

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:37 p.m., Tuesday, April 28, 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, Nick Napoli.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Liz Strader	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brian Whitlock
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anne Little Roberts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John Overton
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doug Taylor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Luke Cavener
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mayor Robert E. Simison	

Simison: Council, we will call this meeting to order. For the record it is April 28, 2026, at 6:37 p.m. We will begin tonight's regular City Council meeting with roll call attendance.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Simison: Okay. With that we will move on to the Pledge of Allegiance. If you would all, please, and join us in the pledge.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

COMMUNITY INVOCATION

Simison: Okay. We do not have a community invocation this evening.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Simison: So, we will move on to adoption of the agenda.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I move that we -- on tonight's agenda we are going to vacate Item No. 3 and also we are going to vacate the Executive Session, Item No. 5. With that I move to approve the agenda.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve the agenda as amended. Is there any discussion? If not, all favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the agenda is agreed to with those changes.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

PROCLAMATIONS

1. Denim Day Proclamation

Simison: Next up will be proclamations, which in case you can't tell by my voice, I will not be delivering them tonight, but we will turn to Council President Overton for -- to once again come in on the proclamations. I have heard he has done an amazing job over the last two weeks, so I have no doubt tonight we will be just as awesome.

Overton: Good evening, everyone. There are two proclamations we are going to do tonight. The first one will be the Denim Day for Sexual Assault Awareness Month and before I start this proclamation can I ask if Laura Honn is in the house? Laura, would you join me up front.

Honn: Thank you for saying Laura Honn's in the house.

Overton: That's right. Now about --

Honn: Thank you for introducing me.

Overton: Laura, what I will do is read the proclamation and, then, we can stand for pictures if you would like and, then, let you have a few comments after.

Honn: Thank you. I appreciate that.

Overton: Okay. So, the proclamation is: Whereas the United States government has declared April as Sexual Assault Awareness Month and the Woman's and Children's Alliance has declared April 29th, 2026, as Denim Day and whereas both events are intended to draw attention to the fact that rape and sexual assault remains a serious issue in our society and whereas Sexual Assault Awareness Month and Denim Day were also instituted to call attention to misconceptions and misinformation about rape and sexual assault and the problem that many in society remain disturbingly uninformed with respect to the issues of assault and forcible rape and whereas with proper education on the matter there is compelling evidence that we can successfully reduce incidents of this alarming and psychologically damaging crime and whereas the City of Meridian is an important partner in the Women and Children's Alliance efforts to educate our community about the true impact of rape and sexual assault, therefore, Mayor Robert E. Simison does hereby proclaim, hoarsely, April 29th, 2026, as Denim Day for Sexual Assault Awareness Month in the City of Meridian and encourage all citizens to

speak out against sexual assault and support local efforts to provide help and healing to victims of these crimes.

Honn: Thank you. Thanks very much. I just wanted to say thank you so much for the support. It means a lot to us. My name is Laura Honn and I'm the new CEO of the WCA. I am three weeks into this role, so it's quite exciting. But Denim Day is a really important day for us. It's tomorrow, so if you are in a position to wear denim that would be a really great thing to do. But thank you so much to the City of Meridian for your support.

2. World Landscape Architecture Month Proclamation

Overton: Our second proclamation this evening is for the Landscape Architecture Month and is Celeste Penny in the house? Celeste, would you -- if anybody else wants to come up with you they can come up as well. So, I will read the proclamation. Whereas landscape architecture encompasses the analysis, design, planning, management and stewardship of the natural and built environment and whereas science, technology, engineering and mathematics, known as STEM, knowledge is at the core of the professional practice of landscape architecture and informs landscape architects as innovators, educators, researchers and leaders who can solve the most pressing challenges facing Idaho's communities and whereas licensed landscape architects play a critical role in transforming ideas into places that endure, ranging from parks and school yards to waterfronts, commercial sites and natural systems and whereas the 2026 theme of Landscape Architecture in Action emphasizes the vital role of these professionals in providing nature based solutions to manage stormwater, reduce risk and increase access to high quality outdoor spaces and whereas Meridian's economy benefits from licensed landscape architects through the creation of inviting and safe places for the public, residents and tourists alike, while simultaneously protecting the environment and associated ecological systems. On behalf of Mayor Robert E. Simison I do hereby proclaim April 26th as Landscape Architecture Month in the City of Meridian. Encourage all residents to recognize the contributions of landscape architects in shaping our community for the future.

Penny: Yeah. So, I just wanted to say thank you for the recognition for there is many landscape architects in our community, we are just trying to advocate for our profession and know that we think about the health, safety and welfare of the public in all of our designs and our creations and really trying to make the community a better place for all. And to the whole audience thank you for bearing with us as we wrapped up that last meeting. We appreciate you sticking around for the proclamation and our taking action items.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND RECOGNITION

Simison: With that, Council, we will move on to announcements and recognition. Anything from Council this evening?

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Just for the record, earlier in our work session we had a wonderful tribute from our Parks and Rec Commission chair about John Ness who passed away last week and was a great public servant that served for 19 years on our Parks and Recreation Commission and as part of this meeting and the official record I would -- I would like to recognize his passing, as well as maybe take a moment for personal privilege and -- and talk about another public servant who has passed away who was a friend to Meridian. I had the opportunity of working for Governor Kempthorne for 15 years. Started with him when he was mayor of Boise and he worked very closely. As I walked in today and looked at the pictures that are on the wall, he worked closely with Grant Kingsford and Bob Corey and Mayor Tammy and in all of his different capacities as mayor, as senator and as governor and I can tell you he had a love for not only Boise where he was mayor, but this community as well. You could tell by the friendship that he had with -- with Mayor Kingsford at the time. Winston Goering over in Nampa. Pete Cowles, who was mayor in -- in Caldwell. There was great synergy among local leaders in this community and I was proud to -- to witness that, to have a front row seat to a lot of the good things that happened that made the Treasure Valley the treasure that it is today. The last conversation that I had with Governor Kempthorne was sitting out here in the parking lot before a City Council meeting and he asked about you, asked about how you were doing, asked how the city of Meridian was and that was still on his mind these many years later after concluding his public service. I think he was proud of you. I think he is proud of this entire council. I think he is proud of public servants who day in and day out try to make life better for the constituents that we serve. So, I would just like to recognize and get on the record my appreciation for a good man who worked hard for all citizens in the state of Idaho and -- and helped make Idaho and Meridian and all the communities in Idaho a better place to live. So, thank you for that opportunity.

Simison: And I will second everything you just said and I won't try to add anything to it. Council, any other announcements this evening?

PUBLIC FORUM

Simison: Okay. And, then, with that, Mr. Clerk, did anyone signed up under public forum?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, yes. MacKenna Marshall.

Simison: Come on up and you will be recognized for three minutes.

Marshall: Hi. I'm MacKenna Marshall. I'm an IB anthropology student conducting my internal assessment trying to answer the question how does Meridian's environment influence its city council's response to water shortages to ensure sustainability. Do I

have your permissions to use your responses as part of my research or do you have any questions? So, my question for today is what triggers a response to water conservation plans and have there been any recent changes or any policy documents that aren't available online related to the most recent update to Meridian's water conservation plan?

Simison: I'm not sure how to answer this one. Mr. Nary, I mean the public forum generally don't reply.

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, I -- I do think probably at least we could help direct her to Public Works and that probably could get her information that maybe more than what's on the website and to maybe answer some of those questions. But we can -- I -- I can certainly talk to her.

Simison: I see Director Miles right there and I think he could help answer some of those questions and -- either connect or answer questions. So, MacKenna if that will work I encourage you to chat with Mr. Miles, either now or whenever you feel is appropriate through this meeting. Great.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: So, we -- just as background information if something is not on a noticed agenda, then, we can't discuss it and respond to the public. Just so you understand it's not intentional. We wish we could respond to you and help you with your survey. If you want to send me an e-mail I would be happy to try my best to answer your survey just as a suggestion.

Simison: Thank you, Council Woman Strader. Okay. Mr. Clerk, was that the only person on the public forum?

PUBLIC HEARINGS [Action Item]

- 4. Public Hearing (continued from March 10, 2026) for Rolling Hill (H-2025-0040) by The Architects Office, located at 1560 Rolling Hill Dr. (Parcel #R7555000032), 1520 Rolling Hill Dr. (Parcel #R7555000041), 1480 Rolling Hill Dr. (Parcel #R7555000050), 4270 E. Overland Dr. (Parcel #R7555000015 and Parcel #R7555000025), 4240 E. Overland Rd. (Parcel #R7444000022)**
 - A. Request: Annexation of 8.16 acres of land with the C-C zoning to construct 184 vertically integrated residential units and 18,226 sq.ft. of commercial space across four (4) buildings.

Simison: Okay. Then with that we will move on to our public hearings this evening, which is public hearing H-25-0040, which was continued from March 10th, 2026. We will continue this public hearing with staff comments.

Napoli: Good evening, Mayor, Members of the Council. The next item on the agenda is the annexation for Rolling Hills. The applicant requests annexation of 8.16 acres of land with a C-C zoning to construct 184 vertically integrated residential units, 18,226 square feet of commercial space across four buildings. The site is generally located at the northeast corner of Overland Road and Rolling Hill Drive. As shown on the screen the existing zonings are R-1 in Ada county and the FLUM designation is mixed-use regional. In 2023 an application was submitted for five of the subject -- of the subject six parcels with this application. This -- the applicant was requesting annexation and a conditional use permit for a mix of vertically integrated units and multi-family. In total they proposed 154 dwelling units across 5.89 acres of land. That application was denied by the City Council due to the creation of a county enclave, inadequate transition to the surrounding areas and insufficient integration, particularly with the property to the east. That layout created a narrow underutilized strip of land between the future road and the edge of the development. In addition the City Council discussed vehicular connectivity and traffic, which was a large concern for several members of the City Council. So, the new concept plan depicts four vertically integrated residential buildings consisting of 184 residential units and 18,226 square feet of commercial space. The applicant has indicated that the commercial tenants are envisioned to be gyms, personal and professional services and offices. In addition, during the review process to address comments from staff, the applicant revised their plan to incorporate approximately 53,000 square feet of open space and amenities that include pickleball court, Bocce ball court, playground, fire pit, pathways, two barbecue areas and a pergola with outdoor seating, as well as a clubhouse. The number of parking stalls required is 272 spaces and the applicant has provided 332 stalls, exceeding the UDC standards. They have also provided a parking exhibit to differentiate the stalls from residential and commercial uses. The applicant has submitted elevations that do not meet the City of Meridian's architectural standards and as previously noted a reason for the previous applications denial on the property was inadequate transition to the existing county residences. To address this the applicant proposed elevations for building A and B, which is on the north side of the property, that are three stories facing the interior of the site and two stories facing the north. Staff would like to note that the applicant has recently revised this elevation and will talk about it more in their presentation. However, the roof height for the buildings remains the same from both perspectives. So, from the three story side and the two-story side it is still the same mass of the building, which is approximately 43 feet in height. The previous application had buildings that were four stories with an approximate height of 45 feet. While staff understands the intent behind the applicant's proposed transition the overall height of the building has only been lowered two feet in total. Staff is asking the City Council to carefully consider whether this proposed transition is adequate. The current proposal provides a single access point -- a single access point to the proposed development via Rolling Hill Drive. This raises significant concerns from staff regarding safety, as Overland is provided -- planned to be widened to seven lanes, which would limit access

onto Rolling Hill Drive into right-in, right-out movements only. In addition there is no established timeline for the construction of the future roadway, which would be on the eastern portion of the site -- or off site on the eastern boundary. Staff has had multiple discussions with the applicant regarding this concern. It has encouraged them to contribute towards a solution for connectivity and traffic in the area. Some of the ideas we have discussed include coordinating with adjacent developers to pursue a solution that would establish a timeline for construction of the collector roadway and signalize intersection at Overland. Constructing a portion of the collector roadway on their property. Exploring different alignments of the collector road and signal and putting money in a road trust -- road trust. The applicant has indicated that they have reached out to the neighboring developer, but were are unable to engage in productive discussions regarding coordinated efforts or potential property acquisition. In addition, staff and the applicant explored other options in an effort to address this concern. However, the applicant was either unsuccessful or chose not to pursue certain options due to it not being financially feasible. While staff acknowledges that this presents a challenging situation for the applicant, the construction of a collector roadway is critical for providing adequate connectivity for both this development and anticipated redevelopment of the surrounding area. Without clearer information regarding the timing and construction of the collected roadway there is risk that it may never be constructed, which would be detrimental for this development, as well as the future developments in the area. In addition, the current design raises concerns about its lack of connectivity to the adjacent property to the east. Instead of fostering continuity, the proposed layout creates a physical -- physical barrier -- physical and functional barrier between this development and the future collector that would hinder the integration with the surrounding property and collector roadway in the future. This was another reason for the previous application being denied. At the Planning and Zoning Commission hearing four citizens testified in support of the project citing private property rights, need for additional housing, low vacancy rates and allowing the county subdivision to redevelop similar to the surrounding area in the much broader area. In addition, some of the residents voiced frustration about coming back to the city every couple years for another public hearing and going on through this process. We also received two testimonies in opposition of the project, citing traffic and safety, transition to the existing homes and the piecemeal nature of redeveloping in the area. As mentioned in the staff report, staff is supportive of the proposed land uses within the broader mixed-use regional area. However, large concerns still persist regarding the project's timing and integration with the surrounding area. As a result the commission and staff are recommending denial due to safety concerns regarding access, a lack of transition to the county -- existing county residences, a lack of integration with the eastern property and future collector roadway and not having a clear timeline for when the collector roadway and signalized intersection at Overland will be constructed. And I will stand for any questions you guys have.

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

Leonard: Mayor, Members of the City Council -- Mayor, Members of the City Council, my name is Josh Leonard from the law firm of Clark Wardle. Our address is 251 East Front Street, Suite 310 in Boise. 83702. We represent Assemble Management and its Rolling Hill project. Thank you for the opportunity to present our project here today. As I'm sure you already know and as from listening from the -- to the staff report, our applications have been given a negative recommendation by both staff and by the Planning and Zoning Commission. We believe those recommendations are undeserved and we are here to -- to -- to try to tell you more about -- more of the story about our -- our application. Our goals tonight are, first, to tell you -- tell you that story. Second to help you understand a little bit about the context of our application and, third, to give you some reasons to approve annexation of our project. As a quick timeline of the property and its development, a previous annexation application for a different project was on some of the same project -- property was considered by the city in 2024 and in a few moments I will talk a little bit about that 2024 project. Again, which staff mentioned was not approved. In 2025 our professional team took lessons from that 2024 application and applied them to -- to approve -- improve the proposal that's before you tonight. We have also made a few adjustments from what we presented at the Planning and Zoning Commission in early March and we will discuss those -- those changes as well. As mentioned by staff, this property is located on Overland Road and Rolling Hill Drive just south of Ahlquist's Eagle View Landing project. The subject property is shown in green near the bottom of this aerial image. As I mentioned, the -- the 2024 iteration of this project got a recommendation of denial from the Planning and Zoning Commission and, then, was ultimately denied. The two big reasons for that -- first, the one parcel was not included in the project, so annexation of the other parcels created an awkward county enclave and I will show you an aerial on that in just a minute. Second, the proposed four story buildings of the project created an abrupt height transition to single family homes to the north. We have fixed that with our new application. As I mentioned, this aerial shows the 2024 project area in green and the omitted parcel in pink that would have created that awkward county enclave. This slide shows the -- the concept plan of the 2024 project, again, with the pink omitted parcel and here are the 2024 project and the current project side by side. 2024 project is obviously on the left, with the current project being on the right. As you can see we have gotten that last parcel under contract, so there would no longer be an enclave left in the county. We have also changed the design of the project and -- and of the buildings, especially along the north side of the property -- to step down to meet that north property boundary. As you can see on the right -- excuse me -- on the left the 2024 project consisted of three four story buildings. The current proposal keeps four story buildings on the south end of the project adjacent to Overland Road, but puts descending three story and, then, two-story buildings along the north side of the project and while I'm on this slide I want to mention the ways in which our project exceeds some city requirements. We have 60 more parking spaces than are required. We have over parked this project. We have 76 more bike parking spaces than required. Vertically integrated projects in the city typically are not required to include open space, but we have 53,000 square feet of it. And although vertically integrated products -- projects are not required to have amenities, this project will include significant amenities, including a clubhouse, a pickleball court, outdoor seating, a pergola, a fire pit, an outdoor kitchen, lawn areas, a playground, a bike repair

station, a fenced dog off leash area and a community pathway. One of the things I wanted to address is -- is the fact that our -- our height only dropped -- the height of the -- the top of the building only dropped two feet. One of the things that we noticed on -- on site is that the topography of that area is such that there is a gradual descent from neighboring single family existing homes down to the project area. In fact, the -- the closest homes that are -- which are about 270 feet away, would look straight across into the second floor of -- of the -- of the proposed project, meaning that although the -- the proposed project did only drop two feet by lowering that, there is a better -- better privacy -- better privacy screen there. People not looking down from a third floor into adjacent properties. We also responded to -- to neighbor comments. Neighbors in single family homes that are to the north requested more visual -- visual screening. We added some transitional landscaping elements and particularly along the northern edge of the property we added some fast growing evergreen trees, which was a direct response to a particular neighbor's concern and comments. We also included additional open space in the project and we had a shade study performed to resolve a neighbor's concern that the proposed buildings would shade neighboring properties. One of staff's criticisms of the property -- or of the project that you heard is that the project doesn't involve the construction of the planned connector, the extension of Movado, which aligns across Overland Road and I will discuss that more in -- in a moment. As you can see here, though, the proposed project does include the dedication of significant right of way, both for the planned future widening of Overland Road and for the portion of the future Movado connector -- excuse me -- collector extension that is on the subject property up on the top right-hand corner there. I want to talk a little bit about traffic, because the staff report implied -- and -- and not just implied, flat out said that putting traffic on existing Rolling Hill would cause a safety concern and we strongly disagree. Additionally, Commissioner -- Commissioner Perreault, who ultimately made the motion to recommend denial, mentioned that she wanted the applicant to look further into how traffic from the proposed project would affect Rolling -- existing Rolling Hill Drive and we have now done that. Pursuant to the Ada County -- Ada County Highway District standards Rolling Hill Drive has a trip capacity of 2,000 trips per day. The existing single family residences on Rolling Hill Drive that take access via Rolling Hill Drive account for less than 50 trips per day and I would note that currently Rolling Hill Drive is gated and locked at its northern terminus where it meets a private street called Flatiron. So, there can't be currently additional traffic coming down Rolling Hill Drive from the Ahlquist project. As it currently sits Rolling Hill Drive, which has a capacity of 2,000 trips per day, has less than 50 car trips per day on it. The current project before you will result in approximately 650 car trips per day on Rolling Hill Drive, far less than its 2,000 trip capacity. And as noted in that last bullet point the current infrastructure referring to Rolling Hill Drive completely supports the proposed development. I also want to take a moment to discuss the Ada County Highway District staff report, which was excellent. The -- the problem -- the only problem with the report is that the Planning and Zoning Commission didn't get to see it. It wasn't included with the -- with the staff report. The staff report only included the first page of that Ada County Highway District staff report. On the left is the first page. On the right of the slide are the -- the -- is the full report, 18 pages, and I want to highlight a couple of those -- those pages that were omitted when it went to the Planning and Zoning Commission. The first thing I wanted to -- to note is on

this page, page seven from the Highway District staff report, it states: To accommodate the future construction of the collector and as a part of a future development application, the applicant should be required to dedicate right of way at the site's northeast property line as shown on the site plan below. Then looking at the image that's included in the -- in the ACHD staff report, it clearly requires dedication of only that red triangle, because that's the only part of the -- the planned connector that is on the subject property. While on this slide I also want to discuss a little bit more about the Planning and Zoning Commission's recommendation of denial. Although it's true that they ultimately -- ultimately recommended denial, it was clear from their deliberations that they were torn. They truly didn't know what to do with our application. Several of the P&Z Commissioners started their comments by saying, either I don't know where I'm going to land on this or I'm on the fence on this and, in fact, the first motion, which was a motion to deny, didn't get a second. The second motion was a motion to forward to the City Council without a recommendation with further comment -- after further comment from staff, though, a motion was made and approved to recommend denial. But it -- but if you watch that -- that hearing, the recommendation of denial was only seemingly begrudgingly approved. I would also like to -- to look at page 17 of the Highway District staff report. Here it says that the Highway District approves the proposed site plan subject to compliance with all of the site specific and standard conditions of approval and, again, this was one of the 17 pages of this report that the Planning and Zoning Commission didn't get to see. We want to address staff's two biggest concerns. First staff has pushed us to include some or all of the future Movado collector extension in our project. This doesn't work for several reasons. Perhaps the biggest reason it doesn't work is that the north-south portion of the Movado extension must align with the existing Movado Road south of Overland Road, which is approximately 60 feet east of the subject property on property owned by a different landowner. As staff noted, we -- we tried to engage that landowner in a dialogue about potential collaboration on the road. We even asked -- offered to purchase that property to be able to build that road there, but that owner would not engage with us. The next biggest reason it doesn't work to put the planned Movado collector extension on the subject property is that the east-west portion of that collector, which is located north of the -- the subject property, needs to align with the existing right of way of existing View Circle, none of which is located on the existing -- or on the subject property, it's all located north of the subject property. It -- it's critical to understand that -- that this east-west piece of that collector isn't necessary to serve our project. Our project -- none of the traffic from our project is going to go north and across and down. The traffic from our project is going to be well served by Rolling Hill Drive until the widening of -- of -- of Overland. Put simply, our project can take access via Rolling Hill Drive without overwhelming it. In fact, as I mentioned earlier, our project's car trips, plus the existing car trips on Rolling Hill Drive only equal about a third of what Rolling Hill Drive can handle. We just don't believe that our annexation and zoning applications should be denied based on a planned future off-site road, particularly because our project has safe and sufficient access without that road. Additionally, as Commissioner Perreault noted during Planning and Zoning's deliberations on our application if the landowner to the east had wanted to attend and complain about the collector extension being entirely on his property, that owner certainly has had ample notice and an opportunity to raise that concern, but hasn't --

hasn't shown up so far. Moving to staff's second concern, improve building height transition. We didn't have good enough building high transitions to the properties to the north in our initial -- in our -- in the first application. When we came back we had -- we had stepped down those -- those transitions to meet the properties to the north, but it -- it had a big -- a tall roof. We have since tried to fix that. This updated elevation that we have here uses raised heels to create a shed roof that breaks up that main roof plan. This project is important and although it's just an annexation and initial zoning, it's important to this little area. This little six parcel assemblage could be considered the keystone that will enable redevelopment of this entire county enclave. This aerial depiction shows the status of various projects nearby. For example, the St. George project was approved by the City Council earlier this year. That's -- there is an application pending for Idaho Town and Country's project, which is located immediately to the west of our project, is shown in red here, and a restaurant was approved there right on Overland on the -- on the parcel in green and it redeveloped modern offices on the parcel identified in purple. You can also see on this slide how close the city of Boise is with an approved project in Boise city limits shown in yellow. This slide shows the project parcel assemblage in green. Five Mile Creek is a thin blue line that runs east-west near the northern boundary of our project. The planned -- this also shows the planned alignment of future Movado collector extension in red. This is ACHD's master street map. I have added the labels. Other than that it shows the alignment of Movado and the extension with -- of the collector with View Circle and up and over to Topaz Avenue. Again off site for this -- from this project. Five Mile Creek basically runs along the northern border of our -- of our project. This poses a -- a problem for us in that we can't do just a half section of the road on our project, because to keep Five Mile Creek open we have -- to keep it open we, obviously, can't pave over it. We would have to move the entire road onto -- onto the subject property, which essentially cuts it in -- in -- in thirds and makes -- makes it so that it -- it just absolutely doesn't pencil. The next picture here I have got is a picture of the multi-use pathway that we have proposed along the -- the south bank of Five Mile Creek and here -- this just shows -- actually, I want to stop on this slide for just a minute. I have only got about 20 seconds. One -- I went -- in preparation for tonight's public hearing I went back and watched the Planning and Zoning hearing once again and I was struck by one of the comments that -- that -- that I, then, went and found in the staff report. In several places in the staff report, as well as in staff's report to the Planning and Zoning Commission, they use terms like that we were pushing or shifting -- pushing or shifting this -- this collector onto adjacent property. That's just not the case. The -- the collector as shown on ACHD's future street -- or master street map exists on those -- those adjacent properties. I will come back in rebuttal with a little bit more information, but for now I will stand for questions.

Simison: Thank you. Council, questions?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Josh, thank you. One question on the -- the northern buildings, you have two stories on the outside, three story immediately inside. Are they separate buildings or are they -- is it just -- is it one building and one side it's two stories, inside it's three stories and you just kind of -- how -- you are designing the pitch of the two-story building. Can you help me just sort of understand that a little bit more? Is it separate buildings? Same building, but --

Leonard: Sure. I appreciate that. Mr. Mayor and Council Member Taylor, same building adjusting the pitch of the -- of the roof and -- and that's why the building itself only dropped by two feet is because on the other side it remains at three stories.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor, follow up. Are the -- is it all of it residential on those northern buildings or did you have some commercial in those northern buildings? I'm sorry, I --

Leonard: Ground floor commercial.

Taylor: Ground floor commercial. And, then, residential above that?

Leonard: Correct.

Taylor: Okay.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Mayor. Josh, thank you so much. So, do you have -- I know that the Corey Barton property is right next to you, but do you have something -- do you have a street stubbed prepared to go out?

Leonard: Yes, we do. That is correct. Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Little Roberts: We will have --

Leonard: Council Member Roberts.

Little Roberts: -- traffic flow eventually?

Leonard: Absolutely.

Little Roberts: Thank you.

Leonard: Yeah. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Josh, can you go back to the elevations to show that three story, two-story transition? Yeah. That one. So, again, just to clarify, you are saying that the first floor, both on the north and the south side of those buildings, is going to be commercial. How do you access --

Leonard: Just on the south --

Whitlock: -- just on the south side.

Leonard: On the north side residential.

Whitlock: Both residential. And, then, the second and third stories on the south side would be residential?

Leonard: Residential.

Whitlock: Okay. Can you talk to me about access into those second and third stories above the commercial property? And I'm also kind of interested where Councilman Taylor was going in terms of one building or two, are they -- I mean is that first floor residential on the north side abutting the commercial on the south side, just a wall in between, or, again, two separate buildings? I --

Leonard: Mr. Mayor and Council Member Whitlock, I appreciate the question. When you are talking about access into the residential are you -- just in terms of stair -- stairwells and -- and -- and elevators or are you talking in terms of -- of -- are -- are they actually abutting each other?

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor, Josh, I'm just -- I'm wondering, again, if I'm looking at the south facing buildings and the first floor is commercial, how do I get up to my apartment on the second or third floor?

Simison: Okay. So, Josh, if you could repeat that.

Leonard: Yeah. You bet. There is stairwells and it seems like I -- I was -- I thought you were asking a more difficult question than you were. The stairwells, obviously, will avoid the commercial areas and will work their way up to the second floor and third floor of residential.

Whitlock: Okay.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Josh, could we go to the slide that show -- it kind of had some colored depictions of the properties that have been approved. I think you need to go forward a few.

Leonard: It's not letting me move. Oh, there we go. Yeah.

Taylor: You said something that I wasn't sure if I heard correctly. The property that's in the city of Boise did you say that has -- in the yellow box that has been approved or it's in the process in the city of approval, meaning it's kind of going through --

Leonard: My understanding is that that's an approved -- an approved project.

Taylor: Okay.

Leonard: Let me -- let me back up. It may be just that it's been approved with annexation and that they are going through the process of -- of design review and things like that for the project itself, but -- but in terms of it being within the city of Boise city limits that is approved.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor, follow up. Maybe staff -- is there any way that you could find out in the next ten minutes if that's an approved annexation or if there is a -- an actual application approved? I would -- I would be very interested in that. And, then, I'm just kind of curious on the -- that -- this is a really strange alignment with Movado and sort of that connection to the north of Overland. I mean I understand if I own that property and it looks like a lot of my property is going to be lost to development of the -- of a roadway, that would be of significant concerns. You said you have reached out, you have tried to have some conversations. I wasn't sure if staff had proposed solutions to both that property owner and you for kind of collaborating, but can you walk me through your efforts to reach out to suggest a solution, because that's clearly a very significant part of this application and how I would -- I mean to me the central question is not so much what's the use type, it seems in alignment with where we want to go and it -- this is a very challenging part of Meridian, but the sort of infrastructure connectivity is a really significant part of the overall decision making process, but it's -- I -- I would just like to understand better -- describe to me your outreach, your conversations, what has looked like it could work, what has significantly failed in terms of finding a solution. I'm trying to grasp what has actually happened there.

Leonard: Thank you, Mr. Mayor and Council Member Taylor. I appreciate that -- and -- and to your point that alignment of Movado is kind of weird. It -- it's the fact that it cuts through that part -- instead of being on a shared property line, it is a concern. Unfortunately, where it's aligned south of Overland it needs to align north of -- of -- of Overland and that just happens to -- to bisect that -- that -- that -- that parcel there. Our project team has reached out on several occasions to that -- that property owner. That property owner has -- at least based on -- on testimony that was given to the Planning and Zoning Commission -- has said that he has a 20 year plan for the area and it has been -- I will put it politely -- less than responsive to our -- to our attempts to engage,

both to discuss purchase of that property and to discuss a collaborative approach towards constructing that collector.

Simison: Maybe to piggyback on that a little bit -- and I don't know if staff's spoke to this, but what I'm concerned about is it almost seems like it's going to create a spite strip between the road and your project where what can be -- could anything legally be built in that space based upon the width of what's proposed?

Leonard: Mr. Mayor, if that's a question for staff, I think that's about a 40 foot space in terms of what can legally be built in there. I don't know the answer to that. I can tell you that -- that if it's left as -- as open space it's a -- it has the potential to be a -- a -- a nice spite strip, if there is such a thing. A spite strip that would cut off access; right? This -- this wouldn't -- we would stub to that -- to that property line.

Simison: I guess I would say that to me -- the only people that would benefit would be your side of the road.

Leonard: I think that's a fair statement.

Simison: The other side of the road gets left out of this and we are not here to -- well, maybe we are here to solve problems, but part of me thinks that your development should be more off your property line to allow something else to go along that side working with the property owner to the other side, as compared to sharing the road. It's almost sharing your property to -- to have something built that would make sense. Just my two cents. I can't talk anymore.

Leonard: I appreciate that, Mr. Mayor, and I appreciate you expending your -- the last bit of your remaining voice. I -- I -- I will tell you that -- that none of those options are off the table in -- in talking to the adjoining landowner. If the adjoining landowner would engage with us in those conversations. The -- the problem hasn't been that we have a lack of potential solutions, the problem has been the -- the inability to raise contact or return contact from that landowner.

Simison: Council, additional questions for the applicant at this time?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Mr. Leonard, a couple maybe just quick questions. The -- the green area -- maybe specifically the area where that -- that arrow is pointing out for BVA Development, is that multi-family that's right there?

Leonard: There -- Mr. Mayor and Council Member Cavener, the voice from above, I -- there is a multi-family there. I believe that -- is that the -- what's the name of that?

Cavener: It's okay. I just I want to make sure I'm -- I'm remembering correctly. Mr. Mayor, maybe just a couple of quick follow-ups. Mr. Leonard, you -- you mentioned I think in kind of your opening you took maybe exception with the -- the feedback from staff about maybe some of the safety issues on -- on Rolling Hills and I'm hoping you can maybe give me some understanding as to how you drew that conclusion. I -- I -- I very likely possible that I have -- I have missed something in your application that speaks to that. I didn't see it necessarily contemplated in the ACHD staffing report. So, help me understand kind of why you are right and why our staff are -- are incorrect.

Leonard: Well, as -- as an -- Mr. Mayor, Council Member Cavener, as an initial matter the fact that -- that the Planning and Zoning Commission didn't have the opportunity to view that -- that ACHD staff report I think is problematic. In that staff report one of the conditions of approval that was proposed by the -- or not proposed, but that was requested by the -- the highway district -- by highway district staff was completion of half section of Rolling -- Rolling Hill Drive and the -- and the dedication of property if necessary to make that a curb -- you know, with curb, gutter and sidewalk. That -- that to me is a -- a large piece of why -- why -- why we believe that Rolling Hill can safely -- can safely handle the traffic. The other piece is just in terms of raw traffic count.

Cavener: Mr. Leonard, you are -- you are a very intelligent guy. Help me understand what gives you the expertise to draw that conclusion?

Leonard: That -- Mr. Mayor, Council Member Cavener, the conclusion that -- that the ability -- that our willingness to construct additional infrastructure on Rolling Hill Drive would make it safer or that it's safe based on the -- the -- the existing traffic count.

Cavener: Yeah. I -- I guess probably the latter. I guess that's -- that was my take away from your opening statement was that it's -- it's already safe and that your -- your project would not generate enough traffic to -- to meet the staff's level of concern about safety.

Leonard: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Cavener, I would -- I would also note that there has been no -- that there was no concern about the -- the function of -- of Rolling Hill Drive from either the -- the Meridian Fire Department or from the Ada County Highway District staff. I -- I -- I -- I don't -- I don't consider myself an -- an expert in that area and I'm certainly not willing to -- to myself overrule staff. I'm merely arguing that those factors play into the fact that -- that Rolling Hill, with its existing traffic -- traffic count of 50, can handle the -- the additional traffic from the proposed project.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, maybe one last question. No concern, then, about kind of the -- the queuing challenge on a -- on a right-in, right-out there at Rolling Hills? You don't -- you don't anticipate on Overland that that's going to cause challenges and -- and traffic safety issues?

Leonard: I -- Mr. Mayor, Council Member Cavener, I -- I think there could be challenges there and -- and I think that -- that it's -- that it's up to the -- the developer to -- to produce some solutions to those challenges. For example -- well -- well, as a -- as an

initial matter it's not going to be right-in, right-out to my understanding until Overland is -- is -- is widened. Our -- we -- we firmly believe based on the -- the activity and -- and comments of -- of neighbors and -- and properties that are on -- currently on the market now and brokers for those properties, that this property will break a log jam and cause dominoes to fall in that area that will result in the -- the creation of -- and the construction of that collector across the -- the property that's just north of this -- of this property. There really has been a bit of a log jam for properties that aren't directly on -- on Overland Road there. So, we -- we believe that that's going to solve that -- that queuing problem when that right-in, right-out occurs. In the meantime if we needed to -- to help absorb some of the queuing on the -- on the parcel itself we -- we are -- we are welcome to -- or we are -- we are -- we are absolutely willing to do that.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Cavener: I think we could probably clear this up pretty quick. So, I always have -- I have a question for staff. I have always viewed an application as not only a staff report, but also all of the attachments in laserfiche. So, could our city staff clear up -- was the ACHD report available to the Planning and Zoning Commission?

Napoli: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, so that's correct. You know, in our staff report we typically do not include the full 20, 30 page from each agency. However, it is in the public file and we do provide a link to the public file with directions on how to get there in the staff report, so people can access the full document and that is correct, it was in the public file at the time that the P&Z Commission heard this application, so that is correct.

Strader: Thanks.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Yeah. Bit of a question for staff. Two questions. At the end of -- at the northern end of Rolling Hills where it intersects with Flatiron Lane -- I know it is blocked off. Is the future traffic flow anticipated that that will open up at some point or is it always meant to be sort of gated off? And, then, just a second question on access. As far as a stoplight, is the -- the -- the plan at some point, if it were to develop, to put a stoplight at Movado and can you just clarify those two questions?

Napoli: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, Council, Councilman Taylor, that is correct. So, there is a planned stoplight in the future at Movado at that intersection, because it would align with the south side, you know, to access -- so, there would be access for people on the south side of Overland, as well as on the north side. That's really the intention there, as well as I believe that is the half mile section between Clover -- Cloverdale and Eagle

Road. For your first question regarding the gated access or the -- the bollard and access at the top of Rolling Hill and Flatiron, so the City Council actually -- that was a requirement with -- I believe that multi-family project to the north that Councilman Cavener was discussing and it was something that City Council actually wanted to see at that time and would be reevaluated as development did occur in this area on when that could potentially be opened up. You know, ultimately it -- the DA that Bill just showed me, the language in it says as determined by the city and ACHD and, obviously, City Council's purview, if that is something they wanted to see open, those are conversations we can definitely have. I know that there are some discussions on, you know, future actually using Rolling Hill Drive in the future when Overland's wide and maybe even vacating that right of way and having a road that actually goes along the canal instead of Rolling Hill. They get up into that area. You know, nothing's set in concrete. Those are all very preliminary conversations. But definitely some things that are being explored. But, yes, you are correct that that -- that access at Flatiron and Rolling Hill right now is bollarded, it is emergency access only and, you know, it's -- the city and ACHD purview on when that would open and that would include, you know, feedback from the City Council. That's correct.

Parsons: Mayor, Members of the Council, if I could just chime in a little bit on that topic about getting off that roadway. One was because of the amount of traffic that would be generated with that mixed-use development, but part two of it was safety concerns. That is a -- a rural road section. There is no curb, gutter, sidewalk along that roadway and that was some of the discussion you had on that project back in 2022. So, there are no streetlights, no curb, gutter, sidewalks. So, the Council was mindful of that and they were supportive of that being gated off, understanding that all of those trips -- the city and ACHD understanding that all of the trips would go and use Silverstone and use that light and that's why this project is all about timing. Is it the right time, because as we discussed in all the other projects that have come before you on this roadway, Overland is getting busier. It's not going to get less busy. So, having those signalized intersections are going to be critical and having those collector roadways are going to be critical and that's why we were hoping this developer and all the adjacent developments occurring in the area could work together on a comprehensive plan and figure out how we can get that road sooner rather than later. Unfortunately, we couldn't make that happen and so looking at the -- the past record and what you did on this application, understanding there are impacts and that road is critical, staff felt it appropriate and Planning and Zoning Commission felt it appropriate that we just have to wait it out. It's not the right time to annex the property and, therefore, you had the recommendation from staff and the Planning and Zoning Commission on this particular application.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Hey, Josh, just to -- just to -- my take versus your take on the width of Overland Road. Currently I think we have in excess of 6,000 multi-family units

approved to be built within our city. Some of those multi-family projects are spread throughout the entire city. They have sat there for years some of them with not a unit going up, while those roadway projects are going to continue to expand as the roadway needs to be expanded. So, I can't help -- and I think everybody on Council can't help but look at a project like this from the standpoint that I have to look at this as Overland being seven lanes, because I know that's going to happen and it may happen before your units go in, because you got to compete with 6,000 more units in this city that are already approved to be built and right now I -- I know I have the director sitting in the back. He can tell you that the last 12 months has been virtually flat on developments of multi-family. So, I would like to know what the secret sauce is that you have that it's going to tell us that you are going to get this approved and yours will go up and yours will be built, compared to a lot of other great projects we have seen and great projects we have approved, because there is just some that we have approved -- I'm just -- I can't believe that they are not breaking ground. It has more to do with -- and good locations. We have good roadways. A lot of it has to do with economic issues that we sitting up here have no idea what are going to happen, we don't know what they are going to go, we don't know where interest rates are going to be. I don't have to try to -- to tell you that, but I -- I have got to ask you how you are going to be better off than all these other projects that are already approved that want to be built and how you can look at this from our standpoint, which is that Overland's seven lanes, because we have to deal with that. And I know we have ACHD on the line and I want to make sure we prep him that we are going to ask him questions, because I would sure like to know what the plan is for Movado and if they are in compliance with the thoughts that we are hearing about how that would come to be in that parcel and line up and have that signal, because eventually, you are right, this whole area is going to develop. We just want to make sure it develops in a safe manner, because right now a seven road, if it's right-out, that's going to kind of hurt all of the commercial aspects of what you are developing. Anybody that's coming east turning left into that project it's going to be very very tough and everybody coming out having to go west is going to be very very tough and I just want to make sure we are clear. I don't ever want there to be surprises. I drive that road a lot and on school days, afternoons, it gets backed up clear past Rolling Hills. So, traffic's an issue now without these other ones being built. So, tell me your future thoughts how this is going to work? How -- how is this secret sauce you have got going to be that this is going to be the one that's going to sell, it's going to build and that road is going to handle 2,000 vehicles a day.

Leonard: Mr. Mayor and Council Member Overton, I'm not going to share the secret sauce. With that said I can appreciate that you need to view Overland as a -- as a seven lane road, because that is going to happen as you mentioned and there will be right-in, right-out. As I -- not just the -- the project that -- that we are talking about here today, but that interior city en -- or county enclave that's up through there -- not the -- not the properties that are right on Overland, but the ones that are north of the subject property, one of the reasons why that -- and one of the reasons why that was gated at the north end up at -- up at Flatiron was because there was a significant complaint by -- by members of the public that live on that -- that road through there they didn't want that traffic coming down their road. Understandably. And -- and I get it. Those properties,

though, are transitioning out and are in the process of -- of being listed for sale. There -- there is at least -- I know of at least a couple of properties in there that have -- that have been on the market now for a while waiting to see what happens with this application. Developers like certainty. Developers like the ability to come in and point at a circumstance and say we know what's going to happen here. Without the approval of this application developers don't know what to do in this particular part of the city and the likelihood that another one takes a jump and a run at a -- an approval like this is probably pretty unlikely in the near future, because of exactly what -- what you -- what you mentioned, pending construction of -- of additional multi-family and some even in this area.

Overton: Mr. Mayor, follow up.

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Josh, I appreciate that. You know, one of the things I -- I deal with a development daily that has one of the restrictions that this one's got, which is you have no access to the north because of something called Interstate I-84 I mean it's an absolute -- you don't go any further. You have got to go east, you have got to go west or you have got to come out to Overland Road, which means for me that infrastructure -- that roadway system, that collector street, is a critical piece of seeing these properties develop and I think we are going to wait and see if we can hear anything from ACHD this evening as well on what that plan is. If what they are saying jives with what you are saying, because that's the most critical piece that's hanging me up right now is making sure that we don't build something that is just another one of those situations where I'm going to have traffic hazards just due to the fact of I have got so much traffic backed up, even though the roadway Rolling Hills can handle it, they can't get out on Overland Road. So, those are my concerns as we go through this and we will ask other questions. Now, I know that it was mentioned about curb, gutter and sidewalk and I appreciate that. Remember what my background is. Same with someone else in the audience. You forgot to mention the most important aspect. It's curb, gutter, sidewalk and streetlights and that's what's missing from those old county roads, those rural roads, and that's one of the reasons that was gated. So, when we do see that developed -- I mean that's some of the most important safety aspects we have to see on these roads. I love the curb and gutters, but the streetlights are what really keep it safe for everybody on those roadways.

Leonard: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Overton, I omitted -- I accidentally omitted saying streetlights. I can promise streetlights will be included in those improvements.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Maybe a question for staff and I'm just -- I'm trying to look at the city and county maps and layouts and just confirm for me if you would -- everything north and

east of the Ridenbaugh Canal on this map and the yellow portion have -- are city of Boise; is that correct?

Napoli: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Whitlock, so, yes, starting -- I will put my cursor -- starting to the yellow, that is the first -- this is -- this is the boundary of Meridian city limits is the -- the east side of Corey Barton's property and, then, it runs along the Ridenbaugh all the way to 84. So -- and here I can actually share a more zoomed out picture for you guys.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor, while he is doing that, just to clarify -- so that CBH property that -- that strip has been annexed and is part of city limits?

Napoli: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Whitlock, no, that is not. It is still in Ada county.

Whitlock: Ada county.

Napoli: That is correct. But it is in Meridian's area of impact. So, this blue dashed line is Meridian's area of impact. Let's go a couple more. There you go. This will show you. So, this is our area of impact. So, the city of Boise, City of Meridian.

Whitlock: Thank you, Nick. I -- I guess my -- my question was ultimately is that CBH property up for grabs or is it in our area of impact since it's contiguous to the Boise city limits or what they have already annexed?

Napoli: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Whitlock, that's correct. It is in our area of impact. And I did want to give -- circle back while we are on that topic to Councilman Taylor's question about that city of Boise project. I'm trying to navigate city of Boise's website. From what I'm seeing on their maps and their development trackers and what's been approved, I don't see an active application on that property. I will continue to look to make sure and see if I can dig it up, but as of right now I do not see one that's been approved or is active currently on that property, but I will continue to look.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for the applicant? Okay. Thank you very much. Mr. Clerk, I'm going to let you take over and --

Johnson: Okay. Yeah. First, Mr. Mayor, Kathryn Mason. He is getting your slides up now.

Mason: Thank you.

Johnson: And you will be recognized for three minutes.

Simison: State your name and address for the record and you will be recognized for three minutes.

Mason: My name is Kathryn Mason. My address is 1560 Rolling Hill Drive. Are you ready? Okay. Good evening. I have owned 1560 Rolling Hill Drive since 2017. I'm speaking only as -- not only as a property owner, but as someone born and raised here who deeply cares about the community. The immediate area around my property has declined. Homes are no longer being maintained the way they once were. At a recent neighborhood meeting regarding this development one homeowner said his house now, quote, looks like ass cheeks. It was a blunt comment. But it reflected something real. There is frustration and there is visible deterioration. What was once a neighborhood people took pride in has now become an eyesore. At the same time commercial development has grown up around us. My property now sits next to commercial buildings with more already approved nearby. The character of this area has changed and our neighborhood is increasingly surrounded by uses that no longer match its original intent. This has been a long process for us. Over five years. Brett Slagle and his team have worked to meet every city requirement, adjusting plans, collaborating and even acquiring additional property to resolve that ongoing issue. The homeowners involved have remained committed throughout reflecting a shared belief in this project and its potential. This proposal is the result of persistence and a good faith effort on all parts. I truly believe this property is an opportunity to bring life back into a declining pocket of our community and it's not just about development, it's about revitalization and thoughtful growth and I wanted to go over some slides -- can I push on these? I don't know. Okay. I took these back in 2017. After I purchased the home. This is my house that actually sits on -- it's on my property. It sits on the corner of Overland and Rolling Hill. As you can see. And I am not at this point going to be making any improvements to my home, given the -- you know, existence of the area. Next these are pictures that I took of many homes in -- in the area that are run down or poorly maintained even back then. I have pop-up businesses that were around my house. I had a gunsmith business, a sprinkler shop, a motocross adjacent to me and, then, of course, there is that property that we talked about to the east. Then we have dilapidated homes alongside polished commercial properties as you can see. Fast forward to the spring of 2026. That's nine years later. Again there is my house -- or my -- well, my property that I'm really not making any improvements to and not planning to. We have more construction now happening. This is the -- this is the sprinkler shop. Now it's a roofing company and it's -- now has adjacent, you know, commercial businesses next to it. Oh, I have one more slide. Is that okay?

Simison: Yep.

Mason: Okay. Great. And, then, this -- I just wanted to make my point on this one was as you can see there are now limited investments, aging infrastructure and an abundance of people trying to sell their homes in the area. I counted ten that were for sale within the two streets just yesterday. So, thank you for your time.

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

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, next we have Ian Mason.

I.Mason: Hi. Ian Mason. 1516 Rolling Hill. Don't worry, I get it all the time. So, as has been presented it's been a long process and first I want to say thank you for -- I have been to several of these with you guys here and the attention you guys give to this is actually really -- honestly impressive to see. So, thanks for the service and -- and providing this. I'm a willing seller trying to sell in this market. Have been and this particular contract for a number of years now, coming to these meetings and seeing what's wrong, what gets fixed, what's wrong, what gets fixed, kind of back and forth process, and Brett and his team have always had open door policy from my standpoint. Honest negotiation on what they are trying to do, what they are trying to bring in the project. I live in the area. I'm happy. I -- I want to see something useful in the area and so the project kind of feels right as far as mixed-use and having some retail available there on the right side instead of always having to go to the left side of Overland heading towards Eagle. The -- the in-fill I think is -- well, you guys know better than me -- is more important than putting more approved properties getting built farther down, two lane roads that aren't approved either. This is -- yes, Overland's busy, but people commuting have ten minutes to commute to get out of there to reach Eagle, go the other way on Overland or reach the freeway to commute elsewhere. I commute that almost daily myself, depending on how Franklin is looking. So, I -- I feel that it's -- it's, obviously, ripe and it's a difficult situation. I didn't know there is that number of other developments approved in the area. I have just seen for sale signs. I'm hopeful that some resolution comes that lets me exit the property. But, anyway, thank you for your time.

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

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, next is Alicia Eastman.

Eastman: My name's Alicia Eastman. I live at 1485 Rolling Hill directly across from where this project is proposed to be. I just have a few issues. It seems like the main thing here is the access in and out. We all know it's landlocked. You can't go north or east or west. You just have to go south onto Overland and even one Council Member before said we are not going to widen the road our way out of this. Since we are having such a problem with this Movado thing, what -- what -- why can't we just put a signal at the end of Rolling Hill? That seems like logical to me that that would fix it -- or fix part of that. But also I know that, yes, we don't have curbs and gutters and lights and the -- this City Council maybe five years ago decided and said that we were not going to do any street developments until all the homes were gone on Rolling Hill and it happened after -- as a result of that Rackham project at the end where the -- where BVA did all that and we got the road to -- to Flatiron. There is -- there is no access, just emergency access because of that reason, and part of the -- the issue was doing modifications to the road would knock out wells and another drain field for somebody. So, the City Council said, well, let's wait until all the homes are gone. Many residents are just waiting for somebody to, you know, make them an offer. So, that right-in, right-out access, that's just a horrible idea, because if you go -- you turn right you just end up going to Eagle Road and so it seems to me like a signal would solve all that. This developer has done everything they can, worked with the residents -- I mean they have really worked with

them and I feel really bad for the neighbors that they can't move. It's been, you know, over four years that they keep working with this and although I'd like to see this go through, it's still the same concerns that everybody has expressed here, you know. So, my idea is can we just go with the signal? My -- my property currently is -- and the neighbor next to me -- south of me is under contract. So, even if you -- right there you would make the road developments from this developer here. From the canal to Overland you would be able to make the road developments, because it looks like they are going to do a new project with my property and the property behind mine, too. So, that kind of would fix it right at the end of the street there. Thank you.

Simison: Ms. Eastman. Ms. Eastman. Alicia. Just to get clarification, because our notes show that you testified against this at Planning and Zoning. Are you actually against the project or you just think that there needs to be a light for the project to move forward?

Eastman: I'm really not against the project itself, because the developer has really worked with the neighborhood. It's the access and that we are landlocked in there. So, it's -- it's the access in and out. So, if the -- if you put a -- it's -- to me it's just the -- the answer. If you put a signal at the end of Rolling Hill you could do the street developments, lights, curbs, gutters, everything from the canal, which is really not a canal, it's a ditch there, to Overland and that would kind of really facilitate the traffic and everything through there. You know, you could widen the road there. It would accommodate the traffic coming out of this project and there would be a signal there and people wouldn't have to be turning right or there wouldn't be the accidents or the even though -- I -- I called and I got ACHD to put a sign that says keep clear, you know, like -- and to put the lines in the street. Okay? But still if -- if -- if there is nobody there and you want to turn left, oh, sometimes there is another car sitting there to -- in that center turn lane that you don't see because of the traffic, so that's kind of a hazard. It's dangerous.

Simison: Okay. Thank you.

Eastman: Thank you very much.

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Alicia, so the problem with the whole process -- because no process is perfect -- is we work with land use.

Eastman: Uh-huh.

Overton: I can't tell you how many times we have looked at a project and we have sat up here and said I wish we could get a traffic signal there.

Eastman: Uh-huh.

Overton: That's when we are reminded that we are not the Ada County Highway District, because they are the ones that decide the roadways and the high -- and where the traffic signals go and they are the ones who have said the signal would go at Movado. So, we don't have any -- we -- we can't change their mind and say we want to put it at Rolling Hills.

Eastman: Although I did talk to Kent Goldthorpe and he said that that's what the plan was and I said can they possibly ever take that Corey Barton land eminent domain and he said, no, can't do that. He says but if the -- if you were forced to, you know, you could -- he -- he led me to believe that it's possible to have a signal there. Now, I don't know what magic land I was thinking in that I understood that, okay, because, you know, at my age maybe I don't have all my brain cells in the right place, all right? But that's what I understood him, that it's -- that it's not completely like no way that can that happen.

Overton: Mr. Mayor, quick follow up. Alicia, I will make sure we have ACHD on the line that we ask him your question tonight.

Eastman: Okay.

Overton: Thank you.

Eastman: Thank you very much. And I will call Kent again.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, next we have Kim Boyak.

Boyak: Good evening and thank you for giving us time to share our point of view with you. My name is Kimberly Boyak. You can call me Kim. And I live at 4270 East Overland Road. So, when you are stopped on Overland Road, because the traffic is backed up, we are the property that's right beside the Corey Barton piece of property that we have talked about. We have about two and a half acres in there. We have lived there for 40 years. Raised our two kids there. Some of you might have seen our horses there. We have -- we have always had horses or some kind of livestock there. It's our little farm. But it's like has already been pointed out, the whole area is changing. It is not the same as it was. As a matter of fact, one of the things that I have learned through the last five years or so is that I lived in the town of Star growing up and my folks had 33 acres and that they sold their land to developers and I know that just because something is proposed doesn't always mean that's what's going to happen, because, you know, theirs was all laid out for a subdivision and now it has a -- you know, a church on it and extended to the cemetery and, you know, it's just -- it's not the what they actually proposed. So, I know things can change and we had tried to sell our property a couple of times, but both of the buyers at that time were turned down from the City Council for the projects that they had proposed. So, we had kind of given up hope when this energetic developer from the back row here, Brett, came and knocked on our door and that was in November of 2021. Made us an offer and we -- you know, by the time we, you know, went back and forth and negotiated things, we came to an

agreement with an offer that I actually don't think that I could get in today's market, because it started four and a half years ago. What's going to happen to us if this project isn't approved is that we are going to be at the mercy of Corey Barton, because he is the one that holds the cards on this -- this access road. This stoplight. And my big concern is is that if this project is not approved that it's going to stall even longer. I would not be surprised if it just sits there for quite some time, because we don't have this outside development coming in to help kind of break things loose. So, what I would really like to do is ask for your support on this project, because I -- oops. Sorry. I really don't see us getting -- this project moving with that -- I guess you would say kind of the cog in the road with that stoplight there and so I just -- I'm -- I'm asking for you to really think about -- kind of ignore the stoplight aspect of it in that there has been a lot of other development around there that didn't have to take responsibility for it and I'm really hoping that you don't make that become our responsibility when it's not even on our property. So, thank you very much for your time.

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

Johnson: And, Mr. Mayor, I have Rick Boyak.

R.Boyak: Hello and thank you. My name is Rick Boyak. I live at 4270 East Overland Road. A lot of stuff -- a lot of information that you guys were asking about and stuff and as far as -- so, BVA built up there the north end of our -- our subdivision and I know that when they were doing that you guys were concerned about the access of getting all the people out of there and I know at one time they were talking about bringing a road down by the canal and dropping it down to the back part of my property and out on Corey Barton's property and -- because they came and talked to me about buying that -- if you look at the map I own that -- it would be the furthest east piece of the property there by Corey Barton and they came to talk about that corner part and I know there was a couple of you guys that were concerned about the -- getting rid of that traffic and stuff from up there and so you leaned on the ACHD saying that Silverstone Way was adequate enough and Rackham Road was enough and so I know a couple of you had some doubts about that, but you went with ACHD's recommendations and that road went away. Now, I don't know if it was because Corey at that time didn't want to participate in adding that up to Movado Way, that same problem that we are having now -- I don't know. But my thought is is all that land up through there, if the rest of the subdivision is all up, people are wanting to buy it up and stuff, but they don't know what to do, they can't because of the road situation. Rolling Hill was blocked off mainly because of all the gravel trucks going up to that project up there. People were concerned about all the gravel trucks running up and down that. That is the main reason why that road is shut off. So, at this point, if we get this -- this development going and stuff, I don't understand why we can't open up Rolling Hill up to Flatiron and access people out around that way until Corey Barton comes to the table and allows that other access road to be built up through there. So, that's my thought. I have been there for 40 years. Things have changed. I don't want to wait another 20 years until Corey decides what he is going to do. So, I would ask that you guys approve this project. I mean the state of Idaho is no more a secret. People are moving in. They

need a place to live. These guys are offering places to put people. Welcome to Meridian and enjoy it. Let's do it. That's all I got. Any questions?

Simison: Council, questions?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman -- you know who you are.

Taylor: Taylor.

Simison: Taylor. Thank you.

Taylor: You are getting sick. Go to bed soon enough. So, your comments are tracking with some of the things I was thinking, which would be -- you know, the biggest problem here is just -- there is only one access out onto Overland. But, you know, we could open up, you know, Rolling Hill Drive to the north. I guess my question would be from your experience -- lived experience on the road, if that were to open up would it be easier, would it make sense for you and your -- let's assume that the project's not even moving along just in your -- you know, today reality, would it be easier for you to go up to Flatiron and around to Silverstone or would you still be trying to go out Overland? Does it depend on the time of day or -- well, I'm -- I'm saying if we were to open it up.

R.Boyak: Oh. Yeah.

Taylor: I mean would you -- would you or your neighbors actually start using that northern -- so, that you are not trying to do a left turn on Overland at busy times, things like that? I'm just kind of curious what your --

R.Boyak: If I had access to Rolling Hills, yes, but my property faces -- it's on Overland Road, so I only have that access out. I have no choice. But, yes, I would probably go up around and use the stoplight at Silverstone. Make it a lot easier getting in and out. Absolutely.

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: This is not a question, but just a request for people if -- if there is additional testimony. I am curious to hear people's feedback about opening up the closure of Rolling Hills and whether people would support that, because it -- from what I recall when we originally closed it, that was -- as a condition, because of the development to the north, there were significant safety concerns and I think they were legitimate by people in the neighborhood. I'm -- I'm concerned there may be people that are not here that really would have a vested interest in it and hearing from them, but, you know, that is a potential solution at some point if there is enough of this redeveloping maybe that can get opened up and, then, that's kind of the answer for people to get to Silverstone.

So, just a request if -- you know, if people come up if they could address that I would probably ask that question. Thanks.

Simison: Thank you. Any additional comments, questions? Thank you.

R.Boyak: Can I kind of address what she was saying. So, the people that are north of Five Mile Creek there, most of those people have either sold or their kids are no longer the little age. There is like two families there now and that was their big concern about the gravel trucks running up and down the road and that was the big push of why that got closed.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: As -- as a person who was a decision maker at the time I recall safety concerns beyond just gravel trucks. I get what you are saying, but there is a complete lack of sidewalks, a complete lack of lighting -- I mean all of those aspects -- I really wish -- actually, that would be an interesting thing to find out if there was a way to know is there a critical mass of these properties that have been listed on the market. Maybe if planning staff was able to refresh our memory about how many different parcels there are between here and the kind of northern boundary where BVA's property is. I -- I feel like there is a -- a research project to be had here that might provide helpful context. If -- if what you are saying is true -- if it's true that like the vast majority of the neighborhood is selling at this point, we could really say, okay, this area is really finally in transition. Maybe we -- we can pick a direction and kind of move on that. But at the time we made that decision it was certainly a safety concern is what I recall very strongly. Thank you for your help.

R.Boyak: You are welcome.

Simison: I think there is seven or eight properties north of this parcel.

R.Boyak: I believe there is seven. Two of them -- one's for sale, one already sold. Well, actually -- and, then, on the other side there is one for sale, so -- and the one is -- another one is in negotiations.

Simison: Okay. Thank you.

R.Boyak: You are welcome.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, two online. First Michael Blowers. And, Michael, you can unmute yourself.

Blowers: Hi. My name is Michael Blowers. I'm at 1325 Rolling Hill Drive. Just to kind of address what we were just talking about, yes, it does concern us much more than just

the gravel trucks. There is a transition area now between the apartments and what would be going in. So, there is constantly people walking up and down the street, people that aren't in the neighborhood and there is -- like you said, no curb, gutter or whatever. But beyond that one of the questions I wanted to ask -- my understanding is that this wasn't necessarily just because we complained about it. My understanding is that a local road, once it exceeds a certain ADT, has to become a commercial or some -- some sort of road and opening that up would exceed that amount, which would, then, require curb, gutter, sidewalks, lighting, which would require the removal of the homes. That -- that was my understanding. Not that we just complained about it and kind of -- to -- to echo overall this whole project, like we want them to be successful in it. I don't make the rules and kind of like how the -- the last meeting for the previous project last month, good luck to any business that attempts to open here, because it's going to be chaos and I don't know why you would want to open up a business here without that, because as someone who actually lives on Rolling Hill and drives it every single day, I don't see how you can have that much traffic coming in and out of there without some sort of solution to this problem.

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

Johnson: And, Mr. Mayor, David Ellis did have his hand up, but it's not now. So, I'm not sure if he wants to speak. But you are able to unmute. Mr. Ellis, you should be able to speak now. There is David Ellis online with hand raised able to unmute and I'm just waiting on him to speak. It looks like he may be having some microphone issues. Just brought him as a panelist to see if that would help.

Simison: Did we have anybody signed up --

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we do not.

Simison: Are there others that want to testify? Okay. Why -- why don't we do this. why don't we take about a five minute break right here. Council has been going since 4:30 and we will try to see if we can get Mr. Ellis figured out and, then, we will continue right after that. So, we are going to recess and it may be seven or eight, minutes, so -- okay.

(Recess.)

Simison: All right. We will go ahead and come back from our break and we have Mr. Ellis ready to go?

Johnson: Yep. Mr. Ellis, you should be able to unmute.

Ellis: Yes. Mayor, Council, how are you guys tonight? My name is David Ellis. We own 1395 Rolling Hill and we also own 1300 Rolling Hill. To point out a couple things that have been addressed tonight, I definitely agree with Mike on opening up Rolling Hill. I'm totally fine with Rolling Hill opening up, as long as all the houses are removed off of Rolling Hill prior to that happening. I do want you guys to know we have been

approached by a developer and nine out of the ten existing homes north of Five Mile Creek have all kind of committed and said, yes, we are going to move forward with this once this developer gets going on it. According to him he actually is sitting down with staff or with the City of Meridian tomorrow, which they have an appointment to -- to basically get the ball rolling on that end of things. So, with that being said, I know that that is -- their future plan is to go to Flatiron and have all the traffic go out that way. So, I guess if both of these developers kind of work hand in hand, then, at that point in time it should solve a good portion of the traffic issues. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions? All right. If there are others that had raised their hand if you just want to come on up.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, there is someone online as well. Do you want to get them first?

Simison: Okay.

Johnson: Bethany Irwin, you should be able to unmute. Bethany, you are able to unmute if you want to speak now.

Irwin: I'm sorry. Can you hear me now?

Simison: Yes, we can.

Irwin: Okay. My name is Bethany Irwin and I live at 4240 East Overland Road. I have lived there since 2015 and I have been an Idaho resident for almost 50 years. I am also one of the five homeowners in this development. First of all, I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak to you tonight. If any of you have driven down Overland in the last several years you would have noticed and most likely may have been a part of many of the changes. I remember when it was just a brick house across the street and acres of farmland. Now it is apartments and Movado Subdivision. I will say when this developer approached my family we were one of the holdouts in the beginning. Sometimes it's hard to watch bare land go up into apartments, commercial development and other residential units, but that is what has happened in our area and across our valley. I will say that watching the first round of development being turned down, we didn't understand the commitment this company would bring to this community. I call it a community, because they have bent over backwards to accommodate and comply with every form of objections they have received. I know that they have named a few, but what got my husband and I on board was the residential community they will bring to this area. I don't know about you, but I love to see people outdoors and enjoying our beautiful city and state. With the -- this proposed development it will bring dog parks, walking paths, fire pits, playgrounds, pickleball courts, not to mention a clubhouse for people to gather. This allows this development to be a community, not just a dwelling of buildings and that's what sold us on becoming a part of the bigger picture. When we took -- when we look at Overland and Eagle Road, there is a bigger picture and it is coming. Whether most of us like it or not, traffic will always be a problem, but the people that I have talked to that have moved here say there is no traffic here at all.

That's -- that I think was a little sarcasm; right? I think most people who have lived here most of their life like me want to keep Idaho a secret, but for the last 25 plus years the secret is out. Once again I just ran across an article that Idaho has been listed as one of the top ten best places to live. I do believe not only as a homeowner, but even the properties around this proposed development will benefit from this approval if approved. The developers have spent countless hours and actually years making sure everyone was heard and going out of their way to accommodate all objectives that have come their way through these meetings. I want to thank you for your consideration and hopeful approval this evening. Thanks again.

Simison: Thank you, Bethany. Council, any questions? Okay. Appreciate it. Anybody else, Mr. Clerk? Okay. Now, you all can come on up if you would like to speak and if you want to come up to the front row that way we -- whoever wants to go next can go. Angela, you are good. Come on up.

Raney: Hello. My name is Angela Raney. We own the property at 1480 Rolling Hill Drive. My husband Gary and I. Mr. Mayor and City Council, thank you for your time and your energy in this. I really appreciate it. So, we moved away. We used to call -- we lived at that residence. We called it the goat ranch, because we had goats and it was our special little place. We would go out in the back, never see anybody. It was wonderful. But we saw the development coming with Ahlquist at the end of the street, we saw it coming and so we bailed and -- but now our daughter and her husband -- kind of husband and their small child live there and it's to -- to -- to borrow everybody else's that has spoken before me, I mean our house is a hovel. I'm embarrassed. I'm embarrassed when we go over there, because we don't -- we haven't put any money or anything into it for five years, knowing that it was going to sell and that the homes all around is the same way. It's embarrassing to -- you know, to -- to think that our kids live there. But, anyway, so my whole point of reason why I want to talk tonight was we went over to our kids' house and we walked down -- we had never been down there. I had never been down to the end of the street and had actually gone into the Aren Apartments, those are the end of the street there and it was just like going into a completely different area. There were like people in the pool. There were kids running and playing and you could tell the neighbors were all like, hey, get in here, come on and it was just like, oh, my gosh, this is what I want for the goat ranch, you know. I mean we know our little -- our little special, little goat ranch is going to be torn down and to -- to think about it just being some, I don't know, awful place, but this developer -- when you say what's the special sauce, I -- he has more energy and I believe the funding and we believe in him and -- and I wouldn't want just anybody to be building there and I never thought about opening up the end, but when we were walking with our kids the other night that's a huge -- once -- once you get off of the end of Rolling Hill it's a huge wide street with curbs and gutters on both sides and people walk in with their dogs, riding bikes and very, very wide street. I was very impressed, because, you know, I have my granddaughter, I didn't want to be unsafe and I never once felt safe. So, to -- to -- to -- to even think of that's an option I think that's a game changer for me. So, anyway, thank you. Any questions?

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

Raney: Okay. Thank you so much.

G.Raney: Good evening, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. Gary Raney. We own the property of 1480 Rolling Hill Drive. I'm the less attractive half of this combination. During my -- all my years of government service I didn't deal with land use. Now, I know why. I do know about growth and that is that it is always complicated and it is always inevitable and you here in Meridian know that better than anybody. I want to focus on -- my comments on what Councilman Taylor, Councilman Overton -- both were commenting on. We know this area is going to develop. We wish -- all of us wish that that Movado intersection was in a slightly different place. We can't control that now, but some -- something that I want to share with you -- so, from a very prominent developer with a very prominent development very close to this development, he and I were having a conversation, because he tried to partner with Corey Barton. He tried to buy the land from Corey Barton and it was absolutely a non-starter and what Corey Barton told him was that I have a ten to 20 year plan. Now, if Corey Barton has a ten to 20 year plan it's not going to go east, not where that yellow spot was in that; right? The only way it's going to go is west and north and what bothers me about this whole thing is whether or not our property sells or not, I don't want Corey Barton to have a stranglehold, that he should not have a stranglehold over these properties, because if this gets denied, the logical -- the probability is that nothing will be able to be developed unless it's developed by him. So, you have heard the testimony tonight about the condition of the properties and people are struggling. The people next to us, the garage caught fire, rather than fix it there is a piece of plywood on it. I don't think we have a -- I don't think our place is a hovel, but it -- it's a tough neighborhood. I don't want Corey Barton to own all of us and I hope you agree with that. I would stand for any questions.

Simison: Council, any questions? Thank you. Good evening.

Waddles: Hi, there. My name is Amy Waddles. I live at 1360 Rolling Hill Drive. I have attended numerous meetings probably the last eight years and I do want to address the point about why Rolling Hill was closed at that point. Rolling Hill was closed because of safety. People coming out of Top Golf, coming down Rolling Hill Drive, the possibility of drinking, driving, no lights, on and on. One of the things that's changed in this conversation is now we have the concert hall going in right there at the end of where Rolling -- Rolling Hill meets Flatiron. So, any discussion about possibly opening up Rolling Hill while homes are still there is dangerous. Twenty-five hundred people capacity. Parking is already overcrowded there. People are going to be drinking and the quickest route out is right down Rolling Hill Drive. My understanding is that ACHD report said Rolling Hill would remain closed until the homes were gone. Regardless of what latitude you all have, I encourage you not to even consider that. There is children on these streets. There is families on these streets and regardless of what some neighbors think about the quality of the homes, we all agree, but they are our homes and not all of us want to leave. We are being forced to leave because of these developments. My concern is -- Assemble has been wonderful. They have been great

to work with. My concern is whatever issue comes from that development is that going to further delay our development. Are we going to have to deal with those consequences? We had to deal with the consequences from the north and is that going to stall our developments? I don't have those answers. You all are the experts here, but those are definitely some issues and concerns that we have. That's it.

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

Waddles: Okay. Thanks.

Simison: Is there anybody else that would like to provide testimony on this item this evening? If you are online you can use raise your hand or -- and come forward. Council, would you like to speak to ACHD before we ask the applicant to close?

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: See if we can raise Matt from ACHD online.

Pak: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Overton, yep, this is Matt Pak with ACHD, 5800 North Meeker Avenue. Happy to stand for any questions.

Overton: All right. Matt, we can barely hear you here, but I will go ahead and fire off the first two questions. You have -- you have been listening to this testimony this evening and probably my biggest concern all evening has been what does the future look like with the intersection of Movado and maybe also you can address whether there can or can't be a signal at Rolling Hill and Overland.

Pak: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Overton, I raised my mic a little bit. Hopefully that helps on your end. Yeah. So, to comment on the signalized intersection on Overland Road. We would need it to be a collector street intersection, which, of course, Movado is built out as and shown in our classification layer as a collector. Additionally, the MSM, the master street map, shows the future collector to be built in alignment with Movado and that's consistent with ACHD's planning practices and discussion with the city. With that being said, that is the -- the ultimate location of a signal on Overland. It's not necessarily a discussion to -- to signalize the Rolling Hill intersection given the south side there. The driveway is a private driveway, serves no public connection to the south and, really, with the -- the entire existing conditions to the south with Movado being the collector there that provides the ultimate public connection and where we want to see that -- that signal.

Overton: Thank you, Matt.

Simison: Are there other questions for ACHD at this time?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Couple of questions. What would ACHD recommend for a neighborhood in transition like this? So, the end of Rolling Hills Drive is currently closed. It could be opened I think with the joint action or recommendation of the City Council and ACHD, but we have kind of this interim period where we have people still living in these homes and it's certainly a huge safety concern. What would you recommend in terms of how to address a neighborhood in transition like this in terms of best practices? Is there a way to do this in a safer way? Is there a way to, you know, get some pedestrian improvements going. I -- I just -- general feedback and curiosity on my end of how -- how can we do this in the best way possible?

Pak: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Strader, ACHD would love to -- to provide some opinion. However, I can really only necessarily speak to the facts that we have available and our standard practices. The -- the best way to -- to go about it would be through a development. That's the process in which these in-fill projects occur. That's how these local roadways -- collector roadways get built and improved. Our master street map, which is the planning document, it's showing that collector roadway there and the only way to achieve that collector roadway being built out is through a development, which would, of course, require the -- the CBH parcel or the parcel adjacent to the site to the east to be developed. The intent of a collector roadway is to -- to -- to -- to transfer vehicle -- vehicular traffic from local roadways to arterials and so that really the -- the best way, based off the MSM -- what's planned in the MSM is to -- to allow development to -- to construct that roadway and carry that traffic to Overland Road. Yeah, that's what I can provide based on -- on how to alleviate any -- any concerns here.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Matt, can you tell me what is the -- sort of the future plan for Rolling Hill Drive? How do you anticipate -- is it going to be considered a collector? Is it a -- what -- really just give me a better sense of what ACHD views for that road in the next -- you know, whatever the next phase of -- of that being developed or built out. I just want to get a sense from that. Understanding Movado is the designated collector with the -- a stoplight, but I want to know what you think -- or what the plan is for Rolling Hill Drive.

Pak: Rolling Hill -- excuse me, Mr. Mayor, Council Member Taylor. Rolling Hill Drive is classified as a local street. It is not shown in our MSM to be built as a -- as a future collector roadway. So, there isn't necessarily a plan for Rolling Hill. Any improvements, changes, vacations of Rolling Hill Drive would all need to be accomplished through the development process, which, of course, is proposed by the development community. So, yeah, ACHD does not necessarily have any plans for Rolling Hill Drive.

Simison: Seeing no further questions for Matt at this time, would the applicant like to come forward and close?

Leonard: Can you pull my presentation back up? There we go. Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the City Council. Let's see. I'm going to start -- as you have heard tonight from -- from some of the testimony existing landowners in this -- in this area who want to sell are -- are currently stuck. There -- there are -- are some that have made an agreement in principle with a developer. I think I heard nine out of ten that are north of this project. But a domino needs to fall to be able to -- to continue and -- and allow -- enable redevelopment of the interior properties in this little enclave. Really quickly before I jump into rebuttal I wanted to -- to hit a couple of last slides in the presentation. First looking at the city staff report, the analysis of specific use standards. I would note that we meet or exceed each of those standards. I -- I would also note that we are compliant across the board with the Comprehensive Plan. We provide a unified coordinated plan across multiple parcels -- six parcels actually. We -- we are contiguous with City of Meridian on two sides. This enables the continued growth of Eagle View Landing and El Dorado and -- and Silverstone and -- and other projects in the area. It significantly improves on the project that was previously proposed and its road and layouts conform with the ACHD and fire department requirements, ensuring that safe vehicular access like I discussed a little while ago. And although we -- we previously received a denial recommendation from the Planning and Zoning Commission, it -- it was -- it was actually less a denial than it was an acknowledgement that the problems that are associated with this particular area deserve recognition and decision by the city's elected officials. This developer has made herculean efforts to try to engage with the -- the private developer that's to the east of the property, but without the engagement of that neighbor to the east this -- this little project can't solve the -- the -- the connectivity and transportation areas for this -- this little enclave. We recognize fully -- I'm going to click ahead a couple of slides here. Maybe. It's not going again. We recognize that this is a tough area from a planning perspective. This developer has made, as I mentioned, numerous good faith efforts to address staff's concerns with regard to timing and with regard to -- to connectivity and with regard to transportation. This developer has offered to buy the property that's to the east. This developer has offered to collaborate on a road through that property to the -- that's to the east. This developer has even offered to commit money to a road trust with the Ada County Highway District, which was an -- an offer rejected by the highway district, understanding that that's a little bit of an accounting nightmare for -- for the highway district. Although it's certain that Overland Road will be widened, the timeline for that project is -- is uncertain. In the meantime you heard that there are those ten properties for sale on the two interior streets. There are degrading conditions. This is an area in transition. I can tell you after -- after sitting down and sitting next to the developer for a few minutes, this developer plans to move quickly to construct. You have probably heard this before. I can tell you that this -- this developer has a proven track record of this in the Treasure Valley. It's not just -- it's not just lip service. A strong record in the Treasure Valley of building projects. It doesn't behoove the -- the -- the developer to sit on -- on dirt so to speak. What we are -- what we are asking you to do is -- is to use a little bit of a crystal ball and to look forward 2.5 years, two and a half years into the

future when this project is completed. It's gone through its permitting and it's -- it's -- it's coming into fruition and it's starting to lease up. What are the conditions going to be then? Based on what we have heard tonight I think it's not just logical, but it's likely that this -- that this project will spur further development in the area and will result in the construction of that -- that collector road. We are open to solutions and I know it's not your job to solve development's problems. In this particular area, though, these are -- are unique problems. Our -- our concern is that without an approval of this project other development in this little enclave is -- is essentially stymied. The -- the linchpin, the keystone if you will, is Corey Barton's property and without him engaging in meaningful planning or the sale of the property, it's impossible to -- it's -- it's just impossible to get him to the table and it's impossible to solve that unless -- unless that occurs because of that alignment. Our intention is to continue to try to work with Corey Barton to get that -- to get that done. An approval here perhaps puts Corey Barton on his toes. Hopefully an approval brings him to the table to address solutions for connectivity in this area. And as you heard from Mr. Ellis, as -- as I mentioned a few minutes ago, nine of ten property owners north of our project are in agreement with a different project development that's meeting with the city tomorrow -- with city staff tomorrow. We have previously offered or proposed signaling Rolling Hill and we got about the same answer that you got from ACHD on that, but it doesn't make sense, because it would be a three-way intersection because of the driveway south of -- of -- of Overland. Opening up Rolling Hill at the north end certainly is acceptable to the project developer, understanding that there are safety concerns in the interim. Importantly, though, none of the testimony that you heard tonight was opposed to the project. In fact, in stark difference to some of the projects that come before the City Council, a lot of people who typically would be opposed to a project like this actually stood here at this table or -- or were online and -- and heaped praise on this developer for being willing to work with and -- and -- and address concerns and objection -- objections from neighboring landowners. We understand that this is a tough one and we understand that -- that -- that there is a little bit of a leap of faith here. We ask you to take that leap and -- and approve our application. Stand for questions.

Simison: Thank you. Council, questions?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Would you just remind me what your timing is? When do you think realistically your project would -- would deliver?

Leonard: Assuming approval tonight, passed -- passed any appeal period, we would begin starting engineering and design immediately. We still need to go and submit the design review. I think we are probably six to nine months out from horizontal improvements starting. I think that might be maybe a little bit optimistic, maybe nine to 12 months from -- from horizontal happening and, then, completion of the project anywhere from two to three years out.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: If you will indulge me I have a little bit of a thought process and I wanted to comment and maybe get input from staff and the applicant. So, we have really a chicken and egg issue. This is a neighborhood in transition. A few years ago I think this whole neighborhood -- not the whole neighborhood, but a big part of this neighborhood was united around safety concerns and wanting to maintain their quality of life. What I'm seeing now is a big change I think, but I -- I -- I kind of want to run that down and establish that. We don't have a recommendation for approval right now from city staff or Planning and Zoning. So, I wanted to check with city staff. What would be involved -- if you were to draft findings of approval what kind of time frame would be involved there?

Napoli: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, as far as findings and conditions of approval, probably -- just so the applicant and I can collaborate and make sure we are on the same page when we do come back to you -- or at least relatively on the same page, I think four to six weeks is probably realistic with that, so we have time to draft it up, send it to them, let their team review it, send it back to us and actually get it published a week before the next City Council hearing. That's -- that's probably a pretty realistic time frame.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I'm curious if city staff or the applicant potentially, but I think it would be more appropriate coming from city staff, would be open to a little bit of an outreach project or some kind of a neighborhood engagement project. I would never normally ask this, but we are not talking about a huge number of homes. It's -- it's -- it seems like a manageable amount of homeowners. I'm curious if city staff would be open to contacting the homeowners in this area to make sure that the impression we are getting tonight is representative of the neighborhood as a whole. They don't have an HOA, so there is no easy way to do that, but if it was possible for city staff -- and maybe with the other application that I don't know about, but it sounds like might be swirling -- city staff could kind of establish are there big pockets of this neighborhood that are in transition now and -- and how much of Rolling Hills does that kind of include? Because part of what I have been thinking, just to think out loud for a second, is this project is going to take two to three years, which is kind of what I thought. It's not happening in 12 months. Two to three years is a long time, relatively speaking, to give people in the neighborhood a heads up that we believe that -- if we believe the neighborhood is in transition, if we establish, yes, this whole neighborhood is in transition and -- and the status here is really changing, could we work toward the idea of trying to open Rolling Hills Drive in like three years? That -- that's kind of what I'm kind of working toward. If we -- if we -- there is a lot of facts that have to line up, but if the neighborhood as a whole were moving in the direction of selling to development, if we really felt we

established, you know what, this neighborhood is in transition and, then, there was a goal of opening Rolling Hills Drive as part of approving this application, that would make me feel comfortable that there is a solution to the roadway dilemma, because from where I'm sitting right now it's very frustrating and I understand that Corey Barton Homes is a property owner, they have their rights to engage or not engage, but it does kind of feel to me like there is one particular piece of ownership of this whole area that's kind of holding it hostage and I feel like opening up Rolling Hills is the solution that would help everybody in this neighborhood in the long term and, then, we are really talking about there is a transition period where it could be dangerous and so I just wanted to kind of understand if the whole neighborhood is really transitioning and it's like we are talking about ten homes and nine out of the ten homes confirmed to us, yes, we are talking to developers, we are actively interested in selling, then, that would give me a time frame and some guardrails around what that risk would look like, as opposed to where we sit today, which is a huge safety concern that can't be solved and it feels like we have opened up development along this corridor. I wasn't a huge fan of it without a plan, but this at least would get us toward a plan. So, I was just talking out loud, but, Mr. Mayor, if city staff has feedback about that brainstorming idea.

Parsons: Yeah. Mayor, Members of the Council, we are on the same -- same wave -- wave link I was on -- I was thinking out loud. I appreciate you kind of reaching in. Certainly I think I can confirm with the Council that we are meeting with the developer tomorrow to discuss the additional properties north of this site. In our initial meeting with them they talked about three or four properties and we are like it's going to take more than that and we also asked them to reach out to this applicant to come forth with a solution. So, although staff is happy to take on that effort, what I -- what -- what I would propose is allow staff to meet with that applicant tomorrow and, then, we will report back to you on the findings on how many properties they do have and what an approach -- an appropriate approach will be. I think what you are saying about understanding the safety concerns I think it's very valid, because if you recall it's -- it's more to it than just removing a gate. Again, this is a substandard street section and anytime you add trips to a road that's substandard there has got to be a requirement or a trigger to improve that street section to -- to accommodate the additional trips. So, although this development and the current Rolling Hill Subdivision doesn't hit that threshold, we know if we remove that gate it will hit that threshold with everyone coming out of that mixed-use development north of the site. So, we have to understand what was going to be required from ACHD as far as that component as well, because as Matt testified, they don't do anything unless there is an actual development proposed. It's -- it's a local road. So, again, if -- if that is the case it is going to take a partnership between this developer and another developer to do those improvements and make that happen. Add the sidewalks, add the streetlights, widen the roads or whatever it may take and also handle that -- the drainage for the roadway. So, there is a lot of coordination that needs to happen. So, if that's something that the Council would like us to pursue and take and -- and come back with some findings, then, I would probably recommend a continuance tonight and allow us to get some more information. I don't know if the applicant's open to that or not, but at least we can start that dialogue and get

through some of that fact finding for you and, then, let you know what that effort will take.

Simison: Yeah. I -- I saw Bill Nary reach for his, so I think when -- I would get his input.

Nary: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. I -- I think the last part of what Bill said I think had a hit on the head. I mean we -- we got a couple of different things and I'm just trying to make sure the record for this project stays pretty clean. Now, again, if we are going to get other information and the applicant's understanding that we are going to continue this to gather further information about the roadway and from the -- what I understood from the Council is -- is right now without that additional information there was less of a desire to want to move forward with this project by itself without at least understanding the interplay with the rest of the area. So, if the -- if the applicant is okay with that and a continuance -- not, again, presuming any outcome or not presuming any decision is going to be made either way and we are still gathering information, I think -- I think we are fine. I -- I was concerned how that was playing out. But I think if we do it that way with their -- with their buy in to that I think we are okay from a record standpoint, so --

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: So, I will turn to the applicant now. So, I -- I -- and I know this is a little out of order. This is a little unusual how we are approaching this, but we are trying to be creative I think, because this is a really tricky area.

Simison: Yep. Come -- come on up.

Slagle: Hi, Mayor and Council people. Thank you for your time and this -- I appreciate the deliberation. I really do. It's been --

Simison: If you would state your name for the record.

Slagle: Brett Slagle from Assemble Management. And so I -- as everyone said here I'm very solution oriented. I really -- I'm committed to all these people here. I want to figure out a way to make this work. They have effectively partnered with me and they have -- they have dealt with continuous extensions and draining e-mails from me and conversations and it's been unfortunate, you know, we have put it in an incredible amount of effort into this to date. But I don't want to just lose that effort. I just believe in this parcel -- these parcels. I believe in this area and so I -- I -- I -- I'm not -- there is people in this crowd right here that have the ability to blow up this deal for me in the next week or two and so I can't speak for them allowing me to get an extension, I -- I can say it would be fantastic to approve it tonight, but if -- if it's -- if it's either denial or a continuation, then, I will choose continuation. But I just need everybody to know that I don't have the ability -- the timeline from all these sellers that are somewhat represented

here and somewhat represented on Zoom, to say that I can come back here in four or six weeks. So, this project may not exist in four or six weeks and I would be very sad about that, but I cannot force these people to give me another extension. This was all predicated on -- today we thought was -- today was the day and -- and maybe it's not. So, I -- I'm willing to, because I'm solution oriented, but I need you all to understand that it might not be around and that would be terrible. So, I guess -- I guess that's where I sit right now. I -- for -- for whatever it's worth I will always be a solution oriented person and I am happy and -- and -- and I think these gentlemen can attest -- I mean I have spent hours in meetings and on phone calls with these gentlemen and everybody in this crowd trying to find a solution and I didn't actually know about the nine of ten properties being in LOI or whatever and I'm happy about that. That's great for all the people that continue up the street. I would love to sit down with that developer and talk about how we could work together. I have tried so hard to get Corey Barton to do anything with me. Buy the 40 foot strip. Buy his whole parcel. Frankly, even pay for the road, you know, like it's been incredible and I just -- all I can think about is that he is trying to create a position of leverage over this area, because that's what he has been effectively given if this project is denied and, sure, we could maybe open up to Rolling Hill to Flatiron, but also maybe not. I don't know what the findings are going to be from ACHD or from this other developer. I don't really know. But what I know is that our project is conforming and it's approvable. Everybody's been saying this is a great project and we believe in it and so I will continue to try to buy Corey Barton's parcel, because I'm vested in this project and I want my egress to be better and undeniably it will be better once Movado is built. So, I have a vested interest in making that happen. I also have a vested interest in making sure that Rolling Hill is a nice place to live and that means working with adjacent developers as I do on all of our projects. So, I -- I -- you have my personal commitment that I will do that. I really will, because I care. I'm not -- as you probably have all heard tonight, it's -- I'm not an average sort of developer. I -- I -- I'm really trying to do something different and -- and care about it.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I think we can all feel that. I -- I think that is coming across and I guess what I -- what I -- just maybe some feedback would be even this evening we could not -- we could not approve this development this evening, because we don't have any findings. So, with -- without any support from Planning and Zoning, without support from city staff -- it's not anyone's fault, it's just the spot that you came to us at with recommendations for denial, we don't even have the findings to approve tonight. That's not actually possible. I mean we could, but we have never approved something without, you know, some guardrails and -- and some -- some support from staff and conditions from staff that are workable. So, just from a -- a practical perspective that -- that -- that isn't an outcome I think that would work well tonight. But I do think a continuance might make a lot of sense, even if it's for a few weeks, to just give an opportunity to work with city staff and give us a chance to get our arms around just establishing -- is this neighborhood really in transition? It seems like it is.

Slagle: Yeah.

Strader: And if that's the case, then, I feel like there -- there should be a path toward opening the end of Rolling Hills and, then, that creates a complete workaround where we would love for Movado and that intersection to happen, believe me, but if the reality is that's not happening for 20 years, it seems like in everyone's best interest to have some kind of an alternative. So, that does -- I was just trying to be solution oriented, too. That's where I was coming from.

Slagle: I didn't understand that it couldn't be approved tonight. I mean it was news to me. I thought it could -- I thought City Council could -- they could vote to approve it, but they would have to come back with findings to approve those findings in three to four weeks.

Simison: Did you still have more comments for your closing?

Slagle: No.

Simison: Okay.

Slagle: I -- I -- I guess my statement, then, is if -- if the option is continuance or denial I choose continuance with the risk that somebody out here might not give me a continuance of a contract timeline, but if -- if that's the decision I choose continuance and I would love to get introduced to this developer who has not reached out to me, FYI, and I can be happy to be a part of that conversation and happy to be a part of the conversation with the ten parcel people above us and a conversation with whoever at the city is necessary.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I -- I think it's -- I -- I want to say this, because appreciate the creativity of -- for trying to move ahead. I think it's incumbent for us to remember that we need to consider what's in this application and make our decision on this and that we shouldn't be considering a future potential application as how it may pertain to how we agree with here. So, while I appreciate the fact -- and I think that -- you know, Bill made it pretty clear, if you are okay that we are getting more information, that's okay, but it's -- we are not going to be making a decision on this application based on what the future application may or may not look like. So, I think that's important to clarify here as a quasi-judicial role that we have, we have to look at the application and the facts before us and you rightly point out -- consider the facts, what are the rules, what are the development -- or the zoning and the annexation requirements all that. That's what we are going to look at, not, hey, what's the -- I don't even know what the next application -- what we are talking about. It's the first I have heard of it and that's appropriate. I don't even know what you are talking about. I shouldn't know. And so I just want to put that

on the record that whatever -- if there is a continuance, one, it would be because we don't have findings to approve and we would have to work through that and that's what Nick was saying would be four to six weeks to -- to work out those findings that we can improve. But I also want you to understand we won't be making a decision based on what a future land use application may or may not look like, because that -- we are not really supposed to do that.

Slagle: Yeah. That -- that makes sense to me. I appreciate you saying that, too. I -- I guess my follow up would just be the findings that would be coming from this four to six week process I would be working with Bill and Nick to -- to help generate these and -- and I guess the question goes back to you is what -- what will -- what would we be finding in the next four to six weeks that would allow you all to generate positive findings that would allow us to get approved, because four to six weeks is also four to six weeks and, you know, where are we going to be at that -- if -- if we are not going to be -- we are not going to have a proposed project for the upper -- upper parcels in four to six weeks, I don't even know who this developer is, so -- so, we are going to be right -- in four to six weeks we are going to be right here and it's going to be the speculative future development.

Simison: Well -- and I think that's -- from -- from my perspective where I would want to go with this Council is I -- generally are you supportive of the project enough to even ask staff to do this and, if so, what direction would you give to staff for those findings? What are the things that are -- again on this project that are relative to that. Yeah. My -- my struggle is through this conversation this -- whoever has the properties to the north could have been here to testify tonight if that invested the interest -- they evidently chose not to for whatever reason. You know, they may be watching, they may not be watching through that process, but I -- I -- I think if you are going to continue with the intention of findings to come back of, yes, I think -- it would be important for Council to state that that's actually where you are headed and/or what are some of those answers so staff can do their work.

Slagle: Mr. Mayor, I -- I just want to clear it up. There are people that are part of the ten parcels in this crowd and -- and on Zoom. There were people that -- it's more than just this land sellers here. There -- there is people up and down the road that spoke.

Simison: I'm just referring to the person who has got the -- the proposed application coming in after you. Yeah. They are -- they are -- they are not here tonight or haven't spoken if they are here tonight.

Slagle: Is that the landowners of that proposed application or the developer?

Simison: The one coming in to talk to staff. The one that would -- you would be, in theory, collaborating with.

Slagle: Okay. I don't -- I can't -- no, that person is not here, but the people that he is theoretically purchasing property from are represented here tonight.

Simison: Yes.

Slagle: Okay. Got it.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I -- I think all important points and it's -- we are walking a fine line. I -- I would say based on what I have seen I'm supportive of the project if I can find a solution to the roadway network at some point that will make this more functional. Okay? I -- I think right now -- and probably you are even feeling it -- that the access and stuff is going to be a challenge. If I saw -- if I think -- I don't need to know the details even of this other -- whatever development is happening and I don't even tie it to that, I just want to establish -- because it's not a huge number of parcels, I just want to establish that the majority of this neighborhood along Rolling Hills is in transition and actively looking to sell or talking to developers. That's what I'm trying to establish is that the conditions in this neighborhood have changed. When -- when they came to us before this was -- and people were -- I don't want to paint it as a monolith, because everyone's different and every individual homeowner has their own decisions to make, but this is a very different tone and very different feedback than we received back then that makes me suspect that this neighborhood is really in transition and we are in a different point and that there could be a pathway eventually when it's safe toward opening Rolling Hills. I just want to understand that this is a neighborhood in transition. That is the piece of information that I would need to feel comfortable with moving forward with your application in addition to just ensuring that city staff has come up with appropriate conditions of approval. You know, that sounds scary. It could mean anything. I don't think that's what it means. I -- like I think it would be even -- for example, you all have even stated you understand you need to dedicate right of way, right, up here in the corner. That would need to be a condition of approval. That's just one example. So, there are like usually dozens of these kinds of conditions of approval that we need. We need to see those. We don't approve projects without them just from a practical perspective. That -- that's kind of where I'm at. I'm leaning toward wanting to see this happen. I would like to understand that the -- the neighborhood is in transition and, then, that would give me a pathway toward there is an answer to this and it might not happen in two years, it might happen in five years, whenever that time is, but if we feel it's in transition that at some point because of the nature of this development will have to be the mechanism that improves these roads and so if I knew that this whole neighborhood is really in transition and things have changed, that would -- that would give me the confidence that, yeah, that's occurring. I hope that helps.

Slagle: Mr. Mayor and Councilman Strader, I -- I think -- I -- I know most all those ten people up and down the road we have been working with them for a long time and so -- and I -- I generally think they are interested in selling and you heard Mr. David Ellis, who is -- who represents two of those ten parcels, he spoke on Zoom tonight, he was the gentleman that said nine out of ten, so -- and I trust him. He has been very honorable

and so I gather speculation that -- that we could get a letter that could be signed by those nine of ten people that says, yes, I'm interested in selling my parcel. Yes, I am -- I -- you know, I'm interested in selling the parcel, because I understand that a larger development play is -- is here. So, I -- I -- I'm comfortable saying I'm pretty sure we could probably generate that in a couple of weeks, if not quicker.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Just to pivot just for a second. Alternative idea. This is the first time I have seen this part of Meridian all come in in support of change. I don't have a lot of people saying -- in fact no one really saying we want to keep it the way it is. They -- they understand it's going to redevelop and it was overwhelming. I didn't expect that when this public hearing started this evening. I expected that we would see what we saw before. So, a couple questions. First one to staff. We have an option to approve this project tonight. If we approve this project tonight without those findings, what's that next step look like?

Napoli: Mr. Mayor, Council President Overton, so, yes, if you guys recommend -- or if you do approve the project tonight, you know, you would request us to make the findings -- to revise the findings and create a development agreement, because it's an annexation application, so it would be an associated development agreement for the site and, then, we would come back to you guys at your purview on what time frame on when you would want to see that back at Council.

Overton: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, follow up.

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: The -- the reason I ask that is because I think everybody in this room has a very vested interest in seeing this project commit -- us to commit to you. You have committed to a developer, you have committed to an idea, you have committed to a dream, but you are waiting on six people to say we also commit to that and what I have come to understand about a lot of developments is that area behind you, those nine to ten homeowners, to me are waiting to see us approve you. They are not waiting to see us continue you. They are not waiting for us to delay that. They want to see this approved, so they, then, know that we are committed before they are going to move forward. I see this as one of the major dominoes falling for this whole area developing. I see this as a major domino falling in trying to pressure a property owner to the east that he has got to start playing ball with everybody else, so we can get Movado. I think everybody in this room understands, as I do, and I don't have to drive these roads, that your traffic is going to get a heck of a lot worse before it gets better and that I would never suggest that Rolling Hills be opened until we got to such a point that we had that curb, gutter, sidewalk streetlights, that those developments made that roadway safe that we could open that up. But I don't expect to try to have that crystal ball and say it's

going to happen in this 12 to 24 month period, because I have never been able to do that with any development anywhere. They happen as they happen. We all know that. So, my alternative thought tonight is that I would move forward with approving this tonight, getting the findings. I think we have had enough discussion and enough commitment from neighbors to know that this is going to happen and I would feel terrible if we put this on a continuance to the point that you started to lose any of your homeowners that were willing to be part of this development or we start to get doubt with the other homeowners that are also hoping to, then, meet with the other developer. So, I guess what I'm saying is I would be in favor of moving forward with this tonight. Taking that vote and, then, getting those findings later.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: But maybe a question for -- for Mr. Parsons. Bill, can you give Council a little flavor of how often the Council has -- has made a motion or has approved a project without appropriate findings in your career with -- with the city?

Parsons: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, Council Member Cavener, it's a -- it's -- I guess it's a loaded question.

Cavener: Okay.

Parsons: Historically you do ask staff to come back with -- with findings for approval. We do ask for a continuance because it does take time for us to draft those appropriate conditions. But there have been on occasions where you said bring forward the findings and the DA for a future agenda and so we have done it different ways over the years. It's really the -- the comfort level of the Council this evening on how you want staff to proceed.

Cavener: Fair enough. Thanks, Bill. Mr. Mayor, maybe just a quick thought for Council. Team, there is a reason why I -- why I asked that question is -- is I recall a time earlier in my time on Council where I think the City Council was very supportive of an application and very sensitive to the feedback from the neighbors who were wanting to see development occur and the decision to approve an annexation was correct. The steps in which we went about it were incorrect and caused future challenges for future councils and I know all of us on this Council have probably at one point or another -- we have got a -- a fix that comes before us and we are all kind of scratching our head and saying, hey, why -- why did the City Council make that decision back then? And often it comes from a place of being well-intended, but not having all the details. So, I appreciate what our good Council President is attempting to accomplish tonight and I think in theory I likely can get there. I -- I do have some outstanding questions on the -- on the traffic impact, but I -- I would really urge caution about issuing an approval

tonight without appropriate findings. I just think that it -- it puts us in a -- in a better precedent long term should something go wrong that we -- we really have a lot of confidence about what it is that we are approving. So, I -- I won't be in favor of that action tonight, although I do think that by and large I'm support of -- I'm in support of the application. I just think that a continuance is more appropriate, so the Council can have a lot of clarity about what it is they are voting to approve.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: It's been a long day, so while I -- I apologize if I'm asking a question that you have already answered. I recall that you said you have even offered to help pay for the Movado Road construction. I don't recall what you have said in -- in terms of Rolling Hill improvements to the west. Can you describe what investments you are going to make or improvements that would be made to the west of that property?

Slagle: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Whitlock, you are talking the -- the west side of Rolling Hill Drive. The east the -- the east side. Our side. Yeah. No, it's -- it -- a full -- full improvement. Sidewalks. Curbs. Streetlights. We have even -- some of the -- some of the folks down the street said it -- you know, people drive fast up and down the street. We offered. They said we would be happy to put speed limits signs, maybe even flashing signs. At a certain point we even offered to put speed bumps if like that was allowable. Just trying to propose solutions that -- that they would appreciate. I'm not sure that the city and the fire department would necessarily like those things, but, you know, these are all things that we are willing to do. But we want that edge of our development to be polished and nice and beautiful and that's part of our community. So, absolutely, we want that.

Whitlock: Follow up.

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: So, essentially, to the center line from your property you will have curbs, sidewalk, gutter, streetlights?

Slagle: Yes, sir.

Whitlock: Speed bumps if we want.

Slagle: Yes.

Whitlock: Okay. That's one of the things that I think we have -- is important to us. We want to see those improvements starting to make their way up Rolling Hill, because I think you have heard tonight that ultimately until we get a solution on Movado that is the

solution and I just wanted to clarify that at least to Eastview Circle or the Five Mile Creek we will see those improvements.

Slagle: Yes. And -- and this is covered in the ACHD report as well. They go through and they -- they -- they -- they have their findings of sorts and -- and it says that the applicant will improve that area of Rolling Hill.

Whitlock: The only other comment I wanted to make, Mayor, was, again, you -- you have changed the application, basically, with the elevations on those north buildings and I appreciate that. We really haven't talked much about that modification that was made in between the Planning and Zoning denial and what you are bringing to us tonight. So, you know, ultimately I think you have done the things that -- that address my concerns. So, whatever the process ends up being, whether we have to continue for findings to be developed, that's -- that's one thing, but I think you have made the modifications that address some of the concerns that I had in looking initially at the application and the denial from P&Z.

Slagle: Thank you.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I think just maybe a question for city staff around timing. I know normally it takes four to six weeks. Is there any flexibility there? Could it be accelerated? Because I think -- like from my own perspective I think a continuance for me would be necessary tonight. I -- I am like Councilman Cavener, I would not feel comfortable approving tonight. I want to get there, even like in a two week time frame I think is that a possibility -- or some -- maybe three weeks. I -- but I'm just curious like what -- if -- if planning staff has any ability to accelerate their normal timeline and at least from my perspective if I had any information that was a little bit more systematic or scientific about the neighborhood being in transition, then, I would get there on it. That's kind of where I'm at.

Simison: I'm going to speak for staff. Sorry, guys. Yes, it can be done faster.

Strader: Okay.

Simison: And --

Strader: You are the boss.

Simison: And -- and secondarily, though, they need direction. So, if you guys can provide what you want in those findings to them it will take a lot off their plate. They don't have to come up with them, you know, so spend 15 minutes now, save three weeks on the back end would be my two cents. And I would maybe look for staff to say

what direction -- what are the areas you feel like you need direction from Council on, because it has got to be a two way street.

Napoli: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, so, correct, you know, Staff's recommendation for denial and P&Z's revolves around traffic and safety concerns. Transition to the existing county residences to the north. I think those are really the two main things that I would want you guys to touch on tonight and also in addition to that if, hypothetically, the properties to the north are going to redevelop, is it really necessary to have that transition at this point? That's something I would also like to kind of consider from you guys, because personally if it's going to redevelop in that area I think three stories probably makes more sense than having a weird -- try to transition that may not really be that functional if it's really all going to be, you know, garden style apartments. I -- to be honest, just for the record, the people we are meeting with tomorrow, it's very high level. I have -- we have met with them once. Haven't seen a site plan. You know, they are -- what about this, what about that, what would you support. We talk with hundreds, sometimes thousands of developers in a year and I don't know if they will move forward with it, but, ultimately, that's where I would ask you guys to weigh in on that, as well as do you want to see the transition now or do something that maybe you don't want to see the two-story transition. Those are some of the things for the findings that ultimately -- and, you know, whether it's consistent with the comp plan, one of the findings we have to make as it is. Part of the reason staff said it wasn't, because there is in the comp plan that says you analyze roadways that are part of the development and not part of the development in the larger area. Is it adequate to serve this development and the larger area as it redevelops. So, that's another thing that I would like for you guys to touch on if you could and, you know, ultimately I can come up with it, but if you guys give me more clear direction it may read more of the way that you guys want it and I do have, you know, draft DA provisions for the approval. So, yes, I think a two to three week timeline so they can review it, we can have some collaboration there, that is definitely doable for, you know, condition or development agreement to be proposed.

Simison: Sorry, Doug, I thought you had some questions earlier. I don't know if they -- or comments, if they were resolved.

Taylor: Actually, Councilman Whitlock asked my question, but maybe staff did bring up something I would ask. The transition issue is -- I mean I'm -- I don't think anyone's bringing in some single family residential homes between these two big apartments, so in your opinion if we don't make a -- the transition a condition of approval would you prefer two, three story buildings there? I mean if that's something -- I mean I'm just throwing it out there. I'm not saying that's what we are going to do, but part of the transition is because of what was the adjoining property.

Slagle: Mr. Mayor and Council -- Councilman Taylor, yeah, absolutely. I mean that -- that was -- when the original development came in and it was four stories, the acknowledgement was, folks, this is not going to be single family for so long. This is going to be some sort of commercial product and that's -- that's what the future comp

plan supports. So, the answer to your question is absolutely. I mean I -- we -- we have -- we did that two-story thing to try to get this thing to the approval line. But, frankly, it -- it -- financially it's -- it's a huge burden on the project. I know that's not your purview, but we have -- we have lost just a bunch of income and I know there is more than just money here, but like all these things are so expensive. I mean this is not a -- this is not a home run for us as we have worked on this for three years now. I mean this is -- this is a single at best. And -- so, yeah, absolutely. And we -- we -- we -- we could easily generate a plan so quickly. Our architect is here. I'm like, yes, please. I think we would be limited to -- to -- we would raise it, we would have about -- I think we are limited to 200 units, because we don't have two points of egress for fire department and -- and that actually is a plan that we put -- we actually -- when we first came with this application it was for a 200 unit building and the feedback -- we got the feedback from -- from Nick and -- and Bill like what -- you know, it was I think three stories on that side and -- and so that's when we lowered it. So, we already have that plan and I would love to put that back in. That would be -- I know it's minor, 16 units, but that's a big deal for the finances of this whole thing.

Parsons: Mr. Mayor and Council, I think one other item that I at least want to get on the record and just make it clear to the -- to the neighbors and those that have participated in the hearing tonight, is the Five Mile Creek runs along the north boundary. We are aware of that. Appreciate the applicant willing to show a bunch of trees and vegetation, but I don't know if that's going to be allowed by the irrigation district. So, I -- I hope they are -- they are working with them and -- and communicating, because the last thing I want to have happen is you see 50 trees behind the buildings and the irrigation district says we don't want any trees in our easements and, then, all of a sudden we are stuck at the mercy of the irrigation district and the neighbors didn't get the trees that they wanted. So, I think some of that needs to be worked out with the applicant, too, because that could impact their -- their site plan a little bit and so if there is a give and take on density and maybe some -- some refinement, had to make sure that they are being true to what the neighbors expect to see. I think that's -- that's critical, at least from my standpoint. I want to make sure that everyone's working together and collaborating and everyone's kind of getting what they want at the end of the -- the project. So, just -- just keep that in mind. That ditch is a natural waterway. We want it left open. So, I don't know how much wiggle room we have there in order to allow all those trees.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I will just share some thoughts to kind of indicate my -- my thoughts on this. You know, Council Woman Strader's comment about wanting to feel comfortable with the -- is the neighborhood in -- in transition. Coming into tonight I'm not sure I could answer the question, but I do feel that the testimony was unique. I'm like Councilman Overton surprised that the neighbors came in to say make a decision, please, to give us some certainty about what our future is. Certainly there has been many years in limbo. I do

feel like this is an area in transition and I do agree this is a bit of a domino -- maybe not in the way that some people might think it's a domino, but it's -- it's a domino in that it would become an intolerable -- intolerable place to live if you just owned a property right next to it, you would want to make some moves and move on and -- and -- and see the rest of the area develop. You know, I'm reminded of a hearing we had maybe four weeks ago, six weeks ago, I think, where we all acknowledge that the -- the key to unlocking this area and the infrastructure was the -- the development and it was kind of a leap of faith that we had that we needed to do this to help pay for some of the infrastructure and I find ourselves in a similar situation here. That said, trust us, but verify. I trust, but verify is what I keep thinking. I don't think I can approve outright this application tonight. I would rather give it a continuance and give direction to staff on what the conditions of approval should be, because I would like to just come back and see what we actually have, because this is a difficult area and I -- I want to make sure we get it right as much as we can. But to me in voting for a continuance and signifying that I'm -- I like what -- what we have and agree this is -- this is -- you know, you got to take an applicant who is willing to kind of take some risk, too, which you have, because a very uncertain -- or unknown how you will be received by us with a very challenging part of Meridian. So, I want to reciprocate that, but I -- I do feel like I trust, but verify, I want to see those conditions of approval worked on, but I think we can give staff enough clarity for what we want to see in that. So, overall, I -- I -- I would support tonight a continuance, but from my perspective with the purpose of -- just because I want to see in writing the conditions of approval, but I intend to support that when we get there. So, it's not a 50-50 when we walk out the room, but I'm not going to support approving it tonight. That's -- that's kind of what I feel comfortable with tonight.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Maybe just some feedback for city staff. So, I think conditions of approval would be everything that the applicant has already said they would do, right, things they have committed to doing. So, obviously, the completion of dedicating the right of way that they talked about. The curb, gutter, sidewalk along their property. All of the things that they have already committed to doing. For me if I have -- and it's kind of I think a low bar of just establishing that this neighborhood is in transition. I just -- I need something a little more scientific than just hearing public testimony. It helps me to understand, okay, there are ten properties along Rolling Hills Drive and out of those ten we -- we have checked and we know that a certain amount are in discussions or whatever that is. But like -- I think it's a pretty low bar for me to meet, but I just want something a little more scientific than just public testimony anecdotally. If that is established to some level, then, I -- I don't care as much about the transition. Like that's not as important to me, because at that point we know this entire area is changing and we are acknowledging that. I do think --

Simison: Council Woman Strader, on that one point would -- would the transition primarily just be to the property directly to the north since it's already 270 feet or do you want to know -- all of them have to be transitioning before that becomes an issue?

Strader: Mr. Mayor, yeah, you are correct, I don't care as much about -- like I don't need a transition to a two story building for somebody on the corner of Rolling Hills and Flatiron or -- or whatever that street is. Silverstone? Yeah. Maybe to continue I do think the landscaping is kind of an important point that staff brought up that you should probably run that down and, then, on the adequacy of the roadway network I view -- I -- I view that as mitigated somewhat by the potential to eventually open Rolling Hills Drive. So, it -- I view that as being mitigated in the sense that there is something within our control eventually to fix this situation. I do expect it will be an acute situation. I think it will probably get worse for a couple of years before it's going to get better. So -- you know. But there is no easy way to do this. Hopefully that's helpful feedback. I would expect if the neighborhood is in transition and it looks that way, if this came back in two weeks and nothing had changed materially, I would expect I would be in support at that point.

Slagle: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, just so I'm clear, if -- if we get the support from the ten or so neighbors above to the north, then, am I hearing you correct that the transition issue isn't so much an issue anymore? So, raising those two levels to three levels and potentially adding up to 16 units could be acceptable as well?

Strader: Mr. Mayor. Yeah. That's correct. I -- I do care about your immediate neighbors the most though and I -- I think that's an important distinction. If -- if your immediate neighbors, you know -- and that's something I will have to mull -- honestly, I will be mulling that over, because you -- you brought up some interesting points about the topography that I hadn't really fully thought about. So, it's something I'm going to be thinking about. No, it's not as important to me at that point though. If the whole neighborhood is transitioning it doesn't matter to me as much, because it's clear, then, this is going to become a very dense area and the timeline has changed.

Slagle: Thank you.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Can I ask kind of a process question? We -- would we be wanting to keep the public hearing open? We would not be closing that tonight? Okay. And if I may just to provide a comment I didn't share. On the transition I appreciate the creativity in the two stories on the north and three stories that -- I would prefer not to see that. I would prefer three stories both ways. So, if staff is indicating that transition was kind of asked for because of the -- we are not going to see single family homes stuck between two large dense developments. So, for me I would -- I would -- my direction would be to --

to remove that as a -- a need in that -- that we would allow for three stories on both sides.

Slagle: Thank you. Appreciate that.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: As part of that process question, just want to reach out to staff, the applicant and the rest of Council. Is May 19th okay? Three weeks.

Napoli: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Overton, that -- that works for staff. I want to make sure for the applicant it works for him and his team. We are probably -- we are going to need revised elevations, revised -- you know, want to make sure the unit count is correct and the square footage for the commercial. So, we will want to see those things and verify those things, so they are in the DA. So, it's clear what you guys are approving in addition to the updated landscape plan. You know, elevations we are probably going to work with them on design review, so they may not look exactly the way they do now, but -- because they -- yes, they don't necessarily meet our standards as they currently sit and I don't know if they have enough time to revise them, but those are the updates that we would want them to make as well. So, we have a complete record for you guys when it does get approved.

Overton: Appreciate it, Nick.

Slagle: He is going to be out of town on May 19th. I -- I -- I -- I'm happy to come and stand here myself, if that's preferred or not -- and it could be via Zoom. Does --

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Slagle: -- feel as we can --

Overton: We can do that if that will work for you. I'm trying to find the quickest solution. I don't want to push us out to the six weeks if we don't have to.

Slagle: I would love that.

Overton: For you, for the neighbors, so if -- if three weeks will work for everybody involved, we can do that on May 19th, if that will work.

Slagle: Works for me, sir.

Simison: Okay. Any other items you would like direction on?

Napoli: Mayor, Members of the Council, I think I got a pretty good basis. We will, obviously, collaborate with Brett and his team and the applicant and make sure, you know, we are on somewhat mostly the same page, if any, if not fully on the same page going into that with the development agreement provisions. I already have some drafted up and we will -- we will give reach out probably as soon as tomorrow to send you a draft as soon as we can with that, so we can start the conversation. But, no, I -- I think I have enough direction from Council to revise the findings and, you know, make those development agreement provisions.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: And I will just note the reason I wanted a continue versus approval is we can add some additional conditions of approval at that time if -- if there is something that we felt was missing or we have -- you know, maybe on the landscape plan there is some nuance that we need to work through. That's -- I think that's why there is value in that.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: If there is no more comments this evening, I move that we continue with the public hearing for File No. H-2025-00402 to May 26, 2026.

Taylor: Second.

Overton: I amend that. May 19th, 2026.

Taylor: Concur.

Simison: Second agrees -- concurs on May 19th. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the item is continued. We will see you back here.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Slagle: Thank you so much. I appreciate the conversation.

FUTURE MEETING TOPICS

Simison: Council, anything under future meeting topics?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Just a -- just gentle reminder. It would be lovely if the employee benefits trust group could come back at the appropriate time when they are ready and they have everything from the audit and some more information for us would be fantastic.

Simison: Okay. Sounds good. With that do I have a motion to adjourn?

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

Little Roberts: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:40 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON

_____/_____/_____
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK