehicles per day going across -- past Ustick Road. There is 4,500 vehicles per day traveling -- maximum; right? Traveling along the service drive here. And it's buffered substantially, so -- substantially, more than what would be buffered along Ustick. So, for these reasons -- these are all reasons that the Commission recommended approval of the commercial use here, because you are going to have either a house 35 feet from Ustick Road or you are going to have a house 35 feet -- well, we will actually talk about it -- about a hundred and -- I think it's like a hundred feet from the driveway. It's actually 61 feet. So, double the distance from a driveway with ten percent of the vehicle trips or you are going to be right up on Ustick -- you are going to have your house right up on Ustick with 35,000 trips going past your front door. You are going to be 35 square feet away from that. So, this is kind of -- you know, you were asking about a fence. You were asking kind of how the landscape buffer looks. This is a cross-section of the landscape buffer here. So, you have got the -- our development is on the left. You have got a six foot planting bed, five foot pathway, five foot landscape buffer, 26 foot service drive, Sky Pilot irrigation, 50 feet of open space, five foot pathway, seven foot planting bed and, then, residential fence. So, how does this compare to other buffers in the area? So, McUstick Subdivision has three times the distance between the nearest homes and the nearest commercial use as the Dayspring Subdivision does. So, McUstick has 180 feet. Dayspring has 64. Here is another -- a bunch of other examples. At Pine and Ten Mile there is 84 feet between the Jackson's car wash and the residential across Gray Cloud Way. McMillan and Locust Grove, 38 feet between the nearest residence and the coffee stand there. Fairview and Venture, there is 70 feet between the back door -- or the back, you know, side of the house on Congressional Drive and Walmart. McMillan and Linder, 60 feet between the gas station and the multi-family there and another gas station or car wash I guess 140 feet away. But the drive aisle is, you know, within that 140 feet. So, overall this is actually far more buffered than what we might expect out of other interactions between

residential and commercial uses. So, in conclusion, about the impact to residential development, residential units adjacent to Ustick Road would be far more negatively impacted by noise, light and odor than where they are currently proposed. If homes were developed on the subject site there would be a dramatic negative impact on quality of life of future residents and most of the traffic to this site is pass-by trips, so at times when there is minimal traffic on Ustick there will be even less traffic into the site; right? Since two-thirds of the trip generation -- trip traffic is just people driving on Ustick anyway. So, if you take that away very little traffic goes into that drive through. So, because of that, you know, we have asked that the future tenant of Lot 1, Block 1, be allowed to operate 24 hours a day, seven days per week; right? What is proposed is a fuel center. It's pretty common, right, to roll up and get gas maybe after 11:00 p.m. driving home from the Ford Idaho Center. I have done that a couple times. And so we are requesting that and the -- again, Commission was supportive of that request. Because the site is currently a single buildable parcel we also request the ability to complete site work associated with the commercial uses and receive a single building permit prior to recording the final plat. So, the conditions nine and ten can be updated as shown here to reflect that. And, then, you know, we kind of talked about how this was removed in Durango's. I just wanted to touch on it here. This is the cross-access off of Monte Vista Street to our development. Again, Durango conditions don't require this, so it was a required condition of us. There would be a stub going about six feet north to our property line and stopping. So, in summary, auto oriented investment drives, auto oriented uses. This shouldn't come as a surprise. This happens fairly often. The uses that we are proposing are less impactful to the roadway network than other commercial uses and similar in intensity to residential uses at eight dwelling units per acre. Residential units adjacent to Ustick Road will be -- would be far more negatively impacted by noise, light and odor than where they are proposed and we have interest from more tenants than we can support on this site and, you know, notably each of these users performs an extensive amount of market analysis to optimize site selection. So, you know, they are not just picking the only piece of available land, they are picking this corner, because it's a good corner. For these reasons a CPAM to accommodate our proposed use benefits current and future residents of Meridian and on May 28th as a reminder the Commission recommended approval with the three updated conditions. With that we are respectfully requesting your approval of H-2023-0059 and H-20206-0007, with updated condition one, five, nine, and ten and the removal of Condition 2.2. Thanks very much and I'm happy to answer any questions.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions for the applicant?

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Just a real quick one, Ethan. I know it's a temporary right -- or right-in, right-out off of Ustick until such time as ACHD takes over the McDermott bypass. Remind me what that access is going to look like on McDermott bypass. Is that also a right-in, right-out?

Mansfield: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Overton, it would be a full access and ACHD has approved that access as a full access and that's because there would basically be one full access off of Ustick through the Durango Subdivision, which basically connects to the other full access off McDermott. So, we can just take a quick look. May be helpful.

Overton: And while he is looking at it, Mr. Mayor, a follow up. Ethan, by the way -- and maybe staff can help with this. The description of the McDermott bypass, if I'm not mistaken, is it going to be three lanes with a center turn lane?

Mansfield: Is this --

Overton: Whoever has got the answer.

Mansfield: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Overton, yes, it will be one lane in either direction with a center turn lane.

Overton: Thank you.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Thank you. You mentioned that you -- ACHD is requiring you to make some frontage improvements on Ustick. Tell me what that entails. I think you had the picture of the trees and the five foot path and -- but I'm also interested in -- in the McDermott bypass. I don't recall if there is even curb or gutter or sidewalks that's part of it right now.

Mansfield: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Whitlock, you are correct. Currently there is no -- there are no improvements on McDermott bypass and as part of our application ACHD is asking for a road trust deposit, similarly to Ustick Road, to cover those improvements and that actually doesn't go all the way up, but after that we actually are required to make a small amount of frontage improvements. So, really quickly on Ustick Road I'm sorry I don't have a diagram of it, but it will be a small -- I think it's a five foot landscape buffer, a ten foot multi-use path along the length of Ustick and, then, there will be our internal landscape buffer within that. On McDermott bypass there would be a detached five foot sidewalk, ACHD may opt for a seven foot attached, I think that's their collector standard, so because we are paying a fee in lieu for those improvements I'm not actually sure exactly what they look like, but there will be a sidewalk, curb, gutter.

Whitlock: Thank you.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Ethan, I just want to go back to the access on McDermott. You mentioned you are highly confident in your discussions with ITD and ACHD that this transfer of the jurisdiction from ITD to ACHD is soon -- almost sounded imminent. I mean you can stand here and say, hey, it's going to happen, but we don't have any assurance or guarantees. I'm not inclined to want to give you the temporary right-in, right-out. I would rather just say, hey, let's do that. But I also don't want to approve something where you don't have access and so is there anything more you can offer in terms of like helping me feel like this is actually going to happen in a time frame that is reasonable?

Mansfield: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, Council Member Taylor, we actually have a letter from ITD that's in the staff report. It's after section six, I believe. Or five. It's actually on page 17 of your staff report, if I'm not mistaken, of this project and it actually specifies the amount of time ITD believes it will take and the letter is dated. That's -- aside from conversations we hoped that that would, you know, satisfy the -- the amount and we -- I mean we are confident enough in that to understand that, look, you know, if we can't get that -- we don't develop, we are like very eyes wide open about that and there is no reason that ACH -- ACHD also feels comfortable that they are going to accept it, because if you read their staff report the language they use there -- and I should have snipped them out. I'm sorry I didn't. But the language they use there is, you know, once this is transferred to ACHD we will approve a full access in this location. It's just one of the conditions of approval.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: So, you are totally fine if we can't give you a right-in, right-out on Ustick, it sounds like you are prepared to take that risk and that would really be, you know, on your shoulders?

Mansfield: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, we, obviously, would prefer, if we had our druthers, to have a right-in, right-out. We did our traffic analysis and it actually improves traffic flow at this intersection. That is McDermott and Ustick. However, we totally understand that, you know, a temporary right-in, right-out is a special ask. So, if that's a deal breaker, absolutely, yeah.

Strader: Thank you. That's helpful.

Simison: Counsel, anything additional for the applicant at this time? Okay. Thank you, Ethan. Mr. Clerk, do we have anybody signed up on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we did not.

Simison: Okay. Is there anybody present who would like to provide -- go ahead and come on up and if you are online you can use the raise your hand feature. Come on up.

If you would state your name and address for the record, please. You will be recognized for three minutes.

Thacker: Cory Thacker. 5900 West Ustick. The property in question. I'm going to try and do two things. I'm going to give you a little bit emotional, which the decision shouldn't be based on that, but also a little bit of just let's call it factual look. I mean this is a commercial property. I -- I bought this place when it was nothing but farm ground. Nothing but farm ground. And it was my dream house; right? Plenty of property. No one around. Traffic was just nothing. And, then, all of a sudden development, development -- I get it. I mean one man cannot stand in the way of development. I mean it must come. But, nevertheless, it's kind of one of those things that, okay, so you have ITD and ACHD that put in the bypass at 232 feet next to my driveway. That doesn't meet code. The state itself did not meet its own code. And so now I sit there and on a school day, you know, my children have to sit there and wait and wait and wait; right? And that's not just on a school day, but even on a regular day. I think it was last Saturday I went to go out and I was like, oh, well there is one, two, three -- 12 cars right in a row. What the heck? I can't hardly get out of my own driveway. So, if this doesn't change to commercial -- I'm not moving my driveway. It's one of those things that you are condemning me. Not to mention it's like, all right, no one's going to want to live on that corner. I developed for residential. That's not a residential corner. All the traffic that's going to be captured, it's -- a year ago I was here when we were kind of addressing the Durango stuff a year -- not the Durango -- Dayspring a year ago. The Council talked about more commercial in this area. There was so much residential and they said, well, what are we doing to develop the commercial? Well, here it is. We are providing an access, we are providing basically a convenience to the people that live in the area. As it was pointed out, these other people are going to have to drive other places to find their gas, to find their coffee, to find their everything. It only makes sense. Personally it's one of those things that I have had to sit there and witness not only the increase in traffic, but I have got horses and my horses have been impacted. I have had somebody randomly come in and just clip the tails of my horses at night. I wake up and I have got -- I was like what the heck? I don't know where it went. I have had a horse that basically -- I can only assume it was a gunshot overnight. I had to nurse that horse back together. I have had a horse that was hit by a car because of the increased traffic. Okay. I have got kids that I got to worry about. I got -- I got plenty of things to worry about. But when you sit there and you think about it logically, all right, they are talking about a right-in, right-out clear out over on the corner and that's like, okay, that makes sense. That's all over the place. You go over -- all over in Meridian, tons of right-in, right-outs. All right? McDermott. Full access. It's been granted by ITD and ACHD. That -- that -- that -- I mean it seems like it's a no brainer. Personally, it needs done. It's not a residential lot anymore. I need to leave and the only way I can do that with housing markets and prices and all that other stuff is if we do what we are doing, so -- questions?

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Mr. Thacker, I just want to say thanks. I followed your testimony, your letters and your testimony at Planning and Zoning. I appreciate how passionate you are about our community and how passionate you are about your home and just -- it's one of the reasons why I really appreciate public testimony. You really paint a picture as to what you are experiencing and I appreciate you sharing it with us tonight.

Simison: Thank you. Is there anyone else who would like to provide testimony on this item? Okay. Would the applicant like to come up and make any final comments? So, the applicant waives any final comments. So, Council, your direction?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I'm happy to just maybe start a discussion. I -- I think that this is not a residential area. That's my feeling. I agree with that thought process. I think this corner does not work well for single family residential. I'm also very sympathetic to staff's concerns about traffic piling up. We already know there is an issue here and so I wouldn't be supportive of any access on Ustick. I think the applicant is feeling confident in their business plan and taking access off McDermott and I think that's a -- that's a path that assumes a lot of things happen with other agencies and that's out of our control and out of their control, but they must have the assurances that they need. I think on that basis I'm more comfortable proceeding. I would hate to give the right-in, right-out on Ustick and, then, just see a bad situation get worse. But I do think -- like for better or worse the reality is that the first time we made our Comprehensive Plan and everything I don't think we had -- we have a little bit of a bubble plan ourselves; right? We thought there was going to be some commercial to the south of this. I don't know if that's the order it's going to go in. It feels like there is a lot of interest here. This feels like what belongs here at some point. So -- I don't know. That's kind of just how I'm looking at it so far.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Go right on top of Council Member Strader's comments. I -- I just naturally looked at this corner as it has to be commercial. I wouldn't want to put residential there. And if I lived in one of those residential areas close to that, that's where I would want my gas station. I seriously want to have it on my way -- on my trip, not having to go out of my way. That's why gas stations aren't located in the middle of subdivisions. We put them out on those -- those corners, we put them out on those main arterials for a reason. We want to make it convenient and I don't know how you make it more convenient than having this location. I do want to follow up -- and I want to read this right out of the report, because the applicant brought it up and that's page 17 of the

report. The report from ITD. It paints that comment from ITD in a slightly different fashion and you may have already read this, but the McDermott -- this is from ITD. The McDermott bypass is under ITD's jurisdiction until it is accepted and transferred to Ada County Highway District. While the department will not currently grant new access to the bypass, we will continue coordinating with the applicant and ACHD. The timeline for the transfer is uncertain, but efforts are underway. It certainly looks like everything we are hearing is there is a working partnership in process. They know this is going to happen. They know it's going to be turned over. And at some point you have to have faith in how that process works everywhere. But ITD and ACHD have to work together. I think it's the right commercial project for the corner. I think it fits well. I think it's going to be a very successful fuel station whoever it is and I would support it.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I was actually looking at the letter as Councilman Overton was reading it and also of note they said ITD doesn't -- ITD does not have concerns with the proposed development. The fact that they acknowledged efforts are underway is a -- is a big acknowledgement by an entity like ITD. So, yeah, it seems like it makes sense. I think this is a good project. I'm not inclined -- I don't support the right-in, right-out on -- on Ustick, but it looks like there is really good access on McDermott and the -- the cross-access with Durango. So, I think it's a good project. I'm going to support it tonight and happy -- I do have a question, though, for staff, Mayor, if I may ask. Just to clarify some of the conditions that Ethan brought up for the 24 hour day, I think that's condition 1-5, modifying that. The conditions nine and ten and removing condition 2-I which I think Planning and Zoning made those exact same motions. Do we need to restate those in any motions tonight or are those considered already part of the staff report?

Parsons: Mayor, Members of the Council, 2-I was removed already, so that is not in the -- in the staff report, so that was per the Commission's action. The -- the 24 hour use is already addressed in the DA as well and there is -- although it's a little different than what the applicant was expecting, we do have a DA provision that allows them to get a building permit prior to recording the plat. So, that will still allow the applicant -- he showed you the two different -- nine and ten, don't need to add that. The one condition satisfies that. He will be able to submit what's called a certificate of zoning compliance application, begin the site work, start getting things pad site ready and, then, when he is ready to get a building permit he will get one, which indications is it may be -- the C-store may be the first building permit and, then, as I mentioned the Commission did recommend the 24 hour use on Lot 1, Block 1. So, that's -- all of those things are already in place for you to move forward tonight. So, there really is no -- nothing that you need to modify as part of your -- your approval this evening.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: With that, unless -- I would like to make a motion to close the public hearing on Item 5, H-2025-0059 and H-2026-0007.

Overton: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and second to close the public hearing. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Unless there is no further comments, I move that we approve Item 5, H-2025-0059 and H-2026-0007, as -- want to make sure I'm getting this right. If I can just put a quick pause. I'm just looking at the -- the -- the agenda here. We have A, B and C. So, I want to make sure -- there is nothing we need to do to -- to stay, we just need to -- okay. All right. So, let me start that over again. I was thinking out loud. Move that we approve Items H-2025-0059 and H-2026-0007, as stated in the staff report, dated July 14th, 2026.

Overton: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second. Is there discussion on the motion? If not, Clerk call the roll.

Roll Call: Cavener, yea; Strader, yea; Overton, yea; Little Roberts, yea; Taylor, yea; Whitlock, yea.

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries and the item is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Simison: Okay. Council, let me ask you -- do you want to take a break before we start the next one? Okay. Let's go ahead and take a ten minute break and we will try to restart at 7:50, if I did my math correctly.

(Recess: 7:40 p.m. to 7:53 p.m.)

6. Public Hearing for The Fields (H-2025-0057) by Idaho Holdings, located south of McMillan Rd, north of Ustick Rd. and between Can Ada Rd. and Owyhee Storm Ave.

- A. Request: Annexation and Zoning of approximately 480.26 acres from RUT in Ada County to the proposed zoning districts of Community Business (C-C) (42.87 acres), Neighborhood Business (C-N) (45.63 acres), Medium Density Residential (R-8) (194.44 acres), Medium High Density Residential (R-15) (100.63 acres), Traditional Neighborhood Residential (TN-R) (45.05 acres) and Light Industrial (I-L) (51.64 acres).
- B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 985 total lots on approximately 200.06 acres. This includes 899 residential lots (602 single-family detached units and 297 single-family attached units) and 72 common lots and 14 common drive lots. The development is proposed within the R-8 (157.48 acres) and R-15 (44 acres) zoning districts.
- C. Request: Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment for approximately +/-45.63 acres of land in the Southeast part of the development to be designated as Commercial (29.09 acres) from Mixed-Use Community and Medium High Density Residential (16.54 acres) from Medium Density residential and designate +/-45.63 acres of land to Civic from General Industrial for a future City Park.

Simison: All right. Council, we will go and come back from our break and we will continue on with Item 6, which is a public hearing for The Fields, H-2025-0057. We will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Ritter: Good evening, Mayor and Council. So, tonight we are here with The Fields. So, the site consists of 480.26 acres of land. It's zoned RUT and it's located south of McMillan Road, north of Ustick and between Can-Ada and Owyhee Storm Avenue. So, they are proposing annexation, a Comprehensive Plan map amendment and a preliminary plat. So, a little history on the property. So, the project is located within The Fields sub area, which is the -- again, the -- bounded by Ustick Road, McDermott, Chinden Boulevard, Can-Ada Road. The Fields sub area plan was adopted on December 21st, 2021, by Resolution No. 21-2302. The Fields sub area encompasses approximately four square miles in the northwest portion of Meridian and represents one of the city's final major growth areas. The plan provides for a framework to guide development in a manner that is consistent with the vision of Meridian Comprehensive Plan by supporting expansion of the employment base, while integrating high quality neighborhoods, parks, pathways and school. The area is adjacent to the city of Star's impact area to the north and the city of Nampa's impact area to the south and west. The vision for The Fields sub area is to create a series of interconnected community oriented neighborhoods, organized around a central mixed use activity center. This center is planned at the intersection of Star Road and McMillan Road and is envisioned as a pedestrian oriented main street. Environment featured in a -- a central green integrated civic and commercial uses and direct connections to the Five Mile Creek pathway. A variety of residential types, including vertically integrated live-work and

medium to high density housing will support and activate this core area. The plan emphasizes connectivity through an enhanced greenway and pathway system, several waterways, including Five Mile Creek and the Phyllis Canal, the West Tap sub lateral and the Sky Pilot Drain are anticipated to include pathways along their corridors. These improvements will allow The Fields sub area to connect to broader Meridian pathway networks with regional linkage extending west into Nampa and north into Star and the Boise River system. In addition to the central mixed use for The Fields sub area plans identifies The Fields business parks at the northeast corner of Can-Ada Road and Ustick Road as the hub for light industrial and flex uses. This area will benefit from access to State Highway 16, while incorporating walkable connections to surrounding neighborhoods and regional pathway systems. Mixed use areas are planned along Ustick Road and Chinden Boulevard to take advantage of high visibility locations. These areas are intended to generate lower traffic volumes than more intense commercial corridors and provide uses that complement rather than compete with the smaller scale neighborhood services located within the central mixed use core and along in this area we have the Williams pipeline. There is a high pressure natural gas pipeline that runs through the northwest and southwest areas of Meridian. This pipeline, which is operated by the Williams Pipeline Company, carries pressurized natural gas. There is typically a 75 foot wide easement that is associated with the pipeline. Future development is required to comply with the Williams Pipeline director handbook and coupled with this gas transmission pipeline there is an existing Intermountain liquefied natural gas plant located in the northwest part of the area of the city of impact at 4014 North Can-Ada Road. The storage tank, which was constructed in 1974 and underwent maintenance in 2022, has the capacity of 7.35 million gallons. The facility continues to operate at its designed capacity. The area within the Intermountain Gas facility and safety buffer has a future land use designation for the -- of industrial. So, that residential uses aren't allowed within the buffer area of the tank. Therefore, residential dwellings should not be permitted within 1,500 feet of this tank to address the worst case scenarios elevated in the 2005 -- 2005 fire safety and prevention plan. And as you can see on this map this is the buffer safety area and no residential development is allowed in it. And this is just a picture of the tank. And there were some Council Members that kind of did a field trip out to that area. There was a traffic impact study that was submitted. The traffic impact study evaluated the development impacts on the study area intersections and roadways for the build out year 2040. The traffic impact study also provided an evaluation of what improvements may be needed beyond those planned in ACHD's capital improvement plan. So, the tables that are shown include the intersection and roadway segments and the traffic study and note existing travel lanes and intersection configurations, what improvements are planned in the CIP and master street maps and what improvements would be needed beyond those in the CIP and the master street map to mitigate the traffic impacts of The Fields area in 2024 -- I mean 2040. So, the annexation and zoning that is being requested -- again the annexation and zoning of 40 -- 480.26 -- 26 acres from RUT in Ada county to the proposed zoning districts of community business, C-C, which is 42.87 acres. Neighborhood business C-N, which is 45.64 acres. Medium density residential, R-8, which is 194.44 acres. Medium density residential, R-15, which is 100.63 acres. Traditional neighborhood residential, which is TN-R, which is 45.5 acres

and light industrial, which is 51.64 acres. As part of the annexation the applicant is proposing design guidelines for the development of the proposed annexation area. All future development of the proposed -- proposed annexation area shall be guided and -- shall be guided by and required to comply with the specific -- project specific design guidelines. This guideline will be incorporated into the current and future development agreements. The design guidelines will adhere to UDC design requirements, while ensuring development of the project embodies the modern rural thematic vision of The Fields sub area plan. The design guideline manual states the guidelines are intended to ensure high quality commercial and residential buildings, along with thoughtful -- thoughtfully designed site development and landscaping that embraces the area's history using enduring, high quality building materials and design practices, foster pedestrian friendly connection environments that support a vibrant mix of businesses, living and recreation and enhance long-term investment and property values for residents and businesses. So, this is the design guideline that the applicant submitted that will be part of the requirement for any development in the area. So, the Comprehensive Plan map amendment that the applicant is requesting, the applicant is proposing a Comprehensive Plan map amendment to change 40 acres from general industrial to civic. So, this is a future park land for the city. The parcel is owned by the city of Meridian and staff believes the civic designation is the most appropriate and consistent classification for public park land and will better reflect the intended long-term use of the property. The proposed amendment is aligned with The Fields sub area plan requirement that this area will be within the safety -- safety buffer of the Intermountain Gas facility, be developed only with nonresidential uses. The site is planned for development as a large community park, designed to serve both nearby neighbors and broader Meridian community. The park includes sufficient acreage to accommodate a variety of recreation -- recreational needs, support community gatherings and events and provide amenities that contribute to a high quality of life. Adequate on-site parking will be an essential component of the design to ensure accessibility for all users. The applicant is also proposing a Comprehensive Plan map amendment to change 45 acres at the northwest corner of Ustick Road and North Owyhee Storm Avenue from medium density residential and mixed use community to medium high density residential and commercial. The applicant states the amendment creates the amount of commercial area necessary -- necessary to support a larger anchor tenant and a functional mixed use of commercial uses that -- to serve the planned residential development in the area. The site is located directly across from Owyhee High School and has immediate access to Ustick Road and the new State Highway 16 interchange. These factors make it strong -- make it a strong fit for regional focused commercial and other commercial compatible uses. The applicant believes this is -- this amendment supports the city of Meridian's planning goals by expanding commercial services on major transportation corridors. The amendment also enables the 15 acres north of the commercial shopping area to be developed for multi-family housing, promoting efficient land use, providing opportunities for housing near schools, employment and major transportation routes. These are the areas that are being proposed for the comp plan amendment and, then, this is the preliminary plan that the applicant is proposing. The applicant is proposing a preliminary plat with single family detached and attached dwellings, which are listed as the principal permitted use in the R-8 and R-15 zoning districts in the UDC. The future

land use map identifies this area as medium density residential. This designation allows for dwelling units at a gross density of three to eight dwelling units per acre. All proposed lots and public streets appear to meet the UDC dimensional standards per the submitted preliminary plat. This includes a minimum lot size of 2,000 to 4,000 square feet and requires street frontages of at least 40 feet. The subdivision is proposed to develop in seven phases. Development of the subdivision is required to comply with the subdivision design and improvement standards within our UDC. The applicant is proposing a minimum lot size of 3,984 square feet. Maximum lot size of 10,610 feet and an average lot size of 5725 square feet. There are 15 common drives that are proposed with this subdivision. The applicant has provided common drive exhibits that demonstrate that no more than three lots are served, where a maximum of four lots are allowed. The common driveways meet the minimum requirements width of 20 feet and does not exceed the maximum length of 150 feet. Solid fence adjacent to these common driveways is prohibited, unless separated by a minimum five feet of landscape buffer. So, there are some existing structures on a couple of the lots and those structures are proposed to be removed and any existing wells and septic systems will be abandoned as required. The site shall be designed to meet the requirements of the UDC for R-8 and R-15 and, again, the applicant did submit their own design guidelines, which will be a requirement of approval, as well as The Fields sub area plan, the UDC and our Architectural Standards Manual. These are examples of the street layouts. This is their phasing plan and these are your pathways and sidewalks, pedestrian connections throughout the proposed -- so, access to this site is via Malibu Ridge Drive and Bear Creek Street via North Star Road, West Black Butte Street, West Achievement Street and Echo Ridge Street via Owyhee Storm Avenue and Echo Ridge Street via West Ustick. A ten foot wide detached pathway is reflected along West McMillan Road, North Star Road and North Owyhee Storm Road. West Ustick Road is consistent with the alignment on the Master Pathways Plan. There is a ten foot wide detached sidewalk along Echo Ridge Street, Sky Pilot Drain and the Teeter Drain, which connects to various pathways throughout the development. There are several -- again there are several micro pathways -- are reflected providing connectivity to internal portions of the development as mentioned in the Comprehensive Plan analysis above the improved -- to improve more direct pedestrian activity staff is -- would not recommend any additional pathway connections, but we feel that they have provided fairly good pathway connection, so -- and as far as open space amenities based on the standards in the UDC, a minimum of 40 amenity points are required to be provided. The amenities proposed are clubhouse, picnic area, fitness course, open space, commons -- open space common shelters, dog park, dog waste station, outdoor fire ring, swimming pool. They have exceeded the open space amenities, but the applicant does need to work with the irrigation district and enter into a license agreement to provide some type of landscaping other than gravel in the open space area on the southern part of the property and the applicant will need to revise a portion of their landscape plan accordingly with the understanding that trees will not be allowed in the area, but grass and shrubs may be allowed to be negotiated within the agreement if maintained by the homeowners association. If they cannot get -- if landscaping is not allowed within the irrigation easement, the applicant will provide five feet of additional landscaping outside of the irrigation easement and this has been relayed to the applicant and they have no

objection to this. And, again, this is more of the layout and the amenities within this development -- proposed development. Several of the roads exceed the 750 block length that is required, but the block face length does not exceed the one thousand square feet in length, so staff has no issues with the ones that are over 750 square feet. They also have several roads that exceed the one thousand foot block length, but include pedestrian connections per the UDC and staff has no objection to those block face that have been proposed, but there is -- West Achievement Street does exceed the 1,200 foot block length and it requires Council waiver for that and we are asking for traffic calming along that. So, that is a waiver request by the applicant to exceed the 1,200 foot length for West Achievement Street. There are several waterways running through the area. The applicant is requesting Council waiver to -- waiver to keep the Teeter and Sky Pilot Drains open to provide a natural amenity adjacent -- with adjacent pathways, as irrigation easements wider than ten feet shall be included in the common lot that is a minimum of 20 square feet wide and outside of a fenced area, unless otherwise waived by Council. The Five Mile Creek, which bisects the entire Fields development, is proposed to be left open and used as an amenity -- as an amenity when possible. So, the applicant did provide building elevations. Staff is proposing a DA provision for the homes along the collectors and arterials, incorporate articulation through changes in two or more of the following: Modulation, bays, bands, porches, balconies, material types and other integrated architectural elements to break up monotonous wall planes, roof lines and views that are visible from adjacent public streets. Single story homes will be exempt from this. Design review will be required for the attached -- for any attached and townhome buildings, but this is not required for single family -- single -- for the single family detached structures. So, we received a letter from West Ada School District after our Planning and Zoning Commission and so West Ada -- so, they clarified the schools that were related to the proposed development. We have Ponderosa Elementary, Star Middle School, and Owyhee. So, basically, the district stated that they have experienced significant and sustained growth in student enrollment during the last ten years based on current -- current enrollment data specific to the area surrounding this proposed development. They estimate the development consisting of 901 single family units and zero multi-family units could house approximately 442 school aged children. So, you showed that the middle school and the high school are over capacity, but the elementary school still has capacity. These are just pictures of the properties that have existing structures on them. So, we have listed a couple of DA provisions that I just wanted to kind of bring to your attention. Just want you to know that all -- other areas that are part of this annexation and the Comprehensive Plan map amendment prior to any future development and once sewer is readily available at the site, they need to submit the following for review and approval. A development agreement modification to create a new development agreement. A preliminary plat to further subdivide the property if required. And amend the concept plan to be consistent with The Fields sub area plan. The Fields design guideline, Comprehensive Plan, UDC and Architectural Standards Manual. No development shall commence on the property until sewer is readily available at the site and meets one of the following -- following criteria. The connection to the city sewer collection system is actually being installed by the applicant or sewer has already been stubbed to the site. Future development shall comply with the Williams Pipeline Developer's Handbook. A

TIS shall be required with all development applications that include a change to The Fields master planning area -- master plan planning area that may alter traffic impact projections at the sole discretion of ACHD. The final plat shall be recorded prior to the submittal of any building permit application for the commercial or residential portion of development and prior to the issuance of any certificates of occupancy within the commercial portion of the development. They need to provide a road trust development for half of the crossing for the future extension of the Mapleton Street stub street across Five Mile Creek feeder and Five Mile Creek. The exact amount of the road trust deposit will be determined during plan review. They need to install PBH with intersection lighting at the Owyhee Storm-Achievement intersection. They will need to enter into a signal agreement with ACHD to ensure that the PBH is installed. The signal agreement shall note that the applicant is responsible for all costs associated with the hardware, design and installation and that this improvement is not eligible for reimbursement by ACHD. The applicant will need to order and purchase the signal hardware as ACHD does not have these materials available for this project. And, again, the only thing that is actually being approved tonight is the preliminary plat, the comp plan amendment and the annexation of the 480 plus acres. The other areas -- this is just a concept plan -- is for illustration purposes only, just to see how the area could develop and when these areas come back in they will have to go through review and depending on the type of development may be back before you -- well, they will have to come back in with a -- a new development agreement, so you will see this again as we go through this process. And as stated sewer is not readily available at this time. Sewer should -- they are installing the new -- the new Can-Ada lift station and they are extending the sewer infrastructure along McMillan Road and it's anticipated to be completed at the end of this year or early next year. So, the Community Development director and the Public Works director determined that even though the property cannot be served by the city sewer, that we can annex it due to it being contiguous and the city is currently constructing the sewer trunk line in McMillan Road. And with that -- I know it was long. I just wanted to make sure I gave you enough information. I will stand for any questions you may have.

Simison: Thank you, Linda. Council, any questions for staff?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Are we -- so, I understand tonight there is three basic things; right? There is the preliminary plat for Westveil. The Comprehensive Plan map amendments. And, then, annexation of the entire 480 acres. Are we also -- with that annexation are we approving the zoning requirements as well on the entirety of the acres or just on the acres -- like the Westveil property?

Ritter: Those are the zones that they have requested with this annexation.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for staff at this time? Okay. I will invite the applicant to come up, see what they can get done in 15 minutes.

Nelson: Mayor, Deborah Nelson, 601 West Bannock Street. May I ask for 20 minutes?

Simison: Sure.

Nelson: Thank you. We do have a lot to cover. I will try not to be too repetitive, because Linda was very thorough and she's pulling up our presentation now, so I will just go ahead and get started. So, I'm here on behalf of the applicant team. I have got with me tonight Emily Mueller with Mark Bottles Real Estate and also Mark Bottles is planning to join online from his vacation, which is -- maybe -- he may have some spotty service, but he really wants to be here. So, if you have any questions for him he will be available. And the applicant represents eight different landowners whose assembled land really provides the opportunity for this master plan community. We are grateful to the staff and the planning department and other departments that have participated in multiple meetings for a couple of years on this application set, along with representatives from ACHD and ITD and West Ada School District. The applicant has met with them several times as well, so -- and the neighbors, of course, as well. So, there has been a lot of input that have helped shape this application, along with the city's adopted plans. And we appreciate the Commission's and staff's recommendations for approval and the applicant is in agreement with all of the conditions of approval that are included in the staff report, which incorporates all of ACHD's conditions of approval as well. So, Linda already covered the -- the three applications that are pending tonight, so I think we can jump in and before I get into some of those application details, I do want to touch on, you know, why are we annexing such a large area and so -- and the reason is that master planning at this scale has many benefits. A large scale approach enables this coordinated long range planning for public services that includes transportation and parks, utilities, emergency services and public infrastructure. The scale also facilitates a better community design. If you have got all the land under control within a large development you can have that cohesive land use pattern, the coordinated access points and shared design principles that really can foster a sense of place. And, finally, but importantly, a master plan approach supports predictable private investment and so the approvals that are before you this evening help provide some market certainty that's needed by builders and retailers, employers, that need to plan around the future population that's coming here, the rooftops and the demand and know with some certainty what's coming forward. The applications also serve private homeowners, because they get more certainty about where apartments will be located, where a restaurant or a park is located, not just immediately next to them, but a few streets over as well. We can look to other master plan communities in Meridian, like Paramount, as success stories that have proven this concept. Works well here where the city can absorb large master planned communities successfully with good planning. And the basis of that planning starts with The Field sub area plan. So, that master planned community approach works especially well where the city has already gone through this extra step to establish a comprehensive vision for this area and I know several of you participated in that -- in shaping that plan, along with your long-term planning staff and many members of the public, including the applicant team who has been involved throughout this process and continues to share the city's vision. The

The Fields sub area plan is prefaced by stating that the measure of the plan's success is its ability to direct and bring about actions that implement the plan's articulated vision. So, we are here tonight to present the applications to help implement the plan's vision, bringing it to reality for Meridian's residents and business owners. So, in alignment with the Comprehensive Plan and the sub area plan, we are requesting a total of six different zones across the development area. This mix of zoning provides that truly comprehensive master plan, including commercial, industrial, housing diversity opportunities and civic uses. Our application does include the conceptual plan to guide future development applications within the entire 480 acres and this is broken down into 18 different planning areas and Emily is actually going to hand out a physical piece of paper that has this map on it, so that when we refer to planning area numbers you have that in front of you and not just that slide. So, the entire 480 acres that's being annexed and zoned will be governed by a development agreement. This will incorporate the conceptual plan and the city's conditions of approval. The 200 acres that are outlined in green represent the current preliminary plat application for the Westveil Subdivision and build out will be governed by the development agreement and the specific conditions of approval for this area. The remaining 280 acres that are in blue are expected to generally build out in accordance with the conceptual plan, but as Linda noted they cannot proceed with any actual development until the city approves future applications - development specific applications that will at a minimum include a development agreement modification to ensure that whatever specific plans come forward are consistent with the city's plans and if any adjustment needs to be made to this master conceptual plan, then, that would be made at that time with the City Council's approval of that DA modification. There will also be any specific conditional use that are required for conditional uses and any plats that are required for a future subdivision and when each one of these future development application phases come through they will also be subject to requirements by ACHD for updating the master traffic impact study for site specific areas, so that we have updated traffic counts where appropriate, any additional mitigations that are specific to that development phase that would be required at that time. So, I'm going to start by introducing all of the areas that were outlined in blue and -- which is really all the future development phases. So, the industrial zoning is on the southeast corner of Can-Ada and McMillan in Planning Area 18 and the location and the size of this area is designed and intended really to serve these smaller industrial users and employers that is in such demand here. It provides this key employment area that's consistent with The Fields sub area plan. Future development applications would be required here. The applicant is very excited about their work with the city Parks Department to make this large community park a reality. The park consists of just over 40 acres. The city has not planned exactly what the facilities will be here yet, but expects to have large community amenities, like sports fields, playgrounds and sports courts. So, one of two planned commercial centers is the McMillan Center in Planning Area 12 at the southeast corner of McMillan and Star Roads. This includes 14 acres of community commercial development. We envision this center to include a neighborhood sized grocer and other retail or office pad users. The southeastern portion of this site was inspired by East Boise's Bown Crossing. The attached image, which is to scale, shows a pedestrian oriented commercial main street with generous landscaping and extended sidewalks that provide

that destination shopping feel. Our conceptual plan on the right incorporates these same design elements and this is an important area for The Fields sub area and so this site design will be revisited in future DA modifications and preliminary plat applications. As this concept plan is refined further applicant does accept and agree with staff's condition that there will be no drive-throughs along this north-south main street concept or along the east-west commercial road, so that we can further enhance that pedestrian feel. And here you can see a conceptual rendering of that mini main street concept. The second commercial center is the Owyhee Center and this is in Planning Area 1 at the northwest corner of Owyhee Storm Boulevard and Ustick. So, this location near the interchange of Ustick and Highway 16 and walking distance from Owyhee High School is a really important area for commercial use. The Owyhee Center is envisioned to provide multi-tenant buildings along its eastern boundary. Perfect for medical office users or small fitness studios. The western boundary of the site and along Ustick is where we envision some casual and drive-through restaurants. The site design will be revisited in future DA modifications and preliminary plat applications and likely conditional use permits for conditional uses. We do envision that the larger building here would be a large anchor that will really center this development. The concept plan includes three multi-family locations in Planning Areas 5, 11 and 13 with R-15 and TN-R zoning. We have provided conceptual layouts of the multi-family developments, which are planned to be two or three story garden style apartments with pools and other desirable amenities. These multi-family developments are planned in areas that are conveniently located near commercial services, walking paths and transportation corridors. And, finally, the concept plan includes four planning areas that are not being platted right now, but are proposed to be zoned for single family residential development. These areas will be platted in the future, along with a development agreement modification and updated traffic studies. These areas include detached single family homes and attached townhomes with densities consistent with the specific area plan and they will be developed subject to the proposed design standards and continue to build out those planned pedestrian pathways providing connectivity through the area. As staff summarized, we are applying for two Comprehensive Plan map amendments. The first is in Planning Areas 1 and 5. Our request to change the MUC designation to commercial is intended to support commercial zoning and that strong anchor tenant presence. Commercial zoning also allows more land to be available for commercial use than the MUC designation, which is consistent with the comp plan goals and maximizes this key commercial location next to the Highway 16-Ustick interchange area and Owyhee High School. The request to change MDR, medium density residential, to medium high density residential supports our requested R-15 zoning and is intended to support multi-family use here, which is a nice transition between the commercial and single family residential located next to transportation corridors and schools. The second area for Comprehensive Plan map amendment is Planning Area 17. As staff noted, this parcel is owned by the City of Meridian and planned for a city park. So, the civic designation is the best aligned designation for the planned use. So, turning to the Westveil Subdivision, this covers 200 acres and proposes a mix of housing sizes and types with single family detached in the R-8 zone, single family attached in the R-15 zone. The average density is just under four and a half units per acre. The plat will include 23 percent qualified open space, which is a

significant increase over the 15 percent required. It includes a variety of desirable amenities, including a pool, a clubhouse and an extensive pathway system, including ten foot pathways along the Williams Pipeline area, the Five Mile Creek and Teeter Drain, along with additional micro pathways throughout and we will also have amenitized pet stations along the pathways, pollinator gardens, seating and outdoor fitness stations. The drains will be left open to provide natural amenities as well. The architecture will follow the sub area plan's traditional and modern farmhouse style with gable and slanted roofs, neutral colors and board and batten siding. Our students will attend Ponderosa Elementary, Star Middle School and Owyhee High School. We anticipate that Westveil will add approximately 440 students by the time it is fully occupied and phased out over the expected seven years. This would be approximately 4.8 students per grade per year. So, with some variation around four to six students per grade per year. Roadway improvements for the preliminary plat area include widening Star Road and Owyhee Storm Road. Installing a pedestrian crossing light at -- near Owyhee High School and constructing a new east-west collector through the middle of the site that will provide additional connectivity and trip distribution in the area. We will also make proportionate share payments to ITD for intersection impacts and pay ACHD's impact fees. Significant additional roadway improvements are anticipated with future phases. This slide just shows the expected improvements based on the master traffic impact study that was accepted by ACHD and ITD, but the specific mitigations will continue to be refined and updated, traffic studies with future development applications. The Fields applications involve significant private investment in public infrastructure. The applicant is donating land for the city sewer lift station and well site. The applicant already donated half of the value of the 41 acre park site, a contribution that is valued over 3.6 million dollars. The development will also pay impact fees consistent with city and ACHD policies. For the Westveil portion alone this is over 16 million dollars in impact fees. So, with that we are excited to bring forward this application that is the result of long planning and we are -- appreciate the staff support and the support that we have received from all the agencies we have been interacting with. We are happy to answer any questions you may have.

Simison: Thank you. You really didn't need all that extra time.

Nelson: I am glad I was able to move quickly. Linda did a thorough job.

Simison: Okay.

Mueller: Emily Mueller. 839 South Bridgeway Place with the applicant team. I did want to just make sure in case I needed it for the record, the two waiver requests that we would like. One is for the block length waiver for Achievement. That's the collector road that goes east to west that will stub to the current Owyhee High School site and, then, the second is to keep the Sky Light -- the Sky Pilot Drain open. We would like to utilize that as a natural amenity, have those pathways. So, I know that those were waiver requests and I just wanted to make them for the record. There. Yeah.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions for the applicant?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Thank you for walking us through that. That was a lot and you did it very efficiently. I guess more of just kind of a -- a question about timing of the different types of zoning and when you are going to bring them on board. The Westveil is all residential; right? There is a lot of other -- you know, there is some commercial, multi-family. Is there any particular reason why you are not wanting to bring on any other types of -- trying to plat of any of the other use types tonight at this point, instead of just all residential? Is it just timing with the market? Infrastructure? I'm just trying to get a sense for -- as much as that's happening here why we only are looking at doing a preliminary plat on residential only.

Nelson: Mayor, Council Member Taylor, yes, it is just residential with the -- the two different housing types that will come forward with the detached and the attached and the reason is the availability of services, as well as bringing in those rooftops that -- that will, then, support the commercial. We need to have some residents there to further entice those retailers, commercial developers to come in.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Hi. Welcome, Deborah. It's nice having you here. Love master planned developments generally, because there is a lot of visibility into what we are going to see. Tends to work out well when it's done well. A question I have for you. You guys are making a pretty good contribution in terms of public infrastructure. Appreciate that. The school thing is huge. I know you have calculated with your phasing plan and kind of -- I'm assuming divided it by 12 grades and kind of figured that all out. Certainly West Ada's incoming kindergarten classes are lower now than some of the older classes, but is there any visibility as to like a private school or a charter school or something else being located in this master planned area? I'm just wondering if that's a possibility that you foresee and part of the reason is -- you know -- and there is not a school site here being donated and I just want to understand like how are we thinking holistically about access to education in this area? How far are the kids going to be bused, because they are having to redraw boundaries? I did notice that West Ada had two different letters I think at different points in time where they were redrawing their boundaries, trying to figure this out. One letter was really detailed. The other letter was much shorter. Help me understand how to think about this holistically from an education perspective.

Nelson: Mayor, Council Member Strader, yes, that is how we calculated the phasing. You are exactly right. The applicant has had many meetings with the West Ada School District to talk through what this -- this area looks like. West Ada did not desire a school location within the property boundaries and so that's why we don't have a donation of land to the school district, because they didn't need one, want one, and, you know, the

location of Owyhee High School next door is -- is obviously convenient. Ponderosa is the appropriate school based on their current districting from -- from recent line drawing that they have done to allocate students within their boundaries and so, you know, that -- and that's -- that's also convenient for us just down Ustick. So, as far as the anticipated students from -- from our development, yes, as you noted, you know, West Ada does have declining population coming into its schools. They also have schools that are over capacity, some that are under capacity, so even though they overall have a declining enrollment we still recognize that there are, you know, schools that have a need to implement short-term and long-term measures to address development as it occurs and in our discussions with West Ada we understand that that will certainly be happening here with the middle school and the high school. The high school in particular, you know, they have a plan immediately for some interim measures. They are converting a shop space into two classrooms now that will open up another 50 spaces there in their design capacity and, then, they have other programmatic changes and physical changes that they make while the enrollment numbers finally justify the expenditures for a new school or they lead to redistricting to really utilize the resources they already have throughout the district and I know you are familiar already with a lot of those interim measures, but they include, you know, creative allocation of classroom use, so that you don't have empty classrooms, instead you rotate and move classrooms. Use of portables, creating classrooms where you have available space. Owyhee High School does have a lot of space on site. They have a future trade school planned on the property and a lot of other available space there to use. They also long term do expect that a lot of their enrollment will go down when Star High School is ultimately built. They are optimistic about the new legislative tool that's been passed with House Bill 636 to give new funding opportunities throughout the district to not have to turn to voter approved bonds for property tax increases. So, they -- they have a lot of hope that that's actually going to bring schools like the Star High School, which where the land is already owned, to fruition sooner. But in any case we recognize that's a long term plan for them. Does that answer all of your questions?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: It's super helpful detail actually. Just curious about Star High School. I just don't recall. What is the timing of that?

Nelson: Mayor, Council Member Strader, my understanding is that they have acquired the site, but do not -- have not pursued the funding yet for constructing the school and so that's why I think West Ada is hopeful that the new tools from the legislature could come into play there.

Mueller: Awesome. Mayor and Council Woman Strader, I also wanted to note your earlier question about other charter schools and private schools in the area. There is an interested charter, actually, that is looking to develop on Ustick, not -- which is within The Fields area. There is a church and, then, a charter school that would like to locate

and, then, additionally -- and that's a little bit more speculative, but they do own the land. The sewer is just going to take a little while to get there. The other school that is planned for the area is -- Cole Valley Christian is planning their large campus. They are still in fundraising efforts, but we have been talking with them a ton trying to help brainstorm sewer solutions. Sewer is just expensive, as the city itself realized. So, trying to help them get open as soon as they can, because everyone's really excited for that school as well.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you. No, that's helpful. I thought there were a couple that were looking out there, so that's great to hear. You know, always love to support the West Ada School District, but other solutions help, too. So, it all just really helps the effort. Thank you.

Simison: Okay. I think you are off the hook for now.

Nelson: Thank you.

Ritter: Mayor?

Simison: Yes, Linda.

Ritter: Got a little excited when I was presenting here. Just wanted to finish up something for you guys, some information on the Commission hearing. So, the Commission did approve this with no changes to staff's recommendation. We did have people commenting at the public hearing. Most of the comments were based on the traffic, school overcrowding and insufficient infrastructure and those were the issues discussed by the Commission and also the loss of industrial property. We did receive a couple of comments after the hearing, one from Carolyn DeHart and she was -- she stated please consider what you will be doing to all of us residents in this area by not putting the infrastructure and roads needed before building all the projects -- projected homes. This is not good planning. You can do better. Lindsey Madison. She says she lives in the area where all these proposed homes will be set to be built. We do not have the infrastructure to accommodate that many houses. The traffic is already bad now. The roads need to be taken care of and widened first before any new buildings take place. We need to be proactive and not reactive. If housing companies want to build, then, they need to help pay for the infrastructure to support them. Thank you for listening and not letting them build yet. And, then, one of the letters was resubmitted that was submitted for the Planning and Zoning hearing. So, just wanted to get that in.

Simison: Thank you.

Ritter: Thank you.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Just a quick question. I just wanted to double check for -- I guess it's -- I don't know what we are calling it -- Area 18, that that's -- I believe that was light industrial, but I just wanted to make sure that we are all aligned, that that will, in fact, be light industrial. This is a very big difference. Yeah. Thank you.

Simison: Mr. Clerk, anyone signed up to provide testimony?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, yes. First is Benjamin Gardner.

Simison: Okay. Well, when your name is called you can come forward, be recognized for three minutes. State your name and address for the record as well.

Gardner: Good evening, Mayor and Council. Benjamin Gardner. 3041 South Alfani Way for the record. I'm here in favor of this. I'm a good fan of master planned communities. They are great. As the applicant was saying, they are a good way for large landowners to plan out the whole area, instead of piecemeal by piecemeal. But the difference -- it's great. Their plan. But from what I have -- from the map -- sorry. The map that they have put in so far there is a lot of pathways, but they are not contiguous and interconnected. If you have ever been to the Stoddard pathway in Nampa -- not to be confused with the Stoddard Road down the road, but it's a big pathway from an old railroad right of way that the city turned into a pathway. In the middle, not connected to any street, but it runs straight through, there is no twists and turns, but it's really -- it's a really good way for pedestrians to pass through all the residential areas. What the pathways in this area don't do are give that clean straight way through the neighborhoods. So, I would respectfully request that Mayor, Council, to not approve the plat, but the annexation and everything else would be for that and question for the developers, if they have time, is part of the initial drawings -- I think I was on page 17 of the -- the staff report there is -- it looked like a hand drawing for their initial plan. Had roads coming all the way through and I think it was on -- there was a different one, but similar on page two of their presentation today, roads going straight down. So, I'm wondering why they -- why they got rid of those going north and south, because there is great connectivity going east-west, but not so much north-south. That's -- that's it. Any -- answer questions.

Simison: Council, any questions? Thank you.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, next is Garrett Post.

Post: Good evening, Mr. Mayor and City Council. It's a pleasure to meet you. I testified at the Zoning Commission about this. I'm not in favor of how they are doing it, but I do respect that they put a lot of time and effort into their plan. My -- my counter proposal is that they add a lot more commercial space to this area, because we just don't have any.

I understand they are going to put some south of Ustick, but for us if we are going to go to do anything, it's -- we either have to go to Ten Mile or we have to go down by the Ford Idaho Center. If you figure over the next 50 plus years all of the farms in the area are going to get sold between us, Star and Nampa, that's going to be a ton of homes that are going to get put into this area with the same issue of the overcrowding in the schools and not having anywhere to go between us; right? Like 900 homes, you figure that's 1,800 cars to this area and, again, we don't have the infrastructure -- I'm sorry I forgot to state my address. I live on 6600 West Windsor Street. So, the little access road off of Ustick that goes into those neighborhoods right there that's just getting opened, that goes right into my garage. So, one quick selfish request would be that you guys put some speed bumps on that before you open it, because I would love to not have teenagers Tokyo drift into my garage and the other one is on Achievement and Owyhee Storm, we really need a stoplight put up there, even if it's just a temporary one before school starts. The traffic going down there is just horrific even as polite as drivers are out here. It just gets really bad in the morning and that area really needs a light. I imagine it would get one if they are building -- if they are going to add that road to be an entry into their community, assuming this plan would get approved, but we just don't have the infrastructure for 900 homes and plus, again, I think it would serve our community and the city a lot better if we built something like The Village, beautiful outdoor mall, that all of the community that's there, plus all of the communities that are going to be there -- I mean it's an entire city block that is available on this plan, plus there is just that RV storage unit that's that little kind of grade out -- carve out on Star -- the Star Road side, about a little over halfway up the block there. So, that could be very easily incorporated as well if there was an outdoor mall here. I mean even if they added like half as much space -- like took half -- the south half of it, where it was the Star, Owyhee and, then, Ustick on the bottom, just take that whole half at Achievement and turned it into commercial, my opinion is that would much better suit the community than what's proposed here and I'm not against master planned communities. I like that it's not going to be piecemeal like my side of the -- the -- my side of the street is -- Owyhee Storm is, because it is clearly piecemealed together, but I think if they did more commercial it would benefit the community a lot more than what's being proposed.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you. Is it Mr. Post?

Post: Yes, ma'am.

Strader: Great. It's interesting -- so, your comment is that we need more commercial and at least in my conversations with people what I have always heard is that you need the rooftops and the population to support a commercial center. I like that in this master planned community you have a visibility into some commercial. This area -- and going

back a long time when the City Council was coming up with an idea for this district we really wanted like this main street kind of pedestrian feel, similar to The Village, kind of that idea, but a smaller scale. It looks like they are planning in -- and I think -- I got to go find it, but there is this McMillan center area, which I think might be No. 12. Thank you. And that -- so, that's going to have kind of a street oriented main street kind of feel with commercial and, then, there is a lot more of a traditional commercial area being planned in this area No. 1, which, you know, that's going to include some kind of big commercial tenant and, then, fitness centers and drive-throughs and things like that. They at least have mentioned a possibility of a grocery store. Who knows; right? No one knows what will happen. Is -- is that -- is your comment that that is inadequate? You feel like more is needed and what -- what is the sort of rationale of how could we foster more commercial here without having the residential around it I guess would be my question.

Post: Well, the other side of The Fields to the west of Star is going to be built. I mean if they build more homes there, plus you figure when the farmers that haven't sold will sell will get incorporated into what they are doing, plus -- the way I'm looking at this, too, is we have the big freeway off ramp that's going to be there with starting out 80,000 plus cars a day, that's a ton of traffic coming through the area. You have the Durango development and I can't remember the smaller one associated with it, the one that was before us, they are building a gas station and some more commercial in there. So, we are already going to have a ton of people in the area, so why not bring some more jobs here? Why not bring more industrial -- industrial -- like not big industrial stuff, that's to the south, but you are going to have those -- when those are open you are going to have probably a few hundred people that are going to need places to go eat. So, there is going to be a lot of local traffic, plus the nine months a year school is in; right? All the kids can just walk across the street there, like my wife and I and everybody that lives in our neighborhoods can walk across the street as well. And I understand it's -- you need people in the area to support business, but we already have quite a lot of people. Plus on McMillan and Owyhee Storm Road, that top corner there, they are -- they are just starting another development that's probably going to have 70 houses I think. I'm not sure. There is going to be a good amount of homes that are up there, plus you have Cole Valley coming in, as they mentioned as well, for the middle school and elementary school I think. So, there is going to be a ton of people in this area and it would be nice to have -- especially for -- that most of us will be local in the area, be nice to have more to do; right? Like I'm not against master planned communities. I'm not against them developing the area. I want to be clear about that. My perspective is it would be -- I think it would serve the community better to have more to do in the area, instead of having to go all the way to The Village, which is 25 minutes or go into Nampa or go all the way to downtown Boise or Eagle where there are kind of some stuff to do. I just personally think it would serve us a little better to have more closer and that's even with Ten Mile Crossing coming in, which itself is right off the freeway.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I think that's helpful. It sounds like it's really -- not necessarily just like immediate needs, but recreational opportunities as well is kind of what I'm hearing from you; is that right?

Post: A little bit. It is that, but it's just -- in my opinion the community would be better suited having like little shops. I understand they are going to put some fast food restaurants, a grocery store, maybe a gym is going to go in there and that's all wonderful and great and I appreciate them doing that and, again, I do appreciate all the time that they have spent that they are going to donate a park across Star Road there, between Star and Can-Ada, I -- and the infrastructure money they are going to contribute. I'm grateful for that. I appreciate that. But I just think it would serve the community better if there was more commercial space and I do appreciate that they are going to leave that irrigation way open, because I think that's really cool, that I get -- you know, when I drive by that every day. It's a really cool little greenery and I appreciate that they are going -- they are planning to add to that as well.

Strader: Thank you. Hopefully the applicant will address -- address your concern when they rebut. I think that -- it sounded like this Area 12 might end up with a lot of little shops and things, but we will find out. I wish -- I wish development worked that we could like wave a magic wand and, then, boom we have this whole thing built out the way everybody wants it simultaneously, but, unfortunately, you know, it's going to be pretty chaotic here for awhile while a lot of development is all happening at once and you have got this huge Highway 16 thing going on -- I mean it's -- it's going to be really busy. Thank you, though, for coming and sharing your -- your views.

Post: Yeah. And I mean to that point I understand it's a Catch 22; right? There is not exactly a perfect solution. Either we bring a bunch of residential in and everyone complains about it or you build a big mall that attracts a ton of people and everyone complains about it; right? No guarantees in life, except death, taxes and making everybody unhappy with urban development.

Strader: Thank you.

Simison: Thank you.

Strader: Thank you very much.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, next is Denise LaFever.

Simison: Good evening.

LaFever: Good evening, Mayor and City Council Members. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name is Denise LaFever. 6706 North Salvia Way, Meridian, Idaho.

Simison: Denise, can you pull the mic down? Thank you.

LaFever: There you go. I'm not here to support or oppose this application, I'm here to speak about the importance of following the plans we adopt. Several years ago during the Comprehensive Plan process steering committee members and I encouraged the city to prepare a site specific plan to Meridian's remaining large growth area. We believe the plans -- planning these areas before they developed would produce better neighborhoods, better transportation, better parks and ultimately a better Meridian. I was pleased to see that the city embraced the vision and adopted the Fields sub area plan. The plan represents years of work by the city staff, council and consultants, property owners, stakeholders, elected officials and residents. It reflects a shared vision, not a simple for where growth should occur, but how it should occur. As I reviewed this application I appreciate the city's staff evaluating against the adopted Fields sub plan and identified areas where additional refinement is needed, including the mixed use center, commercial integration, pedestrian orientation and implementation of the plan's designed vision. Those are not minor details. They are fundamental elements of the adopted plan. The Fields sub plan was adopted to guide development, not simply to describe it. Development agreements, future approvals and conditions of the approval are valuable implementation tools, but they should not become substitutions for demonstrating consistency with the adopted plan. What does -- whatever decision you make tonight I respectfully ask that you record clearly demonstrate -- demonstrate how the application fulfills the vision, principles and design intent of The Fields sub area plan. Residents invest hundreds of hours participating in planning, because they believe the plans they help create will guide future decisions. Development invest based on those plans. Future residents and future council rely on those plans to provide predictable consistent fairness. Plans matter only if the -- they influence decisions. If they become documents that can be re -- reinterpreted, adjusted or accommodate development, the planning process risks becoming an exercise in aspiration, rather than implementation. Tonight's decision is about more than one development, it's about whether Meridian's adopted plan will continue to guide development or whether development will begin to guide the plan. Thank you for your time and your service to our community and, yes, I do have concerns about this, but due to time constraints I will stop there and stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I think we -- we were willing to give Ms. Nelson additional time and I will just ask you what are your concerns if you want to take a couple minutes to talk about them.

LaFever: I would love to. First of all, this was a really exciting plan, because this is the one that got behind and that drawing that's on the face of it, that's because I asked the consultant to design it free of charge for Meridian. So, I -- I really like the fact that this plan is done. My greatest concern is ensuring that the adopted Fields sub plan remains the governing document. As this application moves forward I encourage the Council to avoid conditioning approval in a way that effectively modifies or relax the intent of the

plan simply to accommodate the proposed development. Areas of concern. Ensuring that Star, McMillan center achieves the pedestrian oriented integrated mixed use vision envisioned in the sub plan, rather than evolving into a more conventional commercial center. Maintaining the integrated relationship between commercial, residential, civics and public spaces envisioned by the plan. Preserving the plan's emphasis on walkability, building orientation, streetscape designs and public gathering spaces. Ensuring roadways improvement, pedestrian facilities, pathways multi-modal transportation are implemented as coordinated systems consistent with the adopted transportation framework. Using development agreements and conditions of approval to implement the adopted plan, not to subsidize for or redefine its intent. Avoiding incremental amendments or conditions that override the substance -- the unaltered -- the original vision without a transparent public planning process. Continue requiring roadways, utilities, parks and other public infrastructure be provided in step with development. Preserve the importance of the park, civic gathering place and community amenities at integrated components of the overall plan. Apply The Fields sub area plan consistently throughout the future planning phase of this development, so the years of planning invested in the city and the public are reflected in the completed area. My concern isn't should this develop, my concern is is to make sure it develops within what the vision of the plan is. So, thank you for the opportunity to express my concerns. Like I said, I'm excited that you guys did the plan, so -- thank you.

Strader: Yeah.

Simison: Thank you.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, that was everyone.

Simison: Okay. If there is anybody else that would like to provide testimony on this item you can either raise your hand online or you can come forward at this time. Seeing no one raising their hand or coming forward, would the applicant like to close.

Nelson: Thank you. Could I pull up our presentation again? I would like to use the pathways exhibit. Or if that's easier to pull up in yours that's fine, too. Great. Thank you. Mayor, Members of the Council, I just want to address the comments we heard. So, Mr. Gardner talked about the pathways. So, I wanted to have this exhibit up in front of you and staff walked through this, so we didn't spend time on it, but we are connecting really everywhere that the landowner controls and so there are gaps where we don't control property around us, but that's kind of the benefit of having so much property that we do control. In particular you can see there along the Five Mile Creek that builds out the city's Ten Mile plan corridor there and extending those pathways. It really does create that strong east-west connection. We have got -- all of the pathways that are shown in red, by the way, are ten foot multi-use pathways. All of the blue are micro paths, so that could be six or eight feet, depending on the city's desires and so we have got connectivity running north-south, east-west, through a lot of the open space corridors with the Williams Pipeline, along each of the drains with the Sky Pilot Drain and the Teeter Drain and so we have tried to really bring in that exact pathway

connection and pedestrian connection that he is asking for. We do desire the same thing to connect from micro paths to get to the uses and, then, back to the more significant pathways. As for Mr. Post's comments, really wanting more of that Village concept here or all commercial, the specific area plan wasn't intended or designed to be that regional draw for commercial or the transportation oriented destination shopping and that wasn't the vision that the city had at that time based on a whole lot of feedback from the public, even though I appreciate that he may have a different desire for this particular use. We do want commercial here to be integrated, just like the sub area plan calls for, so that we have got -- not just the rooftops to support it, that's absolutely essential, but also so that it is -- it's truly an integral part of how people live, that they are able to get on one of these amazing pathways and get over to that neighborhood commercial use or if they are driving and it's destination, they have got to kind of pull up on street and the mini main street elements here or they are at least consolidating trips and if they are going down to this larger Owyhee Center, then, they are able to really capture trips within their development, because they don't have to go as far. I mean he talked about how far they have to go to get to The Village and so by integrating it around the needed housing we are really trying to -- to limit that -- that problem that he is experiencing. With our commercial, too, we don't want to just build commercial for commercial sake, we want it to be vibrant and in use and within the market capacity, so that it is built out and actively supporting the vision and our future residents here and we are increasing the amount of commercial slightly above what was called for in the specific area plan through that Comprehensive Plan map amendment that we are requesting here. As for Ms. LaFever's comments, you know, we are following the sub area plan. We appreciate her comments and the comments we received from staff that have helped us already make some adjustments, cutting out the drive through uses. One -- I want to just highlight some of the language that's in that McMillan main street concept area from the sub area plan that talks about having that pedestrian oriented streetscape, generously sized sidewalks, outdoor seating, that all enriches the pedestrian experience. A centrally located and highly connected park. These are all things that we are incorporating into our overall conceptual plan and will be finalized in more detail when that area comes forward and a follow up to Council Member Taylor's question about sequencing, the applicant is anticipating that the commercial areas will come on as the next phase after this preliminary plat and so that will bring in some of these concepts sooner rather than later to help fulfill that vision as well. I would stand for any additional questions that you may have and also invite Emily -- okay. If she had anything to add.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Probably more for Emily --

Nelson: Okay.

Overton: -- because she brought it up and this was a lot of information tonight, but there is one thing I just don't remember the answer being given, which was having to do with the requested waiver for the excessive block length. I believe in the presentation there was a request from staff for traffic calming measures along that street, but I don't know that I heard you mention traffic calming, only that that request was there for the length of the block.

Mueller: Mayor, Councilman Overton, yes, we plan to do traffic calming. I'm not exactly sure what those measures are. I would need to chat with our engineer. But I think that there is a list of things that we can work through for traffic calming on that.

Overton: Mr. Mayor, just a quick follow up. So, you are in -- you are in agreement with the request from staff on what we would do on that street for traffic calming, we just don't know -- all of us don't know what that looks like tonight.

Mueller: Mayor and Councilman, yes, we are in agreement with staff.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Just curious. What do you think your timing would be to come back with like preliminary plats for some of the other areas, like especially the -- I think the biggest one, which I think Denise touched on in her comments and I could tell we will be really keyed in on is this little kind of mini main street area in Area 12, like what is the timing of that and kind of the vision for when that's going to come together?

Mueller: Mayor and Council Woman Strader, so I think probably the next plat would be that Owyhee Commercial Center. The main driver for that -- and it is going to be the opening of Highway 16. Ustick is being expanded tremendously right now, so we have a tremendous amount of interest for commercial development there. So, sewer will be -- sewer will be at Star and McMillan and it will be brought down pretty far within the residential subdivision, within a realm that a developer -- a commercial developer could go and get it and bring it and -- and that would be justified. So, you know, I would say in the next couple years that one would come online or we would have another hearing -- another application within a year or two and maybe, then, a year after that for the other McMillan center. Yeah. That one is, yeah, going to be a really important part of -- of this. I absolutely agree. And I -- I don't know exactly the timing on that. I don't know the exact timing on that, but I would -- I would expect that to be, then, another maybe year out after the -- the Owyhee center.

Strader: Okay. That's helpful.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Thank you for this. This is very helpful just to get the full picture of it. It's very one dimensional for me though. So, when I -- when I hear things in testimony like this will be similar to Paramount or Bown Crossing or The Village as a destination, then, I can start to picture things. I -- you know, I have been there, I have seen it, I have experienced it. It's hard to do on a one dimensional map. So, kind of an open ended question. We have heard about the Comprehensive Plan. We have heard about the sub area plan. We have heard concerns from our constituents who have talked about, you know, maybe more commercial here, something to drive people here. In your mind what is the signature piece of this 480 acres that we are talking about annexing tonight? What's your signature piece that someday people will be saying, like Paramount, like Bown, like The Fields. Because what I see is a southeast corner. I see something up toward the north. I see a potential regional park west. What is The Fields that people will be talking about in the future?

Mueller: Mayor and Councilman, I'm -- I'm going to say that I think that the signature thing is that it will feel like one community. I think people that live there will feel a sense of identity of just being in The Fields for a number of reasons, for the park, for the mini main street and for the pathways that enable them to get everywhere. So, I do -- it kind of like, you know, I wouldn't say -- I would say kind of like an east Boise where you kind of feel like you are in a whole separate section. The highway is going to be that kind of natural divider where you feel already like you are in a different area. So, I think really the signature thing is -- is just really the community as a whole and the shared design principles that everything will have some shared design concepts, so I think the -- the scale of it is what's going to -- is going to make it feel that way and that we can design it all together with these integrated pathways, with integrated design and so, you know, I think the signature part of it will be just the feeling of -- of being in your own unique community.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Probably for Deb -- either one of you to chime in, just because you touched on -- on the pathways piece and the -- the testimony I did at least spark an interest as to, you know, how -- how we are best going to connect people kind of from the southeast part to the northwest part where the park is, recognizing there is a big chunk of land there that you don't connect, but you do have an opportunity to kind of lay that foundation and I -- I look to the Sky Pilot Drain, which part of it is listed as a multi-use pathway and, then, it kind of dog ears into a micro path and, then, kind of just terminates before it gets to Star Road and I'm just curious what's -- what's driving that termination there and why not connect it up to the -- the point where the -- the multi-use path and that other micro path that kind of converge -- and I don't know if I can control screen or not, but --

Mueller: I see what you are talking about.

Cavener: There is just -- there is -- it's not bad, it just seems incomplete and -- and I look at where those all three paths could converge as almost as a trailhead that could help kind of -- I don't know -- plant a flag for future connections that would get folks to our park.

Nelson: Mayor, Council Member Cavener, we are trying to see on the -- on the map and we think we see what you are talking about where the Sky Pilot Drain angles up and so I'm not aware of why that couldn't be a ten foot. It sounds like Emily isn't either and so we are certainly amenable to that, assuming that works with the agreements with the drainage district.

Cavener: Okay.

Nelson: And Linda may have more to offer.

Cavener: Linda, don't come with a -- don't bring the wet blanket.

Nelson: Reality. She may offer reality.

Ritter: I would never do that. Mayor, Council, in the revised conditions for the Parks Department that will be a ten foot multi-use pathway that connects up to that sidewalk.

Cavener: Correct. Cool. Our Parks Department, as always, do a much better job than I do. Thanks, Deb. Thanks, Emily. Appreciate it.

Nelson: Thank you, Linda.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I will just say this while the -- while the public hearing is open. I -- I often struggle with developments that have big impacts on our roads and our schools. I know you have heard my comments that before. The longevity of this project, the plan of it gives me great confidence that we are -- again you are planting a flag in this area for the school district and for the highway project, those concerns that I typically voice I think are satisfied, because of the plan that you have put together. I just -- I want to commend the entire team for really working diligently to look at this from all different angles, not just from the city. I just think that this is going to be a really unique part of our community and I just -- I want to thank you for that. Truly.

Nelson: Thank you.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor. Deb, great presentation. I just want to commend you all. When I started the first round on Council in 2016 The Fields District at that point was already being discussed and even included, scarily, like a working farm and so this is just years ahead and I think that it's just a great example of how things can evolve and just thank you. I know there is still a whole lot of work to be had and ahead, but yet just commend you on where we are sitting tonight. So, thank you.

Nelson: Thank you.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I have a few thoughts. Number one is I just want to commend the Council in the past when we looked at this park space for doing a lot of due diligence and something that public didn't see, because it was in executive sessions of field trips and like five meetings with the Williams Pipeline people, because I flipped out that I thought there would be a mushroom cloud of natural gas that was going to like wipe people's neighborhoods out. That was my number one fear about The Fields District to be honest before even like vision or anything was just safety. So, I just appreciate everybody humoring me and digging in on that, so that we could just take that concern and put it aside at this point that that was at least as well thought through as -- as humanly possible. So, I feel really good about that. I -- to me the vision for this area has always been a tiny city within itself. It's never going to be able to be a regional draw because of its size. It was meant to be a place that would at least be cohesive and a place where people could meet their immediate needs in terms of shopping, retail, access to a park and that was all because of this huge transportation project coming that was going to bisect our city and that was a major piece of work that the public and Denise and other people put their feedback and hearts into helping to craft a vision for this. I think this goes a long way toward meeting that vision. It's not going to be exactly the way it was laid out and part of the reasons for that -- I could speak to at least with the location of the park. We had originally started with kind of a different concept of a huge park that would kind of meander through here and what became obvious to us was based on our concerns about the Williams Pipeline and wanting to have a really good buffer around that and availability of land that this made the most sense for the regional park. So, there was a change there. But I do feel like it's been offset somewhat by this beautiful series of pathways. I would love to see a trailhead. I think Councilman Cavener made a great point about this opportunity where we could see our ten foot multi-use pathways coming together and seeing another trailhead, because the trailhead that we have in town that we just built is a huge amenity that people love. So, heads up to the Parks Department about that. But I really think that this goes a long way toward meeting the vision. My biggest concern is going to still remain around our mini main street, because I could see that going sideways very easily. I appreciate that you are very amenable to lack of drive throughs and stuff in that area. That's completely appropriate for that area. I don't think we want to see that there. To really create that community feeling it needs to be super pedestrian oriented. I -- you know, I

know the Council will be looking out for that and I wanted to commend staff, because these are some very broad conditions of approval, quite masterful I have to say in terms of giving us a lot of flexibility to really look at these components as they come in. So, I have a lot of support for this project. Of course I still have concerns, but I think we are going to iron them out as -- as things come through. So, I want to compliment you. I think you all have done a good job getting us started here. I think there is a lot of heavy lifting that will remain to be done in different phases, but I think it's a great start.

Simison: And if I could just add on. For me it's like I want to see what's not here, unfortunately, that's what -- you know, to get the full feel you need to see north of McMillan and how that connects and how that hopefully fulfills the -- the full vision that you are striving to accomplish and I think on this map -- I mean it's a big map and this is one of the challenges. Frankly, I feel like this -- as a city -- I don't want to say this Council -- but as a city, you know, we can -- we can overanalyze a five acre development to no end and sometimes when you see something this big it's really hard to get into the details about all this and if you -- if we just zoomed in and only worked on ten acres at a time I think that there would be a lot more conversation about every aspect of what this plan is, but I think to me when I look at this what we call the mini main street -- yeah, well, on this plan it looks really mini and I'm like I don't think that's enough, you know, but there is going to be an opportunity to have that conversation and, again, it's as much as how it connects to the north of this project that it is to anything else and we don't -- we don't get that conversation today about that and I think that's going to be the interesting part as you do move forward. What else comes in is going to greatly impact every part that we are not talking about tonight, you know, the -- the vision for the plan might get eaten up by the area between nine, 15 and 17 and you are going to be sent back to the drawing board on certain parts of what you -- what happens when other people bring their plan in. So, it's -- it's interesting that we are really only talking about this residential portion tonight. Everything else -- it's great, but everything else is going to be redesigned, rethought, re -- re-figure it out as they come in as other things happen around you that you may not control is going to impact what the actual -- what actually gets built out in this area. So, you know, my -- my main thing is does the residential component that we are looking at tonight meet the intent of the plan. Everything else is great in theory, but it's -- who knows what we will actually be considered at the future time, at least this is how I look at this and it's master planned, but more master planning the residential part tonight, you know, from my reality and if someone comes into the north with another part of this, how is it going to work? Is it going to integrate? Who is going to get there first to -- to develop with a plan. These are just words I'm saying at this point in time, but it's trying to put it into perspective about -- it's a great start to a vision, but I'm excited to see what's not here and I'm going to answer Councilman Whitlock's question, from my perspective that is not even on this map yet. In my opinion what we don't see here is what is still going to be the future of The Fields and, you know, whether that's the park or something else, it's going to really I think define this area in a way that we don't know yet. But it's definitely not going to be just the residential section we are talking about tonight in my mind.

Nelson: Mr. Mayor, I would just add, if it's all right, the quick comment that we are listening to all the comments from the Council and you about, you know, what you want to see as we bring forward these future development applications. So, we are certainly taking note of that.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: If there is no other comments, I would be ready to make a motion to close the public hearing. And I will do so. I move that we approve -- excuse me -- I move that we close the public hearing on File No. H-2025-0057.

Overton: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to close the public hearing. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I'm going to make some comments and I'm happy to make a motion at some point, but I will give others if there is more comments that want to be made, but I remember I was on the steering committee for the Comprehensive Plan in 2018, 2019 and I remember looking at this area thinking -- and I remember distinctly looking at the natural gas facility there and thinking there is just no way we are ever going to be even out here. Why are we even wasting our time? It just seems so far away and middle of nowhere and I'm -- in a relatively short amount of time we are looking at something like this is actually quite astounding when you consider how cities grow and how they are planning. So, I'm not sure if that's good or bad, but that's where we are. But I do remember thinking that. I also think we ought to add a subtitle that says The Fields, Meridians Last Great Frontier, because it's kind of what it feels like. We are looking at not just what we see here, but to your point, Mayor, and -- there is a lot more to go here and I'm pretty sure many of us that are sitting here tonight won't be here when we are still looking at a lot of these parcels that we will be approving and to that point I think as I look at this tonight 480 acres of annexed land, yet we are going to get a lot of bites at the apple as it were as we kind of start looking at these different more detailed specific development agreements that we want to look at with the different parcels, with the multi-family, the commercial. So, I think that gives me some level of confidence that even though this is a big thing we are doing tonight, we are going to be coming back time and again looking at the details and there is going to be a lot of work and it's going to be a lot of -- a lot of years. So, I think that's -- that's good. I will just say one last

comment about with schools. I think -- my confidence in West Ada has gone up a lot in recent years with their ability to manage in a very fiscally responsible way. One of the best -- I think it's the best run school district hands down in the state of Idaho with what they do and so -- and looking at the trends in education, I mean we are not losing a lot of kids, we are just seeing a lot more options and -- and we are always finding ways to do it. I was actually -- when I learned that West Ada didn't request to have a school in this area that spoke a lot about their -- their planning. They know this is coming. I think they are accommodating it. So, I think this is a good project. I think it's a good start. I'm excited to see what we have here. So, I'm going to be -- like I said, I'm happy to make a motion when that time is up. If anyone else has any other comments. Hearing none. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: After considering all staff and applicant and public testimony, I move to approve File No. H-2025-0057 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of July 14th, 2026, and also include a waiver for the block face length on West Achievement Street and to provide some traffic calming measures. I believe that was part of the request. And also to the second waiver to allow the Sky Pilot Drain to remain open.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second. Is there discussion on the motion?

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor, do we need to add the Teeter Drain?

Taylor: Yes. Is that -- that's right, because we have the two drains. So, I would add the Teeter Drain to remain open as well. Thank you.

Little Roberts: Second concurs.

Simison: Second concurs. Okay. Staff, anything more that you feel like you need based upon --

Ritter: No. Again, a lot of these are coming back before you, so we can make conditions at that time.

Simison: Okay, then we have a motion and a second and staff feels it's adequate for their purposes. Is there a discussion on the motion?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I was hoping Linda could go over her staff report maybe just one more time for all of us just to make sure we got it right. Just kidding, Mr. Mayor.

Simison: With that Clerk call the roll.

Roll Call: Cavener, yea; Strader, yea; Overton, yea; Little Roberts, yea; Taylor, yea; Whitlock, yea.

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries and the item is agreed to. Thank you all for your comments and being here and effort on that thing.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

FUTURE MEETING TOPICS

Simison: Council, anything under future meeting topics?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Either a topic or a memo at the appropriate time in preparation for tonight's meeting I read about West Ada having convening their long range planning committee in September. So, just to put on the radar either a report from them or an update maybe from West Ada as to what was covered in that. I think the information that they cover in that meeting is going to be very pertinent to us and our decision. So, either an update from them or a presentation from them, whichever you and Council President think is the most appropriate.

Simison: Okay. If not -- anything else? Do I have another motion?

Overton: Mr. Mayor, I move that we adjourn.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Motion and second to adjourn. All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it. We are adjourned.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:32 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON
ATTEST:

DATE APPROVED

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK