

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:00 p.m. Tuesday, June 20, 2023, by Mayor Robert Simison.

Members Present: Robert Simison, Brad Hoaglund, Luke Cavener, Jessica Perreault, Liz Strader and John Overton.

Members Absent: Joe Borton.

Also present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Bill Parsons, Sonya Allen, Tracy Basterrechea, Joe Bongiorno and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

☒ Liz Strader	☐ Joe Borton
☒ Brad Hoaglund	☒ John Overton
☒ Jessica Perreault	☒ Luke Cavener
☒ Mayor Robert E. Simison	

Simison: Council, we will call the meeting to order. For the record it is June 20, 2023, at 6:00 p.m. We will begin this regular city council meeting with roll call attendance.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

COMMUNITY INVOCATION

Simison: We had no one sign up for the community invocation.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

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

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: There are no changes to tonight's agenda, so I move adoption of the agenda as published.

Cavener: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to adopt the agenda as published. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the agenda is adopted.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

PUBLIC FORUM – Future Meeting Topics

Simison: Mr. Clerk, anybody sign up under public forum?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, nobody signed up.

ACTION ITEMS

1. **Public Hearing continued from May 23, 2023 for Promenade Cottages Subdivision (H-2022-0013) by Steve Arnold, A-Team Consultants, located at 403 E. Fairview Ave.**
 - A. Request: Rezone approximately 6.819 and 0.326 acres of land from the R-8 and C-G zoning districts to the R-40 (6.61 acres) and C-G (0.535 acres) zoning districts.
 - B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 30 single-family residential lots, 5 multi-family lots, 2 commercial lots and 8 common lots on 7.64 acres of land in the requested R-40 and C-G zoning districts.
 - C. Request: Conditional Use Permit to construct a 90-unit, multi-family development on approximately 2.8 acres in the requested R-40 zoning district.
 - D. Request: Conditional Use Permit to construct single-family, detached dwellings on the 10 of the 30 single-family residential lots in the requested R-40 zoning district.
 - E. Request: Conditional Use Permit to allow the existing, non-conforming parking, landscaping and mobile home park to remain as is for an extended period of time in the C-G and requested R-40 zoning districts.

Simison: Okay. Then with that we will move right into our Action Items this evening. First item up was a public hearing continued for May 2023 for Promenade Cottages Subdivision, H-2022-0013. We will turn this over to staff for any comments.

Allen: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. Give me just a moment and I will share my presentation here. At the last hearing on May 23rd City Council directed staff and the applicant to come up with some possible solutions pertaining to

displacement of residents of the mobile home park if the proposed multi-family development is approved in the second phase of development where the mobile home park is currently located. Staff issued a memo that included several possible options. Mr. Mayor, would you -- would you like me to go through those options or does everyone feel comfortable with having read the memo?

Simison: Council, would you like to hear them? Okay. Everybody good?

Allen: The applicant also submitted a letter with an inventory of the number of RVs, mobile homes older than 1976 and mobile homes newer than 1976, that includes some possible options to help with displacement of residents of the mobile home park and that's in the record, too. I assume you have read that. The applicant is here tonight to go over those if you do have any questions. Thank you.

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

Arnold: Mr. Mayor, Members of the City Council, for the record Steve Arnold. A-Team Land Consultants. 1785 Whisper Cove, Boise. 83709. I came tonight to mainly be here as a resource about any questions that you may have about the mapping or the subdivisions or things that we did, but kind of where Sonya left off is our understanding as well, the last item that needed to be addressed was the re-homing of the residents to a new park or how we were going to help them out. I do believe that Mark Kelly, one of the owners, is online and I think I will let him address that and, again, I will stand for questions on the platting and the application before you.

Kelly: Hello?

Simison: Chris, would we like to bring in Mr. Kelly? Or is he unmuted? Okay. Mr. Kelly.

Kelly: Hello? Can you hear me?

Simison: Yes, we can.

Johnson: He is coming in as a panelist, Mr. Mayor.

Kelly: Hello?

Simison: We can hear you.

Kelly: Yeah. We had submitted a letter with some options of what we could brainstorm on helping with the displacement of the tenants. I would be happy to read through that for the Council if you -- if you would like. Otherwise, I don't have a whole lot more to add than that. But I did notice we didn't mention that everyone is on a month-to-month

lease at the park and I know we -- I realize we didn't include that in our letter, but I would be happy to go through the details if you would like.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I have a few questions for you about the four items that were proposed. On the first item the question is -- there is a belief that it will be easier to move the RVs -- I believe there is about 15 in the -- in the park currently and that there isn't as much concern about those RVs moving. From everything I know about the -- the amount of RVs that are looking for permanent or semi-permanent placement in parks in our area, the parks are completely full. It's very hard -- there is months long waiting lists for folks that want to live in the RV parks permanently and so I'm trying to understand the belief of the ease of those folks moving to parks where they might be able to live in a permanent way and, then, also wondering if you had gone into detail on what the costs for the monthly space rent would be for those parks versus what's being charged now. The reason I ask is because I know the Meridian KOA -- there is a lot of individuals that have lived there for two plus years and they are running around 500, maybe even more per month and that's quite a bit of cost for an individual whose income would require them to live in the park that you currently have. So, I'm going to challenge the applicant a little bit on the belief that it will be easy to move those -- those RVs -- to allow them to move to another location in a cost effective way and my understanding was that there was only assistance that was going to be provided if those folks moved to a park that was currently owned by the applicant. So, if you could comment on that first and, then, I will ask subsequent questions afterward.

Kelly: Yeah. We were referring to the ease of moving the actual, you know, structure. The mobile homes have other difficulties with moving and that's what we were trying to say with that comment. We haven't researched what any of the local area costs or any of that, to be honest with you, and we are just going off of, you know, what we see as we drive around. I don't know if you have researched or expanded your radius of what you are looking at, but I thought there was more availability. We are building an RV park over in Ontario and, like we said, we would be open to assisting with moving the -- moving it over there if they don't have a vehicle to move there and it's a trailer RV, you know, we would be open to talking about, you know, filling their tanks so -- they can get to our park and, you know, accompanying them with that, but other than that we -- we didn't really look into the details nor the costs. So, I -- you know, I didn't know we were tasked with that.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I don't think it's so much that the city is asking that of you, it's just looking into the reality of whether these folks do have a place to go. I think that's more of the

concern. It's not that we are tasking you with that, it's just the reality of them potentially not having a place to go. So, I assumed for your sake you would have looked into where they could go, so that your -- the timing of your development would be able to be accomplished.

Kelly: Well, yeah, I didn't -- you know, I don't think we are responsible for finding everybody a home. I -- you know, but, technically, we have certain notice rights and, you know, we -- you know, we have been talking about extending the time periods and everything else, but perhaps we misunderstood what you were wanting us to try to do.

Perreault: Well, I apologize if -- excuse me. I apologize if that wasn't clear. I don't -- I don't believe from the last meeting there was any indication given that you were being required to do anything. Really the discussion was around whether they had been notified and we really appreciated your response and an effort to do things to help them from being displaced. I was thinking of it more along the lines of the reality of whether there actually was anywhere for them to go and what that meant for the timing of your project without leaving them without a place to live and that that was the city's primary concern. So, we can -- we will probably get into that topic more here at the -- the end of this conversation. Really appreciate the 180 -- 180 day notice. I think as much notice as you can give them as possible will make your process easier, so that they have as much time as they can to work through the challenges of moving to a new location, being able to save for the cost of that process. I was under the impression from the last hearing that there were potentially some of these units that were not movable, because they were in poor shape. Do you know about how many of those there are and were they included in the numbers that you gave us here tonight?

Kelly: Yeah. Those were in that inventory of homes and there is 17 of the older homes -- older than 1976.

Perreault: So, they aren't -- are not in good enough shape or they just -- they can't be moved because they are --

Kelly: Every jurisdiction is different. I'm not sure what the city of Meridian's, you know, codes are in regards to the 1976 and older homes. Many of the cities now, you know, require them to be brought up to HUD standards and that can vary with each home, whether rewiring, because there is old over wiring in there or other -- other reasons. Egress out of windows -- a multitude of different things to bring them up to HUD standards. But we are hearing that some jurisdictions, like Twin Falls and others, are not even allowing the older homes to be moved once they get beyond that 1976. Don't quote me on that, but that's what we have been hearing. It's always hard to get definitive answers sometimes when you are trying to -- trying to see if you can move a home or do something with it.

Perreault: Okay. Thank you.

Kelly: Uh-huh.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: Mark, would you mind walking us through some of the details? I want to confirm a couple of things here. You talk about in number two give a 90 day notice to vacate when they are ready to begin construction and I want to make sure you had this phased in three phases. The single family -- if this was granted, single family would come first, which is on the south side of the three sections, commercial, mobile home and, then, the vacant lot. So, that would be first phase. The second phase would be the current situation we are talking about with the mobile homes. You would do the apartments and the third phase would be the commercial area and I recall that once the single family homes are built there was going to be a request for four years. There was some financing situations and you have two years -- you would have to come back for a request for a two year extension because of the loan agreements the way that's arranged. Can -- can you confirm that my memory is accurate? I was trying to read through the minutes again real quick on that, but --

Kelly: You know, we have confirmed we have about two more years on our loan and just where we are at in the process now, we -- we think that it will take us four years to get to the multi-family portion of the project, just -- it's such an uncertain time right now. We are proceeding extremely cautiously. The financing that's out there, it's -- it's -- with all the commercial office space problems, you know, the lenders are -- it's -- it's just they are super uncertain times. So, if this -- if the market warrants to go as fast as we can we could do it. Our financing restrictions change after two years from now or this -- later this summer. So, you know, if we -- if we can get through the single family -- yes, you are right, we wanted to start with the single family and cottage product, the paired homes in the back and, then, move into the multi-family after that and, then, we are -- city staff wanted to stretch out the noticing to them, too, and we weren't a hundred percent sure of our timing, but we have confirmed that our finance constraints are really two years from September 1.

Hoaglun: So, Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: And, Mark, to confirm what I think I heard, then, was at a minimum it will be two years before those folks would have to leave, with a possibility of four years; is that correct?

Kelly: Correct.

Hoaglun: Thank you.

Kelly: Uh-huh.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for the applicant?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah, I guess it's a question for staff to react to -- maybe with the applicant, but I thought the proposal under number four was interesting, but I have never heard of us doing like an applicant building half of the width of the improvements on a street. Is that something we can do or have done? If staff could reflect on that. And, then, maybe we have questions for the applicant.

Allen: Sorry. It was on. I just flipped it off. Thank you. Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, typically the requirement is half plus 12 from ACHD. In this case all of the right of way lies on this property.

Strader: That doesn't sound --

Allen: So, that's the reason --

Strader: Okay. So, it doesn't sound like that's really a feasible solution.

Allen: No.

Strader: Mr. Kelly --

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thanks, Mr. Mayor. Sorry, I got a little turn around here. But just to kind of reflect back, I did think that, you know, extending the noticing period I thought was a positive change that would help. It -- you know, I don't think, though, we have kind of avoided the -- certainly the issue with the older mobile homes that can't be moved, it just feels like there is not a great solution for those. It's lucky that you are in this business. So, could you help me understand with moving them, is it -- is it possible to typically move them, but repairs are required or is it that the condition of them are such that it's not safe to transport them? Is it like a HUD regulation? Help me understand that. I'm not aware of a City of Meridian regulation about moving them, but I can be misinformed. But help me understand a little bit about the issue with moving those older ones.

Kelly: Yes. So, there is -- there is a total of 40 spaces out there and, again, there is -- 15 of those are recreation vehicles, seventeen of them are 1976 or older mobile homes and those -- those are the ones that are more difficult to move because of the HUD standards and bringing them up to HUD standards, so -- and, then, the remaining -- the eight other homes that are newer than 1976, we believe, just from assessing them from the outside, that they could be moved and would make economic sense to move them. And then -- you know. So, the older ones -- we have -- we have fixed them up in the

past and, you know, put new windows in that provide the egress and changed the wiring out. But usually you are doing that with a home that, you know, warrants spending the money on it and, then, the moving costs of the homes -- of the mobile homes get really expensive, you know. So, an older single wide could cost -- you know, depending on how far you are going and what you are doing, but, you know, it could cost five to ten thousand dollars to move -- move the home easily.

Strader: And so --

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Mr. Kelly, would a good outcome for you today be to approve the other parts of your project, so you can proceed and, then, continue to work on this, you know, multi-family aspect with the city? Is that what you are looking to achieve today or are you just looking for full approval?

Kelly: No, we could be very flexible on the multi-family and we see that -- we could move forward and work with that on a DA or if you want us to reapply for that. You know, I -- I would hope we would be able to get the zoning all done and everything just to save some work for everybody. But, you know, if -- if we didn't get that, you know, yeah, we -- we would appreciate moving forward with the cottages and doing that part of the project and, you know, I'm confident we will be able to work through this stuff and, you know, do our best at finding everybody a home. It's just so hard to predict when we will still be there and everything else. We do have quite a bit of turnover in the park. so --

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: But like hypothetically though -- so, you are not accepting -- I assume you are not accepting new transfers of mobile homes that are older than 1876; right?

Kelly: No. Absolutely not. We are not accepting that.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: And so, you know, part of what I'm kind of wondering -- and just talking out loud and it's not a great systematic way to do it, but having looked at the photos it looked like several of the older homes were really like substandard housing and so something I was wondering about was -- if you would be willing to work with staff on an outreach program, even before you are ready for that phase of the multi-family, with the ones that are in the worst condition to help those folks get on the lists for affordable housing. For example, we do have an affordable housing project being built in

Meridian, but by the time -- you know, by the time you are going to do this multi-family phase that one will have a huge wait list and it will be full. So, I was just wondering if you would be willing to work with the homeowners of the -- of the -- of the older homes that are in the worst condition that can't be moved now and, then, if you backfill them if you would be able to fill them -- any vacancies with newer homes or RVs that could be moved. If there was a way there that we could kind of move out the -- out of that group of 17 that are probably the most problematic, identify those and, then, if there was a way to like work with them earlier to help those folks, if there just sort of -- some kind of a plan you would be open to there -- because I imagine -- I mean I like the other phases of your project and this is the only one I was hung up on, but I'm sort of hoping we can approve the other phases, just talking out loud, and, then, there might be a way to work with -- out of that 17, the ones that are most problematic now. Is that something you would be open to?

Kelly: Yeah. You know, we would be open to it. I think it's -- it's really -- in reality it's really two years from now, because, you know, that's collateral for our existing debt on the property and we are responsible for keeping the park full. So, we have got to -- I got to keep that in mind until we can transition into a new loan and -- and, hopefully, by then we have the cottages up and going and have more collateral and whatnot, but -- so, I think the reality is, you know, we would start doing that two years from now with the older homes and, you know, we could certainly do that and try to replace them with -- with an RV is really the -- the realistic thing that would occur, because a newer mobile home with the cost to move in and just set up, it wouldn't make sense to move them in for the short period of time, all depending on, you know, what our forecast is to break ground and do it and get the multi-family going. Does that make sense? I mean we -- we could certainly work on those ahead of time and -- but at this point they are providing housing in the park and it -- you know, it could be two to three years and, you know, we are seeing that and, you know, who knows what the economy is going to look like three years from now. So, I just -- that's where -- you know, we might as well utilize the housing that we do have in the interim for as long as we can and, then, we would definitely work to get people into any vacant spaces we have and work with them to find -- find housing, you know, if they have to stay in the immediate area.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I mean just -- so, talking out loud, I appreciate that -- it feels like you want to be really collaborative on it. I think -- you know, it sounds like even finding spaces for RVs that -- that's very difficult right now in the valley and I guess I am concerned, having reviewed the photos, of the living conditions that some people are in and just wondering -- I understand it could impact your cash flow if you were to suddenly work with a bunch of people and get them moved, but if you were to work with one at a time, kind of prioritize the ones that are in the worst shape and help them -- just at least be aware of the resources available to them, you know, especially the affordable housing resources, at least if they were made aware of that earlier, you know, that might

help some people get out of some -- some living conditions that might not be ideal, even two years from now, just -- you know, some of the pictures it looked like there were some that didn't have a roof or that had a tarp serving as a roof and some stuff like that. I guess I -- I think I would be comfortable approving the other phases and -- and holding off on the multi-family piece while we kind of work together on this. But I thought -- you know, it seems like you are really open to working with the city on it. I guess I would like to hear other people's thoughts. But it feels like that might be a good way to proceed.

Kelly: Yeah. We would -- we would appreciate moving forward with the cottages for sure.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for the applicant?

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: One last one. Mark, under Idaho State law I believe if you could -- as the landowner you have a contract with each of those residents. Give them a 30 day notice and, then, they would have to vacate the premises; is that correct?

Kelly: We are on a month-to-month lease and I'm not a hundred percent sure if that's -- I believe it's -- there is differences. We started -- we looked into it a little and I think there is a difference between giving notice, which -- I don't know if it makes a whole lot of sense, but giving notice and, then, giving notice if you are closing down the park and so I -- you know, I'm really not an attorney, I don't know for sure, but there is certainly a prescribed period of time and we would just need to confirm that. Like under number two we are basically saying, hey, we will -- we will do -- because we went back and looked and I'm not a hundred percent sure that 90 day notice to vacate is correct. If the park is being closed it might be 180 day notice and if that's the case, then, what we are saying in number two is we will give them 360 day notice if that's what the statute states.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Steve, do you have any insight into that -- into the day -- the amount and length of time?

Arnold: Mayor Simison, Councilman Hoaglund, the -- my understanding -- and this is single family housing and not mobile home so I'm -- rental properties mine is 90 days is my understanding. So, I have not a clue with mobile homes and demoing them and moving them off and -- Mark might be right, it may be 180 days.

Hoaglund: Okay. So, at least we have established that time frame, anywhere between, Mr. Mayor, 30 and 180 days a landowner can force them off the property.

Arnold: Correct.

Hoaglund: Okay. Thank you.

Simison: Okay. Thank you very much everyone. Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone signed up to provide testimony on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, nobody in advance.

Simison: Okay. If there is anybody present who would --

Arnold: I have one last comment if I may.

Simison: Why don't we -- can you save it for closing remarks?

Arnold: Oh, sure. Yes.

Simison: You may be right up, but I just want to see if there is anybody else present. Okay. If you would like to come on up. And if there is anybody online, please, use the raise your hand feature, so that we can bring you in on this. If you would state your name and address for the record, please. Choose one of the mics.

Hanrahan: Scott Hanrahan. 403 East Fairview, Trailer 46. Obviously I'm emotional about this and, you know, I know it's their property, but I know -- you know the guy next to me, there is people on Social Security that are on fixed income of like 1,400 dollars and their home -- you know, my mobile home is one that wouldn't be accepted in Ontario because of its age and I'm not aware of when -- when he said that there was a -- that we have tried to upgrade these units, I don't know of one person that that has taken place with. I would like to have some more information about that, because I have spent the money to put in a heat pump and central air and all that stuff out of my money. There are people in the park, not only on Social Security, because of their injury that can't work, but there is people like Mike that, you know, is a Vietnam veteran. He's worked at McDonald's his whole life. He gets 1,400 dollars a month and that's it. He -- you know, where in the hell is he going to go? Excuse me. Where is he going to go? There are people in the park that even if they could move their -- their trailers -- you know, I know one of them around the corner, she walks to Auto Zone, because that's where she's -- she's got a job and she doesn't have enough money to buy a car and simply moving all these things to Ontario sends a really bad signal for the city to me, because you are going to displace -- I don't know how many people are in there. There is probably like 60 some odd spaces and, you are right, some of them I wouldn't live in if I could help it, but yet that's all these people can afford and there is people like next to Mike that is -- that are not bilingual, their -- their language is not English, they struggle to make ends meet and where are they going to go, you know. And I can't sell my trailer,

even though it's in decent shape. I can't move it anywhere. Like even to Ontario, because it's too old and there are literally no spaces that I know of, without buying a new mobile home, in this city that you could move a mobile home to. Or an RV. I mean I just -- you know, I'm a capitalist. I understand it's his property. But yet this is just a worrying situation for me. I am one of the probably the lucky few that I could probably in two years find another place to live or whatever, but 180 days, if that ever turns out, you know, that's -- these people will be on the street and we are talking, you know, tonight United States veterans on the street. I just -- somebody needs to stand up and say no and I don't know how you can say no, because it is their property, but I think -- I'm trying not to be too emotional about it, but it's -- it's portraying this city as some place that doesn't care about their citizens. To me that's how it feels, you know, and what you were saying that there is -- I had a contract originally when I -- I don't remember what it says. I tried to dig it out. I can't find it. But it wasn't month to month and they came around -- I think they said in a week they were going to do an inspection. So, they came around and since I have been there since 2017 we have always been able to park on these roads. All of a sudden they said if you are parking on the road we can eject you, basically, and there are simply people with two cars that don't have room to park their cars in the space provided and that's -- that's a shock to me. It's like, well, when -- when did that happen? The other thing is that people have -- in some of these substandard housing things they were told to clean up their yards. So, they went out to Harbor Freight and they bought those little canvas sheds; right? Garage sheds. And they put all their stuff in there. They tried to clean it up and this last time it came through they said, no, you can't have that anymore and these are all reasons that they can remove you from the park and it says right there on the paper. I don't trust them. You know, when did that happen? So, right here, four years and two years and possibly 180 days or 360 -- that time frame for me doesn't work for most people in this park, including me. You know, 180 days, I don't know where I go, you know, and part of it is I choose to live there, but part of it is a financial thing for me, because of, you know, money coming on. I make decent money, but a lot of that goes elsewhere and I don't know if Mike wants to speak, but --

Simison: And if you could wrap up your -- your comments, we might have some questions for you as well.

Hanrahan: Okay. Thank you.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thanks. Appreciate your -- your testimony tonight and while I don't think there is anything more emotional for any of us as Americans about talking about our home, so don't feel you need to apologize. We all deal with housing in different ways and I appreciate your testimony here tonight. So, I do have a couple of questions for you and it starts with -- I think your -- your perception that the city doesn't care and it's okay if you feel that way, but I just -- I want to reaffirm for you -- the reason why we are

having another meeting tonight is because when this was first brought before the Council we were not excited about this and we wanted to have an opportunity to hear from people like you. So, thank you for being here tonight.

Hanrahan: Can I just clarify that statement? The only reason I'm here tonight is to plead with you, because I watch the meetings on YouTube or wherever it was, the last one, and I know you are sympathetic to it and you are trying to make some changes or allow with sufficient time. That's why I'm here is because I watched that last time and I appreciate it.

Cavener: So, that this comes with my first question is I know -- I mean Council Member Perreault inquired about this in the last hearing about what type of communication about these changes have been made to you and your fellow neighbors?

Hanrahan: The only thing we have had is the public hearing notice, billboards and it said last time it was updated it said it was in December, okay, and, then, the next -- the next two or three meetings that had come out that billboard had not been updated and when I called the city here they said, well, it's not my job -- our job as a city to update the dates on that billboard and you just go online. Well, probably, half that park, if not more, doesn't even have internet. So, there really is no -- there wasn't sufficient warning or explanation of any of this in my view.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, maybe a couple follow-ups.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Do you recall being invited or getting any notification about a neighborhood meeting of any kind?

Hanrahan: I did not.

Cavener: So --

Hanrahan: I heard that and I had not received that.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. And my last question -- this is I think really helpful for me, because you seem very rooted in logic, you say you are a capitalist, which I appreciate. I think most of us in this room, like almost all of us likely are. So, give -- give me advice as a Council Member, what -- what should I do about this situation where clearly I hear your pleas and your concerns and, frankly, I'm sympathetic with them to the point that you don't own the land and there is -- the owner does want to do something different with that. What should we as a City Council do?

Hanrahan: I think your idea of helping those people individually that maybe are substandard and can't go anywhere else because of limited income and getting them on some kind of a public housing list that's affordable, that's a great step. I think the time frame of two years to four years I think that's sufficient. What I'm afraid is going to happen is that's going to shrink and we won't know it's going to shrink until it does. So, any kind of long-term plans -- like if I wanted to put 500 dollars a month away for four years to put a down payment on a house; right? If it becomes 180, 360 or two years less, then, all my long-term plans are for naught. That would be my major concern is some kind of a firm contract about dates.

Cavener: Thank you. I appreciate your testimony tonight. Thanks for being here.

Simison: Thank you. And, Mike, did you also want to provide testimony?

Karish: Well --

Simison: You need to state your name and address for the record.

Karish: Mike Karish and I'm in 403 East Fairview Avenue. It's a trailer park. And I'm space 40. And I -- my trailer won't move. That's almost a guarantee. It would fold up, because I have got -- part of the ceiling is coming down. When it rains it leaks, which I know I'm supposed to take care that, but Pat's helped me trying to cover up and patch cracks and everything to stop it, but it -- it finds a way and I try to save money and -- but when it gets close to the end of the month I have to dig in what I have tried to put aside to save and come two years I know I'm not going to have enough to buy anything and where I'm going to live I have no idea and I want to live around -- either Boise or Meridian, because I go to the VA. I have got Parkinson and it will spread, get worse for me, but -- ask me questions, because I'm lost.

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

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you very much, gentlemen, for coming here this evening. We appreciate it. It was my understanding that -- that your homes were owned by yourselves individually. Is that not the case? They are all owned by the park and are you making improvements to the units, but you don't own them?

Karish: I own mine.

Perreault: Okay. So, some are owned by the -- the residents and some are owned by the park or do all the residents own their own? Okay.

Simison: We will let the applicant reply to that if they would like.

Perreault: Excellent. Thank you very much. Thank you.

Karish: Thank you.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Sir? I'm sorry.

Simison: Mike, I think -- I think you have another question that's coming from Council Woman Strader.

Karish: Sorry about that.

Simison: No. You're fine.

Strader: Sorry, sir, to make you come back up. But if the city and the applicant were to work with folks like you that have a home that can't easily be moved and you were helped to connect to resources for affordable housing, is that a process you would be willing to start working on, you know, soon or is it something that you would tend to wait on until it got closer to when they were going to make changes to this part of the property?

Karish: Well, I don't quite understand everything that you said, but --

Strader: Yeah. I was just trying to understand from your perspective if you would be willing to go and try to get on some lists for affordable housing resources now or if you would prefer to wait and stay -- you know, stay in your home the way it is until possibly two years from now. And the reason I'm asking that is there is a long wait time I think on a lot of these affordable housing resources and so just wanted to kind of talk about that a little bit.

Karish: Well, I would look into it.

Strader: Yeah. Look into it. Yeah.

Karish: I have got dogs, so I got to find a place to let me have my animals that I have raised him from puppies and their ankle biters, they are Pomeranian mix, so trying to find --

Strader: Well, thank you. Yeah. I guess my -- my concern is, I think, you know, we have heard two stories. I think there are at least 40 more stories that sound a lot like this and, you know, I think that's why it's so important that we try to figure this out. Thank you for coming.

Karish: Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Is there anybody else that would like to provide testimony on this item here in the audience or online? Okay. Would the applicant like to come back up for final comments?

Arnold: Chairman -- or, sorry, Mayor Simison, Members of the Council, for the record again Steve Arnold, A Team Land Consultants. I think the only thing that I was going to address before our neighbors came up was the question that came up with ACHD and the road and right of way. Typically the -- the road section that you do is exactly like what Sonya explained. It's half plus 12, curb, gutter, sidewalk on your side and, then, 12 additional feet of pavement. Having worked at ACHD and worked with them for the last 20 some odd years, we have never had to do a full section without reimbursement. It's important to note that we brought that up at the last meeting and ACHD staff issued a new -- at that meeting said, look, I'm not going to -- we can't ask the city for reimbursement. It's not a city improvement, it's an ACHD improvement. Well, they really issued a staff report that says no reimbursements will be issued for that. So, they are either watching, but -- so, that's not typical by any means to do the full section. As opposed to the housing, it -- it makes me sad listening to -- you know, we have got veterans in the house and we spend billions overseas on pointless stuff and what I have told the neighboring mayor is the only way that you cure the housing problem and the expenses now is you -- it's supply and demand. You get more rental units -- you get more units on and prices will stabilize and that's really city and local government that does that. So, one thing that will help out by approving the multi-family in this area is it will be helping, you know, the affordability for people like our residents there. So, I -- I think a lot of this -- and this goes back to Mr. Nary, but a lot of this can be handled through a DA, a conditional use. The city can condition that it expires or daylight at a certain time. The one thing that I know Sonya brought up in the beginning in the presentation is -- at the last meeting is that we have -- we have got nonconforming uses. We have got a commercial use in an R-8 zone that we are proposing to fix. We got a mobile home park that's not allowed in any zone, unless we do the conditional use and, then, the cottage units at the south, again, those are -- that's -- that's the main focus, but the secondary focus is cleaning up everything that is not, you know, up to code, so to speak, and I think would -- with the option combination of staff's item number one and the applicant, item number one, I think a combination of the two and a development agreement would cover a lot of the concerns, so that the city isn't allowing basically existing residents to get kicked out and become homeless. I have worked on -- through a distant family member that sort of path where they get into a program and it does take a good year, year to four months. So, I believe that can be something that could also be put in the -- the DA that, you know, somehow the application sets up some sort of system that helps start moving these people in and out. But, like I said, I think a lot of this stuff can be addressed to a DA or at least approve the cottages, conditionally approve the -- the multi-family and mobile homes temporarily and, then, clean up the commercial. With that I will stand with any questions.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: We -- we appreciate your willingness to have this conversation and -- and there are some applicants that wouldn't -- wouldn't be willing to have a conversation with us, so I want to say thank you first of all and at this point in time I'm more inclined to -- to number two on the staff's recommendation, which is just to wait every -- on every approval related to multi-family, because I have concerns about us creating conditions in a DA that are so subjective and don't fall in line with -- with maybe some sort of, you know, code or -- or matrix that we can track. I just -- I get concerned about asking our staff to create conditions that -- that really are just really subjective depending on how you, the applicant, decide to go about helping the residents that are there to move and so I'm not in favor of that method currently. But my question for you is are you -- you know, Mark had mentioned in a question from Council Woman Strader if there would be a comfort level with proceeding with -- with some approvals on the cottages and holding off on -- on everything related to the mobile home park. What does that -- how does that impact your overall project as it relates to the lending, because that's primarily why we are having this conversation about the timing, is would you not be able to proceed because you wouldn't have the -- all of the property being in the City of Meridian, so that it can be encumbered in a particular way or would you be able to still proceed?

Kelly: And, Steve, I will go ahead and answer that. Well, no, I think -- I think that would work. I would also explain that that back property our lender -- we do have a carved out -- the ability to carve that property out of the collateral, the undeveloped portion of it and -- and we have that in our existing documents. So, I think we will -- we will be able to proceed with the cottages and -- yeah. I mean we would appreciate getting that going and -- and, then, figure out how to, you know, get -- work with the people to try and find housing for them.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Hoaglund: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Question for Steve or -- or Mark here. You know, in bullet point one where you offer some possible options, it talks about moving any of the RVs or mobile homes newer than '76 to a mobile home or an RV park they -- they are building in Ontario or to a park they own in Eagle, Twin Falls, or Kimberly, assuming there are spaces available. We don't know if they are or not and I know that helps mitigate some of the cost of moving if it's going back to a revenue producing site that's owned, but would you be open to moving them to any site within the Treasure Valley or southern Idaho, Ontario to Twin Falls type of area?

Kelly: I don't think we could commit to those costs, to be honest with you. We just don't know the homes well enough and, you know, we would be -- we would be willing to contribute something, but -- I don't know. I don't -- I can't say with -- about all those homes. It would just get too costly. I mean, again, back to the half of the street, we just -- you know, the project is -- we take on so much risk doing these projects, you guys.

We sign personal guarantees and it's extremely risky. I stay up all night worrying about making the payments and trying to figure out how to do these projects. So, it's -- we just can't keep piling the costs on and, unfortunately, the costs for moving are expensive, even if we don't need to at parks we own for several years and I would like to add, too, just that we already work with a number of our tenants in our parks across the state and Oregon with numerous age groups that find housing and help pay for a number of our tenants. A number of our parks are C class parks. This happens to be one of the -- the rougher ones, but we do work with them already and -- and help them to figure out how to make their payments and get their payments to -- some of them to a level where they can afford to stay with that. So, you know, we are already really familiar with a lot of those and our manager in particular is very good at -- at working with those groups. So, I think we would be pretty successful in finding them housing, but I think Commissioner Strader's questions -- you know, the people don't want to move until they have to move. So, we are really at a flux with -- with this whole thing. You know, we would be willing to guarantee that we are not going to move them out. The one gentleman that was up speaking, you know, in two years, we can guarantee that we will not move them out in the next two years and if we do we will find them a place to go that's acceptable to everybody. But, you know, it's -- so -- so, I think that -- that two to four year period is where we are really going to be able to, you know, figure out what our options are, because like you have already researched, you have gone to the housing that's been built with affordable restrictions and it's already filling up now, but, yeah, that's where I think we are going to -- you know, until we get to that two years -- and to be honest with you, this has been because staff and the city really wanted to deal with the whole project all at once ironically. That's why it's taken us so long to get to this point and wanted to deal with the whole piece of property, because we wanted to just carve out the cottages six years ago.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Kelly: Just so you are aware of everything that's gone on. But I'm just trying to explain my personal -- where and how I think it's going to work best for everybody, because when we get to two years we can all put our heads down and try to pick off and like Commissioner Strader, we will focus on those oldest homes and work with those people, but, you know, they are going to have to want to do it, too, themselves.

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Yeah. I appreciate that, Mark, and I think Councilman Strader expressed the appreciation that you guys have been willing to do something and not just toss people out and -- and try to find a solution here and -- and, you know, I kind of, Mark, agree with staff's assessment to deal with the whole thing. My concern is if we just piecemeal and approve the cottages and, then, you turn around and that property gets sold, the new owner comes in and scrapes it clean and they come to us with a new application and we have got people out on the street, we have -- we have taken people from what little housing they have -- they do have housing to even a worse situation for them personally to not having housing and worse from a taxpayer standpoint, too, because

now you have public support for people who are in a worst situation. So, there are no winners in that -- in that situation. So, I'm just wondering with your -- your two year -- two year guarantee, Mark, and that find a location, that that's -- that's -- that's -- that's interesting. What -- what would that look like? I mean find a location. That can mean I -- I would ask legal counsel what does that mean and he says it can mean whatever you want it to mean. I'm pretty sure Bill -- been around long enough to know what -- those words. But what -- what do you mean by, you know, find a location? Just in locations that you own or other public housing that might be affordable housing?

Kelly: All public -- all public housing options. You know, that's where, again, I'm saying it's difficult, because people get used to what they are living in and, you know, who is going to define what's an acceptable spot for them? And I can probably go find RV spots, too, you know, but it's -- it's -- it's difficult to say. But, really, what I'm -- what I'm saying is in two years -- you know, they don't need to be concerned about it for two years. At that point it's a 360 day notice at a minimum is what we are saying. So, I was trying to address, you know, the gentleman that was up speaking that was -- I forget what space he was in -- and, you know, because his biggest concern was getting noticing and that's where, you know, it works both ways for us, you know. We have seen parks like the Lazy J down in Twin Falls, they gave notice because they were going to redevelop and the place cleared out and, then, it was empty. I mean you will be dealing with our bank if that happens to us, but -- so, we don't want -- we want to keep the people there as long as we can. You know, for some reason if the economy is in the tank and we get done with the cottages, you know, worst case scenario we are in another depression like '08, you know, we are not going to be starting anything in that area. So, that's where, you know, I think we should just, you know, try to work through it in the proper timing and -- and we are willing to give people, you know, a year notice and -- and work with them during that year and the following year and probably -- you know, because I really think it's going to be that fourth year that we are going to be ready. The time it's taking to generate working drawings on this stuff and get it through the permitting process, it takes that long. I wish it didn't, but it does.

Simison: So, Council -- and I don't think the applicant is going to like what I have to say, but I must say it anyways -- is, you, know I -- I know there has been a conversation about what role the city can play. I'm happy to take on this role with our staff to bring in outside organizations to help organize to start these processes, but the reality is in our market right now when there is an opportunity for someone to move, they need to -- they need to be prepared to actually do it in my opinion. I don't think that we can hope that we can keep everyone into these places for two years and all within a defined time period and everyone is going to be able to move very quickly and -- you know. So, I don't -- but I think that we could figure that out over the next six months, so we could work with some of our housing partners and we can have more in-depth conversations about what that looks like. I have always heard it's about six months to get somebody into a type of housing opportunity. That's what some of the time frames are. But what is the duration of that housing? What's its purpose? Is it going to meet the intent of each individual person? We don't know. But to the point that could dry up their financing if they are expecting these to be rented fully for the next two years, but I just

don't think we -- we can't have the cake and eat it, too, in this regard, but I also think that having some -- some deadlines are important in terms -- because it puts everybody on notice. Most of the people that live in the -- in there are on notice, I can put myself and our staff on notice for the time frame to try to work with the developer and the residents and our neighboring agencies to see what we can do and if -- if people aren't willing to move or there is not opportunities, then, we can't -- we can't -- we can't tell someone that you have to do this, but they at least have a time frame in that regard. But, yeah, they could start losing revenue in 30 days, 60 days and I don't know what that is long term for them.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I completely agree. If I -- if I were a resident in that park I would start looking now. If I knew that this was coming down that that's what I would do. If I was -- if I was there I would start figuring out what my options were now. I think that's -- that's normal behavior with housing as our -- as our primary security and I -- I appreciate your support of creating a time frame that makes it plausible. I had the unfortunate experience of working with manufactured home evictions and defaults on mobile home parks in my prior -- my prior work. I'm very familiar with the costs and everything associated with defaulting with moving mobile homes, with the state laws, HUD laws and I'm not going to speak in that capacity here, but I am very familiar with what all will be involved with this process. Respectfully more than the applicant is. And so that's why I'm -- I'm choosing to sort of push on this a little bit more, not only as -- as a member of our Council, who truly believes that affordable housing is a super important part of our taking care of our community, but also somebody who is involved in the real estate industry and intimately understanding the costs that will be associated with -- to -- the cost that will be incurred to these individuals, even in the applicant's kindness and of offering of covering some of those costs, there is still going to be costs involved in physically moving, getting rid of things that they can't take with them to likely a smaller place, potentially not having somewhere that will allow them to park a vehicle, all those things will be involved, there will be a significant impact and I am not stating that to say that I am opposed to this project, I am stating that because it's the reality and I think if the applicant doesn't really truly start working on that part of the process, that your own -- that your own role in this is -- could be complicated. So, I would hope that you would see it to your benefit to educate yourself on all these different things. That was -- that's really where I have come from with all of -- all of the statements I have made is that the applicant will become more educated and more aware of what all is going to be involved for these folks and so -- I don't have any question. I just -- I just wanted to say that it can get very complicated. In my opinion you could spend just as much money at five plus thousand dollars apiece moving these units as you could the loss that you will -- that you will incur over say 400 dollars a month per unit and loss for a year of lost income. You could easily spend just as much in assisting the move of them than if folks were to move out early because they now know that there is -- that they are going to have to at some point. That's my just quick math. Maybe I might not be right. But I

have done this enough to figure that there is no way to guarantee that even if we make a decision that benefits you today that -- that folks will stay there long enough to make it beneficial to you for your entire project.

Arnold: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Perreault, I don't know if you were speaking to this applicant or that applicant, but you are right, I mean I -- my dealing with mobile home parks is they are evicted first, I go in and I doze it, scrape it, clean it off and, then, we are -- we are, you know, building. But now I -- the cost with the -- you know, moving them, driving on the years that can -- I know -- I have never looked at that, I just point and doze. But, yeah, you are right. I think -- I think you have heard from our online applicant that he is willing to start working now and I would forget what Councilman said it, but, Mayor, the dates, I think if you put dates in there for certain actions and to have certain things done, I think all of this will fall into place and, then, all of the moving pieces will come together and your assurance that even -- let's say Mark moves to Hawaii or whatever and stays there and sells it, I have got really good experience with a project at the northwest corner -- northeast corner of Ustick and Linder. We came in before you, we tried to do some four-plex and commercial there, but because the development agreement ahead of time didn't allow it, you know, obviously, the Council had to deny that, but -- I mean I think there is a lot more weight in a development agreement and I think it can be conditioned to move this along and help these guys out, because it is going to take probably a good year plus time to re-home people.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: A couple follow-ups, please, to Steve or to Mark. You know, the -- the worst part about this entire application is it's going to have an effect on someone that's negative. For Mark specifically, if you didn't have a two year loan on this property would you be looking at more of 180 day eviction process right now?

Kelly: I don't think so, John, because -- or Commissioner Overton. You know, we really don't want to do the project in one phase. We want to phase the project and get the cottages going. Council Woman Perreault is absolutely correct, the costs -- we have a lot of risk -- just going through this process and telling everybody we will have people moving out and getting uncomfortable. So, you know, we get the risks and we want to try to figure out the best way for everybody, including everybody that has to move their homes most importantly, you know, that they -- that they land on their feet and can move on and we disrupt their lives as little as we possibly can. But, you know, I can't -- I can't -- you know, I think phasing the project -- it sounds like the best idea now if the city's not comfortable moving ahead with the entire master plan.

Overton: Mayor, follow up?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: With your two year loan on that property --

Kelly: What's that?

Overton: Hang on. I'm going to get the whole question out. I just want to make sure that we are crystal clear that what we are talking about is not -- we are going to let them live for the next one year and ten months and, then, give them a notice, we are talking about working immediately on trying to help them find housing, even if the answer -- or the solution was that they would find housing elsewhere well before that two year time period came to be; is that correct?

Kelly: Well, we -- we were talking about doing that with the older homes; correct? That was what I believe Council Member Strader brought up; correct? Is that what you are referring to as far as the two -- two years working with -- with people to move out? We can't -- I thought I made it clear earlier that with our existing lender, no, we can't jeopardize the collateral that's bringing in the income to service the debt. We -- you know, we can't afford to do that.

Overton: Mayor, one more follow up. So, with your current lender -- then I guess that would be correct and we would be -- if we approve phase two and nothing was to happen for at least two years, you would be looking at giving them one and three-quarter years before you gave them notice, so that would put that closer to the end of that two year contract; is that correct, Mark?

Kelly: Yeah. I was just thinking, you know, the -- the end of the two years -- I really don't think we are going to be through the cottages and done with that and ready to move on in two years from now, to be honest with you. So, I think it's, you know, two to three years we are giving them notice and it's a one year notice is what -- is what I'm envisioning and that's -- you know, things stay status quo. If things went crazy again with the market we have -- we have tried to -- we -- we would say we would give notice in two years and we would give them one year. We are fine committing to that if that's -- if that's your -- you know, what you are trying to get to.

Simison: So, Mark, if we said you can't do it for five years is that a problem?

Kelly: Sure. The mobile home component?

Simison: Yeah.

Kelly: I would say that -- that, you know, we would like to do it sooner than that. That three to -- somewhere in the three to five year program I think is realistic. You know, if you insisted on the five we would take that if we could get through the whole approval process now and we would commit to that.

Simison: Five year with a one year minimum notification and, really, for myself, Council, just becomes at what point in time does the conversation -- if the city is going to be

involved in working with their homeowners would or should that really exist and part of it you could start working with those that maybe have fewer options now and you can still bring in somebody else who has a home -- a mobile home that would want to be there for five years. I don't know what the expectation is for someone with a mobile home, how long they expect to leave it in a place. But, you know, if -- if you could -- if they could be there for two, three, four years is that financially viable for them? If you can move out people that don't have as many options or aren't able to take their home with them and bring in others that can fill that space -- I don't know. But just trying to --

Kelly: We -- we would certainly try that -- that approach to keep the income if we were constrained to the five years, but I don't -- you typically, move in a home, it's so costly, you know, to move them and set them up properly per code, that it's prohibitive to then turn around and move them even five years later.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: But, Mr. Kelly or whoever on your team wants to answer, but wouldn't you most likely backfill with RVs? Wouldn't that -- I mean I don't want to put myself in -- in your shoes, but to the extent that the city -- we are working with folks, move them out that are in the most dire circumstances first, wouldn't your natural business plan to deal with that would be to backfill with RVs?

Kelly: Yes. Yes, it would.

Strader: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, I kind of like where you are going with it, because I feel like -- although it is a long time frame and probably not the outcome I was hoping, I think a five year time period would give us a lot more runway to try to work with people and, it's true, I mean it -- and it's also true that any -- anyone who is living there now that watches this public hearing is not obligated to stay there either; right? Like anyone is able to work on addressing their housing situation to the best of their ability with, you know, the public resources available at anytime and so that's important to acknowledge as well. But I -- I do like the five year time period idea, because I feel like that would give us a lot -- a lot more runway to try to solve the issue, would still allow the applicant to move forward on, obviously, the cottages product. Yeah. That -- that feels a little more comfortable. What I don't like about the conversation up until now was -- two years sounds right, but, then, it was 90 days and it was like 180 days, now I'm hearing 360 days -- it just felt like a very fluid situation. Five years feels like it would give a lot more of a heads up, a longer time frame for people to save up if they could, time to get connected with resources. So, yeah. I don't know. I like that idea.

Kelly: Well, just to clarify on the noticing period, I was just trying to clarify that we needed to verify the state statute as to the noticing period and it's confusing when you look it up between either 190 -- 180 and what I just wanted to clarify was that in our second option that we threw out, whatever the statutory is we are saying we will double

it. We would agree to double the period. So, that's the only thing I was talking about at that point. You know, the five years -- if we could notice in four years and give the 360 day notice, I think we could -- we could live with that. I don't know if everybody did review item three, which was the city -- and working together with a piece of property where we could build another RV park or another RV or a mobile home park to house these 40 people and if the city had any property that would be a candidate for redevelopment or -- we would certainly look at joint venturing with the city if the -- you know. Or allow us to design another property with a mobile home park and we will move these into a district and a zoning area that you feel comfortable with.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I know I'm not ready to make any comments on that specifically at this time. That would entail at least for me a lot -- a lot more research and I don't know that that's an option that I am ready to discuss for this specific hearing. I think it's a great idea. I just think it's -- it's very very involved and not something we have ever had requested from us, at least that I can remember in the seven years I have been making land use decisions. So, for me that's not something that I would consider this evening as part of -- as the solution. I can't speak for my fellow Council. But the question I had is -- just trying to understand from the Mayor and Council Woman Strader the benefit of going five years versus four. I think I missed -- I missed the benefit of -- or other than giving more time and potentially allowing if -- if residents were to leave, allowing the owner to bring in other residents and there would be a set amount of time they would be able to stay. I have a feeling that's not super likely, that that's not ultimately going to play out the way that it would sound like it would. So, help me understand the benefit of five over four.

Simison: It's a number. I didn't get the impression from the applicant that they were super keen on moving this project -- part of the project forward at all to begin with. It's part of what they were asked to do. They seem to be oscillating somewhere beyond two years, so it was just a suggestion from my standpoint, but nothing beyond that.

Allen: Mr. Mayor, excuse me, may I make a couple of comments?

Simison: You bet.

Allen: I just wanted to point out that the current DA provision 1.1B states that the final plat application for the second phase of development shall not be submitted to the Planning Division for a minimum period of four years from the date of approval of the preliminary plat to allow residents ample time to find other housing prior to redevelopment of the site. That submittal of the final plat application -- so that will take likely another year by the time it gets approved and they get signature on that before they can start redevelopment of the property. So, I think it will probably be about the five year mark. If you change that, please, be aware of that that DA provision needs to

be changed as well. And, then, just to comment on the statement by Council Woman Strader -- and I believe the applicant may have offered this up to you, but backfilling the spaces where the mobile homes are moved out with RVs, the RV -- an RV park would be the use that that would be allowed and -- and that is a prohibited use in the current R-8 zoning district. However, it wouldn't be a conditional use permit or conditional use in the R-40 zoning district, which is what's requested by the applicant tonight. So, just want to throw those things out. Thank you.

Simison: So, if I can read between what you think I heard you said -- approving the full application allows more ability to accomplish that goal through our processes.

Allen: Yes, Mr. Mayor.

Simison: Thank you.

Arnold: Mr. Mayor, if I can follow up. The -- it does. From the time that we submit a final plat application to the time that we even start moving dirt is at least a year. So, it's more likely a year and a half going through the agency processes before we would ever start turning dirt after a final plat application.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I apologize, Sonya. I -- I remember reading in the staff report that -- that there -- that four years was going to be the earliest that the applicant could apply for a final plat and so however long it takes the applicant to the point that they can submit for one is really up to them, but what -- just to clarify what you are stating is that there would be no opportunity for them to start construction -- well, they have to put the infrastructure in to get the final plat approved; right? To get sign off from the city engineer, so --

Arnold: No. I have got to submit a design and, then, the final plat to city staff, then, that goes back before City Council and that -- but that whole process -- sorry. That whole process takes significant amount of time before we would roll dirt, so -- but, no, the infrastructure doesn't go in first, it's after you guys approve it.

Perreault: Okay. So -- Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: So, realistically, walk through the time frame for that for us. The earliest they would be able to begin construction on any multi-family would be a year to a year and a half after the final plat was submitted. So, you could potentially -- so, if you are prevented from submitting the final plat before year four, then, the earliest you would actually be able to begin construction on your multi-family project would be like five, five

and a half years; is that correct? Is that what I'm hearing, that -- the DA currently as stated?

Allen: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Perreault, Council, it's a minimum period of four years to submit the final plat application. That application typically takes a couple months, give or take, to go through the Council hearing and -- and get approved. They then -- the applicant then needs to get signatures on the plat and get it recorded and do all their -- their improvements or bond for those improvements. The property has to be subdivided prior to them even be able to apply for any building permits. So, it's not a requirement -- or it's not a minimum time period of five years, but I think that's probably about what that's going to work out to.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thanks, Sonya. I guess the -- I'm looking at the -- condition B. So, I think what would need to change here would be -- if we wanted to do it as a DA condition, choosing it to five years, but, then, I didn't see there was like a notice period to the tenants -- like a notification period like has been discussed. So, I think what we were talking about would have been five plus -- you know, whether it's 180 days or 360 days, do you -- do you feel that doing it as a DA requirement is the best way to accomplish this, Sonya, as opposed to any of the other options?

Allen: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, the DA -- a DA provision is probably the best legal document we have, yes.

Strader: Okay. Thanks. Sorry. I need it spelled out for me sometimes. I appreciate it.

Allen: No worries.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: One question for Sonya. Sonya, so if that condition we put in there is a minimum of four years before plat application, that meets the time frame we think it would be, then, about five years; correct? If we --

Allen: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Hoaglun, Council, yes. Yes, sir. Thanks.

Hoaglun: And question for Steve or Mark then. If we do that -- we have talked about time periods of 360 day notice, that sort of thing. If you are following this process when would you give notice to the -- I mean I think we -- I would like you to give notice right away. What's there -- this -- if this is approved to say, okay, folks the clock is going to start ticking, there is going to be about a five year window, but I think there has to be

some official notification at some point in time that we want to put into the DA to lock that in and I don't know how we follow up on that, staff, to -- to make sure that's done, but what would that time frame in your mind, when you talk about 360 days, that's a year out, approximately, what -- what time frames do you have in mind if you have that window?

Arnold: Mayor Simison, Councilman Hoaglun, I think maybe the easiest thing to do is add another condition in the proposed DA that -- you know, right now it says we can't submit anything until, you know, four years for a final plat application and since we all know it's going to take us over a year to get through that process and construction, maybe at that four year mark that's when -- in the provision of the DA that that noticing kicks in, that they are noticed from the date of the final plat submittal and, then, I think there can also be another provision -- I think there was some discussion tonight about working with the housing authority. I think that that could begin, you know, within several months of approval of coordinating with the city and wherever that goes and then -- again my only experience with that was with a family member and it was a HUD process that took a long time and that's all I know. But at least that process can be started sooner, before that four years, and, then, the four years we give the notice to -- that they have got, you know, one year or one year time frame to relocate and put those in the DA, so that you do have those cutoff dates.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault. Sorry, just --

Perreault: So, if I'm hearing you correctly what you are saying is final plat is submitted 360 days have to go by and, then, it's permitted to be recorded. Is that essentially how that would be worded?

Arnold: No.

Perreault: Three hundred and sixty days notice -- giving notices is at the time the final plat is submitted -- cannot be recorded until that 360 day period is over? Is that the condition you are asking for?

Arnold: Mayor Simison, Council Woman Perreault -- or something similar. But by default if we can't submit a final plat for four years -- if -- when we do submit that it will take over a year plus to do. So, in that time frame that could be our kind of final notice basically. Here, you know, we meet with them in a couple of months, do some fliers or send out some mailers directly. We can start getting on our end to try to figure out, you know, what spaces we may have available. But, you know, in that four years we are doing that initial work with the existing mobile homes and, then, after the four years -- or might be five years before we submit for a final plat application, by the time we submit the final plat, then, we give -- that's their final notice. So, up front notice now and, then, from the time we submit final plat, no sooner than four years will be the final notice.

Simison: At least in my head I am going to no final plat application shall be received by the city unless residents have been notified. To me that -- that gives us the ability to insert in the DA that they will have to have notified before we will even process the final plat application now. There is always a chance it doesn't pass and they can go back and talk to the residents. But, you know, to me that's what -- the time frame and, then, you just have to make sure you meet the legal requirements on the -- if it's a year or three -- how many days before you could actually process that through, because what the -- you know, if they want to buy in six months, because we got really really good -- right, Bill? At getting our things through. That's how I would do it. I would not allow the -- I would put it on the -- you have to have done it before you accept your final plat notification.

Arnold: And we would definitely support that.

Allen: Mr. Mayor? Excuse me. May I add to that?

Simison: Yes.

Allen: Possibly a condition of approval would be submit proof of notification to those homeowners via registered mail with the final plat application and that no building permits shall be issued for the new development within that year period of submittal of the final plat.

Simison: Just between you and legal, would we want to cross-reference state code? Is it state code? Is it federal code? Which code gives the housing notification requirements that we would want to reference?

Nary: So, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, it is state code. I mean HUD may have its requirements, but they don't have a noticing issue. So, it is a state code. But the code could change and so I think -- if we are going to decide on 360 as the notice requirement, then, we just put 360. If we reference the code it could be something different.

Simison: Okay.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Could I have Sonya repeat that first one? Submit proof of notification to residents prior to final plat submission or what was that wording?

Allen: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Hoaglund, submit proof of notice to neighbor -- or notice to residents of the mobile home park via registered mail submitted with the final plat application. No building permits shall be submitted within one year of the date of submittal of the final plat application to ensure that they have at least that year notice

and I further suggest to the applicant that they include in their letter to the residents some references for affordable housing, phone numbers, internet links, that kind of thing to further assist.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I appreciate -- Sonya mentioned that there are even more detailed links than what -- than what were put in your -- in -- in your letter. There is -- there is much more significant information that -- that you can provide. So, that just to let you know that you are welcome to call me and e-mail me if you want some links to some things I'm happy to share them with you. Meridian city we have the housing taskforce that we are working on resourcing ourselves and understanding more about affordable housing as well. So, we are in this with you in terms of -- of understanding what's going on in our community. The question I have for you is just a general question of why be willing to pay to be annexed into the city and pay taxes -- to pay city taxes for four or five years? What -- how does that benefit you and is that going to, then, cause you to increase the rents to the -- to your residents?

Arnold: Mayor Simison, Commissioner Perreault -- I'm sorry. Councilman. Took lead from my other -- I can't speak to the -- to the rents, because that's -- that's something that fluctuates and I'm -- I'm not sure how they -- that part of their business model. But one advantage of annexing into the city is we have got quite a bit of infrastructure and we have not really talked about that. I would say your Public Works Department is out there significantly fixing problems with sewer and water, so if we were to upgrade those we would have -- have to annex at that time. The other advantage of annexing is we can -- you can provide -- the city can provide sewer to the cottage units. The cottage units were the main focus and like we have said, the -- we wanted just to submit that, but city staff wanted us to clean up the whole thing, because it's -- it's a mess with the zoning issues and things that are going on out there. But it -- it benefits us in the fact that we can provide sewer to the cottages and, then, eventually when they burn through the cottages, which I think it's going to take a while. It's 30 buildings. Then they move on to the multi-family and, then, clean up the commercial. So, that there is a benefit.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I apologize if my question wasn't clear. Obviously you need sewer and water to the cottages. My question was number one versus number two on what the staff had recommended. Why not wait to annexing for the multi-family piece at a later point in time, so that you are not paying taxes on that. It was specific to that piece, not to your whole project, so -- but you already answered my question by saying that there may also be other Public Works related updates or upgrades that goes specifically to that

bare ground piece -- or, excuse me, that goes specifically to the future multi-family piece. That may be necessary in the interim.

Arnold: Mayor Simison, Commissioner Perreault -- Council Woman Perreault, that is correct. I mean it -- it doesn't make any sense for us to do any major upgrades out there for sewer or fix anything until we actually do the multi-family. But I can't speak toward taxes, but I got to think that mobile homes aren't taxed very much. I don't know what their levy rate is, but it's probably fairly low.

Allen: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Yes, Sonya.

Allen: Excuse me. I just wanted to clarify. The property is already annexed in the city. The applicant is just requesting a rezone.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: My bad. My apologies. I thought we were discussing the possibility of leaving one outside of city annexation, but my bad. Thank you. Well, good. We will happily take the -- the tax income. Thank you.

Arnold: I forgot. Sorry.

Simison: Council, additional questions, comments?

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, one additional question for Mark or Steve. Your bullet point number one, the offer to move any of the mobile homes newer than '76 to one of your facilities, that sounds like that offer is -- applicant's willing to do and would -- and we could include that into the -- in case anybody takes you up on that, you would be willing to do that? Is that still on the table?

Arnold: Yes.

Hoaglund: Okay. Mr. Mayor, a question for staff. The --

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: The -- that half section, that's ACHD requirement, that's baked into the project. We don't -- we don't have any -- where they -- the applicant's offering that only build half. I mean ACHD, it sounds like from Steve's comments, that they have kind of walked that in. So, there is no wiggle room on that whatsoever. So, no discussion there; correct?

Allen: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Hoaglun, Council, ACHD currently owns the right of way for the extension of that street. It is the city's recommendation -- staff and the Commission's recommendation that the applicant construct the full street section. So, you do have the ability to change that if you wish.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I know that this property sits in urban renewal district and MDC has sent in some questions and concerns to our planning staff and in the final report issued to ACHD on June 1st it sounds like ACHD is sort of stating it's the city's responsibility to require the half -- if we want the full to be done or the half and that ACHD is not going to require it. At least that's how I understood the final report. My question to the applicant is since this is an urban renewal district are you -- I mean I would assume you could -- since ACHD is not going to reimburse you, I would assume you could apply for -- I know you can apply for funds from Meridian Development Corporation to cover some of those costs in the URD. Have you made a consideration of doing that?

Arnold: Mayor Simison, Council Woman Perreault, yes, we will talk -- that will be one of the groups that we -- we talk to, but we have not talked to them about reimbursing now and I don't know what those costs are or what it would be. I need to get some construction drawings done, so that we could submit for bids and estimates and we have not done that. But if that is a condition placed on us definitely we are going to reach out to see if there is fees. All's we are trying to say is that that's not a standard condition. ACHD didn't require it. I understand why it's wanting to be done or requested now, but it's just -- it's not a typical condition and it's considered, you know, almost like an off-site improvement. But I don't know how we could ask the city to -- yeah. I don't know how we could put a condition that we go work with MDC to get funding or -- for us the easiest thing is just to do the standard ACHD half plus 12.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I wasn't recommending that we condition it, I was just asking if you had looked into it as a way to compensate for some of the funding that would be additional cost that would be required to do the other half side of the street, if you would have some of that offset by your ability to go and pursue some tax increment funds from MDC. But if you haven't looked into that, then, you can't answer that question. So, thank you.

Nary: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Mr. Nary.

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council -- and I guess just to put a fine point on it, I mean Steve is correct, it is normally that it is half plus 12. Normally there is another property on either side and they do the other half. So, that's normally how -- why it is done that way and here it sounds like that's not the opportunity that exists. So, it will likely have to, then, be built at some point in the future if it's going to connect either by an ACHD project, which right now appears not to be in there -- at least on their radar or an MDC project or a city project. So, just as long as the Council is comfortable that the other half isn't going to get built by an adjacent property owner. It sounds like that's not the option. That's -- that's why the half is normally the -- the standard. So, as long as the Council is comfortable with that and understands that eventually someone will figure it out.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: So, before I get into anything real crazy here, I want to make sure we kind of have an understanding of some of the points and whatnot that -- before I make a motion for approval of this project that I would include their bullet point number one of the offer to move any of their RV or mobile home parks newer than '76, that whole thing, would be included as one of the conditions. That they would be required to submit proof of notice to residents of the mobile home park via registered mail about the move at submission of the final plat. I can't read my own writing on some of this -- on this other one. That no building permits submitted prior to approval of final plat submissions -- I don't think that's -- I have that right, so -- I can't read my writing. No building permits submitted prior to approval of -- what -- that was one that you had as well.

Allen: Mr. Mayor, may I respond?

Simison: Yes, you may.

Hoaglund: Yeah. Well, we are not in a motion. I want to get feedback on this to make sure we have all of these down and the applicant is aware and -- and the residents are aware of what we are discussing here.

Allen: The latter part of your comment. No building permit applications shall be submitted prior to one year from the date of submittal of the final plat application.

Hoaglund: Okay. That's the word have been -- no building permits -- building permit applications submitted prior to one year of final plat submissions.

Allen: Final plat application.

Hoaglund: Applications. Okay. I got things backwards here. No building -- building permits -- submitted or application? I missed --

Allen: Building permit application.

Hoaglund: Applications prior to one year of final plat application.

Allen: Yes.

Hoaglund: Okay. There we go.

Allen: Sorry. Kind of confusing.

Hoaglund: And, then, local resources provided to the residents. So, I want to make that a requirement as part of the conditions and we talked about one year, but we also recognize the fact that it takes a while for those things to get processed and I would like to go a little longer, 18 months. I don't know if -- two years is quite a ways out, but because of the wait list and different things like that, but I don't know what the marker would be, because we can tie everything else to the submission of final plat, but at 18 months I don't know what we can do to make it a little longer or two years to kind of say, hey, two years and, then, how do we know that it's tied to something, so -- because you might change people and people forget and we have got enough to do. So, Sonya, do you have a suggestion?

Allen: Yes, Mr. Mayor, Councilman Hoaglund, Council, we could include that in the conditions of approval of the preliminary plat to require -- thinking out loud as we go -- to -- to require a notice to be sent possibly as a -- as a condition of a future time extension application on the preliminary plat. That would be two years. So, that still leaves us three years out, but that might be a good -- a good reminder at that point as well. I can't think of any other possibilities, options on that.

Hoaglund: And what I like about that, Mr. Mayor, is the fact that, yes, three years out and, then, we tie that to also the submission of final plat another one year out notice. That way there is two bites of the apple two years out when you submit the preliminary plat approval they are -- they are notified and, then, when -- one year out for the submission of final plat. That way they can't say, oh, we didn't know. It's -- it's there. So, Steve, do you have any -- any thoughts on that? Any issues?

Arnold: Mayor Simison, Councilman Hoaglund, let me see if I understand it correct. So, we go -- is it four years and then -- then we can submit our final plat and at that four year mark that's when we notify the neighbors that they are basically moving?

Hoaglund: Yes. They have one year left. However, at the -- at the two year mark you would provide them with local resources, kind of a reminder saying, hey, you know, the clock's ticking, here are resources for you to -- and, Mr. Mayor, if city staff was involved in that, I -- what are those resources? Can they provide them I don't know. But something that as -- as was in this about the housing company agency and the different links, local resources available. Here are some local resources you can go to to find housing and that would be done at the two year mark and, then, it will be done again at

the one year mark with -- when you say, hey, here is the notice, they have been notified by registered mail and we also provided local resources for them to investigate.

Allen: Mr. Mayor, may I add to that? Earlier I said as a condition of the time extension for the preliminary plat. That should actually be associated with the conditional use permit for the multi-family development, because a time extension likely will come after that for the preliminary plat if the phase one records within a year. The CUP would be more appropriate for that -- for the multi-family development. Thank you.

Hoaglund: So, Mr. Mayor, require local resources provided to residents at submission of the conditional use permit with phase one.

Allen: Time extension.

Hoaglund: Time extension. Phase one time extension.

Allen: Not phase one, because it's not the plat, just conditional use permit for the multi-family development. There is three conditional use permits before you tonight. There is one for the multi-family development in the R-40 district and that condition should be associated with that time extension.

Hoaglund: Okay.

Allen: Because they have two years from the date of approval of the conditional use permit to commence the use. They, obviously, aren't going to do that, so they are going to have to come back in for a time extension. If you approve the conditional use permit tonight for the multi-family development.

Nary: So Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Mr. Nary.

Nary: So, Mr. Mayor, just so it's clear -- and I don't think we need to create more rules for this, but we don't know in two years what resources will exist or how that will be communicated to anyone. So, as long as the Council is comfortable that if we were to look back at the minutes of this meeting whatever exists, because, really, the way it's written right now one notice of one place to go is adequate and I don't want to change it, because I don't know if there is going to be ten or -- or one and so I just want to be clear to everybody that that condition really is satisfied providing one notice, because we don't know what will exist at the time, so --

Simison: And I can always -- you know, I can't say who is going to be here, I can't say who is going to be in community development, but as far as I'm concerned this would be -- if I'm still around and someone reminds us -- we are working with Crystal on CDBG to initiate a city neighborhood meeting to talk directly with the homeowners and we are bringing in outside resources. No disrespect to a notification. That's not how this is

going to get accomplished. My opinion. But how do we -- how do we know when that trigger is and who is going to reach out and make sure that that happens? I can put it on my calendar in three years from now. If I'm here, great.

Nary: Didn't want an expectation that something more to be done and, then, they would be arguing in two years that they didn't do enough or they should have done more and we don't know what that's going to be.

Simison: Mr. Nary, I think you said you are going to be here at least five years; right?

Nary: Yeah. I will keep an eye on it with the billboard down on Locust Grove.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: That's -- that's why I stated a little while ago that making this a condition -- condition in my opinion is just too subjective. I don't see how we feasibly condition it from a timing standpoint or -- or what -- I don't know that we all could get on the same page specifically as to what would be enough for the residents. I'm not saying we shouldn't try, but I think we will go down a rabbit hole with it in my personal opinion. So, here is an example. If a resident were to apply for a housing voucher that's federal funds that are -- that are distributed by the county, that housing voucher only allows that resident 90 days to go find another place to live and if they cannot find a landlord that's willing to accept their housing voucher, which is substantially less than market rate housing, they have to give up that voucher to somebody else who is on the wait list and reapply and, then, wait another two years to get another 90 days to get a shot at it and that's the reality of what's going on with housing vouchers in our area and the wait list is very very long. They -- they increased -- they created a -- quite a few more housing vouchers about two years ago, they added 2,600 new vouchers for folks to apply for. They didn't get used, because landlords aren't willing to accept them. They are not -- there is no requirement that landlords have to accept vouchers. So, this is one small part of the problem with housing affordability in our area, even if you were to go through your process to help folks do that, there is no guarantee that that will actually get them someplace they need to go. That's why I'm concerned about the subjectivity of what we can and cannot condition. I want you all to do that voluntarily, because it's the right thing to do for people. I struggle with the city trying to regulate when you do that, how you do that and I'm the first person to say I want you to do it, I just don't know that I would ask our staff to get too specific on it. I like the idea that -- that Council President Hoaglund proposed about the preliminary plat as a way for our staff to be reminded to follow up with you. My hope is that at that time you all will take -- take it and run with it and do the right thing. If that means that, you know, our -- we may or may not have someone on staff in the Mayor's Office that's handling housing, we may not have the same CDBG director, but at minimum I would think that we could at least put something in the DA that allows all parties to be notified that this is -- needs to get started and the applicant should proceed with -- with that.

Simison: And maybe the best way to do this is to put in the DA, but that they -- that the Mayor's Office and Council is notified when that note -- when that notification is given, because that will at least elevate it to everyone's attention who is here for those that want to be engaged and involved in -- in that process.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I think that's acceptable. I think us trying to get any more specific than that is just going to be too challenging for all parties involved.

Hoaglund: So Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: The local housing resources would be part of that registered letter, that they are required proof of notice to residents in the mobile home park via registered mail about move at submission final plat and to include local housing resource options. And that's one year out. So, I think we are all good on that. Okay.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: So, just to recap in the most simple terms possible for anyone that's tuning in, they are -- they are not going to be able to start doing anything at this site for four years to even apply for it at the earliest and, then, after that time they will have at least a year that they have to notify everybody before you could be moved out of your home. But there is nothing stopping you from checking into all of your housing options earlier of your own accord. Am I getting that -- I think I have that right. I just want to make sure that's very clear for everybody who might be watching later.

Simison: I think that's clear and accurate to me.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Appreciate Council Woman Strader putting in very clear language. You do have -- other residents that have joined, so it's -- it's -- it's good to put that out there and -- and I will say before we make the motion that, you know, this -- these are difficult -- difficult decisions. These are -- there is no good answer to this. So, we try to find the best possible solution. We work very hard at it. We have several hearings after this and they are patiently waiting and I think they understand the reasons why this -- this takes quite a while to go. But to do nothing in my mind was not an option, because that

gives the residents even less time to move, anywhere from 30 to 180 days, with no assistance if you want to go -- and this brings the applicant into the process to offer assistance to the parks they own and if there is openings and residents want to go and we appreciate that offer. But I just appreciate the good work of everybody on Council and the Mayor to try to figure out what is the best path on this and, you know, they say that -- that old saying about laws and sausages, it's something you don't really want to see being made and this is kind of the process. It looks messy at times, but we hope the outcome is good in the end. But it does -- it does impact residents and we know that there will be change in their life at some point in time. So, appreciate everyone that's worked on this, so -- unless there is other comment, which we have comment after a motion anyway, but I think we are done. Steve, did you have --

Arnold Mr. Mayor, one last comment. No. We have been talking a lot about the relocations and timings and all that. There is one last thing that we have not talked on as a condition on the preliminary plat. The Planning and Zoning Commission didn't fully understand how our housing worked, so they wanted us -- and recommended to this body that we eliminate the sidewalk at the southeast corner and that sidewalk -- that leads to the front of people's homes. So, we would ask that that condition be eliminated, because they basically need access into the front. But what we would do is -- you know, you can add, you know, decorative lighting along that, because I believe the concern that the P&Z had was that it could become a crime scene behind homes, when, in actuality, this is the front of the home. That's all I had. I do appreciate the Council's approach and concern with housing. It's been one of my biggest things in the valley. We are unaffordable right now. We are not making anything more affordable and I would be interested to sit in on your -- any of the committee -- the committees that you have about that, because I would like to learn more about it. We have done some things down in Kuna on some really tiny lots and I think that agencies and jurisdictions are going to have to start doing things that are kind of outside the box to make things affordable, because we are not affordable right now. And I would also like to thank staff. We started working with them in 2015. So, this has been a long run. And I will stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions on the last point that he brought up regarding the path?

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I want us to ask staff -- was that -- I vaguely remember that now about that sidewalk, to remove that requirement in the southeast corner I think it was.

Allen: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Hoaglund, yes, please. That's Condition 2.2F. Strike that condition requiring the removal of the pedestrian pathway along the eastern boundary of the site adjacent to the single family residential portion of the development and if you

wish add a condition, as the applicant offered, to include pedestrian lighting along that pathway. Thank you.

Hoaglund: All right. Thank you, Mr. Mayor? Thank you, Steve.

Simison: Then with that, Council, do I have a motion to close public hearing?

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I move that we close the public hearing on H-2022-0013.

Overton: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I will make a motion -- motion to approve. After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony to approve File No. H-2022-0013 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of June 20th, 2023, with conditions to be -- to be added, which include the bullet point in the staff report of moving costs be covered as outlined in their -- their bullet point. That they submit proof of notice to residents of the mobile home park via registered mail about move at submission of final plat and that that registered mail informing them of the submission also include local housing resources, links or information that they can access to help find other housing options. That the -- no building permit applications be issued prior to one year of final plat application. No building permit applications prior to one year of final plat applications. And that we strike Condition No. 2.2.F and include a condition that includes the pedestrian lighting plan as outlined by staff and applicant.

Allen: Mr. Mayor, may I clarify the motion, please?

Overton: Second.

Simison: We have a motion and a second. Question from staff.

Allen: Did the maker of the motion intent to require with the CUP time extension a notice to neighbors?

Hoaglund: Yes, I did.

Allen: Thank you.

Hoaglund: I did. Thank you for --

Allen: The conditional use permit for the multi-family development.

Hoaglund: Yes. Well, actually, conditional use permit for multi-family development. That's the two years out. I think -- I think in discussion, though, we went to the one year with the final product -- for the submission of the final plat. One year. Instead of the two year. Just to keep things a little cleaner.

Allen: Did you want to do both or just one?

Hoaglund: Council Woman Perreault --

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you. I apologize. I missed that. I was under the impression that we would -- that neighbors would be notified -- is that what you are discussing, neighbors -- you are mentioning neighbors being notified. That would be at the submission of the final plat.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Perreault: I didn't hear anything about a CUP being a trigger for communication --

Allen: There was discussion about two notices. One going out within two years of the date of the conditional use permit for the multi-family development with the time extension request that will be required, because the -- this property won't redevelop within that two year period. The use won't be commenced. So, it will require a time extension if that conditional use permit is approved tonight. They had -- we had discussed a -- just a really early notice, then, that would give them still about three years out to get on any possible lists or affordable housing that might take longer than a year.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Council Woman Perreault, it was to try and give them maximum notice during that two years and that gives them three years, but, then, one -- one year prior and that's the -- basically the last one year to go and that's -- that's it. So, if you are okay with adding that condition I think we are good.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I apologize, I was -- I was not recognizing the vehicle that was used to renew the -- the plat for two additional years. You are saying that we use the CUP to do that. Got you. That's where I was getting messed up. So, yes, two -- two notifications. Two years in advance of final plat and, then, at the final plat submission. Absolutely.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, that condition of -- conditional use permit for filing multi-family development time extension that they would also provide notice to residents of housing resources if the second agrees or would like to add that.

Overton: Second agrees.

Simison: Second does agree. I have a motion and a second. Is there further discussion? Okay. Ask the Clerk to call the roll.

Roll Call: Hoaglund, yea; Borton, absent; Cavener, yea; Perreault, yea; Strader, yea; Overton, yea.

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries and the item is agreed to. Thank you, everyone, for being here and the in-depth conversation and the work that needs to be moved ahead.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Simison: With that we are going to go ahead and stand in recess for about 20 minutes. Council Woman Strader, does that work, 20 minutes?

Strader: Fifteen would be fine. Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Simison: We will take a 15 minute break, so reconvene at 8:20.

(Recess: 8:05 p.m. to 8:20 p.m.)

2. Public Hearing for Graycliff Estates Subdivision No. 2 Lot 13, Block 5 (H-2023-0023) by KB Home, Sabrina Durtschi, located at 4456 S. Redwater Ave.

- A. Request: Vacation of the northern 5-feet of the 10-foot-wide public utilities, pressure irrigation and lot drainage easements along the southern boundary of Lot 13, Block 5.

3. Public Hearing for Graycliff Estates Subdivision No. 2, Lot 21, Block 5 (H-2023-0027) by KB Home, Sabrina Durtschi, Located at 4469 S. Colditz Way

- A. Request: Vacation of the northern 5-feet of the 10-foot-wide public

utilities, pressure irrigation and lot drainage easements along the southern boundary of Lot 21, Block 5.

Simison: We will go ahead and come back from our recess. Thank you very much for allowing us for those that are still here in the audience and with that we will move on to our second action item and we will open these both together? Okay. Then we will go ahead and open public hearing H-2023-0023 and public hearing H-2023-0027 with the staff comments.

Allen: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. The two vacation applications are before you tonight. The properties are located at 4456 South Redwater Avenue and 4469 South Colditz Way. Both properties in the R-8 zoning district. The applicant requests to vacate the northern five feet of the ten foot wide public utilities pressurization and lot drainage easements along the southern boundary of Lot 21, Block 5, and the southern boundary of Lot 13, Block 5. The reason for the request is that the configuration of the lot and the utility easement along the subdivision boundary does not accommodate the footprints of the applicant's housing collection for this development. Approval of a reduction to the easements as proposed will allow all of their building floor plans to fit on these lots. Relinquishment letters have been submitted from all impacted utility companies consenting to the partial vacation of easement as proposed. Letters were received from the Boise Project Board of Control, CenturyLink, Idaho Power, Intermountain Gas Company and Sparklight. Staff is recommending approval of the requested vacations. No written testimony has been received. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions for staff? Is the applicant here? Good evening, Sabrina. Nice to see you.

Durtschi: So great to see you all. For the record my name is Sabrina Durtschi. I am here on behalf of KB Home. My business address is 1299 North Orchard Street, Boise, Idaho. 83706. And as Sonya has so thoroughly went over our brief quick application, we, unfortunately, after recording the plat found out that due to the configuration none of our floor plans really fit the lot sizes. So, that's the reason why we are asking for the reduction in the vacation of half the easement. So, with that I will thank you for your time and stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you. Council, questions?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Hello, Sabrina. So good to see you. As far as the utility companies that sent letters approving the -- the partial vacations, how did you get to that list of companies that needed to be notified? Does it specifically say in your plat that those were the

utilities that had easement access or was it just -- were you being very thorough? Are there any other companies that potentially could claim access that aren't on this list?

Durtschi: Sure. Mayor, Council Woman Perreault, actually, there is a checklist that the application provides that lists all of the public utilities that I'm required to notify and that's the list that I did notify, so -- yes.

Simison: Council, any additional questions? Okay.

Durtschi: Thank you so much.

Simison: Mr. Clerk, do we have anybody signed up on these items?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we did not.

Simison: Okay. If there is anyone present and would like to provide testimony on these items, either in the room or online please come forward now or use the raise your hand feature on Zoom. Seeing no one coming forward, no one raising their hand, would the applicant like to make any final comments? Applicant waives final comments. Council, what's your direction?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Move to close the public hearing on Item 2 and Item 3.

Strader: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to close the public hearings for Item 2 and Item 3. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the public hearings is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Mr. Hoaglund did the easy one earlier, I guess I will -- I will make a motion. After considering all staff and applicant testimony I move to approve File No. H-2023-0023 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of June 20th, 2023.

Perreault: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve Item 2. Is there discussion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

Roll Call: Hoaglund, yea; Borton, absent; Cavener, yea; Perreault, yea; Strader, yea; Overton, yea.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: After considering all staff, applicant testimony I move that we approve File No. H-2023-0027 as written in the staff report for the hearing date of June 30th, 2023.

Hoaglund: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve Item H-2023-0027. Is there any discussion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

Roll Call: Hoaglund, yea; Borton, absent; Cavener, yea; Perreault, yea; Strader, yea; Overton, yea.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

4. Public Hearing for Pollard Subdivision (TECC-2023-0001) by Brighton Development, Inc., generally located on the north side of W. Chinden Blvd., east of SH-16, in the south 1/2 of Section 21, T.4N., R.1W.

- A. Request: Time Extension for 1-year on the preliminary plat, until June 4, 2024, in order to obtain the City Engineer's signature on the Final Plat.

Simison: Next item is Item 4, public hearing for Pollard Subdivision, TECC-2023-0001. We will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Allen: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. The next application before you is a request for a time extension on the approved preliminary plat. This property consists of 71.3 acres of land. It's located near the northeast corner of State Highway 16 and West Chinden Boulevard and is zoned R-8 and C-G. The applicant is requesting a one year time extension on the preliminary plat in order to obtain the city engineer's

signature on the final plat. The plat consists of 75 building lots, seven common lots and four other lots on 71.3 acres of land. The preliminary plat for this project was approved by City Council on June 4, 2019, and one time extension has been approved by the director, which expired on June 4th, 2023. The subject time extension request was received prior to the expiration date. The applicant requests approval of a one year time extension in order to obtain the city engineer's signature on the first phase final plat, which was approved by City Council on September 27th, 2022. The applicant is currently working to get the plat signed, but was not able to do so prior to the expiration date. The phase one final plat includes all of the commercial areas noted as -- noted as phases one and two on the phasing plan approved with the preliminary plat. The residential portion remains to be included in a future final plat as phase two. Approval of the subject time extension will allow the applicant to obtain the city engineer's signature on the final plat and proceed with development of the property. If City Council does not approve the requested extension a new preliminary plat application will be required. With all extensions the director may require -- excuse me. The City Council may require the final plat to comply with the current UDC provisions in effect at this time. Since the approval of the preliminary plat in 2019 the following UDC standards have changed. Street buffer landscaping includes more specifications for such and enhanced landscaping is required in buffers along designated entryway corridors, such as West Chinden Boulevard and State Highway 20-26. The off-street parking standards for two bedroom single family residential units now require fewer spaces, i.e., two spaces are required instead of four, with at least one space in an enclosed garage. The amount of qualified open space for the R-8 zoning district has increased from ten percent to 15 percent and some of the standards for such have been modified. A total of 2.19 acres or 12.19 percent was proposed for the 17.97 acre residential area. Based on the current standard a minimum of 2.7 acres would be required, which requires an additional approximately half of an acre of qualified open space. The number of site amenities have changed from one for each 20 acres of development area to a point system requiring one point of site amenity for each five acres of land. One amenity, a children's play structure, was proposed with the preliminary plat. Based on the current standard a minimum of four points of site amenity would be required. A tot lot qualifies as one point. Additional amenities totaling at least three points are required to comply with the current standard. Staff recommends future development comply with the aforementioned current UDC standards for development as a provision of the requested time extension on the preliminary plan. The applicant is in agreement with this recommendation. Staff further recommends the landscape plan for the first phase final plat approved by City Council, but not yet recorded, be amended through an administrative landscape plan modification application to reflect compliance with the updated landscape standards for street buffers, including those for entryway corridors. The applicant does not agree with this recommendation and requests the associated Condition No. 9.3 is stricken. Staff is recommending approval with the conditions in the staff report. Mike Wardle, Brighton Corporation, submitted written testimony requesting Condition 9.3 is stricken. Staff will stand for any questions.

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

Wardle: Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Mike Wardle. Brighton Corporation. 2929 West Navigator in Meridian. I don't want to belabor the issues, but I want to just comment about the two hours that you just spent on a very very difficult and challenging issue. This June marks the 14th year that my wife and I have engaged in helping those of the inner city poor, the homeless, the incarcerated and those being released from incarceration and, in fact, one of our visits was to an individual in the facility that you folks were talking about tonight and as we have watched the challenges that these folks face, it's -- it's heartbreaking, because there are no really easy solutions. In fact, there are most -- almost no solutions to the challenges that they face in these circumstances. So, even though I expected to have dinner at 7:00 o'clock, I do appreciate the fact that you had some time to go over some challenges that are very apparent in -- in the valley, not just in your city, but in the valley and the region. So, hats off to you for taking the time to do that. As Sonya noted in the fall of last year you did approve the final plat for Pollard No. 1 Subdivision and that did include a landscape plan. Since that approval we have been involved now in getting all of our plans approved and signatures and so forth and if you have been out -- or maybe you have been trying to dodge the Highway 16 Chinden area because of construction, but if you have been out there you will see that construction is well underway. We -- I think we might have already completed the city's regional sewer lift station out there. It's at least -- it's a part of that project, but there is a lot of activity on site and we understand the issue, but it's kind of fascinating that here we have a final plat approved just a few months ago and now we are dealing with the preliminary plat from 2019 and, then, the updated standards and we are -- we have no problem with the standards that were noted in the staff report, with this one exception, because after final plat approval -- of course, we, then, do all of our budgeting, we get our plans and so forth approved and now we are being requested to modify something. But it's not insurmountable, but it's significant and so we are simply asking for deletion and we did submit a letter dated June 15th asking for the deletion of that updated landscape plan. It's not that we are trying to do anything deficient or less -- lesser standard, but it just changes something that we have already been in the process of doing through the final plat process and now have to kind of re -- rebound back to preliminary plat issues. So we are agreeable with the requirements that staff has proposed with that one exception and ask that Condition 9.3 relative to updating the landscape plan be deleted from this approval since you just approved the plan a few months ago and we are under construction. Be happy to answer your questions.

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

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Good to see you, Mr. Wardle. I just want to make sure I'm understanding that that is specific to the street buffers and the entryway corridors. Is there anything additional to that that will be affected or would affect open space or is it --

Wardle: No, nothing additional. And, in fact, you are actually going to have a second bite at the apple, because part of the project area that we are platting likely will see a conditional use permit coming forward in the future that will involve a significant amount of that frontage. So, some of these things can be caught up at that point. So, it's a good question and I think a simple answer.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor, one more question.

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I noticed that the final plat is significantly different from the preliminary in terms of size of lot -- of the lots and number of the lots. I know you don't have to answer this question for our decision tonight, but are you willing to give us an update on what has changed in the -- in the concept of the project? Is there anything significant that would be helpful for us to know?

Wardle: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Perreault, the use of -- the residential component, which is the future, will probably be replaced with a new final plat -- a new preliminary plat, excuse me, when that comes in, because likely a few changes there. But in terms of the rest of the project to commercial uses anticipated, no, not significant differences and I think the Mayor actually in his State of the City address recently noted the use -- the primary use that's coming forward of medical service facility -- not a hospital, but a medical service facility, that will be one of the first users there. So, the commercial uses are still intended to be commercial and the only difference here -- I think we have reduced the number of lots, because when you preliminary plat you kind of anticipate the world and, then, you get to reality and we are now at reality. So, the uses are coming forward and they are now being known. So, that's as far as I would go. Thank you.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Mike, you have been talking about the landscape plan not -- not being insurmountable, but significant.

Wardle: Good question, Council Member Hoaglund. We actually submitted the request -- or the condition impact to our landscape architects and they said it would be a fair amount of reworking from what was approved just a few months ago and we have made commitments through our budgeting process and so forth with our contractors. So, it would be taking a step back that we would prefer to move forward.

Hoaglund: Okay. Thank you.

Seal: Council, any additional questions for the applicant? Okay.

Wardle: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

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

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, no.

Simison: Okay. If there is anybody present who would like to come forward and provide testimony on this or online you can use the raise your hand feature. Seeing no one coming forward or raising their hand, would the applicant like to make any final comments? Applicant waives.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Seeing no more comments, I move that we close the public hearing.

Cavener: Second.

Simison: Motion and second to close the public hearing. Any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I would like to move for approval. After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony I move to approve File No. TECC-2023-0001 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of June 20th, 2023, with the request that condition 9-3 is stricken.

Perreault: Second.

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

Roll Call: Hoaglund, yea; Borton, absent; Cavener, yea; Perreault, yea; Strader, yea; Overton, yea.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

5. Public Hearing continued from May 9, 2023 for Artisan Victory Market (H-2022-0066) by Kindi Moosman, Horrocks Engineers, Inc., located at 2820, 2910, 2960, 2990 and 3020 S. Eagle Rd.

- A. Request: Annexation and Zoning of 14.47 acres of land with the R-15 zoning district.
- B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 5 building lots and 1 common lot on approximately 13.6 acres in the requested R-15 zoning district.
- C. Request: Conditional Use Permit for a multi-family development consisting of 138 units on 13.60 acres in the R-15 zoning district

Simison: Council, next item up is item -- sorry. Turn the page. Public Hearing No. 5, which was continued from May 9th, 2023, for Artisan Victory Market, H-2022-0066. We will continue this public hearing with staff comments.

Parsons: Thank you, Mayor, Members of the Council. Here to get another project wrapped up tonight. So, last one on the agenda this evening is the Artisan Victory Market. As Mayor mentioned this -- you heard this item on May 9th. During those discussions you had talked about the potential of the applicant removing some of the commercial, potentially going all residential, or maybe removing the drive through component and keeping a small commercial component. There was some discussion around some integration and how that commercial was actually integrating into the overall project. So, based on those discussions during that hearing the applicant actually went back to the drawing board and went with what they felt was their best option moving forward and I have laid some of that out in a memo that I prepared for you on June 15th. So, the applicant did go back to the drawing board and, essentially, submitted all revised plans for what is, essentially, now an all residential project in the mixed use community designated area. As we discussed last time, typically staff likes to have more than one land use type on this particular property. But, again, when you are looking at the larger 50 acre area staff did make note of -- that there are additional uses in this area that could support a single use on this particular property. So, the annexation itself has changed -- again, I would also mention to the -- the Mayor and Council that the project has been really noticed to reflect the plans that we are talking about tonight. So, it's been properly noticed, reposted, everything is in order to move forward on this application based on some of that discussion that we had at the previous hearing. So, as -- as -- as you recall this did have a small C-C component that has been removed and now the applicant is proposing to annex in the entire property with an R-15 zoning district. Revised plat was also submitted. Probably the most notable change here that you can see is that originally it was two commercial lots and three multi-family lots. They have now since changed it to four multi-family lots consistent with their annexation request and based on some of the discussions that they heard. I would also mention to the Council that this site still has a private street app -- application associated with it, along with some of the local street network that will be

extended as part of the project. So, if you recall this portion here was the local street and, then, it was a looped internal private road that was proposed -- that was -- has been approved by the director. I would also point your attention to the southwest corner of the development and this is where that commercial was going to happen and they were trying -- the applicant was -- had the two commercial lots there and they were tying into the shared access with the adjacent property. Based on discussions with the applicant and some of the discussion that we had on the May 9th hearing, there was some concern that the commercial didn't integrate well or there was concerns with commercial traffic driving through the residential portion of this site and so the applicant has -- rather than provide that vehicular connection there the applicant is just proposing a pedestrian connection in -- in that area of this -- this plat and the conditional use permit site plan that you will see here shortly. So, I just at least wanted to point that out to you as well, that there is no longer -- there is no -- the potential for cross-access has currently been removed in favor of that pedestrian connection. So, here is the revised site plan for the conditional use permit. Again, as you can see here the applicant has added more townhome units and actually reconfigured probably this portion along the south and, then, that southwest corner. So, this is where a majority of the site has changed from what you previously saw and you can see the unit count increased from 131 to 138. Now, because the R-15 zone has expanded based on the annexation request, the density has gone down slightly, even though the unit count has gone up. So, when we talked about this project back in May the density was about 11.2, if I remember correctly, and now it's about ten. So, a modest decrease here in density. And, then, the applicant's also showing you some of the pedestrian connections and, then, here is what I was referring to as far as the connectivity to the future daycare here along the southern boundary. Also mention to you that there is some traffic calming that has been added as well. Moving on to the landscape plan, again, completely redone. The applicant has provided an open space exhibit. So, open space has -- minimum qualified open space required for the project is 2.21 acres and the applicant has stated in their revised narrative and on their submitted drawings that they are providing 2.28 acres, which is in excess of UDC standards. Also mention to you with the increase of the residential units the applicant has updated their parking calculations, too, and I think they have conveyed to me that there is 274 parking stalls that they are providing, code only requires 261. So, again, open space and parking does exceed UDC standards. And, again, I went ahead and threw in the -- the fencing plan and that's been updated to reflect the conditions of approval as well. Here are the amenities. Again, the applicant is complying with all amenity requirements for the proposed use. The one that isn't noticed here noted here on the plan is the requirement for the charging stations. But in the applicant's narrative they are proposing that as one of their amenities and they were conditioned to do so as well. And, then, because there are no commercial elevations anymore, the elevations have been updated to reflect only the potential elevations and no commercial component. So, just wanted to quickly touch on those items for -- for your consideration tonight and, then, also in that memo, as I received those revised plans from the applicant, I had a chance to go through the recommended DA provisions to you and some of the conditions of approval and I noted in not only the memo, but also this slide which items need to be stricken or modified if you guys are in favor of this

application tonight. I will go ahead and conclude my presentation and I will stand for any additional questions you may have.

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

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: While the applicant is coming forward, I just -- I kind of want to share -- I was -- I was absent for this -- when this was heard in May, but I have had a chance to review all the application materials. I have watched the hearing, read the minutes, so I'm prepared to be involved in this conversation.

Simison: Thank you, Councilman Cavener. Good evening.

Koeckeritz: Good evening, Mayor, City Council Members. I'm Elizabeth Koeckeritz. I'm with Givens Pursley at 601 Bannock. I am here on -- Boise, Idaho. I am here on -- tonight on behalf of the applicant Baron Properties and with me tonight is Matt, Riggs Greg Hector and Shannon Ely, all members of Baron Properties. It's good to be back here. I would like to start by saying once again thank you to Bill, because there have been so many discussions in the last six weeks and over the last year and a half working through other iterations of this project with various staff members, going from more commercial to just commercial to some commercial, but always trying to really listen and pinpoint in on what staff was looking for and, then, really listening to the comments that were coming from you, the Mayor and City Council, at our last hearing to really try to come up with a plan that we think is really the best fit for Baron Properties and for the city as a whole. So, Bill did a good job of just kind of going over some of the highlights of the changes and so I just really wanted to sort of focus in on how we ended up on that a hundred percent residential. Well -- just scrolling in a little bit. Bill covered this. We are off of -- we are directly east of Eagle Road, a little bit north of Victory. I'm going to pass slides so quickly. Okay. All right. As you can see on this site plan, the real changes are all down, as Bill mentioned, in that southwest corner and we have replaced the commercial pad with two townhome units and one one bedroom duplex unit on the west and, then, the townhome units that were on the southern boundary have now been replaced with two bedroom bungalow units that results in 138 units, which is only seven more than was previously approved -- or previously proposed. As Bill mentioned, this is within the mixed use -- mixed use community FLUM designation and it is a relatively small in-fill area within the larger mixed use community. That mixed use community, if you remember, it does include a wide variety of uses from storage to an office park with a dentist and accountant. More high density single family residential. This multi-family proposal -- to the south there is the daycare and the over 55 community. There is a Starbucks proposed -- I don't know if it's under construction yet -- with a drive through and, then, a Rite Aid all sort of within this area. So, really, this -- this FLUM designation has all of the various components of a mixed use community,

except for the multi-family residential housing and when we looked at this when we went back and continued to talk about it, one of the things that has always been a struggle with this site is that it is so -- it is really access constrained and it's not a super desirable spot for commercial due to the fact that it's sort of -- it's mid block, there is only one access onto Eagle Road, and so it's really hard to -- it's just -- it's not a super visible location. It's not the hard corner. It's not the places that businesses are really looking for and looking to develop. It's also not -- we all can recognize, I believe, that having commercial up that close to residential, whether there is the drive through component that we originally had requested or not, is also really tough to really integrate the two uses and not create more of that dangerous cars passing through situation of just having really two very different sort of uses abutting right up next to each other and one of the concerns that was raised and that we agree with is just the cut-through traffic. They are going to come in -- individuals will come in, they will drive in, they will go to the commercial space and, then, instead of just driving out -- back out, because they won't be able to get across Eagle Road, it will be hard for them to make a left-hand turn, they will cut through the rest of the development, drive up Titanium to Easy Jet to get across or they will be cutting down directly south past that proposed daycare to get out onto Victory and either way that cut-through traffic just is not the ideal situation. One of the other small benefits of this is that the traffic counts do go down slightly. I don't know the exact -- I don't have the exact numbers with me, but they were small enough that ACHD did not require any additional updates, they just send an e-mail saying that's fine. We also know that the homeowners association to the east was also preferring and advocating for the hundred percent residential in this location. And, then, finally and really probably most importantly, it just gives a really that much nicer living experience for the residents who live here in this community. They don't have to worry about individuals who aren't members of this community cutting through going to a Walgreens in that location. It's really going to be a lot more insulated, a lot safer, a lot more peaceful sort of community to live and to be able to walk in. The individuals in this community and in other -- the surrounding neighborhoods will easily be able to pass through this neighborhood to the -- to the residential neighborhoods and, then, the commercial to the north and the commercial to the south. One other thing that we have been -- that I believe this one shows it best probably. Another change that we made on our site plan -- I believe that it was at Council Member Strader's request and, then, also Council Member Perreault had sort of seconded it and asked about it -- was sort of really increasing on that Titanium Boulevard, the -- sort of the sense of a boulevard and the sense of a place and having the larger trees, because we also recognize that we have installed the traffic calming, we do have the bulb outs, but trees do cause cars to go slower. They just make things a lot -- it just makes it a lot nicer and so what we have here is we really have tried to put on the maximum number of trees that we can get along that street given the spacing requirements and that these are in the eight foot parkway strips, so you can't have the -- always necessarily the very biggest trees right there, but what, then, we have also done, in addition to having all of those trees, is in our open spaces on both the north where there is the dog park and a small green area and, then, on the south and near the community garden, we have put in some of the biggest trees -- the class three caliper trees, which are swamp oaks and Bloodgood London plain trees and so -- and, then, throughout we also have just a huge number of

trees. We have really emphasized just that that -- I mean trees make -- the tree canopy makes a place -- just a much nicer place to be and overall the city code requires us to have 67 trees and overall this community does have 210 trees and most of them are of the two bigger sizes. And so that was one thing that we did take into account and, last, I just wanted to touch on parking. Bill mentioned I believe that there were 278 spaces. I believe we counted and we hadn't been counting some of the spaces on the townhomes. By our more recent count that -- it actually comes up to 305 spaces that count towards the parking, when city code only requires the 261. In addition to that we still do have approximately 50 spaces of parking on our streets on Titanium and Publisher. And with that I will stand for any questions.

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

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: If I recall correctly I might have been the only Council Member not too worried about the traffic from the surrounding areas coming through and was really hoping you would come back with more commercial. I -- I'm -- I'm always hesitant to give up the frontage of a major road to -- to not have commercial in general. So, my question for you is the FLUM designation that's just to the north of this is M-C, R-G, it's regional, and there are quite a few multi-family projects in there and/or there are some considering going in there, some large projects. So, I'm curious if you took that into account, since it's -- it's an -- it's the same area that you said is in walking distance for these folks to go to for their commercial. If you took those units into account when you were assessing that -- you know, this being only multi-family in this FLUM designation, which is fairly small, if you had considered that multi-family that was going into that, if it's within walking distance?

Koeckeritz: Mayor Simison, Council Member Perreault, one thing we did look at what had been proposed, what was -- what's going in there, what's actually being developed and one of the things that we -- we do know both from -- is that much of that other development, it's -- it's of a very different type than this. It's a lot more of -- even if they are nicer, there is some proposed -- on some of them up north that are more of the three story -- I'm not just going to say a three story walk up, but a three story or four story with interior elevators, but just sort of a different living experience. This is really -- it's sort of -- it's a different living experience. It's sort of where you would go when you move out of more of the apartment -- the standard apartment style and you are looking for more of this cottage lifestyle.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Okay. So, it's not so much that there isn't other multi-family available, it's that -- it's the specific style of multi-family. Is that -- am I understanding you correctly?

Koeckeritz: Mayor Simison, Council Member Perreault, within -- we mostly -- we mostly focused on this specific FLUM designation, because that's what we are really looking at primarily. But, then, I know when you do scroll out further -- so, there -- and there is no multi-family in this FLUM designation and, then, when you sort of step back and look at the bigger picture, within the other multi-family residential that's just in this general area there is nothing of this type to my knowledge.

Perreault: Okay. Thank you.

Simison: Council, additional questions for the applicant?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor, I apologize, I have one more.

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: You had stated that -- in the narrative that not being able to have a drive through you felt like sort of eliminated a lot of commercial options. Can you share with us if -- if you had a specific applicant that, then, you weren't going to be able to work with or kind of what -- what -- how did you come to the determination that -- that you believed that commercial would not be viable here? We -- we have had a couple of applications in the past -- recent past where it was 20 plus years that something sat vacant and they couldn't -- so, that to me says, okay, yes, definitely like it's not viable, because 20 years have gone by and it's been advertised and they haven't found a commercial tenant. I'm not saying that's how long you would have to wait, but I just want to understand the process you went through to make that determination and, honestly, I have seen these mixed use designations with small commercial and residential surrounding be done very successfully in numerous places in Meridian. So, I guess I'm trying to -- I'm struggling with the statement that these two uses don't mix when they are working in numerous areas of our city.

Koeckeritz: Okay. So -- Mayor, Council Member Perreault, so to the first part of your question -- and I will ask Matt Riggs to come up and speak more specifically about the conversations he's had. But I do know that there have been meetings with brokers, discussions with brokers, on the marketing of this and not having a drive through makes a commercial development, especially one that's really a lot less visible, it makes it much more difficult to market. As far as mixed use having the -- it's sort of the same question, sort of a little different. I do think that commercial and residential can live harmoniously and I have seen it done in certain places, obviously, throughout this area. But in this particular instance, because it was a smaller area of commercial that was really -- it's that access challenge sort of piece of it where we only were able to get -- and ACHD was only ever going to approve one access into this development. It just makes it a lot more difficult with the flow and not being able to come out directly and make a left-hand turn, there is just a lot of those things that are going into making this

more difficult. Although I know Matt Riggs here with the ownership team can speak directly to the conversations they have had.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for the applicant? Thank you very much. Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone signed up on this item?

Johnson: Yes. First is Carole Gabrielson.

Simison: Okay. And when you come forward if you will state your name and address for the record and be recognized for three minutes.

Gabrielson: My name is Carole Gabrielson. My address is 4231 East Easy Jet Drive, Meridian. 83642. I live in Sutherland Farm and I come here tonight in support of Artisan Victory Market project by Baron Properties. We first heard of this project at a well-attended neighborhood meeting hosted by Baron on March 30th, 2022. A lot of detailed information was presented and there was an opportunity to visit with team members after the meeting. Everyone left with a positive attitude towards the project for the following reasons. Baron chose a lower density than what could have been built. The rental units are high quality builds, single story units would abut the existing homes in Sutherland Farm and the Village of Sutherland Farm, providing a residential environment for those existing neighbors. The two story units would be built along Eagle Road. Baron Properties will maintain sole ownership of Artisan Victory Market and is platted so that the units cannot be sold off in sections. If a resident has -- has issues with their unit there will be an office on site that is staffed. There are ample parking spaces, much more than what is required. There are 305 parking spaces for the multi-family portion and that doesn't include available on-street parking. There will be additional traffic generated, but the amount will be much lower than what would be generated by multi-story apartments or townhomes. Two wells already on the property will supply water needed to maintain the landscaping. Baron Properties has two of these projects in Meridian that are nearing completion, one on Black Cat and one on Ten Mile and Pine. What was presented at the Planning and Zoning and the City Council meetings was exactly what was built. This is important to our subdivision, because other projects built around this morphed into something very different than what was initially presented. The Baron team has consistently proven that they are willing to work with anyone affected by their projects. Baron held the second neighborhood meeting on March 21st, 2023, to assure residents that there was no significant changes in the project. At a recent Planning and Zoning meeting the manager and many of the residents from The Point were in attendance to express their concerns about the safety of residents crossing Titanium Street from The Point cottages, then worked with The Point and came up with traffic calming measures that helped to -- to create a better situation and there is no one from The Point here tonight to say anything different. I would like to also say something about taking out the commercial aspect of it. This is not particularly good property for commercial. It's hard -- the access is not wonderful here and part of it is because of Titanium and the way The Point was built. So, I think that it is exactly right, that there is no commercial being built and I thank you for the opportunity to speak.

Simison: Thank you. Council, questions?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Not a question, Carole, but just a compliment. To stick with us until after 9:00 o'clock and not only stick with it, but come and speak in favor of an application, I mean that is -- that is a rarity. It's clear you care about your neighborhood, you care about our community. That rang true in your testimony and so for me when -- when nobody shows up to testify that's one thing, but when somebody sticks with us long enough to say what they think in favor of the project, that just counts so much towards me and I just wanted to let you know as one Council Member I really appreciated your testimony tonight.

Gabrielson: Thank you. I appreciate that.

Simison: Thank you, Councilman Cavener. Well said.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor. Eric Gabrielson.

Simison: And here comes the other shoe. If you can state your name and address for the record.

E.Gabrielson: Mayor Simison, City Council members and staff, my name is Erik Gabrielson. I live at 4231 East Easy Jet Drive in the Sutherland Farm Subdivision. I support the Baron Properties and their development of Victory Market. The development is the best use of this land with more density and traffic versus other developments of three or four story apartments or townhouses. This should be a residential with no commercial project, since its borders residential properties on all sides. On the south side you have The Point, the east or north is a Sutherland Farm Subdivision and across the street and, then, you go to the east is Thousand Springs. You have commercial development north of Easy Jet along Eagle Road and south of Victory and Eagle Road. This is a high end residential project with one owner, all residents -- residences of houses and townhouses are leased out. The City of Meridian has approved three other projects by Baron Properties that are very similar to this project in the houses and layout. I sympathize with the residents of Sutherland Farm and The Point regarding the development and the traffic that it will create, but the traffic in this development would be much less than other developments of apartments and/or townhouses on this land. Baron Property has expressed that they are willing to work with The Point to slow traffic through their area on Titanium Way. This type of development of building homes for lease is a developing trend in the United States for families who want to live in a house, but can't afford to buy a house. I request that you approve this project. Thank you so much for your time.

Simison: Thank you. Council, questions?

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I have a very difficult question for you. How long have you and Carole been married?

E.Gabrielson: We just had our 50th anniversary in February.

Hoaglund: Congratulations. That's wonderful. And I bet you have never had a Tuesday night date like -- date night like tonight. Glad we could share it together.

E.Gabrielson: Okay. Thank you. Appreciate it. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you very much. Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone else signed up?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, I do not.

Simison: Is there anybody either online or in the audience who would like to provide testimony on this item? Seeing no hands raised or people moving forward, would the applicant like to close.

Riggs: So, Mayor, Council Members, Matthew Riggs here. 529 West Fordham Drive in Eagle and just wanted to quickly, you know, cover some of the topics on -- on the commercial side of things. You know, Council Woman Perreault, to your question, we were in active discussion for a long time with a pharmacy user there -- frankly, very similar to Rite Aid. They were struggling with where to find a store on this particular intersection and their demographics team, if you will, said we have to have a store here in this area, what is available that would work for this. That's when they approached us. They were needing a drive through, you know, at the initial discussions with -- with that user. It seemed to be a good fit relative to the location and the size that they needed, but ultimately, you know, I think I would echo what, you know, some of our friendly neighbors have -- have said and what has come out, you know, in this room and with staff and the Planning and Zoning and that is, you know, this is surrounded on three sides by -- by residential. You know, we do own other properties as referenced in Meridian that have commercial components that are in this same zoning designation. Those are different really for -- for what we have been speaking about the -- the access and the visibility on those sites make for more viable and interesting opportunities for some of these commercial users. We have seen interested parties, you know, from small restaurants up to full, you know, two and three acre users interested in our other sites. In that same time frame we have been working on this site -- really for two years before we have been going. So, we are three years into this and during that time it's been marketed, you know, the whole time with our brokerage team and, yeah, that one pharmacy user was -- was really the only interested party that approached us. So, ultimately, you know, talking to staff, talking to the neighbors and staring at our site, you know, around our own conference table, you know, felt like this was the best fit for this

relatively difficult, you know, site within the neighborhood and the -- the micro sub market if you will, right -- right in the area. We feel like it -- it is served proficiently, you know, from the neighborhood services are within walking distance, you know, just immediately around the site and, then, what's to the north and also what's going down to the south. So, you know, we have worked hard on the commercial, for a long time there did believe that that was where this project would go and in our best efforts just weren't really able to get, you know, any -- any serious bites, other than that one pharmacy user. So, with that, you know, I would stand for questions and/or request approval.

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

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I don't know if this is a question for you or another member of your team, but the access from the south on the very west side of the project next to the multi-family does that -- does that dead end there in your project or does that connect to the lot -- the empty lot to the -- yes. Right there. That connects, then, to lot to the south?

Riggs: Mayor, Council Woman Perreault, that -- that now is dead ending into our lot. We studied along with staff the connectivity and what's going into the south and ultimately, you know, decided that -- that that through traffic from the school and from the drive-through Starbucks is, you know, not something that our site would -- would want, you know, life safety and otherwise with that traffic coming through and, then, also, you know, it feels like that's a good mitigation to prevent, you know, school drop off from -- from hooking around into the -- into Titanium and the neighborhood to the -- to the back. So, as of now -- or, you know, in this plan, yes, that is -- that -- that tees into a dead end there on the southwest side of the site.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you. I just want to follow up on that with staff. Does that create any unnecessary restrictions on the property to the south to not have that connectivity? I mean typically promote the connectivity. So, can you comment on how that will affect the southern neighbor given that it's a fairly small property and they are on the corner, which, then, you know, affects their access as well?

Parsons: Mayor, Members of the Council, I think the applicant did a good job. We -- after the hearing on the 9th we sat down and we said what -- if we are going to lose the commercial what makes sense, given the fact that a lot of the uses to the south of this site will be auto dominated with people dropping off children at the daycare, the potential drive through for Starbucks and they also have an additional pad site and,

then, hearing some of the concerns that were raised during the public hearing, it was our opinion that it may be best just to do a pedestrian connection in that location, because we do have the local street network and some additional access points that were granted to that property to the south for them to exit onto Eagle Road. So, to answer your question does that put a hardship on them? I think the -- the preschool may appreciate it more that it doesn't go in, to be honest with you, because what happened was with this plan their driveway doesn't quite align with what they were trying to do on the property to the south, so it really created a jog. So, it did not tie in very well and just from -- from a logistical standpoint and just the traffic generation from those two uses staff just felt more comfortable, to be honest with you, with a pedestrian connection.

Simison: Just to follow up on that, are we able to go back and tell them that they don't have to make a road connection or is it going to be an oddly working -- they must build this with this road -- this not to be extended or be more -- I would hope that we would have a way to not require them to do something we don't want them to do and, then, put up stupid bars --

Parsons: Mayor, Members of the Council, no, that is not a public street there, so they do not have to say to be extended in the future and, yes, we do -- they have a condition of approval to grant cross-access to this property, but if you don't require that from this developer, then, it really goes nowhere. They just have a condition of approval that runs with their land. Currently we have not had an application, other than the CUP that you guys acted on for the drive -- for the daycare, excuse me, we have not received any certificate of zoning compliance or design review application for the site. But we could capture some of that in there that -- because it wasn't required with this project, we are not requiring it for them to reciprocate to this -- to this property. So, there is ways to tell that story in a different manner.

Simison: Thank you.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I know for single family homes when we have a cul-de-sac we now limit it to three drives. This has five or six. Are we still okay with our -- with our code?

Parsons: Mayor, Members of the Council, you are. That's, essentially, just a drive aisle. It's not a common drive. So, it's just -- multi-family is treated a little differently than single family with common driveway. So, yes, they can have that number of units, as long as they meet Fire Department requirements for turnaround. It's not over -- overstep my -- my area, but there is a certain threshold they can't exceed -- certain linear footage.

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

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I would just like to say that I know I was kind of critical of the commercial and drive through last time and I really like what they have done. I'm glad to see it all residential. I'm glad to see the traffic calming. Glad to see the extra parking, the lower traffic counts. I think everything they have done to this plan has been an improvement and I'm really happy and I will be supporting it tonight.

Cavener: Yeah, Mr. Mayor?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I echo the same comments. I like the boulevard feel, the addition of the trees. I would have appreciated if we could have had more neighborhood serving really small scale commercial here, but it doesn't appear that that's worked out. I do think this is kind of best case scenario for fit with the surrounding neighborhoods. I think you guys did a nice job and certainly it's much better than having to drive through and the chaos that -- that was going to come from all that being co-located. So, appreciate the continuance and appreciate the applicant taking another crack at it.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, I just want to credit the applicant and I think, Council, you know, if we go through these long conversations, one, two, hours and, then, results in continuance and sometimes it makes me, you know, pull out the little hair that I have, but I think this is a -- a really good example of being patient, allowing the applicant to be creative, respond to feedback from Council and ultimately result in a much better projects. So, thanks for that.

Simison: Thank you.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Appreciate Councilman Cavener's comments, because I think even though it's an inconvenience to have a continuance and takes longer time and we know time is money, it resulted in a better project and we are able to -- you know, felt the applicant really listened to the Council and what their thoughts were and how to make this work

and not how it didn't work and that's greatly appreciated. So, I'm glad we are -- we are at the end of it for -- for you to move forward with the project it sounds like, so appreciate that. And, Mr. Mayor, if there is no further comments I would move that we close the public hearing on H-2022-0066.

Hoaglund: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to approve File No. H-2022-0066 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of June 20th, 2023, and to make sure that the modifications presented by staff, condition modifications per staff memo, are included in the -- in the motion.

Cavener: Second.

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

Roll Call: Hoaglund, yea; Borton, absent; Cavener, yea; Perreault, yea; Strader, yea; Overton, yea.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Simison: Really appreciate it and there is about a three-quarter acre property on the corner of Victory. If you guys can figure out what to do with that, there could be a little bit of neighborhood commercial right there. I just don't know how you are going to get access or parking or anything else, so -- okay. Anyways, thank you.

FUTURE MEETING TOPICS

Simison: With that, Council, anything under future meeting topics or do I have a motion?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman --

Cavener: Move to adjourn.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:28 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

_____ MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON	_____ DATE APPROVED
-------------------------------	------------------------

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK