

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:03 p.m. Tuesday, March 26, 2024, by Mayor Robert Simison.

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

Members Absent: Joe Borton and John Overton.

Also Present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Bill Parsons, Stacy Hersh, Kyle Ludwig, Joe Bongiorno and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

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

Simison: Council, we will call the meeting to order. For the record it is March 26th, 2024, at 6:03 p.m. We will begin this evening's Meridian City Council meeting with roll call attendance.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

COMMUNITY INVOCATION

Simison: Tonight's invocation will be delivered by Jason Billester of the Boise Rescue Mission. If you would, please, join us in the community invocation or take this as a moment of silence or reflection. Mr. Billester, thanks for being here.

Billester: Thank you so much, Mayor. Everyone please join me in prayer. Heavenly Father, I thank you tonight, God, for your servants, our Mayor, our city manager, our city staff, our City Council Members and the Meridian community. We come to you tonight, God, asking for your guidance, your wisdom, your keen discernment and your support as we begin this meeting. We give this meeting and time to you and I pray that you will guide our discussion that brings meaningful discussion and stronger bonds for our community. Help us, Lord, to trust you more with an impartation of your godly wisdom and discernment I pray that they will be able to solve our city's problems and make good policies. Please bring a new level of peace and clarity to everyone involved in this

meeting. Grant them excellence in their governance. In your precious mighty name, amen.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Simison: Thank you, Jason. Appreciate it. Okay. Next up we have adoption of the agenda.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Strader.

Strader: There are no changes to the agenda, but just one note that Item No. 6, the Pathways Project on Ustick, is being withdrawn for anyone in the audience that was waiting on that project. With that and no changes to the agenda, I move that we adopt the agenda as published.

Cavener: Second.

Simison: 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: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

PUBLIC FORUM – Future Meeting Topics

Simison: Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone who has signed up under public forum?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we do not.

PROCLAMATIONS [Action Item]

1. Meridian High School Wrestling State Champions Day (Historic Fourth Consecutive Title)

Simison: Okay. Nothing under public forum. So, with that we will move into our proclamations this evening for the Meridian High School Wrestling State Champions Day. Here they come. They are all the noise outside. You guys know the drill. I don't even have to say anything. Man, I so much love doing the wrestling team more than I like doing the basketball team. So, much more enjoyable from that standpoint. Well, it's an honor to be here tonight -- as we got a few more people kind of coming in. Once again celebrating our state champions at Meridian High School for the wrestling program. This will be the fourth time in four years. Are we ready to call it a dynasty or do we wait for one more before can make it an official dynasty for next year? Okay. Next year we can use the D word. This -- this year is just for a four-pete from that

standpoint. So, I'm going to go ahead and read a proclamation and, then, we will ask Coach Muri or whoever to come up and represent the team at that point in time and we will have each individual state their name and weight class and class year, so we get that on the record. But with that whereas being a Meridian High School wrestler is more than scoring points, escapes, takedowns, pins and achieving state titles, it is training to build leadership, character, confidence, teamwork and resilience, all traits needed to succeed on the mat, in the classroom and in the real world and whereas the hard work and dedication the Meridian Warrior wrestling team and coaches resulted in winning the 2024 state wrestling championship and whereas their determination racked up 14 places and four individual state champs to post 273.5 points and whereas the Meridian Warriors took their place in history becoming the first in Idaho of 5-A wrestling team to achieve a fourth straight championship and whereas the leadership, training and discipline of their coaches helped team members to focus their talents, passion and fortitude to become a dynasty -- sorry -- with each player making valuable contributions to their victory. Therefore, I, Mayor Robert E. Simison, hereby proclaim March 26th, 2024, as Meridian High School Wrestling State Champions Day in the City of Meridian and call upon the community to join me in congratulating the Meridian High Warriors on their remarkable athletic achievement and for representing Meridian so proudly in the state tournament. Team, congratulations.

Muri: Awesome. Yeah. I will keep this short. Thanks for coming out. I'm just really proud to be a part of what we have built at Meridian High and this is just a small group of what we have going on. We -- I think we have 22 coaches, volunteer slash official coaches, and we have about 80 athletes on the team. But, yeah, I'm just -- I'm really proud of the culture we have cultivated over the years and these are really, really good kids, not just good wrestlers and a little bit just on the history. Meridian High -- we had our first four time state champ Jason Mara over there. He is -- he is going to a little school in Cali called Stanford, which is pretty -- pretty neat. We also have Hudson Rogers going to Oregon State. And then -- man, we got -- we got a bunch of other guys that are still trying to find homes, but I think after next year we should have right around ten kids competing at the college level. So, we are just really proud of what we are building and the type of kids that we have at Meridian High. So, thank you.

Simison: If you want to -- name, year in school, weight class you are wrestling. Just run through and, then, we will get a picture with everybody after, if that works.

Mara: Jason Mara, 152, and I'm a senior.

Gooley: Carson Gooley, I was at 195, senior.

Gonzalez: Jeremiah Gonzalez, 113, junior.

Morrill: Brigg Morrill, 98, freshman.

Ramirez: Andrae Ramirez, 138, junior.

Shaver: Logan Shaver, 145, sophomore.

Bourner: Gabe Bourner, 138, sophomore.

Argana: Fabrizio, 172, senior.

Thornton: McKenzie Thornton, 106, freshmen.

Guillen: Tobias Guillen, freshman, 106.

Suter: Hezekiah Suter, 160, sophomore.

Papa: Matthew Papa, 126, and I'm a senior.

Bones: Bradley Bones, 182, sophomore.

Hillesland: Fahad Hillesland, 152, senior.

Amoureux: Ryan Amoureux, 132, sophomore.

Lowe: Tagen Lowe, 195, sophomore.

Beck: Jackson Beck, 113, freshmen.

Torrez: Vincent Torrez, 120, freshmen.

Miller: Draken Miller, 126, freshmen.

Twait: Elise Twait, 152, junior.

Rogers: Hudson Rogers, 182, senior.

Ostoja: Adam Ostoja, 106, freshman.

Jayne: Drake Jayne, 98, freshmen.

Muri: Thanks, guys. Great job.

Simison: And as they are -- actually, I just want to say thank you to the parents as well. I know this is a family affair and a lot of time and effort and energy over a lot of years. So, appreciate them.

2. Proclamation - National Vietnam War Veterans Day

Simison: All right. Next up we have a proclamation for National Vietnam War Veterans Recognition Day. So, if I could have Helen join me up here, as well as the rest of the

group from the Meridian Emma Edwards Green Daughters of the American Revolution Chapter. Thank you all for being here and making this request. So, we will go ahead and read the proclamation and turn it over for any comments you have. So, whereas, the National Vietnam War Veterans Day is observed every year on March 29th, to thank and honor our nation's Vietnam veterans and their families for their sacrifice and whereas the Vietnam War was a time in our nation's history where service members of different backgrounds came together to complete a daunting mission and whereas we have a strong commitment to recognize and acknowledge the accomplishments of all individuals in the diverse community we serve and whereas the City of Meridian wishes to highlight the services of our armed forces and support organizations during the war, pay tribute to wartime contributions at home by American citizens and allies and acknowledge the technology, science and medical advances made during the war and whereas we respectfully say thank you for your service and welcome home to our communities' Vietnam veterans who served and let them know they will be remembered for generations to come. Therefore, I, Mayor, Robert E. Simison, hereby proclaim March 29th, 2014, as National Vietnam War Veterans Recognition Day in the City of Meridian and call upon the community to observe this day with appropriate programs, ceremonies and activities that commemorate the anniversary of the Vietnam War, dated this 26th day of March 2024. So, with that, Helen, you are welcome to make any comments you would like.

Helen: I wasn't prepared for this part, but I would like to say that if you have ever heard of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Emma Edward Green Chapter, is less than two years old. It's a brand new chapter here in Meridian and one of our pillars is, of course, patriotism and so any chance that we get to recognize our veterans we step forward and do that. This is all part of a concentrated effort throughout the nation to recognize the National Vietnam War Veterans Appreciation Day, which will be this Friday and so if you have the opportunity there will be a celebration at Kleiner Park right across from the Senior Center -- Senior Center and it goes on from 1:00 to 3:30 and we will have proclamations on display from other communities here around the Treasure Valley. So, it's a great time to come out. I did invite Vietnam veterans to come, but they must be shy, because they weren't able to show up, but they are aware that we are doing this and they are very happy that we are taking the time to appreciate them and recognize them and I would like to thank the Mayor and the City of Meridian, because they have been so supportive of our chapter and anytime I have asked for any proclamation or anything they step forward. So, thank you and thank you, Mayor.

Simison: Thank you. Council, that was -- while my mom didn't leave the country, she was serving during that and so the -- the Vietnam era for her and I is a little bit unique and special, so I was happy to do that one, too. A little special. I will tell my mom that.

RESOLUTIONS [Action Item]

- 3. Resolution No. 24-2445: A Resolution Appointing Heather Giacomo to Seat 7 of the Meridian Historic Preservation Commission; and Providing an Effective Date**

Simison: Okay. With that, moving on to the next item on our agenda, is Resolution No. 24-2445, appointing Heather Giacomo. That's -- I wanted -- I knew I was -- like it's not what I'm trying to say. Heather Giacomo, Seat 7, of the Meridian Historic Preservation Commission and providing an effective date. As always, Blaine and I sat down and we interviewed the candidates and we had three applicants, they -- they were all excellent candidates for different reasons and purposes, but it felt that Heather was going to provide a couple of different things to the commission moving forward, one of which, you know, she combines both the historic -- having a history degree, but also an engineering degree, which is one of the identified professions in our ordinance that we need to have and let's say if Mr. Johnston decided to step down tomorrow we wouldn't have anybody that had that type of requirements on our commission and so rather than have to go out and seek someone right away to fill that requirement, we thought it would be great to get another person that had that specific ordinance requirement on the commission and would also provide a different perspective to things. So, you know, we -- I think she will be a great addition to the Historic Preservation Commission. She's newer to the community, but been here long enough I think to get her roots established and that and she's at a point in time in her life where she is ready to give back in this fashion and so we are excited to welcome her to the Historic Preservation Commission and she is here for any comments or questions should you have them before or after you make any motions. With that happy to answer any questions or stand for questions.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Welcome, Heather. We are really excited to have you and you are a woman of many talents and we appreciate your background that combines those two very different disciplines. With that I move that we approve Resolution No. 24-2445, approving -- appointing Heather Giacomo to Seat 7 of the Meridian Historic Preservation Commission.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Resolution No. 24-2445. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the resolution is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Simison: Heather, would you like to make any comments to Council since you came all the way down here?

Giacomo: Thank you. I'm just excited to be here. Excited to give back to this community. I have only been here for almost eight years, but I just love Meridian and I'm glad to put my talents to use. Thank you very much.

Simison: Thanks, Heather. Good luck. And, Blaine, thanks for sticking around for the appointment.

ACTION ITEMS

4. Public Hearing for Proposed Summer 2024 Fee Schedule of the Meridian Parks and Recreation Department

Simison: All right. With that we will move on to Item 4 on the agenda, the public hearing for proposed summer 2020 fee schedule of the Meridian Parks and Recreation Department. We will open the public hearing with staff comments from Mr. White.

White: Mr. Mayor and Council, thanks for having me tonight. Good to see some of you guys -- or all you guys. I listen to over here; right, so -- our department brings our fees to you guys about three times a year, April, August and December for our Activity Guide before we publish it, just to confirm all the fees and show you guys what we have to offer for that activity guide. So, with that in front of you is the summer 2004 activity guide fees and be happy to stand for questions.

Simison: Thank you. Council, questions -- or at least substantially -- if you want to speak for the record -- at least substantially similar to previous years, have they changed a lot, just for those that don't have the document in front of them?

White: Sure. Mr. Mayor and Council, some of them have changed. In there is a document that kind of shows the increases, decreases, or no change in particular. Some of those changes do come because if there is five Tuesdays in a month and classrooms on Tuesday, compared to four Tuesdays, so they fluctuate here and there and that's relevant and, then, it documents, but they are primarily the same.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Garrett, I appreciate you putting this in the memo that this is in line with our cost recovery model. Maybe for our new Council Members, maybe a quick CliffNotes overview about what that model is for and what it's intended to do.

White: Yeah. Mr. Mayor and Councilman Cavener, yeah, so our cost recovery pyramid is what we call it. It's basically we -- we do -- provide our fees based on what public benefit they get out of each program. So, for example, special events -- city special events. A lot of times they are free to the public or they benefit the whole public in itself; right? The top of the pyramid is like the individual one-on-one stuff that we do full cost recovery on. So, I hope that makes sense. So, in -- as you go down the pyramid it's like five different levels and as you go down to the thicker part of the pyramid I would say it's less cost recovery, more public benefit.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Garrett, love seeing the new programs. I'm not sure if I'm excited or dreading family golf. It isn't planned for the Caveners this year, so thank you, maybe, but I may be offering some comments unsolicited after this season, but I appreciate just the department's trying to bring new programs and offerings into our community. Looking forward to it.

White: Thanks.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor. Garrett, I just would like to say thank you. Year after year you guys do a great job. I am currently enrolled in two classes right now. I think I -- your staff laughs about me being one of the forever yoga people and so you guys do a great job. I don't know the definition of family golf, so I was going to ask you what family golf consists of in the case of this definition.

White: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Little Roberts, good question. A lot of those descriptions I don't know by heart or off the top of my head, but I think it's getting all the -- the family together and going out and playing some golf and getting a little bit of lessons here and there. Mr. Cavener probably knows a little bit more than -- you know, read the description.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Mr. Garrett, I wanted to compliment you. I know you guys have listened to feedback and you provided a table that had the previous year with the recommended fee and the percentage increase. That appendix was perfect. That is a best practice for any kind of change going forward. That makes it so easy for us to review that memo. I just really appreciated you providing that information so it's right there upfront. Unless there are other questions, Mr. Mayor, I move that we close the public hearing.

Simison: Well, we --

Strader: We haven't had the public hearing.

Simison: Do we have any -- these wonderful people that are here that may want to come up and testify on this issue tonight, so -- so, you are good -- Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone that's signed up?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we did not.

Simison: Okay. Is there anybody present who would like to come up and provide testimony on the 2024 Parks Summer Fee Schedule? And if you are online you can use your raise your hand. Let's see if we have anybody -- nope. It's just Garrett who is here. So, that would be impossible. So, with that do I have a motion to close the public hearing?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: So moved.

Simison: Motion to close the public hearing. Do I have a second?

Cavener: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

5. Resolution No. 24-2443: A Resolution Adopting the Summer 2024 Fee Schedule of the Meridian Parks and Recreation Department; Authorizing the Meridian Parks and Recreation Department to Collect Such Fees; and Providing an Effective Date

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I move that we approve Item No. 5, Resolution 24-2443, adopting the Summer 2024 Fee Schedule for the Meridian Parks and Recreation Department.

Cavener: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Resolution 24-2443. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the resolution is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

6. Public Hearing continued from March 6, 2024 for Pathways (H-2023-0061) by Mussell Construction, Inc., located at 965 E. Ustick Rd.

- A. Request: Annexation of 1.11 acres of land with an L-O zoning district.
- B. Request: Conditional Use Permit for an education institution that takes access from an arterial street without a safe, separate pedestrian and bikeway access between the neighborhood and the school site.

Simison: Thank you very much, Mr. White. Okay. Next item is Item 6, the public hearing which is continued from March 6th, 2024. We will continue this with any comments from staff regarding what they have asked for.

Parsons: Mayor, Members of the Council, pleasure to be here with you tonight. Yeah, the applicant has just asked to withdraw their application for the Pathways Middle School. It looks like they are going to pursue -- or not Pathways Middle School, but Pathways School. It looks like they are going to pursue an opportunity on a different property and they will come back and meet with staff at a later date. They saw that it may not be in their best interest to move forward on developing a school on an arterial roadway, so they have just asked for you to acknowledge their withdrawal this evening.

Simison: Council, any questions for staff? Is the applicant here tonight? Not seeing the applicant being here --

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I move that we accept the applicant's withdrawal of their application on Item No. 6, Pathways, H-2023-0061.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to accept the -- to accept the withdrawal. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the item is withdrawn.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

7. Public Hearing for Cole Valley Christian (H-2024-0002) by LKV Architects, located at 780 W. McMillan Rd.

- A. Request: Development Agreement Modification to request a 6-month time extension for the property owner to sign the development agreement required with H-2023-0011 for Cole Valley Christian School.

Simison: Up next Item 7, public hearing for Cole Valley Christian, H-2024-0002. Open this public hearing with staff comments.

Parsons: Thank you, Mayor, Members of the Council. Next item is the MDA -- development agreement modification for the Cole Valley Christian School. Not -- not a lot of details for you here tonight. Originally when we accepted the application we didn't -- it was our process -- the application -- the DA hadn't been signed or executed yet and in our ordinance we require them to be done within a six month time frame. Well, I'm happy to report since that time the DA has been executed, including the addendum before you this evening, so, really, this is just more of a formality tonight. The reason for the delay was the fact that the applicant was given -- required to record a property boundary adjustment in the county prior to the ordinance and the DA being executed. I'm happy to report that on March 7th the applicant did conclude that property boundary adjustment with the -- in the county, so they have met that requirement of their DA and all they are asking for you is for you to approve their development agreement tonight and their ordinance. Staff will stand for any questions.

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

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Just a quick question for legal. It looks like we could move to approve the DA modification and extension at the same time as the findings and the DA modification. Is that right?

Nary: So, Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, Council Member Strader, we actually separated them intentionally, so that we would approve them individually.

Strader: Okay.

Simison: Any other questions for staff? Mr. Clerk, do we have anybody signed up on this item? Or, actually, is the applicant here? I just wanted to go so fast tonight, just -- thank you. If you can state your name and address for the record.

Van Ocker: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, Amber Van Ocker, LKV Architects, representing Cole Valley. Don't have any additional comments, other than what Bill has covered. It just took us a little bit longer to get all the legal documents in place, but we are pleased to say that's all happened and we are just here looking for your approval and moving things forward. Thank you.

Simison: Council, any questions for the applicant? Perfect. Anyone signed up on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, nobody indicated they wished to speak.

Simison: Thank you. Is there anybody present who would like to provide testimony on this item this evening? Seeing none. Applicant waives any final comments? Applicant waives. Council, your direction on closing the public hearing or --

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I move that we close the public hearing on Item No. 7.

Cavener: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I move that we approve the modification for the six month time extension in order for the property owner to continue the development agreement required under H-2023-0011 for Cole Valley Christian School.

Cavener: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Item 7. Is there any further discussion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

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

Simison: All ayes and the item is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

8. Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for Cole Valley Christian (H-2024-0002) by LKV Architects, located at 780 W. McMillan Rd.

Simison: Next up is Item 8, Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for Cole Valley Christian, H-2024-0002.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I move that we approve Item No. 8 as stated.

Cavener: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Item 8. Is there any discussion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

**9. Development Agreement and Development Agreement Modification
(Cole Valley Christian Schools Pre-K-12 H-2023-0011/H-2024-0002)
Between City of Meridian and Cole Valley Christian Schools, Inc. for
Property Located at 7080 W. McMillan Rd.**

Simison: Next up is Item 9, which is a development agreement and development agreement modification for H-2023-0001/H-2024-0002.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I move that we approve the development agreement and development agreement modification on the same application.

Cavener: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Item 9. Is there discussion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

**10. Public Hearing for Kilgore (H-2023-0063) by Alexi Kilgore, located at
1105 N. Meridian Rd.**

- A. Request: Rezone 0.16 acres of land from the R-4 zoning district to the O-T zoning district for the purpose of converting the existing home into a hair salon.

Simison: Next item up is Item 10, public hearing to Kilgore, H-2023-0063. We will open this public hearing with comments from staff.

Hersh: Good evening, Mayor and Council Members. The applicant has submitted an application for a rezone. The property -- the site exists as 0.34 acres of land, zoned R-4, located at 1105 North Meridian Road. History on the property is none. The comprehensive FLUM designation is Old Town. The applicant is requesting to rezone 0.34 acres of land from R-4 to Old Town to operate a personal service for a hair salon on the subject property. A legal description exhibit map for the rezone are -- are included with the application. This property is within the city's area of city impact boundary. The proposed 11,193 square foot hair salon will be located in the downtown area within the Meridian Urban Renewal District. The building was built in 1948 and is slated for further improvements to meet city code requirements to enhance the customer experience. The rear -- rear porch will be expanded to include an ADA ramp and the applicant will be required to pave the alley adjacent to the property. Additional five parking stalls are proposed to be paved adjacent to the alley. The proposed hours of operation will be from Tuesday to Saturday from 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Due to the size of the development staff does not believe a development agreement should be required. The existing home meets all the dimensional standards. Access is provided via an alleyway to the north from Washington Street. The public street to the south of this property West Carlton Avenue operates as a one way only leading eastward towards North Meridian Road. The existing home has unpaved parking off the alleyway with a space up for five parking stalls. There is currently no off-street parking on this site. The applicant is required to pave both the alley and the five proposed parking stalls with the development of the site upon submittal of a future certificate of zoning compliance application. Wheel restraints should be added to -- to prevent overhanging beyond the designated parking stall dimensions in accordance with the UDC. Additionally ACHD recommends paving the entire width of the alley from the edge of the pavement from Carleton Avenue -- Avenue to the site's northern property line and providing 20 feet of backup area from any parking. The alley should be signed with no parking signs. The applicant has since submitted a revised site plan. As you can see that labeled -- that their first site plan that was submitted that this reflects the conditions in the staff report -- or the analysis and, then, they did add additional parking and we will review that with the future certificate of zoning compliance application and compare that to the UDC code. Old Town is classified as a traditional neighborhood zoning district and no off-street parking is required for a lawful -- an existing structure unless an addition occurs. No additions are proposed with this project, except for expanding the rear entry area. The applicant is providing five parking stalls off the alley, which exceeds the required number of off-street parking spaces, as two are only required per the UDC for a traditional neighborhood district. A minimum of one bicycle parking space is required to be provided. The plan does not include the bicycle racks. The applicant should revise the plan and include that rack and as you can see on the revised site plan

they did include that. There is an existing seven foot wide attached sidewalk on North Meridian Road along the existing property frontage. Staff does not recommend any additional changes to the frontage improvements. The applicant is proposing installation of a four foot wide sidewalk along the southern boundary of the site extending from the parking stalls to the main entrance. All sidewalks around the buildings and serving public streets shall be a minimum of five feet in width according to the UDC. Both ACHD and staff recommend that the applicant construct a five foot wide detached concrete sidewalk abutting the site along West Carlton Avenue connecting to the sidewalk along North Meridian Road. Additionally, staff recommends that the applicant remove the four foot proposed sidewalk on the south side of the property boundary and add a five foot sidewalk in front of the entire parking area. Staff strongly encourages the applicant to include a parkway along West Carlton Avenue with trees, bushes, lawn or other vegetated cover in accordance with the UDC. Staff recommends that the applicant connect the proposed sidewalk at the main entrance of the building to the required sidewalk to be installed along West Carlton Avenue and they have done that in the revised plan and they currently have fencing, so that would we require them to remove some of the fencing on the south side of the property. The applicant intends to remove the existing fence on the west side of the property adjacent to the stalls. As mentioned above a portion of the fencing on the south side of the property should be removed to accommodate for pedestrian walkway to the main entrance of the building. The existing fencing surrounding a small patio in the front yard does not comply with the UDC requirements for fencing. As the maximum height for front yard fences is three feet for closed vision fences or four feet for open vision fences, no additional fencing is proposed at this time. Staff recommends that the applicant remove the existing fencing surrounding the front yard patio with fencing that complies with the UDC. Building elevations -- conceptual building elevations and perspectives were submitted for the existing structure. The building consists of existing siding, fascia trim, asphalt roof shingles and new wood deck railing and an ADA ramp. Only new addition to the structure is the rear entry and proposed elevations are not approved with this application will be reviewed with the design review application with -- for consistency with the design standards listed in the Architectural Standards Manual. Formal compliance with the ASM is not required based on the limited scope of work associated with this project. Commission recommended approval. Summary of the Commission public hearing. Reed Kilgore was in favor. There was no opposition. No one commenting. No written testimony. No key issues. And key issues of discussion by Commission none. Commission changes to staff's recommendation is none. Outstanding issues for City Council is none. Written testimony since the Commission hearing is none. And that concludes staff's presentation and I stand for any questions.

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

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thanks, Stacy. Just one question and I -- I struggled with kind of tracking this in the staff report, hoping you can maybe walk me through it. Some portions of the fence are required to be removed and other portions you are recommending be removed; is that correct? Or is all of it being required to be removed?

Hersh: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Cavener, so you are correct. So, I mean I don't know how they would do that. The front fence, as you can see on the lower left corner, that's over six feet, that is required to be removed. So, the remaining of it that's on the side of Carlton Avenue, in order for them to have the sidewalk attached to the exists -- attached to the proposed sidewalk they are going to construct along West Carlton they will have to have -- remove a portion of it so people can access their business in the rear.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Real quick. I think I'm tracking.

Hersh: Okay.

Cavener: The fence line along Carlton is the one that is recommended and that the fence line that is on Meridian Road, kind of the little porch area that we saw on that image, is required, is that -- am I tracking that correctly?

Hersh: That is a hundred percent correct.

Cavener: Thank you. Appreciate the clarification.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Stacy, you -- I want to make sure I heard this correctly. The applicant was proposing a four foot wide sidewalk along Carlton, but is it recommended or required for a five foot wide sidewalk in my -- did I hear that correctly?

Hersh: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Taylor, so, yes, that is correct. If you look at the site plan on the west side she was actually proposing a four foot sidewalk on her property and not -- not actually adjacent to the right of way, which it should connect to Meridian Road and the UDC code requires five feet in width for commercial.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for staff? Okay. Is the applicant here? Like to come forward, please. If you have any -- if you have anything you would like to add. Okay. Council, any questions? I think we are good for now. Okay. Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone signed up to testify on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we did not.

Simison: Okay. Is there anybody present that would like to provide testimony on this item? Seeing none, Council, what's your -- discussion before we ask the applicant if they want to waive any final comments? Will you waive your final comments, since you didn't make the first one to begin with, too? Okay. All right. Council, your direction?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Move to close the public hearing on Item 10 Kilgore application, H-2023-0063.

Taylor: Second.

Simison: Moved and seconded 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: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I appreciate staff giving me some good clarification on this. To the applicant I love this property. This property provided me with money for water balloons and soda pops and video games as I remoted as a child. This is a great use. I'm excited for, again, another asset like this in downtown Meridian. Mr. Mayor, I move that we approve application H-2023-0063 as presented by the staff and include all staff comments.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Item H-2023-0063. Is there discussion on the motion? If not Clerk will call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

- 11. Public Hearing for Farmstone Crossing Subdivision (H-2023-0045) by Bailey Engineering, located at 820 S. Black Cat Rd. Continued to May 7, 2024.**

- A. Request: Annexation of 33.893 acres of land from RUT to the M-E (Mixed Employment) zoning district. B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 6 buildable lots on 27.59 acres of land in the proposed M-E (Mixed Employment) zoning district.

Simison: Okay. With that we will move on to Item 11 this evening, which is a public hearing for Farmstone Crossing Subdivision, H-2023-0045. We will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Hersh: The next application before you is for Farmstone Crossing. Applications submitted are annexation and zoning and preliminary plat. This site consists of 33.89 acres of land, zoned RUT in Ada county, located at 820 South Black Cat Road. History on the property is none. The Comprehensive Plan FLUM designation is mixed employment. Annexation is requested for 33.89 acres from RUT to ME zoning district. The development abuts mixed employment designated land to the east and borders I-84 to the south. This development is proposed to have access to a collector street as desired. Medium high density residential uses are proposed to the north and light industrial to the west. Allowed uses in the ME district consists of offices, medical centers, research and development facilities and light industrial uses, with ancillary support services. The area is intended to development with approximately 378,360 square feet, encompassing various potential uses like office, light industrial operations, flex space and research and development components, such as distribution and light manufacturing. The inclusion of loading docks on elevations for the proposed flex building implies that all of the intended uses are primarily related to distribution or warehousing, which requires a conditional use permit in the ME zoning district. The proposed preliminary plat consists of six building lots and one common law on 27.59 -- 59 acres of land for the proposed Farmstone Crossing Subdivision. The subdivision is proposed to develop in two phases as shown on the preliminary plat. Staff recommends that the collector street be constructed prior to development commencing on the property. Additionally, the first phase of development -- development should encompass the construction of both the ten foot wide detached sidewalks along South Black Cat Road and Vanguard Way, including the entire street buffers. The second phase of development should encompass the completion of the remaining Ten foot wide pathway along the I-84 interstate. According to GIS imagery there is an existing home and other historic outbuildings adjacent to Black Cat Road that will be removed upon development of the Farmstone Crossing Subdivision. Staff recommends that the applicant preserve some elements of the historic buildings. The applicant presented their proposed plan for the existing silos to the Historic Preservation Commission on January 25th, 2024, with the following option. One. Involve careful disassembling and storage of the structure with the intention to find an interesting -- interested agency that may preserve the silo on another site. An agency would need to be identified before disassembly and prior to the commencement of the road. Alternatively, if no interested agency is identified prior to the commitments -- commitments of the road construction, option two entails utilizing some materials from the silo in the construction of the monument. The meeting concluded with the Historic Preservation Commission expressing a preference for recommending to the Planning and Zoning Commission

that both existing silos be disassembled and reassembled at a yet to be determined future location. It was emphasized that the specifics of the relocation be clarified prior to disassembly and the new site would need to be determined within a reasonable period of time. As an alternating proposal the Commission advocates for the creation of a scale replica of the facilities on the current site. The Historic Preservation Commission wishes to review the details of the proposed monument with the initial certificate of zoning compliance submittal for the site. Additionally, the Historic Preservation Commission wishes to retain the ability to provide comments on the final proposed monument presented by the applicant as per the ones that do not conform to the district setbacks must be removed, except for those agreed upon for historic preservation. The proposed preliminary plat appears to comply with the dimensional standards of the district. Access is proposed to be provided from the northern boundary of the site from the extension of Vanguard Way to Black Cat Road to the west. Vanguard Way is designed as a collector street in accordance with the master street map and the transportation system map in the Ten Mile Area Plan. A driveway is proposed to the adjacent property to the east for future extension. Vanguard Way should be constructed in accordance with street Section C in the Ten Mile Area Plan, which requires two 11 travel foot lanes, six bike lanes, six foot bike lanes, eight foot parkways with streetlights at a pedestrian scale and a minimum six foot wide detached sidewalks. The applicant proposes a modification of the street section to include ten foot wide detached sidewalks and pathways in lieu of on-street bike lanes, which is required by ACHD and as set forth in the Meridian Master Pathways Plan. Prior to submitting the final plat the applicant shall coordinate with the property owner to the north and east to construct Vanguard Way and deed the right of way to ACHD. The applicant should ensure that the intersection of Vanguard Way and South Black Cat Road aligns with the entrance of Black Cat industrial projects on the west side of South Black Cat Road. The applicant is proposing two curb cuts -- two curb cuts off of Vanguard Way, planned collector street in the Ten Mile Area Plan and in accordance with the UDC multiple accesses off of an arterial and collective roadway shall be restricted. The applicant has chosen to eliminate the curb cut aligned with the proposed subdivision to the north and has instead opted for the one closest to the intersection of Black Cat Road. Typically staff recommends that curb cuts aligned directly across roadways, however, staff supports the offset change given that the entrance effectively highlights the features of the proposed plaza provided it adheres to ACHD's requirements. Additionally, the applicant has proposed establishing a shared access on the east of the site in collaboration with the property owner to the east for intended for future shared access. A ten foot path -- ten foot wide multi-pathways are proposed on the site in accordance with the pathways master plan. One segment follows Vanguard Way across the northern portion of the site and one segment runs along the southern boundary within the street buffer along the I-84. Another segment runs along the west side of the site adjacent to South -- South Black Cat Road to the plaza on the north. The proposed pathways are intended to cross the drive aisle between Buildings 1 and 2 where my cursor is. Staff recommends removing the loading docks from the rear of the Buildings 1 and 2 to mitigate potential conflicts between pedestrians using the pathway and delivery tracks accessing that area. All proposed sidewalks and pedestrian walkways have to meet the UDC code requirements. A minimum of a 25 foot wide lane

street buffer is required along all arterial streets. In commercial districts a 20 foot wide street buffer is required along all collector streets. The buffer may be placed in an easement rather than in a common lot in accordance with the UDC. A minimum of a 50 foot wide street buffer is required along I-84. The proposed buffer dimensions appear to meet the requirements of the UDC. However, there is a lack of a combination of planters within the buffer along Vanguard Way. The applicant has provided 52 trees and only 34 are required along Vanguard Way. Staff recommends that the applicant enhance the street buffer by reducing the number of trees and incorporating additional planters. The landscape buffer along south -- along South Black Cat Road adjacent to the open drainage swale lacks vegetation in front of the ten foot pathway, not meeting the requirements of the UDC. The applicant proposes a plaza area between Buildings 1 and 2 featuring benches, a pergola, landscaping and a potential historical monument of the existing silo on the site. The applicant should revise the landscape plan to reflect landscaping within the required buffers along Vanguard Way and Black Cat Road adjacent to the drainage swale in front of the ten foot pathway in accordance with the UDC. To improve the integration of the property with the neighboring ME zoned property to the east staff encourages the applicant to consider removing the entire landscape buffer along the eastern side and coordinate with the alignment of the parking with the adjacent property owner. This would facilitate shared access to the east, improve integration between -- with the property to the east. The proposed fencing complies with the UDC code. There is -- off-street vehicle parking is required for the proposed commercial subdivision as set forth in the UDC based on the approximate 378,360 square feet of proposed floor space a minimum of 757 off-street spaces are required. A total of 764 off-street parking spaces are proposed. Based on the 764 parking spaces proposed a minimum of 31 bicycle spaces are required to be provided. None were proposed with this application and bicycle parking facilities should comply with the standards in the UDC. Bike racks should be provided as close as possible to each building entrance, totaling the 31 spaces or designated area within the plaza. Staff is recommending the removal of the loading docks on the rear of Building 1 and 2, which will create additional parking. Staff recommends that the applicant submit revised plans incorporating the aforementioned changes with the CZC application. Conceptual building elevations were submitted for the proposed flex buildings and light industrial. Building materials consist of horizontal metal, Hardie plank siding and white wood colors, stucco in dark and light grays, metal awning and gray wrapped cornice molding. The proposed conceptual elevations are not approved. Final design must comply with the design standards in the architectural manual and the design standards in the Ten Mile Area for the commercial designation. A certificate -- a certificate of zoning compliance and design review application is required to be submitted for approval of the site and zoning design prior to submittal of a building permit application. Commission recommended approval. A summary of Commission public hearing. In favor was David Bailey. In opposition was none. Commenting was David Bailey and Blaine Johnston -- Blaine Johnston, president of the Meridian Historic Preservation Commission. Written testimony is none. Key issues. The applicant's consideration and proposal for the monument sign is appreciated. However, it would be nice to see the historic silos preserved somehow. Key issues of discussion by Commission. Retaining the historic silos on another property. Ideas given were northeast corner of town. On Franklin in

the middle of a roundabout. Questions to the Historic Preservation Commission regarding funding to move the silos to another suitable location owned by the city. The proposed timing for the extension of Vanguard Way and the disassembly of the dual silos to relocate them out of the right of way. Concerns with the silo being placed somewhere else in the Treasure Valley and losing its distinguished heritage as being part of Meridian. Commission changes to staff's recommendation is none. And outstanding issues for City Council is Commission would like to recommend to City Council to retain the dual silos as a historical monument somewhere within our city, preventing them from being given or sold to another part of the Treasure Valley are discarded and the developer build a monument on site to commemorate the silos. Written testimony since the Commission hearing is none. And that concludes staff's presentation and I stand for any questions.

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

Bailey: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Council. David Bailey, Bailey Engineering, representing Trilogy Development. My office address is 1119 East State Street in Eagle. Thanks, Stacy, for the great presentation you had there and start a presentation here. Do I -- do I maximize that? There we go. Okay. Great. So, we are here for the Farmstone Crossing Subdivision and, again, appreciate Stacy's presentation of that. I think she covered it pretty well. As she stated, we have been a fairly long path on this and gone through several revisions and worked back and forth with quite a few of the items. So, I will go through the project first and, then, I will ask for any questions you might have about what -- how we got where we are. Here we go. Okay. So, she stated the property's at I-84 and Black Cat Road, the northwest -- northeast corner of that. Vanguard Street is to be constructed to the north of us and that will connect from the existing Vanguard project -- actually include the major mega project that's been recently proposed to the east and northeast of Vanguard and the Ten Mile Area to the east of us. To the north of us is the Avani Subdivision, which I understand was before the Council here recently and went back for some changes with a -- with an approval for that. So, I think -- I think we are in line of what we are going to do with the Avani Subdivision as well. Am I doing this wrong? All right. Thank you. The -- as Stacy stated, the future land use map designates this as ME. ME to the east. ME to the west. And medium high residential to the north -- north of the project. We are proposing an ME zone consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and uses consistent with the ME district, which is flex space, office space and light industrial and uses in that manner. Light manufacturing. I will jump right into the solo -- silo. So, this has been kind of a central piece of -- of what we are doing through the project and we initially, you know, investigated the project, we came to a -- to a pre-app meeting with the -- with the city and we were informed, you know, right away, you know, that this is something that we -- we want to look hard at and we have, you know, since that point. So, this is a double silo and I won't say that I know all the details on the historic details of the project, but we understand it's important. It was built in the early 1900s and it was representative of some granaries that were built with this double silo look on -- on the project. I assume for -- for feed of animals. So, you could say to store the grain on the site and provide

this as a -- as a -- as a feeder place. There is another large silo on the site, which is quite a bit taller than this, which is a single silo by itself and there is another barn in between. As I understand this -- this was documented by the State Historical Preservation Commission at some point in the past and was listed there, but it's not listed on any registry, nor with the National Registry, although I understand it's eligible for -- for listing there. So, in doing some -- some investigation we have taken pictures of it, looked at the thing, measured it, you know, and set it on the site. I have had a structural engineer evaluate the thing as it is and how it was built and it turns out the blocks that are used in this are actually still commercially available to build from, but it was -- it was a -- an interesting structure as they could build it quickly and it has the hoops around the outside, but it was meant to be held in place structurally by the grain filling it out and holding the blocks in place, because they are not mortared or held together in any way, except for the hoops on the outside of it and this will come up a little bit -- in a little bit longer. So, we have had that structural evaluation done and we said we think we could brace this thing and maintain it on site if we did that, you know, if we were able to keep it on site. So, we looked for options to do that and we looked for options for moving the road and for where we could do that, where we could do our alignment, the site distance problems and, then, the project to the west was approved and the road alignment was designed and approved by ACHD in a way that this is right in the middle of Vanguard. So, there is just no way this is going to move. We did reach out to ACHD and ask them if that alignment could possibly be moved and they indicated that it was not. So, the -- the bottom line conclusion is this has to come down in some way for anybody to move forward. There is quite a bit of interest with the property owners to the east and to the west and with your fire department and with this project, too, is to get Vanguard built going through there and so now all of the properties around they are interested in doing that. So, that's going to happen at some point here coming forward. We would like to make sure there is a resolution for what's going to happen with the silo, you know, before that road gets constructed. In all likelihood this development will not be building Vanguard Street. So, this provides a good opportunity to have the condition in place of what we are going to do, so that -- so that we can -- we can get moving forward with -- with the rest of that project and have a -- have at least a disposition in place on this. So, we have worked and met with that -- with Blaine several times on this and, as Stacy said, we have met with the Historic Preservation Commission and Ken Freeze on the Commission had suggested that we look into another company to provide an estimate as to whether we could pick this up and move it and I have had it evaluated by a structural engineer and they looked at it and hemmed and hawed and came back with a -- a number that was, frankly, really, really, really, really not usable and I'm concerned that this thing cannot be moved based on the structural engineer. It's more practical and cheaper to take this down and rebuild it somewhere -- is definitely -- is capable of being done in that way. So, we have said that we would participate in getting this thing disassembled and stored and save the additional materials from it if somewhere could be with it. The developer of this project does not feel that this site is the appropriate place to have it for the -- for the industrial site, the size of the plaza we have and the pieces that -- that we are going to have on this thing and moving it 50 feet or moving at a mile or taking it apart and putting it back to somewhere else -- you know, together somewhere else is probably not a significant

factor in what we do. We don't have the size in the plaza and, then, we don't want an enclosed structure on the site that could be -- and I'm not sure that we could get a permit from the city to make that a structurally sound piece after putting it back together. They built it from scratch, reinforced it with concrete on the inside or put it in a different location -- there are ways to do that, but we didn't think it was practical for this site, so we would like to move it there. So, going through that -- that piece of it, the collector street location on the left-hand side and you can see on the thing on the right-hand side here, that's the location of the silo compared to the -- to the -- compared to the road alignment that's required and that's the Vanguard project, which is designed on the left-hand -- on the west side. On the east side of this project we have been working with -- with the developer's engineer John Carpenter with Ardurra on the connection to the road there and on our -- our shared access there and we have provided them plans as we have gone along, so they are on this. It's my understanding that they are actually under the progress -- in progress in designing Vanguard at this point, but I don't -- I don't know that for sure. So, our plan would be to disassemble that, if we can identify an agency in advance of that -- that road construction and, then, we will construct a monument on the plaza and we have gone through several iterations and we probably have a few more, but we have had a rendering done here that shows that we would do a plaza. The scale on this thing is that -- that plaque in the middle, actually, we worked -- we worked a couple times with -- is it Coach Paul Crutchfield and -- and Barbara Bauer and they are with a private, you know, historic preservation firm and so we did have them provide us a mock up and some ideas of -- of our monument. This would be a four-by-eight monument -- or four-by-eight plaque in the center. It was laminated and has pictures of the existing silo and the write-up professionally done by an historian to document what we would do there. And, then, the outside of this would be made with some of the materials of the building and scale wise we are talking about those towers on the -- on each side are about four to six feet in diameter and they would be built on and stuccoed so that they would look like the tile that's on there now with the bars and I think that we probably -- if we can use some of the materials from that we would probably include that in the base of this or have those as a partial wall that would be adjacent to this to show the actual materials from it included in this. We would have the final design at -- at CZC and would be -- we would run it by the Historic Preservation Commission and -- and the city at that -- at that point. Again, on the preliminary plat, six buildings here, central plaza, and this discussion of the -- of the loading docks on this -- and I guess there is -- there is not -- on the buildings one through five there are not loading docks. They are all roll-up garage doors. So, these are intended to be flex space buildings. So, at least the front half of the ground -- or front half of the building is intended to be office space and, then, it could be built out in the rear and, then, there could be a space in the back. Contractors like these buildings. There is a pretty good demand for this stuff. And the buildings are set up to be specifically that way, so they can have a high bay in the back. They can have multiple stores of office. My office in Eagle was in a building like this some time back and I had all of my -- my storage and my extra plans in the -- in the bottom floor and, then, I had offices on the ground and the upper floor. They really make great spaces and they make spaces for smaller contractors and smaller businesses to work out, as well as plumbing supply companies can fit in this kind of -- kind of building. So, it's a great employment use, although it's not, you know, office

space -- specifically, you know, pure office space, it's a mixed use in that and we think there is a good demand for those. So, as shown on the plan there is the roll-up doors on the -- on the backs of those -- on the backs of those buildings, one per unit is the way it's shown on their -- their garage side door that's on that and the green part that sticks out there is extra. We put some pieces out there to provide some extra parking in the rear of those buildings, so that we don't have people just parking out there, we just wanted to designate some parking in that area. We do, in fact, have raised loading docks in building six that is shown for that. We intend that to be some kind of light manufacturing and we have definitely made the delivery associated with that -- that type of use. So, it's -- it's our desire to have the pathway that goes along the west side of this project between buildings one and two, but we think we have great visibility on that. We will mark that specifically across there with a box or whatever, but we don't think that there is a significant conflict between pedestrians and -- and the vehicle traffic that would be behind that building. That would be a major problem for us in that area and the buildings as they are designed, to convert that to a complete office building we don't have any inside access to that, so we would have these big long deep offices that would be with that and it would just be hard to convert -- convert this building to that use. So, we would like to keep those garage doors on the back of those and have all of these be of a similar -- similar design project. So, we are asking for that consideration. The plans on that -- we have on this is in accordance with the UDC, has great access, great visibility from our entrance and Stacy had mentioned that we had -- we kept the entrance on the west hand end of this instead of lining it up -- well, part way along the way your Avani moved their entrance to the west on us, so we had to pick -- go between them from the layout here and, then, the other thing is that we will have truck traffic that goes through here to the back and so we need a complete loop going through this project. We will share that access with the property to the east. We don't have that complete design yet as far as how we are going to lay that out or what that plaza is going to look like -- or, excuse me, that -- that landscape strip on the east side, but, as I said, we are working with the engineer to the east to make sure that that -- that provides the best access to both sites. Question as to how that access lines up on the site as well. So, we will work that out and have that final design in for the -- for the construction drawings in the same. Pathway through the site. This site has great pathways through it, along I-84, along the west boundary, the outparcel there is a storm drainage pond for Idaho Transportation Department, so that won't be developed and we won't move that road -- move the pathway over there and need to. And, then, we do provide the -- the required improvements on Black Cat there and, then, the Ten foot detached sidewalks. The road sections that we show on here, the access locations have all been approved by Ada County Highway District for what we are showing here. Comp plan I think we talked about that. Elevations of the building and as Stacy mentioned these are -- these are conceptual and may go through the design review process and that's -- and we agree to all of the conditions of approval. I will note that we did submit an updated plan on the -- on the landscape plan that addressed some of the issues you had and we are glad to meet all those conditions at the -- at the CZC in any case, so we are in agreement with all of that. Went over a little bit, maybe glad to stand for any questions you might have.

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

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: David, would you mind going back maybe five or six slides to your last image that kind of showed the site layout, particularly with Black Cat. That will work right there. So, Mr. Mayor, David, my first question is that -- that strip of land that runs along Black Cat to I-84 that isn't included in your project, who owns that piece of dirt and what's contemplated for it? It just seems out of alignment with the totality of your project.

Bailey: Mr. Mayor and Councilman Cavener, that is actually Idaho Transportation Department owned property, the block out on the -- along Black Cat and it is -- it is currently a storm drain -- storm drainage pond for I-84, so it's not going anywhere.

Cavener: Thank you. I thought you had meant it was the part kind of that shaded area in your Building 6, so that gives me good clarification on that. Mr. Mayor, a follow up if I may.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: So, David, the subject of the silo I think is going to be a big conversation tonight, at least it's going to be for me. It certainly came up in Planning and Zoning and it should not be a surprise to you. Walk me through kind of what actions you have taken since Planning and Zoning Commission around the silo.

Bailey: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Cavener, so we haven't done anything specifically new since the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Cavener: Okay.

Bailey: So, the recommendation that we received from the Planning and Zoning Commission was support for our plan to remove this -- to disassemble the silo, if we could find a place to put that. Their -- and that we would -- we would be building this monument in the plaza in any case and we would -- if the -- if we couldn't find a place for the monument -- or for the existing silo, we would be using -- we will be anyways using some of the materials in there in order to -- to document this and we would be building a monument on the site similar to that. So, that's our intent and it still is our intent to do that.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thanks. So, I guess, then, that -- that's the question. Who have you reached out to to take ownership of the silo? Should it be disassembled? I mean I guess what I'm trying to see is where does it go?

Bailey: Well, we are -- we are -- we don't know that either and, you know, it -- it's -- the question is that the Historic Commission wants it moved, the city may want it moved or want to maintain it somewhere, right, and that we are not interested in maintaining that silo on our site. So, you know, the question is are you going to make that our responsibility to find a place to put that and as of right now that's not something that we have contemplated that -- that we are going to find a place for it or negotiate with someone to find a place for it. Don't feel it's our role.

Cavener: And, then, David, you indicated you had a structural engineer that said that it would -- it couldn't be moved or it was on the verge of falling apart? Was that letter included in -- in your application? Has that been provided to the city, anything that -- that comments on that? I just -- I couldn't find it in our packet and I'm -- I'm really curious to read what those findings were.

Bailey: It was, Councilman Cavener. So, the documents from them -- the first one was the structural engineer that said that the silo could be -- and the engineer was Bryan Smith with Sage Engineering -- provided the -- the engineering work on that did the work and they went out and visited the building. So, the first one was said that we could shore up the building to maintain it in place if it were going to be there and he talked about putting bracing inside that would hold the things out and probably adding at least a portion of a -- of a retaining wall inside and then -- and, then, we could probably, you know, probably get the big building certified to be, you know, okay to stay in place. The code has changed significantly when you go to move the building, right, as far as recertifying it and it was his impression that it would not be possible to jack up the individual silo pieces and put them on a trailer and move them somewhere and that it would not be possible to -- to jack up the whole foundation, because it's not practical to do that. You might be able to do that -- and, in fact, the moving company suggested that they would do that and, then, they said we will move it over to the site and we will set it there and you guys got to -- we will put it back down. Well, you can't -- when you move a house you jack up the house, you put it over the hole, you pour the foundation and, then, you set the house down on the foundation. We have no way of separating the two. So, it's just not practical to move it. That said they are a fairly easy assembly and disassembly as well and so to take it apart, rebuild the whole wooden structure from scratch, or rebuild the whole thing from scratch using the blocks that you can obtain commercially, right, is a better option than moving it in any case.

Cavener: Thank you.

Simison: Can you tell me -- how big was this? Is it 30 by 70? How big is the footprint, just out of curiosity? Do we know?

Bailey: Yes. Mr. Mayor, I think the silos themselves are about 16 or 17 feet in diameter for each -- each silo and so the whole thing across is like 60 feet long and -- and probably 25 or 30 feet in the -- in the other dimension with the building that's on top of it.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Some questions along these lines. Is it practical to disassemble it -- like once we disassemble it can it be reassembled? My son is an avid LEGO person. I have had a lot of experience with the idea that we are going to reassemble things that cannot actually be reassembled. So, are you going to have to label each block? Like how would that even work? I just -- I just want to understand what disassembly entails. Is it labeling each piece? So, do you think these can be disassembled in chunks? Like help me understand that, please.

Bailey: Mr. Mayor, Council, Council Woman Strader, the -- I'm a big LEGO fan myself; right? And I'm an engineer and I have been an engineer since I was about yay high and so I take apart things and put them together and one of the things I did is I ran a -- I ran a -- I looked at this thing I said, okay, I'm going to get this crew of this size and get this many people, because you get the lifts that go on that and you could have an operator go up there in a lift, pull it, put it down, take off the top course until you get to the first -- that first band, remove that band and, then, move your way down and actually the disassembly of this is actually very simple. They build back up the same way. You build -- you put the blocks in, you put the band around the outside and, then, I don't know if they fill them with something, you know, as they built them. You know, I suppose you could fill it with dirt or something, but -- but as far as the practicality of disassembly and reassembly this thing is actually pretty good.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: So, you -- you are volunteering to disassemble it and store it. I'm a little concerned that whoever disassembles it should reassemble it, if that's the direction that we go, just because it's -- I'm not an engineer. I'm a little skeptical about how it's going to come together, but that wasn't really a question, so in fairness to you -- I guess just a question -- I don't want to totally just direct it at you, but, Mr. Mayor, if you will permit me -- even with staff or with anyone kind of -- do we have leads on -- on --

Simison: I didn't know when to interject -- with a recommendation.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: But I was glad -- I got a preview last week and I have been trying to think about this in terms of -- I -- personally I think Hillsdale Park is a suitable location. I even

think there might be some new ground and -- in Hillsdale that maybe it would go well into, but I think the bigger -- the second question for Council is to what purpose is it being preserved. Are you wanting the community to be able to enter it? Are you wanting the community just to be able to physically see it? Yeah. And that's -- I had the pleasure of serving on an advisory council on historic preservation for several years in a presidential appointment and having these conversations and I -- I appreciate historic preservation as much as anybody, but for what purpose? I think that that's an important part of who we are asking to do what at what cost and for what purpose and I think that's an important thing for Council to consider, because short answer is we got someone willing to disassemble it, drive it over to Hillsdale Park, drop it off, give it to us and we can invest our dollars in reassembling it for the community's value and benefit. What do you want the community to be able to do with that? Or where do you want to put it? Well, the neighbors might. That's what I was kind of trying to see how big it is. It looks like it's maybe about 20 feet tall. There is -- 25?

Bailey: I think probably less than 20.

Simison: Yeah. So --

Bailey: Fairly short on that.

Simison: So, it's not going to overtake -- it's inside your structure in that context. I think that that -- at least for me, as you walk through this conversation, is what do you want to do with it? Because we could take it on and do that if it's important to the Historic Preservation Commission and we want to be partners with them in that. Otherwise, I think that the things that they have offered to do fall well within the realm of acceptable Historic Preservation practices and if it was my magic wand I wouldn't actually have them do anything on the property at all if they were -- if they aren't willing to offer to decommission to relocate it to another -- you know, pick it up and take it to somebody else, place it so we put it up and they just want to do a simple plaque on their plaza -- because I look at -- like who is going to come into this property to come and see this monument that's been erected for this? I don't know. You know, especially if you are going to go -- move it someplace else, you know. So, it's kind of like are we going to move it and put up a monument? Is that the -- the right direction? You know, these are all great questions about what makes sense for the community. You know, obviously, we have a development application here where they have the -- I hate the -- I hate the concept personally -- this is the last one of these here, so we have to put this all on this developer to figure out a way to preserve our history. I don't know if there were -- I don't know if I have ever seen one of these before in my life. So, is this the only and the last? I got no clue in that context. So, what is that -- you know, I think we have another -- how do I put this politically correct? The leaning silo of south Meridian. When that property comes in are we going to try to preserve that, because it's been there for a long time and it's the last silo standing in Meridian? I mean that -- it's a little different, but the concept -- correct. The concept is the last one and it's the one we are going to preserve and we are going to put that on the developer to find out where to put it and those things. I think the developer has gone -- personally has given us the option, but it's how

much does the city want to invest and for what purposes is where I would leave it hopefully for you all to consider. I have not talked to the parks director, not talked to the other people, but, yes, Century Hill Farm, you know, you got a farm based theme in that area. To me it makes sense. We have got some -- like a property that's not going to interfere with other park activities in that element. So, food for thought.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Excuse me. You know, when you are -- you know, you will remember this, the Comprehensive Plan when we were reviewing and discussing the future of Meridian and I was on the steering committee for that, we talked a little bit about how do we integrate ways in which we can preserve sort of the unique identity of Meridian into the future development of Meridian and I -- and that always stuck with me a little bit, because we don't want to just erase what made this area kind of unique in Idaho's history, but how do you -- how do you preserve that in a way where you are not inhibiting growth and the things that a modern society and community wants? I really like the idea of trying to -- to some level preserve that as a good reminder. There are some larger cities that I have been to where they have got small areas where they have tried to build around it or they have tried to set aside some of the aspects to remind them of the history. So, I -- I'm in support of that idea. Initially I thought in a place like this it was a strange place to put a monument for the agricultural history and so clearly it's not the place where we would want to reconstruct this if we did. I'm very open and supportive of the idea of taking it apart -- and I do know you can take it apart and put it back up pretty easily. It actually is going to be more structurally sound and look better and all that and maybe relocating it -- I think we need to figure out, you know, what does it cost the city if we are going to do that and where we are going to put it. I don't think we want people going into it, but I'm totally open to the idea of keeping it as some kind of an entity that speaks our heritage, but I guess the question may be -- and I'm not sure who this goes to. We mentioned before we did that we would want to know which agency or entity would take possession of it. Are we talking about the city or some other historical preservation entity? If we were to disassemble it -- and I think that's the right thing to do in my opinion. I'm not going to keep it here. I'm going to be persuaded one way or the other as to whether or not we actually even have a monument in this park or not. But who actually has possession of it? Does it become the city's possession or do we need to figure that out first?

Simison: Unless David has an answer, I'm -- or Blaine can speak to it, I'm not aware of any historical organization that would want to take this on in the state of Idaho and pay the costs -- any of these costs that could be somewhat significant. I don't -- I don't want to say what -- I couldn't even pretend to guess how much this would cost. They maybe have an idea how much the decommissioning, tear down, and relocate -- you know, moving costs would be you could probably extrapolate. Putting it back up might be similar, if they can even use the same stuff, plus the foundation, plus the site work, plus whatever you want it to look like. You know, do you want to repaint it? Do you want to

make it look nice? Is the wood still good? Does it need to be repainted? There is a lot of I think ancillary questions that we just don't have the answer to and I think it is to a certain extent -- I hate to say it's a blank check, but you are taking on the obligation for a blank check. That doesn't mean you have to do it if you don't like the numbers in the future, because I don't think it's going to anybody else. I have not heard that proposal that we are -- have another entity that's willing to take this, but Blaine can correct me if I'm wrong and says I'm not. So, it's really city in my opinion.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: How much was -- how much do you think it will cost to do the monument component in your plaza?

Bailey: The construction of the monument itself?

Strader: Uh-huh.

Bailey: I'm thinking -- and -- and we don't have a full design on it yet, so we just have an artist's rendering on that. So, that one is a hard one to do, but I'm going to get in trouble for this -- probably -- probably almost 50,000 dollars --

Strader: Wow.

Bailey: -- to build that. To go a little further, I have done some estimates and I think it's close to that to get it disassembled and stored on trailers on the site, okay? And it may be less. Most of that's labor; right? But we do have additional materials from the other silo, too; right? So, if some fell apart or whatever we could -- we could have enough of the silo piece itself, disassembled on site to make sure it's available from that end, so -- but reconstruction would probably be twice that. I'm guessing that reconstruction and that foundation and stuff would be over 100,000 dollars.

Strader: Uh-huh.

Simison: And that was going to be where I was eventually going to go was -- suggest we get as much help from them in putting them back up as compared to rebuilding a replica monument on site. I still think you can recognize it -- like we have done here in City Hall, you can do a simple -- here is where a silo -- you know, one of the -- one of the ceramics that we have done. I think if it's good enough for City Hall to remember some space it could be good enough there. I think the same type of people would see it, but much less cost if you want to -- if there is a need to identify it and it's not that dissimilar to what happened out at Owyhee High School. Again, it's about a marker recognizing issues in the area that existed, not necessarily rebuilding or maintaining a replica of it.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I'm not sure if this is a question for you either, maybe it's for discussion, but is it something where you could disassemble it and hold onto it and, then, decide later -- because I -- my concern is that our decision about what we do with this interferes with what we do with the application and I'm not sure if that's a reasonable thing to do, because I know that we are -- we would be asking, you know, the applicant to disassemble it for a cost, obviously, so I don't know if that is reasonable to separate these two issues tonight in a way that makes sense.

Simison: Maybe ask the question. What is the timing for this project to move forward where you would get to the point where you need -- where you would disassemble this property -- this silo?

Bailey: Mr. Mayor, the -- the timing for this project is probably a couple of years out demand wise; right? As far as when we would be -- want to be building buildings on the site. That said, the demand for Vanguard, as I have said, is that there are other developers besides this who are already designing that road, but the intention to get it through and because they need access to Black Cat, they need access to the fire station -- fire station access, you know, that's going to provide fire access through there and the large projects going around there that are going to push the construction of that, I'm not privy to it, but I'm guessing there is already some kind of letter of intent between four different developers on getting Vanguard built.

Simison: Let me ask a different question to staff. If this was approved tonight what's the quickest that they could actually start any of the processes out there by the time he finishes this, gets entitlements -- I understand you can take things down -- you can kind of start work without being annexed, but what's the realistic time before a road could be built on this property?

Parsons: Mayor, Members of the Council, definitely it's certainly a tough question, because in all the meetings that I have been part of that road is going to happen before any development occurs on this site and our DA provision that we have in front of you tonight also says don't do anything on this site until that road is built. So, if that road happens the silo needs to come down -- probably six months or faster. It's going to happen very quickly and that's why in the development agreement staff has structured the silo in such a way that they could disassemble it and store it at some point or for the purposes of selling it or maybe even a donation to your point, Mr. Mayor, that's always an option as well or build a plaque. So, we have built some flexibility in there for the applicant, because we are in the same dilemma you guys are, we -- we are not usually faced with these types of dilemmas. We don't really have anything in the UDC that says save this building. It's really at the time of annexation where these come up and the DA is the tool we have to come up with a way to try to preserve or protect these types of structures. I know I was part of a barn in south Meridian and they essentially took

photos of the structures -- it had historical documentation. They put a little plaque on the -- on the site that others could look at and certainly that's something within your purview tonight as well, if that's the way you want to proceed with this. But, certainly, if it is the desire of the Council to do something or preserve that, then, we should probably work with the applicant and come up with some language and figure out how long we intend them to store it and whether or not willing -- the city is willing to accept that donation and find that appropriate location. Quicker -- the sooner the better would probably -- is my recommendation.

Simison: My translation is that I think we have got a couple of months before we would have to make the determination if we were to put it on a property and where, but I don't know it would slow things down unless that is -- in that context. Any additional questions for the applicant or comments or should we see what Blaine or a few others have to say? Okay. Thank you. Is Blaine signed up?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, yes. Mr. Johnston.

Simison: Name and address --

Johnston: Mr. Mayor, Members of the City Council, thanks again for having me tonight. A little background --

Simison: Blaine, if you can state your name and address for the record.

Johnston: Oh. Sorry. Blaine Johnston. I live at 6138 North Demille in Meridian and I am president of the Meridian Historic Preservation Commission. I will start with a little background I guess first. If I can find my notes. The history of Meridian and Eggers farm dates back to the early 1900s when the Eggers produced a dairy -- they purchased a dairy farm on Ten Mile and Overland Roads. In 1921 they started a farming operation called Black Cat Farms on what used to be called Post Road, later -- years later Ada county renamed the road Black Cat in honor of the Black Cat sign they installed there. That sign is still there. Ada county historic sites inventory lists the Eggers farm as have historical significance to Meridian and Ada county and it is the only remaining double silo granary in Ada county. So, that kind of answers your question, Mayor. There were some before that, but this is the only one left in existence. Dairy and farming has been a big part of agriculture -- of our history with the growth in Meridian the last couple of years it's gotten busy for everybody and I'm part of that growth. I moved from -- from Boise to Meridian 15 years ago. So, I'm part of that growth. So, I'm contributing to this also. With that said, HPC has been tasked with preserving the history and legacy of the city. Our wish would be that the silos remain on site. That's where the history belongs. That's where we feel the best intent is. We are not against development. We are not against growth. We are just trying to do what's best for the city, its people and everybody that visits here. We feel that the center of this has -- is a good spot for the silos. We feel it can be rebuilt. But we are not all experts. I'm an architect. I have looked at it. I have said I think it can be rebuilt. It's going to take a little bit of work, but I think it's doable. So, whether it's on this site or if City Council says not, that's -- that's

your guys' decision. It's not up to us. But our belief is historically it would be best on site, but that's how we feel. So, with that I'm open to any questions.

Simison: Thank you. Council, questions?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Blaine, it was shared earlier from -- from David that this structure is eligible, but not on the National Historic -- I guess registry.

Johnston: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Cavener, that's correct. It's listed on Ada county's historic registry site. If it remains -- let me rephrase that. The way the development is with the farm going away, the barn going away, this silo would not be eligible for listing. It loses all of its historical integrity as far as the National Park Service is concerned. That doesn't mean it doesn't lose its integrity to the city.

Cavener: Sure.

Johnston: Did I answer your question?

Cavener: Yeah. And that -- Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: That was my question was if it was on the historic registry what could be done with it or what would it -- would it have to remain? Help me understand what that designation means for the use or placement of that asset.

Johnston: We got a letter back from the State Historic Preservation Office and because everything else is going to go away, if the silos -- don't think it remains, it would not be eligible for listing. So, it can never be listed on the national registry. So, does that answer your question? Yes and no?

Simison: Anything listed doesn't mean it can't be torn down.

Johnston: Right. So, being on the registry doesn't give it any terms of preservation protection per se.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thanks, President Johnson. So, it sounds like an order of preference. The Historic Preservation Commission's number one preference is keeping it on the site.

Then we have this concept of potentially could be moved to a city park that does have a farming theme, like an agricultural theme. There right now is a proposal here at the plaza for sort of a small like replica of it. Does the -- does the Commission have a strong preference of wanting that kind of a big replica, as opposed to like a plaque? And kind of where I was going with it -- I was looking for a little bit of a shortcut, but you might tell me, no, we don't want to do that, but I was thinking, well, why don't we put a plaque -- and maybe somehow the funds that would have been used for this elaborate plaza could be directed toward helping to, you know, reconstruct this thing at -- at Hillsdale Park. It's kind of where I was going with it. But if you -- I want to hear feedback from you. If you are like that's a huge mistake. We love the replica. Yeah, I just want to hear kind of what your thoughts are about that.

Johnston: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, again, our first preference was to remain on site. That would be most preferable to have it in -- in the historical context. Second choice would be to have a monument -- a replica, but built of scale to represent the history of -- that agriculture and farming has of -- in Meridian. So, that would be our first two choices. I may be speaking out of turn, David, but my discussions with -- with David Bailey is that the developer is willing to just give it away. There is a barn in there, he is willing to give it away. So, to get the -- it's not going to cost anybody anything. The assembly is going to be some cost for whoever gets it, whether it's the city or private entity or whomever. We would not like have that silo taken out of Meridian if at all possible. The best historical content would be within the city, so --

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Just to tease that out a little further, like you would rather have the monuments even -- in order of preference you would rather have the monument -- it's more important to have the monument, even, then, to have the structure itself in a different location. Or am I like sort of posing an unfair -- unfair --

Johnston: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, I don't think it's an unfair question, but I have never thought of as having both options.

Strader: Right.

Johnston: So, for us it was always can we get a monument, can we retain the silos on site. That was our first preference. We have never thought of it as having both options available to us.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I mean I'm -- sort of where I'm going with it is the developer has agreed to build this monument. It's -- it's kind of to scale. There is a scale to it. It does represent the structure in the place -- around the place that it was. Then it seems like the city is getting somewhat of a free option for now of a donation of the structure and disassembly of the structure and we will have maybe a couple of months to decide, you know, do we want to take on this structure, do we want to move it to Hillsdale Park. I agree with you, Mr. Mayor. I don't think it's realistic that another entity is going to swoop in here, but it sounds like we could -- we could -- in theory we could move forward tonight on an application with the monument and agreeing that the city will have a certain amount of time -- the developer will agree if we -- if we want to agree to disassemble it and, then, we will -- you know, we would have some time to figure out what to do. It would be great if we could get it buttoned up tonight. I don't think we are going to get a cost associated with what we need to do with the structure. So, I'm kind of thinking we -- and maybe we do the monument and, then, we could kind of punt on that piece, but I would like to hear other people's thoughts.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Blaine, thank you. It seems like some of the -- a lot of this conversation is being driven by where Vanguard has to go and so that consideration of the roadways is -- brings into other entities, sister agencies, et cetera, in planning our community. So, I understand -- I understand the first preference would be to leave it where it is, considering that the infrastructure kind of is dictating to some degree maybe what we need to do. I just want to make sure if I -- I'm understanding correctly your second preference is for the monument and not even to keep the buildings -- or am I misunderstanding?

Johnston: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Taylor, we realize that Vanguard is going to go right through where the silos are. We know they are going to have to come down. We are just -- we are asking can we, at least for now, disassemble, save the structure disassembled for future consideration, if it means rebuilding it on site in that -- their central plaza. Fantastic for us. I think that would be our -- our best solution. If that's not an option, yeah, we want to have a monument on site showing Eggers farm, the silos that used to be there, as an historical reference for that. If the city decides in the future with the next couple of months before the roads start getting built that, yeah, they would like to maybe take this on, great. I have talked to another couple of developers -- can't say who -- that are interested in possibly doing it and have it stay in Meridian. Those discussions are preliminary. I don't know where that may go yet. So, I'm still working on -- on saving the structure itself.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Kind of -- I think I would agree with the idea of preserving the -- the physical structure. Obviously, you know, decommissioned, taken down and store is somehow -- I think it needs to be in the possession of the city for now initially, but I like the idea of preserving the options. When considering a monument I -- I'm thinking if I were to go visit a monument in the midst of the development we have I -- I would almost think it's kind of sad, because we are -- it's -- you know, flex base buildings and, you know, loading docks and, then, here is this scale monument to our history. It seems a bit odd. I'm not totally opposed to it, but I think I would be a little sad. I would say we just screwed this up, you know. So, I -- I am very supportive I think initially of the idea of preserving the -- the buildings to some degree with a future determination of like maybe how we actually -- you know, give the -- your -- your body some time to maybe work with other parties I think the city needs to take possession of the materials until we decide maybe how we want to do that. There -- it seems like there is a lot of options for what we do with the silos.

Simison: You know, the -- the short answer is a few -- just continue the public hearing or -- don't approve it the road will never get built and, therefore, this issue doesn't have to happen and you can have the road that leaves the silo and goes around it and be done, but it might be something that would be worth continuing to hear from the Parks Department before -- again I didn't even get an opportunity to talk to the director about this and maybe there is other ideas to -- to at least gather the likelihood if Blaine wants to further explore his two private entities, that we could have some of that conversation. I just don't know if you -- you know, the nice thing is that if we don't move forward with the application right away we are not losing any time on -- on the decision and you guys could think about it in terms of that and maybe we can get a rough cost about -- up to. I know historic preservation is not cheap. There is no other way to put it.

Johnston: It's not, no.

Simison: And so if we are thinking we are going to relocate this for 50,000 dollars and have what we want, I think we are sorely mistaken, so --

Johnston: Thank you.

Simison: Thanks. Mr. Clerk, anyone else signed up on this item?

Johnson: No one else indicated they wished to speak.

Simison: Is there anybody else that would like to come up and provide testimony on this item this evening? Such a great group of people here. I thought someone would want to come up and talk about this item. Would the applicant like to come forward for any additional final comments?

Bailey: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I do have some final comments on the silo, but I first want to reiterate that I did have another request in there earlier that we allow Buildings 1 and 2 to stay as -- if we get to this point, that we allow those -- I want this to overshadow

-- that we allow those to stay as flex space buildings as proposed in -- in the application. So, we request that as a -- within the conditions of approval that we be allowed that. On the silos, I appreciate all the comments on this stuff and, you know, we have worked with Blaine several times on this and talked to him, you know, about what's going on and, you know, I certainly appreciate the Mayor's -- the Mayor's comments on this earlier and all of your -- your input into this and -- and I think it's probably worth proposing -- worth going forward with -- with what we are talking about. So, from our perspective what we are proposing is fully consistent with what the discussions have been, which is that we are willing to disassemble and, you know, my intent with that was to disassemble and put on trailers and store it on site; right? In a safe place on site until such time as -- as we have a place to put that. The caveat is is that prior to doing that disassembly we don't want to know, as the Mayor said for what purpose, we don't -- we want to know that there is a purpose for doing that, because it's going to be an expensive operation just to take it down and the developer has already committed and is willing to do that, but not to just -- to throw the money away. My take on that -- and I will be a little bold to say this -- is I think you should direct your Historic Preservation Committee to find a place to put that thing and put some budgets together to do that and should be a part of their job to do that. To that end -- and I got to be careful, because I switch on my -- what I want to do and what I can commit the developer to do, okay, on this thing and I'm on the side of Blaine on this thing and I have been and get the developer to commit to do the right thing in association with this. I'm not a short timer in Meridian. I started my -- my business in 1993 on South Black Cat Road and drove by this -- this particular silo quite a bit over the years and I -- I was in Meridian up through 1999 before I moved on to another company there. So, I have been doing stuff here a long time. I get it, so -- but I have gotten the developer to commit to pay for -- pay for taking that down, as long as it's not wasted money. We also have, as a requirement of the mixed employment district and part of the project cost, is to build a public art and one of our amenities is we have committed to build some kind of public art in our plaza that we have there and that's one of the amenities that we are committed to. So, in some scale that's going to happen. If there were some negotiations that we can use that money better somewhere else and just put a plaque there, instead of doing this -- this grand monument that that's better, we would be glad to participate in that as well, right, to the extent that we can make -- make a deal for that. But we are committed to build that and to paying for the silo as long as that we are not just throwing money away. So, we would like to be approved with those conditions that were -- that we are proposing there and with -- with those caveats on it. That's I guess the end of what I have got to say on that.

Simison: Thank you. And the one other thing I thought I heard said earlier -- and this is -- kind of plays into a little bit of this is if you were going to do a monument you may try to use some of the stuff from the silo if appropriate in that context and so --

Bailey: We have talked with the artists and with some designers about how we could incorporate the actual blocks from the silo in -- in context with that and, you know, I have had that reviewed by the -- you know, we would want to make it look nice and be appropriate. Again, we have already engaged the historic preservation company, who

would be a -- do a professional job of doing it properly, you know, in that end. I would also like to throw in, again, with the piece of -- if I can have one more stab at it. I'm committed -- I'm limited is what I can commit for the developer on this, but, like I said, I'm -- I'm -- I like Meridian and I like what -- what we are doing. I like what your Historic Preservation Committee is doing. So, I, as an engineer, would personally volunteer to work with your -- your Historic Preservation Committee. I have estimates on things I have done. I understand how things get put together and taken apart and I understand all the use -- land use stuff and I volunteer anytime I need to for my company to help, if you found a site for us to make sure that it got put together and done right on that end.

Simison: Thank you, David. Appreciate that.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. Maybe one question -- and I just wanted to double check if you could bring up your site plan, but I did want to make sure that there is not a different place it could go on the site. I don't know. Would it fill in the plaza? What about this -- there is this kind of wedge shaped green space here at the south part of the property. Just want to check did you sort of start with we don't want this on the site, because it's a liability and you didn't check into it or would it -- in theory could it fit on the site somewhere? Leaving your building's footprint the way they are.

Bailey: So, there is room within the plaza area we have shown there for the site. So, the silos can --

Strader: Okay.

Bailey: -- I mean it would be kind of oversized for the space, but it's certainly -- there is certainly room to put that there and, then, it would overshadow that one building a little bit. That said, the practicality, the cost and the continued maintenance and the -- actually, just the practicality of getting it done -- getting it built on there and the cost of that and the developer doesn't feel that it's the right place to have the monument in the long run and I know that's contrary to what your Historic Preservation Committee says, but it's not going to be seen by people. You know, this is going to be a -- a -- a -- you know, semi-industrial, light industrial site. You know, it's not a residential area that -- it won't have a whole lot of traffic. We are putting a lot of trails on here, but the odds are we are not going to have a huge amount of traffic through those -- or down Vanguard, you know, that's going to be pedestrian traffic that would visit that.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I'm -- but, you know, to play Devil's advocate for a second, if we kept it on site -- I guess what I'm hearing from my historic preservation expert is that that's the best case scenario, keeping the historical thing where it is sited. I mean in theory this is an industrial area, but in theory that's the whole idea of Ten Mile, we have this whole Avani Subdivision just across the street, maybe folks who walk down here, maybe kids could come if they are on a tour of -- historical tour of Meridian. I don't know if I want to foreclose the possibility, you know, that it -- that it could -- that it could be of use, but it's -- okay. So, it could technically fit on the plaza, but it would be crowded. That's what I'm hearing.

Bailey: Yeah. I don't think the issue is whether we could find someplace to put it.

Strader: Got it. Okay. So, there is -- there is space. Okay.

Simison: Any additional questions for the applicant?

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: We have been so busy with the silo issue, I just wanted to make sure that we got the other concerns dealt with. I know at one point we were talking -- or listening about bike racks and some things that hadn't been -- we hadn't addressed yet and I didn't know if we needed to deal with those tonight or if we were going to continue this or what -- what our plan is.

Bailey: Mr. Mayor, I can answer that and -- Council Woman Roberts. So, we had a couple of issues that were brought up. One was about the -- the garage doors in the back of Building 1 and 2. I have addressed that. The other one is that there were questions about the landscape buffers along those roads and we did address those and submitted a revised landscape plan to -- to the staff and, of course, that will go through the CDC and we will meet all the conditions that are required by that. So, we intend to fully meet all the conditions of -- of the landscape plan approval stuff. We are in agreement with that.

Little Roberts: Okay.

Bailey: With that plan -- and, actually, I haven't shown on here and they are probably not good enough, but that -- that did include bicycle racks there on the site and we fully intend to comply with the requirements and, again, that will be shown to be detailed at -- at the end here. Integration with the project to the east. We have addressed that. We did actually move that buffer over on the latest plan we had there and we are continuing to work with that developer to the east on how we integrate that and we will be sharing that site at the -- at the access there. So, that was one that she had brought up and, then, the caveat that this needs to go to the CDC and design review to do all these. So, we are fully in agreement with all those conditions and we have tried to address some of

them and we will have them all addressed, but certainly with the conditions of approval. The only thing we are asking for that's not strictly in accordance with the conditions of approval or in the staff report is that we be able to build Building 1 and 2 with the same building structure as the three, four and five that include the garage doors in the back. The flex space.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor, follow up?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: You have used the term garage door. I thought I heard in the presentation from staff that it was a loading dock. Two very different things. But Building 1 and 2 are garage doors, not loading docks?

Bailey: Correct.

Little Roberts: Okay. Thank you.

Simison: Any additional questions from Council? Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor, just a final question -- and -- and to that point. You want to preserve the garage doors for flexibility with tenants and kind of -- instead of turning it into office space, you want to be able to preserve the multiple use aspect that comes with that kind of design; is that correct?

Bailey: Correct.

Taylor: And I think that makes some sense where, you know, I see that the pathway is designed to kind of go between the two and I think the staff makes a good point, but it seems like the design of the building is such that we are not having big 18 wheelers backing up to the loading docks or -- this is more of a simpler use in terms of what you are envisioning. Not a high use with large trucks that would be using those facilities probably.

Bailey: Correct.

Bongiorno: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Deputy Chief.

Bongiorno: Hi there. David, after -- I haven't seen the site plan. It doesn't look like the one on my report. So, I just want to make sure -- that shared access to the east, are you going to pave your half? Because you need two accesses into this development. There was three on my plan and now you have one and you have to have two.

Bailey: We have two and it will be fully paved. It will be fully constructed in -- with the neighbor next door.

Bongiorno: Okay. Cool. That's what I wanted to make sure.

Bailey: Yeah.

Bongiorno: Awesome.

Simison: Okay.

Bailey: Thank you very much.

Simison: Thank you. The -- as of right now we are done. The applicant's gave their comments and -- after -- once the applicant does we are done for now. So, we will see what Council -- if they feel like they want to hear more testimony, then, we just have to give the applicant more time again. Okay. All right. Come up, speak into the mic. Name and address for the record.

Billaud: Hello, Mayor and Council people. My name is Lori Billaud. 192 West Lockhart Lane, Meridian, Idaho. One of the things that I saw when traveling through Maine -- they have done a really good job in Vermont of preserving their historical monuments, but, then, also turning them into things for children. So, one of the things that they did at Fish Park is they took a building that was historical to that area, that did have a fire, but, then, they had the architects go through and put swings and things. I know it's not exactly the silo, but there is things that you could do. Somebody had mentioned moving the park to a farm themed park. So, you could actually -- of course, depending on budget -- make it so it's a child friendly thing, so that also on here there were bike paths. You can see my husband. But we had just taken a bike path through and by it, so, then, you could stop off. There was also a skate park that you could also go to and, then, in this other area there was -- they took tires -- large tires and made dragons and so forth out of them, really to show recycling and they did a whole recycling thing. And this was in Vermont. So, just sharing an idea that having something inside the location, chances are it will be money spent, like you had said, Mr. Mayor -- money spent that will not be seen by anybody if it's a monument or -- or a little small thing. People probably -- it's going to be money that Meridian spends and needed or the developer. If you move it somewhere else and turn it into something that's child friendly, that people can do in the park, that could be money that's well used and have the plaque there with the picture of the field, so the kids could actually see what was around in the area. Thank you.

Simison: Council, any questions? Okay. Thank you, Lori. David, would you like to make any final comments? Okay.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Just kind of -- appreciate at least kept the public hearing open in case you got any questions. I -- the applications are never easy and -- and I think that there are -- there are just too many details for me that still need to be answered before I would be comfortable making a decision tonight. So, I likely will be supportive of continuing this out for a few weeks to give the applicant an opportunity to engage with our Historical Preservation Commission, Parks Department, maybe Mayor's office -- I think it's important that we have a -- anything we go into this I want it to be eyes wide open, so I think from the applicant standpoint we don't want to say tear it down, preserve it, and six years from now we are like, ah, it was a terrible idea. Get rid of it; right? That was a waste of time and money. I think we have got to have a good plan -- or at least an intentional plan that we want to do. Candidly, I don't like the idea of a monument. I appreciate Council Member Taylor's comments, that I have the Joni Mitchell song, like verse two in my head, you know, instead of paving paradise and put up a parking lot or tear down all the trees and put up a tree museum, we -- we tear down the silo and put a picture about where that silo used to stand. I don't like that idea. Ideally I like the recommendation of our Historical Preservation Commission, which would be to find a way to preserve it on site. That would be my preference. That may not work, but that's at least where I'm starting at tonight and -- and, Mayor, you asked a good question, which is to what end and so I just go back to what I see on the website about our historical preservation and what it's designed to do, which is the Commission works to preserve the character and fabric of historically specific significant areas and structures within the City of Meridian, to honor and preserve its rich heritage for future generations. That's why we have the HPC. I think in the ten years I have been doing this I have never had HPC come and say do something with this. Don't let it get torn down. I'm sympathetic to that. I also think many of us hear from people in our committee who have lived here a long time, that preserving our agricultural history is very very important to them. So, when I hear that from our neighbors -- and we have our HPC who is -- this is their job is to bring us these types of recommendations to preserve history saying let's tap the brakes, I think that's important. Again, it's a challenge; right? As the applicant comes in you are like, hey, I -- I got this patch of dirt, you didn't know the historical significance when it was -- when -- I'm sure when the developer was purchasing it, but that's what's before us. So, I -- I would like to continue this probably for a couple of months and get -- these details get worked out, so that we, as a body, should we choose to approve the annexation and zoning, we are comfortable with about what is going to happen to the silo long term. I don't mind, Mayor, if David wants -- David wants to speak. I'm -- public hearing is still open.

Simison: Yeah. David, you want to come up and --

Bailey: David Bailey again. Mr. Mayor and Councilman Cavener, you can certainly defer this to do stuff, but -- but we have our offer on the table about what we are willing to do with the project and that is to -- is to go forward with -- with the plan that we have there. The alternative is that -- is that you could add that as a condition of the development agreement as the City Council -- a condition of the development agreement that you keep it on site and -- and do that as what you want to do or I suppose you could deny the project. I suppose you're -- you're -- you're open as to

what you can do on -- on that end. But the position of the developer is that if -- if you were to -- to defer this for three months I probably would not do anything different in that time frame. So, I could talk to the -- talk to the city, the city could work on finding a place to do -- put -- put that on that end and so if the city has some work to do, but we have come to where we -- where we need to be from the developer's end in the project.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Dave, I'm going to -- I like given time for -- for the right decision to get -- be made and what I'm hearing from you is either accept our offer -- condition us to do something without involving -- I think maybe getting all the right answers for us the city to be confident or recommended denial -- or issue a denial and I just want to make sure that that's the position that you are at tonight is that you are willing to accept a denial if we are not able to come to a conclusion about what's best for that silo. I just want to make sure I'm hearing you right. And, again, the reason why I'm asking is that's -- that's where I would go is if we don't have an answer on that and there is not a willingness to work collaboratively to find a solution, then, we can save the Council some time and I'm happy to make a motion for denial.

Bailey: And Mr. Mayor and Councilman Cavener, there is no intent to say put you on the spot or say this is our -- you know, stick my foot in the sand. I don't have anywhere else to go -- if you defer this I don't have anywhere else to go in the next several months. I would -- I would -- I guess I would prefer that you place what you want to happen -- or what you want me to do as a condition on the project or I suppose if -- I don't know what I would do in the intervening months. I have been through this over and over again and I don't have any other tools to bring you back something different. I can -- and -- and Bryan's not going to change his mind on where he is and I don't know if we are going to find a place to take that to and already said it -- and there is quite a bit of support that -- that's probably not the developer's responsibility.

Cavener: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, I --

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Dave, I think it's also -- it's not just you, it's -- it's us; right? To your point, if we ask your -- the developer to tear it down and we don't have a plan about where it would go or had to be rebuilt, that -- that's unfair to you and that's unfair to the developer and so we -- candidly, I wish after Planning and Zoning Commission that you would have taken the time and effort to engage with the city about building a plan, so we had a -- an option tonight to pick. You chose not to do that and that's okay, but that -- that's where I'm trying to get to is what's the plan. Asking you to take it down and store it with no -- no plan in place and we don't know what it would cost to put it back together, we don't know where it would go and so that's what I'm saying, is if you don't want us to take the

time to try and figure that out, I'm okay with that. I'm trying to work collaboratively with you to find the right solution.

Bailey: So, Mr. Mayor, Councilman Cavener, again, I don't want to be -- come across as putting my foot in the sand. The -- the take is it's not that I'm not willing to be collaborative, we have been willing to be collaborative. The conclusion that we -- that we have come -- come to in this is that that silo is going to come down and that we would love to see it go somewhere else, but we don't want to see it on our site. Okay? Either we don't want to move it on to our site or build it on our site for the reasons I explained on that. From that perspective, we don't know that there is anything else to look at. What we had left open is the option for the city or the Historic Preservation Committee to say, hey, let's do something besides just throwing this thing away, because that's what happens if no one else takes action. If we don't take action, you don't take action, the Historic Preservation Committee doesn't take action on this thing, then, it gets thrown away and -- and so we think that that's probably what's going to happen in the long run. I'm guessing that's what's going to happen in the long run. It's not -- you know, that that's what's -- what's going to happen here and so we are saying that we want to leave this open, that if there is another solution we don't want to close off the door today; right? But it's -- we are not going to know anything more in three months from now -- or maybe we will. You know, certainly -- certainly we are not -- I'm not telling you what you have to do or what you need to do, your -- that -- that's -- that's your side of the deal, so --

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I think we should be careful not to embrace a false dilemma. I do think if we made a hasty decision this evening, then, there would be a real risk of disassembling this and having it disappear or be discarded. We definitely are in alignment that we don't want that to happen. So, I have faith that we will work through that. I think if we take a continuance it would give you the opportunity -- I know that your developer does not prefer this, but it would give you the opportunity to take a look at -- if it were reassembled on site what would that look like? Is there a way you could get comfortable with that and that would give you an opportunity to look at that. I think it would give our city and the historic -- the Historic Preservation Commission would have an opportunity to discuss with private parties, who may or may not be interested. Could be even nearby, across street, who knows where it could go. Okay? So, that would give us an opportunity to explore that avenue and it would give city staff an opportunity to look at some parks angles. I loved Lori's positivity with this out-of-the-box creative thinking about play structure. I mean there is just a lot of possibility there, but we really couldn't explore that unless we talked with our Parks Department. So, I would -- we are in the driver's seat, because you are the applicant this evening, so I would encourage you to indicate if you are comfortable with a continuance, because I think that would give us all an opportunity to -- to do our homework as a city and, then, that would give you an opportunity to do some homework on -- if you had to locate it on site what's that

going to look like? Is there a way for you to get comfortable? That's just my recommendation. Because we can't force you into a continuance and it's better if you are okay with that, but I think what you are probably hearing from us -- at least a few of us, is that really making a decision tonight may not work in your favor and we -- I think we all agree we don't want it discarded, so that's just feedback from me. I would be in a similar boat to Councilman Cavener in terms of feeling that we are not ready to make a decision, because we don't have really a method yet -- a plan for the silo. But I think if we take time I think we could get that together. Maybe I'm just being optimistic, but I really think we could figure it out.

Parsons: Yeah. Mr. Mayor --

Bailey: Could I answer that?

Parsons: Yes. Go ahead. Sorry.

Simison: Please do.

Bailey: Council Woman Strader, I -- I agree with you and, of course, we are willing to look at a continuance in order to move -- move this forward and with that continuance I would say that our job during that time would be to -- I will talk to the developer and we will look more at the cost and the feasibility of moving it onto the site. I will ask that question again of the developer during that time and I would hope the city and the Historic Preservation Committee during that time could look at other options for what could be done with the site and I think that's -- that would be great. Thank you.

Simison: And -- and just to -- it's sad. I mean from a -- I'm trying to put on multiple hats. It's like -- if we are not willing to relocate it to our property at our cost, why would we expect the developer to put it back on their property at their cost? I think that's a fair question to ask when they didn't -- the road is where the road is. If we really want it to stay where it is, go to ACHD and get ACHD to move the road. I mean that's -- that saves it from that standpoint, but there -- there is a real cost if it's the expectation that this only comes back on the developer's property at the developer's cost in that context and I just want to share one other little story that's kind of relevant to my time in the advisory council on historic preservation was one of the things that they wanted to do was restore a bunch of homes on military bases that were built in the '40s. It seemed like a great thing and I ask the question, well, who gets to -- who gets to see those homes? Well, the people that live in them. So, it was a lot of money to preserve homes that the only people that were ever going to do it was the officers that lived in those homes. They weren't available to the public. It was more of a -- just a general we want them to be maintained in their historic relevance, but no one actually got to have the benefit except for the people there and that was my concern with rebuilding on this property is -- especially if you are not going to create an opportunity for people to visit, it just becomes a building on a piece of property and I think that if you want to have historic preservation meaningful you have to have a way that it's interactive there for the public and just showing up and like, okay, we are here and looking at it and with no

other real purpose or -- okay, we saved the building, but have we really met any meaningful long-term purpose and I think that when Councilman Cavener read the comments, you know, there was -- and I don't remember exactly what he said, but some of the stuff at the very end -- I think where does the community get the best value for this? You know, if we are going to start preservation that's where to me is the important part. It is not just to maintain on the property, but the value to the community in this concept. So, I hope that as we have -- as you talk, staff talks, Parks talks, Council talks, the -- at the end of the day we all come around to, you know, real cost, real value, real purpose, not just to say we preserve the building on an industrial property that people are not going to drive to and look at or interact with or value in that context. So, just want to get that out there as we move forward in this conversation.

Parsons: Yeah. Mayor and Council, if I can just add to some of the commentary on that, too. I think Council Woman Strader was probably going in the right direction. I'm looking at the southeast corner and there is quite a bit of landscape buffer down there and we have to look at Ten Mile as a whole. So, yes, this is one piece of it, but to the east there is going to be an interconnected multi-use pathway along the interstate there. So, it may make sense to put it along there. You can see it as you drive your car and, then, those who are riding a bike can stop and interact there in that buffer area and not even go through the industrial park. So, there are some other ways -- maybe the developer would be interested in doing that or I think continuing the conversation is probably the right approach and, then, if we really want to get creative we can maybe even put some signage on it and help them advertise their business or -- we can make it dual purpose. Give it some meaning. I don't think people are going to drive to the site to look at it, but I do think people will ride their bikes as Ten Mile area continues to build out and we build that continuous pathway along the interstate there, it will connect Ten Mile to Black Cat and I see people in that area using that and maybe interacting with the silos or at least visiting it as they ride their bike in the evening. Just something to consider.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I'm going to move that we continue the public hearing for Item 11, Farmstone Crossing, application H-2023-0045 to May 7th. We are going to keep the public hearing open in a limited capacity as it pertains to the silo and its usage. Mr. Mayor, along with my motion I would ask that we also ask staff to draft a letter to ACHD to ask for additional reconsideration about the placement of Vanguard and in -- and as it -- as it pertains to the current location of the silo. And, then, Mr. Mayor I guess along with that asking you and -- and our Planning staff and our Parks and Recreation staff to work with the applicant and their representative on possible solutions and cost to relocate the silo to a yet-to-be-identified location.

Simison: Blaine is going to get his workout. So, do I have a second?

Strader: Second.

Simison: Motion and second. Is there discussion on the motion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the public hearing is continued. Thank you.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Simison: Council, let's go ahead and take a break. At least five, if not ten minutes. Ten minutes.

(Recess: 8:24 p.m. to 8:37 p.m.)

12. Public Hearing for Reveille Ridge Subdivision (H-2023-0050) by Bailey Engineering, generally located on the west side of S. Eagle Rd., approximately 1/2 mile south of E. Lake Hazel Rd.

- A. Request: Annexation of 59.97 acres of land with an R-8 (34.69 acres) and R-15 (25.28 acres) zoning districts.
- B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 247 building lots and 37 common lots on 59.77 acres of land in the R-8 and R-15 zoning districts.

Simison: All right. Council, we will go ahead come back from recess and move on. Oh, I threw away my agenda, so item next is Item 12, which is the Reveille Ridge Subdivision, H-2023-0050. Open this public hearings with staff comments.

Parsons: Thank you, Mayor, Members of the Council. Last Action Item or land use application this evening is the Reveille Ridge Subdivision. The applicant is here to discuss annexation and a preliminary plat with you. The site consists of approximately 60 acres of land. It's currently zoned RUT in Ada county and is located at a physical address of 7355 South Eagle Road. What's unique about this property here -- if you look at the center map here, the future land use map designates this property with two designations, both the low density residential designation and the medium density residential designation and how that breaks out its approximately 31 acres is confined in the 31 acres, which is the green and, then, approximately 28 acres encompasses the MDR designation and each one of them have different density requirements as well, but overall the aggregate of the density tonight does conform to both of the designations and I will share that with you in my presentation. But right now the MDR designation -- we are looking at three to eight dwelling units to the acre and, then, in an LDR designation it's three or -- three or less. You can see -- also see in the aerial that there is an existing residence and some buildings that will be removed upon development of the site. So, the applicant is here tonight to discuss annexing this property with an R-8 and R-15 zoning designation. You can see in this exhibit here how much of the area encompasses the R-8, which is 34.6 or .7 if you round up and the R-15 area

encompasses 35.3 acres. Here is the plat and the phasing plan for you. So, the -- I know one of the topics during the Planning and Zoning Commission were are the -- the number of road improvements happening in the area or lack thereof, so if you have had a chance to look at the staff report, ACHD is planning -- or they should be close to starting construction of widening Lake Hazel from Locust Grove to Eagle Road and, then, rebuilding that intersection, as well as part of 2024 and, then, in 2025 they plan on widening Lake Hazel from Eagle Road to South Cloverdale. So, there will -- traffic and congestion will occur in this area, as those road improvement happen. Currently there are no improvements planned for South Eagle Road, which is the main access into this development currently. So, a preliminary plat is proposed to show 246 lots and 38 common lots, again, on 59.77 acres of land in the proposed R-8 and R-15 zoning district. The applicant -- the developer is proposing to develop the site in four phases. As we wrote the staff report and went into the Commission we looked at the phasing plan, we asked the developer or the applicant to make some changes, which they did, and so the phasing plan that is on the screen tonight is the most recent change and proposed phasing plan, so you can see here a lot of the collector road -- the entire collector road for this development, which is consistent with the master street map, is going to be built with phase one and, then, with phase two we get a bulk of the open space and amenities with the existing pond site and, then, we transition with the larger lots with phase three and, then, phase four is up in the -- in the northwest corner of the development. Again, staff, was supportive of this phasing plan. It did -- it did coincide with not only our recommendation, but the Commission also supported that recommendation. I mentioned to you that the main access into this development will be from Eagle Road, which you can see here, and that is the collector road per the master street map in accordance with ACHD's plan and, then, along the west boundary is also a collector road that will tie into the future park, Discovery Park. So, we are getting a lot better connectivity in this area, not only for subdivisions, but also access for fire department and access to that beautiful public amenity that we are constructing out there in south Meridian. One other thing that I would note with the Council, this proposed plan also has quite a bit of pedestrian connectivity as well. That was a recommendation from -- not only from staff, but the Parks Department. So, all the collector roadways will have ten foot multi-use pathways or ten foot wide sidewalks. The master pathway plan also shows a ten foot multi-use pathway that runs along the gas pipeline -- the Williams Pipeline here through the site and staff has also recommended that an additional pathway be constructed along this north-south roadway, which is known as Tap, that will tie into the Farr Lateral pathway that the applicant is building with phase three and this will ultimately continue and connect into the Vertex No. 2 Subdivision, which is a Brighton development that's currently been approved and under construction -- or should be shortly. So, again, we are not -- we are getting additional pedestrian connectivity for this development, but it's also tying into adjacent developments as well. You can see here that the site currently has an existing pond, which the applicant is proposing to keep as part of an amenity for the development and they are also including a walking path around the pond, which would also include some sitting areas, so the residents can enjoy that. The code requires that they provide 15 percent open space as part of their development and the applicant is proposing in excess of code, which is 19.69 percent open space, which -- which is a

great amenity for this development, but also, you know, typically when someone is around a regional park staff is amenable to lesser open space, but this applicant's gone above and beyond to do something more. As far as the amenity package, they are required to have 12 amenity points and they have 12. I would probably let the Council know that it's probably higher than 12, if I'm looking at the -- the amount of interconnected pathways that they are providing. So, they are providing miles of pathway with their development, which should be counted for more amenity points, so they do meet -- exceed the minimum requirements per code. Here is the proposed open space exhibit that demonstrates compliance with the UDC standards. You can see here the bulk of the open space is internal to their development. One unique thing about this development as well is the applicant's proposing multiple residential types for this development, so they are having single family detached. I think their breakdown here -- they had -- get to my notes here -- 170 single family detached homes, 14 single family attached, 62 townhome. So, three different residential styles. And, then, the gross density overall is 4.13 dwelling units to the acre. In the LDR designated area you are looking at 2.96, which is, again, under that three. And, then, the MDR areas is at 5.3. So, as I mentioned to you they are meeting the requirements of the Comprehensive Plan as far as the density requirements go. Here are the sample elevations that they are proposing this evening. You can see a mix of single two story elevations taking access off of common driveways and some alley loaded product as well and, then, typical building materials will consist of horizontal, vertical siding, stucco, stone and brick veneers. Any of the attached product, the townhomes and the single family attached, duplex units, will have to go through design review process with staff. Planning and Zoning Commission did recommend approval of this project to you. Testifying in favor was the applicant David Bailey. There were quite a few residents in the surrounding subdivisions that testified in opposition. If you had a chance to look at the public record you also saw a public comment in that effect as well. Primary concerns voiced in the -- that public testimony was density, transition -- lot -- transitional lot sizes and, then, just -- just the overall congestion and road improvements planned in the area, which will hamper access in and out of this area for growth for the next few years. So, key issues of discussion by the Commission, again, was density. Step back here. So, as you're -- as I showed you this -- this low -- area of the plat is low density residential and some of the discussion at the Planning and Zoning Commission was whether or not there was adequate transition to those lots in The Keep Subdivision. So, that's one of the questions that Commission posed to this body this evening is do you feel that this -- these number of lots are adequate enough to transition from that R-2 development to the north. And I'm sure you will probably hear from some of that tonight -- in tonight's testimony as well. Again, safety, traffic concerns. Safety. One other item was also just discussed about R-8 zoned lots, why is there R-8 zoning and not R-2 zoned lots up against The Keep as well and as I think as this body knows when -- back in 2017 we eliminated density requirements from the UDC. So, really, zoning doesn't really pertain to zoning too much as many people still seem to under -- correlate zoning with -- with density and in our code it -- zoning -- or density correlates to the Comprehensive Plan, so someone could still request an R-8, R-15 zone, but still meet the density requirements of the code. It doesn't mean they are getting 15 dwelling units to the acre, it just means dimensional standards. They are smaller lots and meet

additional housing needs for the community. So, I have had a chance to look at the public record as well. There was two additional items of public testimony submitted after the Planning and Zoning Committee. I believe they were the day after the Commission hearing, if I remember correctly. Again, same -- same comments and concerns. Better transition. And then -- then traffic and density. So, with that, again, Planning and Zoning Commission and staff have recommended approval with the appropriate conditions and I'm happy to conclude my presentation and stand for any questions you may have.

Simison: Thank you. Council, questions for staff?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Bill, appreciate as always very thorough, but comprehensive report. My question actually is for Deputy Chief Bongiorno. Deputy Chief, in the -- in the staff report it indicated, you know, that we didn't have enough data at the time to determine response times to this proposed application. I don't know when that determination was made and if it was early when an application was submitted. If this -- if that was looked at again recently. I guess I'm trying to get a good sense as to what our response times would be to this based on Station 7 and if we have got the resources to meet the need in that -- in this proposal application.

Bongiorno: Mr. Mayor and Council, so when this was submitted Station 7 -- make sure I get my number right --

Cavener: Yep.

Bongiorno: -- was not open yet and so now it's open, so the entrance on Eagle would be at two mile mark -- well, now it would a mile and a half. So super fast. And for me, like Bill had mentioned, with phase one we are going to get a connection from the park to Eagle Road. So, now it's -- we are there, because the fire station is on that road that they are going to propose with phase one. So, we are there.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor. Thanks. That was my assumption, but I know when I make an assumption it's dangerous, so I always like to address the subject matter experts to make sure we are seeing things the same way. Thanks. That's my only question right now.

Simison: Okay. Council, any additional questions for --

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Quick question. Bill, on the -- one of the outstanding issues, to leave the Farr Lateral open and just put up a fence, I'm just looking on the map here. It looks like it's at the -- the very top. Currently is that open now in terms of it adjacent to the property to the north?

Parsons: Yeah. Mayor, Members of the Council, Councilman Taylor, yes, it is open currently. So, it's just a standard -- just kind of going through asking you to leave it open, because of the size of that facility and other developments have been granted the same waiver.

Taylor: Okay. And, then, quick follow up, Mr. Mayor.

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Just that Farr Lateral, does it -- when it gets to the end of Block 2 does it kind of turn to the north, it doesn't continue to transition along the -- the -- the rest of the property in what phase four would be; right?

Parsons: Councilman Taylor, that is correct. It does go jog and head north.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: If you have it would it be very helpful or if not if when the applicant presents it would be great if I could see the lot lines and how they match up when we get into issues about transition, since that seems like kind of the sticking point. Thank you.

Simison: Okay. Any additional questions for staff? All right. Then invite the applicant to come forward.

Bailey: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. David Bailey. Bailey Engineering. 1119 East State Street in Eagle, representing Trilogy Development for the Reveille Subdivision and I appreciate the previous conversation. I apologize I'm back. So, we will continue on. But I think that came out great before. I really do appreciate that. So, here for the Reveille Ridge Subdivision. A whole different animal here. We are really proud of what we came up with here. Now, this piece of property has the pipeline running through the middle of it. It had the existing pond on there. The -- the requirement by ACHD to put this east-west collector through this property that's well south of where it should be, so we end up with a collector there. We end up with a full collector in the northwest. Great opportunity had in the park adjacent to this and, then, we have this dual comp plan zone to work with. So, we had a lot of good pieces to work with and we are just really excited about what we came up with here. We are keeping the open space, you know, Bill reported that we do meet the density requirements on this and we didn't just meet the density requirements, we are right in the middle. We are a little high on -- we are close to the high end on the low density, but we are not even near -- anywhere near the

middle on the -- on the high -- on the medium density portion of this and the overall density of 4.12 is -- is really great for this area and certainly consistent with all of the COMPASS planning that goes into the -- into the roads in the future for this -- for this area. So, we also had the opportunity on this to provide that connection as was stated between the park, the collector along the -- along the west boundary of this and, then, continue that vantage point through to Eagle Road and -- and, then, we will be building the entire collector. So, on our initial plans we had proposed that we build a half plus adjacent to the property on the eastern end. They have asked us to shift just about two feet and build the whole road, including curb and gutter all the way through. So, that will be done. The only thing the developer adjacent would need to do would be to add the sidewalk on their side when they get there, so -- so, we are going to be building all that all the way through the project on that end of it. So, with that I will get into the presentation here. So, as he said we are about 60 acres and south of Lake Hazel, west of Eagle Road. To the northeast of us is The Keep Subdivision and, actually, this is a good one to look at to see that there are, in fact, four lots adjacent to us in The Keep Subdivision to the north there at the end of the cul-de-sac and The Keep was -- was -- is zoned R-2 and the lots in there -- the minimum lot size in the R-2 zone is 12,000 square feet and, then, the lots in there are very -- that are adjacent to us are about 14 to -- I think there is -- one of the big ones on the cul-de-sac corner there is probably almost 20. I think almost half an acre on that end of it. To the northwest of that is The Keep West, which was recently approved and the developer on that came and testified, said he chose to do R-2, but liked to do .4 acre lots and so those are -- those are really big lots that are up in that triangle piece there. To the west of that is the approved project Vertex Subdivision, which was zoned as an R-4 and they are all standard R-4 lots that are in there. To the east of us there is some large lots. To the east of us and there is a fairly new home constructed in the southwest corner of that lot that fits in the -- in the panhandle I guess we will call it, of the project. I'm in Connecticut, you flip this over and it looks about like that. As he pointed out, the future land use map shows this map shows this portion as low density and medium density and so we did do this lot transition to move from those areas to -- to what we are doing in here and to the medium density transition density and I will go over that a little more later as far as lot sizes. To the north R-2, R-8, I guess, but it's developed -- the Vertex is shown as -- all the lots are pretty close to R-4 dimensions in that subdivision, but it -- and, then, to the south is a proposed project I think by -- I think Laren Bailey is on it -- working on it that's -- that's going to be an R-8 request in a residential subdivision. So, on the preliminary plat we see we have a hundred single family -- a 170 single family detached homes, 62 townhomes, and -- and 14 duettes and duettes are -- are duplexes with a single lot line. So, it's a two unit townhome that's on this, provided -- a nice variety of housing sizes. As you see on the -- on the boundary we have six lots -- one, two, three, four, five, six, seven -- eight lots, excuse me, adjacent to those -- to the north of us on that project. To the east we are R-4. All along the north boundary we are R-4 lot sizes and then -- then we start transitioning to the south -- I think we are still large R-8 and R-4 that are across from the R-2 lot sizes. Those are all 12,000 square foot, so -- so, while the zone we are asking for is R-2 -- or, excuse me, R-8, those will be R-2 dimensional standard lots that are adjacent to the ones to the north. In addition to that there is the Farr Lateral there, but in between these lots in the Farr Lateral boundary is a 20 foot pathway that we are

putting in there. It will be landscaped along that. And, then, there is the entire Farr Lateral easement. So, the -- the waiver we are requesting not to tile the Farr Lateral has us put the fence -- it's pretty common standard city procedure that we don't tile, but we put the fence at the edge of the easement, so that will be between our pathway and the -- and the Farr Lateral is where that fence we are talking about would be and I think we do -- get online here. I think we do open -- open fencing on the back of those lots adjacent to that pathway also is the standard on that. And, then, there is the whole Farr Lateral easement on the other side and, then, the lots of -- of the properties to the north. So, a significant distance between them, in addition to the fact that our lot sizes are the same lot sizes that could be. They aren't the ones that they are in there exactly, but they are the -- they are the same lot sizes that could be within The Keep Subdivision and that same zone. So, we think we provided a really good transit there. As we move towards the pathway to the south and west, we are increasing the density some on the -- on the road out to Vantage Point Drive that goes out to Eagle Road, those are all R-4 size lots, again, adjacent to the larger lots there and they do have an alley load in the back of those, because they can't front on -- on -- they can't have a driveway on to the collector street, so they will all be -- have this back alley load, but there will be nice houses along that drive that will be set back a little bit from the -- from -- at least 20 feet from that. And we also have detached sidewalk along all of the -- the collector streets here, as Bill pointed out. So, we get around closer, we get to the Williams Pipeline and we are providing a pathway through there. It provides a great connection up to the park that way. The pathway along the Farr Lateral also connects into a pathway that's planned in the Vertex Subdivision, so that continues to the park as well along that way and, then, southwest of that we have the -- we have the pond on there and, then, some of the townhouse stuff is all southwest of that -- that there. So, we do have some narrow -- more narrow single family detached lots immediately adjacent to that -- to the -- the pathway in the Williams Pipeline easement there. And, then, we go up and connect with the planned alignment of Vantage Point to the west that goes all the way out and I forget what it's called -- there is a Lennar Subdivision that's out that way that gets you all the way out to Meridian Road on Vantage Point eventually to the west here. Connections to the south on this point -- and also in that open area to the south we have reserved in there a pressure reducing station for the city of Meridian as they requested in their conditions of approval. So, we have a spot reserved for the city in that area. It's the size of a well site is the -- the -- the requirement for that. We are doing the pathways around the pond. The pathway to the north. And the pathways along all of that and through the -- the Williams Pipeline -- along the collectors into the Williams Pipeline in there and we will be doing some minor modifications of that and we will make sure that that's aerated properly and designed property, so it's a maintainable pond and doesn't become a nuisance at all. And, then, the other amenities we have -- I think I get to that later on here. There is a product mix on there that shows better where things are and those townhouses are all really adjacent to that pathway and to the park. Amenities. A picnic table, fitness stations, tot lot and a bike repair station. So, the fitness stations go along that pathway and Williams Pipeline along there. The pond itself is really a huge amenity. It's just gorgeous around there and there is a lot of trees that are already around the pond and we will preserve as many as possible. We do have a lot of trees on the site and we are meeting the city's requirement for mitigation

and for providing trees -- trees on the site. As far as open space total, again, it's not listed as an amenity on here, but as far as the open space total, as Bill said, we could have asked for a reduction in open space being adjacent to the park on this, but we are almost 20 percent of usable open space on this site that we have provided on here and, like I said, I think we are really -- we are really excited about how this works. Several multi-use pathways. The Farr Lateral we discussed already on that and that does show another good picture here. So, we are talking -- I guess that's a really huge lot in their southwest corner there. So, that would be adjacent to two -- you would have those adjacent to a couple each, those really big lots, and, then, to the east there they would be adjacent to one each -- or one and a half each on the east side. The city doesn't have any particular standard on -- in the code as far as to the transition on that. Having done this, you know, over time with the various standards and done stuff and if we can do one and a half to one or two to one and we provide a significant barrier in between, we feel we are in pretty good shape. For transition to adjacent large lots undeveloped, you know, five acre tracts and stuff, we look at what's the future designation of that as low residential. That could easily be R-4 and we want to make sure that we are less than -- less density than R-4 adjacent to those lots. As Bill said, the phasing on here -- we adjusted with some suggestions from the -- from the city staff on that and we think that works out well. We will be providing the entire collector along the west boundary connecting to the access to the fire station and the entire section of Vanguard -- or Vantage Point all the way out to Eagle Road. Bill pointed out we do have some scheduled improvements in the area, on Lake Hazel, the intersection, and more Lake Hazel widening. This is planned to happen in the next couple years on this project. There is not specifically -- there is not programmed improvements to Eagle Road in this. That's taken into account in our traffic study that -- that is on that. We will do a right turn lane into the project on Eagle -- Eagle Road, so we don't slow the traffic going south on Eagle Road and, in addition, the standard is we will widen that to 19 feet of asphalt from centerline as an arterial street. So, we will make improvements in front of our project of at least that amount, so that opens that up and adds that right turn lane to the north of us. Comp plan alignment we discussed already. And, then, the project timeline -- when we talk about, you know, congestion or the added traffic in the area, you know, we are looking at 2025, hopefully, to start on a first phase on this. Utilities are available on this and we have worked through building those collector streets to connect things. We are doing one and a half to two years typically is what we are seeing on these developments, the buy out -- and, of course, it depends on the market associated with that, but that two year thing -- and I think that's a typo -- we should be looking at 2033 on a full -- on a full build out for the project. So, we are talking several years before we are into the full traffic from the site impacting the roadways. We are into another five year plan that probably has -- by that point the project to the south probably has improvements to Eagle Road planned in there as well. We have quite a few elevations proposed as conceptual. Of course, they are -- on here those are the duettes. And we are in agreement with all the conditions of approval from the staff report and on the ACHD staff report there were two conditions. One was build the entire section of Vantage Point. The other one was that the intersection of Command was in accordance with their code, they said too close to the intersection of Recreation Way on the west end. So, this is a concept of how we would adjust that road to the west and it doesn't

change anything in the number of lots that are in the configuration in the open space with this, but if we can't work through this with the highway district, which, you know, often work through things. We have a plan, right, to -- to move that over and, then, we are totally consistent with all their conditions of approval for this. So, it would probably go in that direction. That said go back to this.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Can I let --

Bailey: Love to answer any questions, yeah.

Taylor: Question. I recall reading in the -- I think in the packet of material about if the pond having the water kind of circulate somehow. Can you talk to -- speak a little bit to that and give me a better idea what -- how you would do that and kind of -- or am I misremembering?

Bailey: It's been a long night, Councilman Taylor. So, the idea is there needs to be a certain amount of turnover within the pond and so we had it designed by a pond expert of the amount of water we do. We will put a pressure irrigation pump station near the pond and that will provide water for the subdivision for irrigation and it will also provide pressure for aerators and sprinklers that go into that. There is also some depth requirements, so we may excavate some shallow portions to make sure that they stay fresh, so --

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Sorry, not to pick on the pond, but, you know, city -- City Council over the years has run into ponds that have become mosquito havens and so forth. Just want to make sure the pond will be year around. It's not just a holding pressure zone for irrigation. So, it -- all year around the pond will be full of water, so I wanted to check with that.

Bailey: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, I don't know fully the answer. It's fed by irrigation water.

Strader: Right.

Bailey: Okay? And so the intent is not to like pump it dry or anything, but it is fed by irrigation water and we don't -- we probably do not have -- I don't have off the top of my head -- probably do not have another source of water. That doesn't mean it doesn't hold water in the offseason, because it was designed to do that originally. So, it is -- it is a sealed pond. It was -- it's a constructed pond, right, and it was sealed originally. So, we will have maintenance procedures for -- for handling the pond, but the intent is not to

just drain it dry in the winter, although there is no other, you know, legal or valid source of makeup water to fill that pond year around.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I'm going to look to staff to provide any pond feedback. Sorry, it's getting late, but just want to make sure we feel that this is a pond and not going to end up just being kind of an irrigation holding area of -- or do we have standards? I don't recall how we put guardrails around that.

Parsons: Yeah. Mayor, Members of the Council, Council Woman Strader, there are guardrails around that. The code does allow it to be counted as open space, which it can't be. Two, it's been my experience in some of the subdivisions that I had some have gone dry and some of them had water all year around, it just depends on how much gets drained out of there and how well the pond is built, but the only thing that code requires is that it be circulated so there is not a mosquito breeding ground and it sounds like the applicant is going to do that. So, again, there is -- there is nothing in code that says they can't drain it during the irrigation season and -- and fill it up again, because it is going to be dual purpose. It will be meant for -- as an amenity and as a resource for -- for the subdivision to --

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Mr. Bailey, just to -- I want to make sure it's being treated really like an amenity. Will there be like a water feature, like a fountain or something? Will there be fish in it or something? Like help me understand kind of how -- how it's -- how it's going to function.

Bailey: Okay. Mr. Chair, Council Woman Strader, the pond currently has been used as an amenity as a water feature in the past and it was built for that. Part of the other thing we do for safety on these ponds is we actually build specific benches on the edge of them, right, so -- so, that -- that you can crawl out of it; right? And that's part of it, making it look like an amenity, as opposed to an irrigation holding pond. It is not intended at all to be an irrigation or storm drainage holding pond for that matter. It is -- I mean we may put some storm drainage in there, because ACHD lets us, you know, but -- but it is not primarily designed for that in any way, shape or form, nor is it designed -- it's way too big -- way bigger than we need for irrigation. So, it's -- it's -- you know, it's a really good pond and definitely with a walking path around the outside, the existing trees that are there and treatment along the banks, this will be a really nice looking amenity.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I think where Council Member Strader is getting is -- is -- is it considered or are you open to -- in an effort, right, we have got to move -- we have got to circulate the water to not have the mosquitoes -- turn that into a breeding ground. Can that water circulation system include something that is a visually appealing amenity? You know, again, to Council Member Strader's -- a fountain or something so -- I hear your intention and I -- and I track with exactly everything that you were saying and doing it, yes, I think the thought is because this is an amenity is there an element that you can incorporate within the pond -- or, excuse me, within -- yeah, within the pond to -- again to use Council Member Strader's -- make it a fountain, so it's -- not only is it circulating the water to help prevent the mosquitoes, but it's also something that's visually appealing. Is that something you guys are open to?

Bailey: I believe so. And I think we did that in Shelburne.

Cavener: Exactly. It's exactly what I was thinking about where you guys did the --

Bailey: We did the Shelburne product --

Cavener: Yeah. Okay.

Bailey: -- sometime back. Katie worked for somebody else then --

Cavener: Okay.

Bailey: But she -- she was in that and we were the engineer --

Cavener: Okay.

Bailey: -- on that project. So, yes, we -- we have done these in the past. We have done them in Eagle the same way and -- and -- and I think they generally do -- I'm not the expert on designing those, you know, and --

Cavener: Neither am I.

Bailey: Yeah. But -- but I think in general I have seen those as part of the aeration system that have fountains or something like that.

Cavener: Yeah.

Bailey: We didn't propose that specifically as part of the amenity, but -- but, certainly, yeah, that would probably be in there and, then, if we have ideas on how to make it better, you know, when we do that -- I think there is little dots. I would have to ask a landscape architect who does all your landscape stuff, so may specify some of that as well.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Fantastic. Thank you. Perfect. Just -- my only other question is around transition. Help me understand the topography of your surrounding neighbors. So, from visiting The Keep I recall that it's up a little bit higher, but is it -- is it the same elevation as you? Is it higher up? Lower? Like help me understand kind of how your other surrounding properties line up with yours.

Bailey: I don't know the exact answer out there.

Strader: Okay.

Bailey: Reason it's not really hilly. But I think -- I think you are right, they are a little higher, so the Farr Lateral serves this direction and they are above it on the -- on the dry side of the Farr Lateral and I don't think it's a huge elevation difference up there. So, will they see these houses? I suppose. Probably. But not hanging over a cliff onto them or, you know, hanging over them.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Sorry. And, then, so you put a finer point on it. So, here along this northern boundary -- I don't -- you showed a picture that had lot lines, but help me understand. So, is it -- what is the most number of houses you have against any one property here along that transition? Three? It looks like three, but I couldn't really --

Bailey: Yeah. I have it on my vicinity map on the preliminary plat. You don't by chance have that, do you?

Parsons: Council Woman Strader, I created a map for you, so that I can pull it up. Just a second if you don't mind, Dave.

Strader: Thank you.

Parsons: I made a map so I can bring it up and share it real quick. Thank you. Bear with me here.

Strader: That was exactly what I was going to ask.

Bailey: Okay.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: While they are pulling that up allow me to compliment Bill Parsons on anticipating our questions and how fantastic that is that you did that for us. Thank you. Oh, there we go. Okay.

Parsons: So, this is -- these are The Keep lots here along the north and, then, this is how their lots transition adjacent to it.

Bailey: So, the western one is three -- the large pie-shaped would -- excuse me. Two. The large pie shaped one would be three and, then, one and a half each for the eastern lots. Well, it's two in the middle and half and half, so three and a half. We got an awful big long back yard lot line for -- for that.

Simison: Do you know what the -- what's the easement size of the Farr Lateral? Fifty feet? Twenty-five from centerline to each side?

Bailey: To each side, yes.

Simison: Yeah. Speaking for someone who has a creek that runs back -- it may as well be a lateral. I can tell you, you know, we -- I also have a pathway on one side. I couldn't even tell you how close my neighbor -- or the neighbors -- you would never -- it's a long ways. Let's just say -- I don't think that personally -- not everyone and I live in a unique place as well where I don't really have a back neighbor because of this situation, you know, so it's -- that's always how we view it. We don't feel like we have neighbors on the other side of the creek where we are. Doesn't feel that way.

Parsons: Mayor, I believe it's 60 feet.

Simison: Sixty feet?

Strader: Very good.

Bailey: Sixty plus the 20 for the pathway then and, then, plus their -- their buildings we set back. And, then, these houses, because the lots are so deep, will probably be closer to the road.

Simison: If you can make sure you speak into the mic so people --

Strader: Thank you.

Simison: Maybe another comment slash question. I really where they say see recommended, kind of going back to the pond. I feel like moving that -- if you have to move those parcel lines you take away that open space that's there on this south side of the pond, so how do we just tell ACHD their recommendation -- we don't like it and we don't want to comply?

Bailey: Well, Mr. Mayor, I asked Mindy and she was giving me no quarter whatsoever.

Simison: Well, personally, I look at this location of this development and even now where it's accessing off to the park, I -- I don't see there is going to be a backup of traffic trying to turn in or around. The way I understand their policy I think that it actually detracts greatly from what is designed and just takes up, you know, what was very nice space in the south around that to, essentially, them -- yeah. So, I know it's not your -- your thing, I just wanted to kind of throw that out -- out there in terms of if there is a way to -- unless Council disagrees that they think it adds value. But I just don't see the traffic density -- because I think this -- I personally think this design -- you are going to have 50 percent going in one direction, 50 percent going the other direction, in and out of this space and I don't see the mid mile collector being jam packed with people trying to access in or out of this location, so --

Bailey: Well, thank you, Mr. Mayor. And we are continuing to discuss that with ACHD. When we get to the plans we will see -- we might ask them for a waiver on that, but we have a plan to move forward and not really change things significantly is what we wanted to show you tonight, but that -- if we have to meet that condition we will.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Sorry. Just one more. Can you talk a little bit about what transition you are trying to provide to the properties to the east? I see that -- you know, I see all of the lots here, but like what's the setback? How -- is there landscaping? Is there a fence? Like help -- help me understand that piece. I think it's great you have the Farr Lateral there to the north. That provides kind of a natural built-in buffer. But what have you got going on to the east, please?

Bailey: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, as I said before, these five acre large adjacent lots -- and whether they intend to subdivide them or not, they could be subdivided to those levels, right, and, then, so who would be responsible for providing -- so, if we provide more transition, you know, extra for that five acre lot, then, they got to come back and provide more transition if they subdivide in the future. So, what we are doing the transition for and what my intent is is to provide that transition as if that were developed in the mid-range of the -- of the allowed density within that project to the east and then -- so, that's generally the thing. You can see there is a large easement that runs there through to the east and so we are providing a connection there. I think originally the plan was to put the collector street through that area there and, then, that was moved off for some reason. I'm not sure. But that's -- that's the way -- that's the way I normally set these up when I do it as far as transition to those large lots. I think it's a semi-commercial enterprise of sorts to the north and there is a single -- there is a single family home that's newly constructed in the southeast there. So, I do have those lots a little deeper there, but those are R-4 dimensional standard lots is what I do on those -- is what I put them.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for the applicant?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Bill, can you -- can you put David's presentation up? Maybe the slide with the phasing plan? And while he's pulling that up, David, I want to start first by commending you in locating the more denser product closer to the open space. Time and time again we see applications come through where the denser it is the further away that it is from the open space and it drives me crazy, because the people with the least amount of yard have to walk or drive or bike the furthest distance to get to it. So, I really commend you for -- for being really forward thinking and making sure that we are providing the open space closest to the densest product.

Bailey: Thank you.

Cavener: I did have a question, though, about the phasing plan and particularly as it relates to the amenities, because -- and, again, I will get this confirmation when I -- when it's pulled up, but one of the pieces that caused me a little bit of concern is phase one, if I remember correctly, doesn't include the pathway segment and so I'm worried that residents are going to move in -- how they are going to get to the park and does that pond, which is designed to be an amenity, be potentially a nuisance or a hazard until phase two is -- is built out and I'm not very good at talking slow to buy some time while we are working through our technical difficulties. Apologies for that.

Bailey: So, I guess there -- there is, in fact, a -- there is, in fact, a pathway along the collector street --

Cavener: Okay.

Bailey: -- on our ten foot detached. So, the detached sidewalk is ten foot there instead of bike lanes in the street, you know, is the way we have it. So, to go along the entire north side of the collector street from Eagle Road all the way to Recreation Way and, then, there is another pathway from there all the way up to the park, so that --

Cavener: I may have you walk me through that with the mouse as soon as we get it -- get it pulled up, just so that I can kind of track with -- I know that -- you know this site out very very well and I'm trying to track with what I remember in my mind and so I appreciate your patience on that.

Bailey: Okay.

Cavener: Awesome. So, it looks like it's up. David, if you maybe want to scroll to -- well, like maybe your phasing plan and I can maybe kind of walk you through where I -- where I'm a little worried.

Bailey: There we go. Are you controlling that, Bill? Good.

Cavener: Okay. Perfect.

Bailey: So, in the pink is the phasing plan and we are providing -- Vantage Point goes from Eagle Road all the way along the south boundary and, then, goes to the north there and ties into Recreation Way on our west boundary.

Cavener: Okay.

Bailey: And along that Vantage Point, which is the collector street, there is no front-on housing in there at all. We got a lot of road and very few homes going on here. And, then, the southern portion there I guess is the more -- more of the lots, but the Recreation Way, then, goes up to the park and that will connect in. The road from the park is actually constructed to that point.

Cavener: Yeah.

Bailey: So, we will connect into a -- a road that's already built at that point.

Cavener: So --

Bailey: -- and there is a pathway along both of those.

Cavener: Yeah. So, kind of to the -- to the greater concern at least for me is you look at, you know, houses, you know, 59 to 49 down kind of that corner on -- is it Cockcrow --

Bailey: Uh-huh.

Cavener: -- and Vantage Point, they are going to move in, pretty typical in Meridian, young families or families are moving into neighborhoods in Meridian and I worry about that you have got this kind of natural waterway that's there that hasn't been fully developed out to the point that you talk about with the steps and so help me understand -- I got an eight year old who loves to explore and as a parent I get a little worried about that there is this pond, essentially, in my backyard that hasn't been set up as a true amenity -- I guess I worry as a parent about what's going to happen to kids out there. Maybe walk me through kind of what your thoughts and prospective is on that.

Bailey: So, those are -- those are townhouses I think that are in that area there --

Cavener: Yeah.

Bailey: -- the area you are talking about. So, they don't have -- they have fences in the backyard. They don't have direct access to the pathway or the pond in this area. I suppose at the corner they could have someone sneak out there from the road out --

Cavener: What about Vantage Point? Is that going to be fenced off?

Bailey: No. So, you could -- you could have access from Vantage Point --

Cavener: Yeah.

Bailey: -- to walk in there certainly from there. I suppose we could fence off the pond if we think it's a safety problem, so --

Cavener: I don't know. I just -- I -- I'm worried at the time between phase one and phase two when -- when that whole area is really developed what could happen.

Bailey: Generally we are seeing that we are under construction in phase two before we are done with homes in phase one as well, right, and, then, for the -- from the practical sense is that we are going to build all this -- all this improvements of the collector streets in phase one and so we need to get some houses up somewhere before we start spending money building the pond and all the pathway to get, you know, even a smaller phase two in this thing. So, we certainly would -- would accept any conditions that you have that -- you know, that we provide safety around the pond from the -- from the people here until that's developed.

Cavener: Yeah.

Bailey: And all I'm saying is that developing that pond with phase one would put us in -- you know, as -- as required with phase one would put us in a really tough spot here when we probably have some alternatives to that.

Cavener: Yeah. And I -- I appreciate the business challenge of that. To your point, Vantage Point is not a cheap solution to have to build that all out. I just don't know what that -- what the solution is for, essentially, a very attractive nuisance before it's developed out for kids and to your point your walk -- kids are walking to and from the park and, again, I guess I'm just looking at it through the eyes of a parent of what -- what is going to happen to my kids and -- and how do we -- I guess I'm asking how do we solve that?

Bailey: So, I think we solve it by preventing access from -- from this, you know, collector street to a pond with something that already exists. We will actually -- you see that the pond -- the existing pond now goes out a little further than it is, so we will be, you know, recovering some of that and probably clean up that edge of the pond and probably fence it off as a nuisance. So, if that's a condition that you would like to see or you would like to have the staff put some proper conditions on the phase one development that we keep that area safe, then, we would certainly be amenable to that.

Cavener: Yeah. And -- and I almost -- and, again, you are the expert. Sorry, Mr. Mayor, if I -- if I may. Is that part of phase one where Cockcrow is? Moving that to phase two and the product that you have on Command that's in phase two? I mean bring those

together. I don't know. I apologize that I'm -- I'm being a sticky wicket on this thing. You are right, the waterway is there, but you are introducing housing to that spot and I don't know if it's that you -- I guess would you support that no -- the occupancy wouldn't be issued for those homes on Cockcrow until the pond portion of phase two is complete?

Bailey: I think I would prefer there be conditions that -- that we have the staff make sure that we provide proper safety for the pond issue there -- for the pond adjacent to this and that the staff can review that, then, we have a condition that says --

Cavener: Well --

Bailey: -- we have to keep the pond safe, as opposed to taking lots out of this phase. I don't think -- we still have to keep the pond safe for the frontage on Vantage Point versus the -- versus wherever we do the phase and, then, we could have that -- you know -- I don't know. I don't know what those appropriate conditions are, except for to say that -- that the staff should review to make sure that we maintain appropriate safety out there for the -- for the -- for the tenants between phases, which we do. We fence between phases and we move -- move those things off. We do phases all the time in that area. So, I don't see why it's -- why it would be a challenge for us to provide appropriate safety from that pond with the phasing plan that we have.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Bill, then, I guess I'm -- I'm looking to you and I don't want bad things to happen and certainly when bad things happen an appropriate response is, well, we asked staff to -- can, you know, create conditions for safety and I'm sorry that didn't work. So, that's -- for me as a parent that -- that is a pretty big hill that I am going to have to climb, but if you have got suggestions I'm open to hearing that.

Parsons: Mayor, Members of the Council, Councilman Cavener, certainly you said -- like you said, it's -- that's why phasing was critical to us, too. We wanted to get these things done sooner rather than later.

Cavener: Yeah.

Parsons: I don't like the idea of holding up occupancy on a home, because that -- we get too far down the road and the building department -- and once you give a building permit it's pretty tough to hold up an occupancy, so we don't want to put any of our other departments in that -- that predicament trying to make that call.

Simison: Bill, can you --

Parsons: I do like the idea of maybe a public safety plan and working with maybe the police and fire department to come up with that as a condition of approval and that has

to be approved and signed off by the experts that we have at the city to deal with it. I like that. We have -- we have done that where we have had hillsides and we were concerned about fires. They had to come up with a fire prevention plan to show us how they are going to mitigate those concerns. So, that -- that's one tool that I think we could possibly use in the DA and say, hey, prior to you doing anything here with phase one you -- you need us -- to provide us that public safety plan with phase one prior to commencing with development and we can look at that and let you know that it's been taken care of.

Cavener: Okay.

Parsons: And, then, to your -- that -- that can have things like signage, fencing, educating the homeowners as they are buying homes or to keep your -- please keep your children away from the pond, because it's not a swimming pool, it's not a -- it's a safety concern here. So, there is -- there is ways to mitigate that, if that gives the Council a comfort level to add that as a condition in the DA.

Bongiorno: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Deputy Chief.

Bongiorno: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Cavener, so I bought into The Oaks early and my lot -- literally I look over my fence at the pond and the pond that The Oaks built was there well before a lot of the homes were. So, it's -- it's really no different than -- than this. The pond is already there. In The Oaks the pond was already there and, then, they built the houses around the pond. So, this is very similar. I am one hundred percent with Bill, I think we could do something -- we could work together to make sure that we come up with a plan. I mean for me -- if you look at the Google -- Google Earth's map of that pond it just needs to be cleaned up and so that way we can see it. I think -- I think -- and that's going to be true for police as well. We just want to be able to see it and make sure that there is no snags or anything that people can get caught in and clean it up and, then, obviously, proper signage I think would be appropriate also. But, again, we can -- we can totally work with David on something like that.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Chief -- and it would be your intention that that safety plan would be in full effect and complete as part of the phase one development?

Bongiorno: A hundred percent. Yes, sir.

Cavener: Okay. That gives me better comfort. Thank you.

Bongiorno: Yeah.

Bailey: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Cavener, not to belay the issue any, but, you know, we are happy to meet any condition we think improves public safety and goes on that end. But what I need on my end, you know, is say here is what you got to do to implement that; right? And so if we have established standards by the -- by the fire department and your staff, you know, to do that, happy to comply, you know, with those things and do whatever we need to on that piece, so that we know -- just so we know what we need to do.

Cavener: Okay. Mr. Mayor, if I may? Sorry.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Not -- not about the pond. So, moving on to another topic. Such a cool spot. Such a cool part of Meridian in close proximity to a park and I know there is going to be a lot of demand for this. It makes sense with kind of a small like, you know, play structure for kids that are staying close within the neighborhood, but recognizing there is lots more recreation just down the way. Something that we don't have a lot of at Discovery is -- is court space. Have you guys thought about or discussed instead of doing, you know, a bunch of picnic tables, having a little, you know, basketball court spot or something like that that could be incorporated? I kind of look there, again, as along Vantage Point and Command in that little area and maybe is there anything you guys thought about, contemplated and maybe I don't know why that didn't make sense?

Bailey: So, Mr. Mayor, Councilman Cavener, we -- we do think about those in all the projects and we do add them to quite a few of them. So, in this project here the open space is -- is gathered around the pond and along the long linear corridor there, so we don't have any open space that's conducive to provide pickle ball court or a basketball court, half basketball court, that -- that kind of play area within this project. So, we don't have a great spot for it there to do that. We probably have room to put something like that there, but we proposed amenities for this that are the picnic tables with the shelters, the fitness stations, the tot lot and the bike repair station because we thought that's what was appropriate for the -- for the site. I'm not sure if those are appropriate or not. We did think about them, right, but we chose these because we thought they were appropriate for the site.

Cavener: And Mr. Mayor. I think like the -- the bike and repair station -- incredibly smart. Makes sense along the pathway to and from the park. My bike always seems to break down not at home or not at my destination, but along the way, so I love that. It's just -- that's to me -- and I get it, I could be wrong -- I see that as a pretty cost effective amenity and credit to Council Member Strader, I think -- I think it's listed as number one, that kind of open space along Vantage Point, it kind of, you know, arcs down where your -- I don't -- correct. Right there. Thank you. Again, maybe this is me trying to tinker with things too much and I would appreciate that feedback as well. I'm just trying to make sure that we are capturing the --

Bailey: From the developer's perspective enough is what the city requires, you know, for -- in their code for -- for the development; right? So, we do more than that. We are

doing more than that on here; right? That specific space there is reserved for the City of Meridian for their -- for their water reducing station.

Cavener: Oh. Okay.

Bailey: So, I don't -- it wouldn't be practical to do it in that specific space. I don't think we can build a structure like that in the Williams Pipeline. We could do the landscaping in that, so we can't do it in there. And, then, we have got the area around the pond. We certainly have that spot in there that's possible, but it's not an amenity that -- that we had proposed for the subdivision I guess is the simple answer.

Cavener: Okay.

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

Bailey: Thank you.

Simison: Mr. Clerk, do we have people signed up to provide testimony?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, yes. First is Bryan Miller.

Simison: Good evening. If you could state your name and address for the record and be recognized for three minutes.

Miller: My name is Bryan Miller. I live at 6876 South Pemberley Way in The Keep. My house was the one that backed up to four lots along the -- the -- so, I'm here basically because I would like to first comment on the -- thank you for taking time, Mayor and Council people. I'm here because of the concerns about the density essentially. When everyone in The Keep -- I guess that my concern particularly was magnified by when we met with the Planning and Zoning Commission and expressed concerns and the public hearing didn't feel much like a public hearing. In fact, my 16 year old son walked away and said it was a public ignoring. We raised concerns about things like the water hazards and that there is -- the Meridian fire in their comments mentioned that they didn't have water rescue nearby and that concern was never addressed. It was kind of just brushed off. We brought up concerns about schools and traffic and the -- I think the frustrating part is that -- well, I guess we -- we brought up that there would be like conditions for traffic and the developer did point out -- or Mr. Bailey pointed out the -- that ACHD had accepted that, but at the time ACHD hadn't even made any comments and now that they have he mentioned that there was only two conditions of approval, but, actually, there is 34 conditions of approval in their comments. It would be interesting to know if -- if they actually plan to accept all 34 comments. We also asked would they make the voluntary impact fees to the Kuna School District, which about a third of this subdivision is there. Again, they refused to acknowledge or make any attempt to talk about schools and so it's still interesting to hear if the developer is willing to make those contributions to the Kuna School District. I think what is probably most

frustrating is that when these concerns were already addressed by Mr. Bailey that the Planning and Zoning Commission felt like went to bat for him. They basically lectured us -- in fact, Commissioner Seal used the word that he was preaching to us about how we should be happy that we are getting such a nice subdivision and it could be much much worse. He talked about schools. He said it's a bummer that schools are overcrowded, but that, essentially, that's the way we do business in Meridian. In fact, I think he said that's just the way things work around here. The way we operate were the terms that he used. And, then, he said if we build it -- or if you build it we will come, which seemed particularly troubling in terms of the way that we do planning. Our schools are overcrowded. The developer doesn't want to make impact fees -- it -- additionally I think the other kind of frustrating thing is when we talked about these transitions and density and people who come and made comments about how, look, I built in The Keep thinking that I was using the city's long-term plan to guide why I would build here. That it says right now the develop -- the plan was developed in 2002. This would be developed at R-2 if it were to be developed and so those people built houses on those things. What's frustrating is, then, one of the other Commissioners pointed out and said, sorry, you were lied to by your developers or your real estate agents, but we didn't feel lied to by our developers or real estate agents. If you approve this kind of zoning change it feels like the city is the one that's lying to us. I mean when we talked about a change from R-2 to R-15 is a very significant change and it -- I like to think that the city's long-term plan matters more than just, well, the right people bought the land and so the plan goes out the window. Anyway, those are my comments. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Council, questions?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Mr. Miller; right?

Miller: Yes.

Strader: Please don't go far. So, before I get into my questions, so I know that the City Council does take our long-term comprehensive planning very seriously. I am sorry you had a bad experience from your perspective of Planning and Zoning. I would like to focus on your property in particular, because I understand the comments about density. If we compare the density to what is contemplated under our Comprehensive Plan this ends up being just under four units per acre across the whole site. When you look at the Comprehensive Plan, that the part of the Comprehensive Plan I think most applies to you is a concern about transition. So, we always want to have appropriate transition between neighborhoods. You are -- you have a very large part of your -- southern part of your property -- the developer says you are bordering three and a half, I counted four, but what -- what could you live with? What's your concern? I mean so talk to me about your property and what your concerns are about your property, because I think that might be a constructive place to start. If we focus on the transition piece.

Miller: To be a hundred percent honest, I -- the -- the average lot size in The Keep is 32,000 square feet. The largest in the -- in this new subdivision is 12,000. So, the transition there doesn't seem very fair and the way I guess that we would look at it -- to be -- if you want my honest concern, I don't -- the fact that I'm going to have neighbors is okay. I mean nobody expects bare land in Meridian to stay bare land forever. You want my honest concern, every single morning at 8:00 o'clock I drive out on Darcy Way to try to turn left. If you put 250 homes back there -- I mean ACHD indicated that that -- at prime peak periods that's like 250 cars. It's an extra 10,000 cars a day. I -- yeah. I'm not going to be able to get out of my subdivision is what it boils down to. If things -- and I -- I just look at this, I'm like I don't understand why if the plan -- the long-term plan said develop this at R-2, what -- what has changed in the last two years that says, you know what, if -- if the south part of Eagle Road can't handle this kind of traffic, then, why should we approve a subdivision that's going to put thousands of more cars on there a day? That would be honestly my concerns. I mean I am happy with neighbors. I don't mind the neighbors. It would be great maybe if there was a few less, but that's honestly I don't worry about. It's more about the density in general. The number of cars going in and out of this neighborhood than -- than my particular neighbors. I'm okay with neighbors.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Got it. No. That's really helpful. So, it's really -- you don't have an issue in principle with bordering four properties. Probably don't love it. You can live with it. It's really a concern about traffic, concern about schools. So, I share your concern about schools. A year ago we paused -- paused residential development approvals until we could work with our school district to understand their long-term plan, so -- and I -- Mr. Mayor --

Simison: Two years ago. Time flies.

Strader: It's going really quick. Mr. Mayor, I did want to check with Bill. At some point I know we were asking for a letter from the West Ada School District. They didn't provide that, but we were going to see if we could do our own calculations of kind of what we are looking at from a school perspective. Is that something that we pulled together at this point?

Simison: Is your mic on?

Parsons: We did. We pulled together some numbers. It was very quickly. I just want to be fair that on the record these aren't official West Ada School District numbers and the data that I received from the long -- long range planning division only showed what was for the elementary schools, not necessarily the middle school or the high school. So, I do have that data and it does show some are overcrowded and some are under

capacity. I'm happy to show that graphic if you want me to. But there is -- there certainly is some challenges in that area.

Strader: Okay. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: That was it for my questions for Mr. Miller, but there may be others that have questions.

Miller: Could I -- Mountain View High School has the highest attendance in the entire school district. Victory Middle School has the highest attendance. About two-thirds of the subdivision would probably go to those two schools. The rest would go to the Kuna School District. Another slightly frustrating thing that the Planning and Zoning Commission pointed out that essentially the city -- that school districts don't make comments anymore, because they, essentially, didn't feel listened to and, then, his son attended private school.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Can't let that one lie. Listen, we have advocated very strongly that we want to continue to receive letters from the school district and we will continue to pass that message along, but thank you.

Simison: And I got confirmation from Dr. Bub today that they will do that, they have just been without the staff resources with turnover through a specific time period, but they will be forthcoming once again. But I was just curious. So -- well, how much of this is in -- you mentioned Kuna School District. How much of this is in -- I'm just curious.

Miller: Where that little panhandle comes up, yeah, it's essentially, just slightly above that. That cuts through there would go to the Kuna School District. So, most of the high density housing would be in school -- in the Kuna School District.

Simison: Okay.

Miller: Like at phase one.

Simison: All right. Thank you. Mr. Clerk --

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Mr. Miller, I just -- I want to -- I appreciate you -- and I think you have sat with us all night and -- and your -- your comment about -- about impact fees with schools is --

is an issue I think growing communities across the state continue to wrestle with and, again, if you follow the news it sounds like the city of Kuna is looking at some litigation about what they can request versus what they can't. We haven't waded into that -- into that area for a -- for a host of different reasons, but it's not that -- I think most people in our community share the same opinion as you, which is that those who are contributing to the growth should contribute to the ongoing growth of our schools, just like they do for our police and our -- and our parks and our fire and so I could hear in some of your testimony tonight certainly you are carrying some frustration. I feel a little more frustrated closer to 10:00 o'clock than I do at 10:00 a.m. So, appreciate you being here and sharing your perspective and just for whatever it's worth, I think that Council shares some of those same frustrations as well.

Simison: Well, since you are here if you want to come back on Monday we have a joint meeting with the West Ada School Board and one of the things that they are going to talk about is, you know, the legislation that's passed. It's a game changer, because it now means that they will likely have funding to go out to start constructing schools, that I know one in south Meridian is their number one -- there and Star. Hopefully we will get an idea from them about their timing and what it means long term, but it also may be too early to tell, but in case you are looking for something else to do on Monday night, we will be back here with --

Miller: I'm a tax accountant, so it matters -- the tax cut involved mattered to me in particular, but, yeah, I have been following that, so --

Simison: Okay.

Miller: So, what I'm doing on Monday night.

Johnson: And, Mr. Mayor, Ms. Carrie Miller.

C.Miller: Before my time starts can you tell me how to run this, so that I can use --

Johnson: Once Bill brings up the presentation your right arrow -- right arrow on the keyboard is the best way to navigate.

C.Miller: My name is Carrie Miller. I live at 6876 South Pemberley Place in The Keep, Meridian, Idaho. So, I prepared a little bit of a slideshow for you today. On the future land map in Meridian it shows the plan for this subdivision and the expectation was a little bit different than we are seeing here. I wrote it down, because, honestly, some of it gets confusing for me, but half of the property is low density, which is supposed to be three or less lots. The other half is medium density or is just supposed to be six to eight lots per acre. As I understand it, they are requesting that each of these zonings be bumped up to a higher density. They are asking for a bump in low density to medium and medium dense to medium high density. So, right here you see the map. We have the medium density that's just -- this is an over general map that we have seen tonight. This next picture is a picture of The Keep Subdivision with a low density plan showing

what the plan was for the future land map. As you have noticed, my house is that one that is the triangle. That house is actually a .6 acre lot. So, even though it may look big, I have less than an acre that I'm looking at and we have four homes that are backing up to that. That is not actually what we were told when we built the house. I saved for 17 years to buy my dream home. It wasn't an easy task and it's not that I have a problem with neighbors. I absolutely love neighbors, but I also feel like there is a -- a part to growing and building in your home -- your dream home and to have that be taken somewhat from the plans is a little bit frustrating. Right here it just explains what a low density was supposed to be. In this they said that it was supposed to be single family homes with one to three -- one to three homes in that -- that acre. Okay. I'm going the wrong way. I'm not going to get through it. Okay. So, let's talk about the property itself. I am not an environmentalist, so to speak. I'm really not. Grew up on a ranch. I love wide open spaces and I just love to be out in the outdoors. I think that if we knew what was in the subdivision it would be really hard for us as the City of Meridian to let it go. Let me show you a little bit of what there is. These are just pictures throughout the property that are going to be changed with the subdivision. I understand that we need growth and I understand that change is inevitable, but a lot of these full-grown trees, which, by the way, take ten to 20 years to grow, will be gone and this is the pond that you are asking about, what it looks like now. This is the area that they are saying would be next to the pond, but these are areas that are not next to the pond. These are areas of trees that show a difference in what would be taken away. I know that my time is up, but if I can finish with saying a lot of things -- like, for example, if we look at New York City, at the time that they planned Central Park it looked crazy. It absolutely looked insane. But now if you look at New York City that is a huge advantage to their community. Can you imagine if Meridian city had something like that and, in actuality, we do. Now, I know I can't propose that we don't have a subdivision at all, but this is a gem and it should be kept as a gem as much as possible and the density that they are asking does not do that justice. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Carrie; right?

C.Miller: Yes.

Cavener: Thanks. It's clear you have put some time and attention into putting your presentation together and you have sat with us all night, so I don't want you to feel rushed. If there are other points in your presentation that you would like to make, I would like to ask you to feel like that you have been able to complete your presentation in the whole. So, if there is anything else I would invite that from you.

C.Miller: Okay. Thank you.

Cavener: No problem.

C.Miller: There is, actually. So, the other part of my presentation was with the schools, besides losing this gem, in my opinion are the schools. My son does attend Mountain View High School. All of my children have attended Mountain View High School. The entire time that we have been there our biggest concern has been the capacity at Mountain View High School. My son describes right now in passing period that they are -- no room. They are bumping up against each other. They are shoulder to shoulder. I asked him to take a video today, but he is sick and so he forgot to take that video. So, I can't show you exactly what it looks like, but I have been in those halls and it's pretty packed. My concern is is if we move forward without first resolving the issues that we have right now that we are just going to be compounding our problems. That is a concern for me as a mom who sends their kids to that school and in closing I just would like us to, please, hold fast to the original plan. I don't have a problem with neighbors. As my husband said, we love neighbors. We want to be their friends. But I think the original plan helps with the traffic, it helps with the schools and we need to be cognizant of that. I also think that if we can take into account some of those trees that are fully grown trees, that's such a beauty that our city has. I mean if I had my way I would say that we should have a greenbelt in that area, because I walk it every single day. Thank you.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: A couple of -- couple of follow-up questions, then, to your presentation. Your -- your concern about the density is -- is well heard. I'm hearing you on that. Where you have got -- for the totality of that project to have over four units per acre, which is significantly less dense than a lot of other chunks of our community, I also know that it is more than your current neighborhood and that's so we as Council look at, again, transition and transition can be subjective. Some person may say, boy, this is great transition. Others may say this is not appropriate transition.

C.Miller: Right.

Cavener: So, the option before the Council tonight is not to turn that land into a park and so I -- I always love those --

C.Miller: I realize that. I totally do.

Cavener: We appreciate, you know, that the -- the applicant has -- they have used their money to purchase the land and we are now trying to make sense of if this application makes sense to come into our community and so that's what's before us this evening.

So, help me understand what you think the right amount of lots per acre are for this project and what -- if you are sitting in this seat what would you be looking at?

C.Miller: I think that you are sitting in a difficulty. I understand that you have a lot to consider, but I also think with everything that's been put in place before the plan that was originally placed is one that I think we should be able to stick to. The land that was originally put it was -- as I read to you -- I'm not very good at seeing it right here, but as one to three lots for low density, six to eight lots for medium density and some of these are actually going into the higher density way beyond that and when we built our dream home that was the plan that the city had put forth and so for us -- and even now like in The Keep we have traffic problems on that corner of Lake Hazel and Eagle every single day and you add all of those homes into there, that's going to be a battle, a nightmare that we are going to be facing. It's just the -- the density just was never -- I think it's an overwhelming thought.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, just a quick follow-up if I can.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thank you for that. And so if I'm hearing you right, then, up to three in the -- in the one density area and up to six in the other, you are good with that?

C.Miller: Yes.

Cavener: And if -- if staff come to conclusion that it -- it meets that, then, that concern of yours would, then, be satisfied, is that -- is that fair to say?

C.Miller: It is fair to say.

Cavener: Excellent. Then my follow-up question -- it is very similar to I think what Council Member Strader asked the other person with the same last name as you who was up earlier. Don't know that relation. He didn't get a high five as he was headed back to this chair.

C.Miller: No, he didn't. And not an appropriate place. My dear husband.

Cavener: The concern of having to have neighbors facing back to you -- and I love you say you love neighbors. I love my neighbors, too. I don't know if I would love four neighbors looking into my back yard.

C.Miller: If I'm being honest that is a huge concern for me.

Cavener: Okay. What do you think isn't it -- what is an appropriate number for you?

C.Miller: I would prefer if the ones backing up to me were equal to me.

Cavener: Okay.

C.Miller: I think that would be fair to have the same amount of houses as I have to The Keep. If they are going to build a lot of houses there, then, give us that buffer.

Cavener: Okay. Thank you. I appreciate you being here tonight.

C.Miller: Thank you.

Johnson: That was all the checkmarks, but you probably have --

Simison: Please come up and do so.

Billaud: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, Lori Billaud. 192 West Lockhart Lane, Meridian, Idaho. I can actually very understand what she is saying. The voters of this area are very disappointed and sad to see the growth that's happening in this community. As I'm going through and canvassing my area, the dissatisfaction I'm hearing from -- about people from the Council is that they are changing areas from low density to high density. Another example at Orchid Park at Chinden and Linder, that was supposed to be all at the Paramount where a lot of us live. Paramount was supposed to be all regular low density and all of a sudden behind Linder we find out afterwards that apartments are coming in, which is fine, but, again, you did not stick to your plan, which I know you say all the time you want to stick to your plan. Voters are very unhappy with that in District 20. Here voters and -- came over here and when they purchased the lot they knew that that lot was a W-2. So, why did they purchase it and, then, decide to change it. Again being true to what you said, then, you constantly say we need to be true to the plan. What did you -- what does the plan say? Well, the plan is a W-2, so what you are doing is going back on your constituency and basically going against their back and their wishes. So, then, you wonder why there is discontent in Meridian. The discontent out of 37 things that I went and -- and had people comment on, number four out of 37 issues was the high density and the traffic. So, right now this is a high issue that you need to consider, because people aren't happy with it.

Simison: Council, any questions? Is there anybody else that would like to come forward and provide comments on this application? Good evening. State your name and address for the record.

Langston: Jerron Langston. 6865 South Pemberley Place. The Millers are my neighbors. I was the developer of The Keep Subdivision. Currently have application for The Keep West, which will be 21 lots over 16 acres up to the west of The Keep. You know, I'm grateful for the opportunity and the blessing to live in a community like The Keep, as I know a lot of the people that live came there. If you looked at public record most people that were here at P&Z came in and said basically the same story; right? They love Meridian. They wanted a little more elbow room; right? So, they came to The Keep. And, ultimately, that's what we are trying to preserve here. To echo what's been said, that area was designated as low density. That's what they were excited about being around. This project is beautiful, you know, hands -- and there is no doubt about that. I just think really protecting that transition is really what I think the residence of

The Keep and -- and lowering that density count and I -- it would be so minor in a 247 lot community to go down to 240 to potentially allow for a better transition. But, like I said, I won't take any more time, but I just want to thank you for your service and -- yeah. Thank you.

Simison: Council, any questions? Okay. It's looks like we do have somebody online who has raised their hand. Mr. Luckey.

Johnson: You should be able to unmute.

Luckey: Mr. Mayor, Council Members, my name is Jeff Luckey. I live at 4355 South Langdon in Meridian. That's in Shelburne. Soon to be moving into The Keep. But that's subject to my ability to drive in there or actually be able to drive out of there, which is the point of tonight's discussion. I wish I had a historic challenge for you is what I really witnessed earlier was an impressive collaborative spirit from the City Council in my opinion. So, congratulations for that. But, sadly, all I really have tonight is a -- is a concern and a complaint and I'm not going to belabor it. You heard it. I won't talk about density anymore. I will just be very specific. I'm wondering at what cost the annexation and the increase in density is going to contribute to Eagle Road -- south Eagle. I spoke -- I met with ACHD twice. They have convinced me that there is no near-term or even a long-term plan on the boards to widen Eagle south beyond a residential arterial and if I might be really specific, there is two entrances and exits -- exits out of The Keep. The second one is called Pemberley and Pemberley now faces Sky Break directly across the street. The center turn lane is a left turn lane southbound into Sky Break. Now you add another 250 houses down the road and we have 500 doors going to and from work and school and everything else every day and we literally will not be able to get out of Pemberley. So, if you are ever in the area I would encourage you to just drive into The Keep and, then, go out Pemberley and you will face Sky Break and you will see what I mean. Imagine trying to make a left turn there to go anywhere of value and you just won't be able to do it. So, I'm sorry. You are tired. I think you do a wonderful job. It's not easy what you do and I thank you. I'm asking you to remember my collaborative comment, because you will see me again. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: So, I can appreciate your -- your feedback and I always hope that we are working in a collaborative manner. Just curious -- your comment about -- about the roadways, I think that's something -- schools and roads are the two things we hear about the most and it's always hard, because we have got the least ability to influence and we rely heavily on communication from the school district and from the highway district and so when the -- when the highway district sends us a staff report and it shows the conditions of the roadway and they identify Eagle as better than D and acceptable is

E, I tend to take their recommendation as accurate. I think what I'm kind of hearing from your testimony is either you disagree with the staff report or that you find it to be contrary during peak travel times; is that accurate?

Luckey: That's accurate. That's accurate. And we probably wouldn't be having this discussion if within the annexation there wasn't a request for increased density. As it was said earlier, when the developer purchased that land as low density, he knew what he paid for it. He knew what he was going to get out of it and he made some assumptions and that -- that was that you would increase -- that you would agree to increase the density. So, score for them. Not so much for the residents in the surrounding community.

Cavener: Thank you.

Luckey: Thank you.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Maybe a question for staff. I think it might help everybody here to understand the -- the dimensional standards, but my understanding is that the low density residential piece of this development is less than three units per acre; is that correct? Bill?

Parsons: Mayor, Council Woman Strader, that is correct. That's what I presented to you.

Strader: Mr. Mayor. And, then, the medium density residential piece sounded like was around five units per acre; is that correct?

Parsons: That is correct. 5.3.

Strader: Okay. And just for curiosity sake, if this was developed with -- well, let me put this differently. The units -- the properties -- single family homes that transition to The Keep, I believe we heard those were done, according to R-4 dimensional standards; is that right?

Parsons: Mayor, Members of the Council, I believe the applicant stated it was R-2, which are minimum 12,000 square foot lots --

Strader: Got it.

Parsons: -- with frontage of 80.

Strader: Uh-huh. So -- so, just a comment. So, the way that the density works under the Comprehensive Plan -- it doesn't correspond exactly to zoning. I know that that is

frustrating. It's frustrating for me. But it still -- I have done this -- this is my fifth year doing City Council and I still find that frustrating. What we look at is units per acre. So, we are looking at units per acre on the low density, units per acre on the medium density. I'm not seeing like an up zoning here. That's not what I'm seeing. But what I am sympathetic to is -- and before I joined the City Council -- I joined the City Council -- again this is -- I'm embarking on my fifth year, so I'm relatively new, haven't been as many terms as others, but we had just approved our Comprehensive Plan and a big frustration for me was actually that we did not have a rural designation any longer in our Comprehensive Plan. A rural designation to me would be a lot more along the lines of what Mrs. Miller is talking about with really spacious properties. That doesn't exist in our plan and that I think is a loss for all of us, especially because of the open spaces and the agricultural heritage that Meridian has had. But that's not in the plans anymore. This is going to develop. We are a very strong private property rights state. We are not going to be able to turn it into a park. I think we can take into account schools and traffic and we can try to work through those things. We don't control those directly. The biggest thing we can help with is the transition. The transition to The Keep we can try to work on that piece I think if the developer is amenable, we will try to work with them on that piece. But, again, because there is townhomes in that middle part of the development, that does make it possible so that the properties next to your property are R-2 dimensional standards. If we used a magic wand, which we don't have, we are developing this and we equalized all of the properties, they would still fit under our Comprehensive Plan, but what would result is on the transition to your lots you would have a bunch of smaller lots, so I think it's important to acknowledge that what the developer has done is they have tried to keep it so larger properties around the edges of this development do have larger -- still a bunch, but larger size properties around, instead of, you know, spreading it out equally. I wouldn't recommend that we start trying to do something like that. I don't think it would be a good outcome for the neighbors. I think you want to have the best transition you can get. So, anyway, that -- I'm just talking out loud, but I hear a lot of their frustration, I share a lot of their frustration. You know, part of why I got involved in City Council and ran for City Council for the first time was I lived in Paramount and I was super frustrated about what I consider to be unfettered multi-family development, large apartment buildings going on roads that were two lane roads that were never going to be widened. So, I understand the concerns about density. I'm just trying to grapple with what we can do here and kind of what's within our ability to help with. Thanks.

Simison: Is there anybody else that would like to provide testimony on this item? Would the applicant like to come forward.

Bailey: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I don't -- I don't have any specific rebuttal. I -- I do appreciate the comments of the neighbors on this thing and -- and -- on both sides of this we hear this and we do think about these issues when we buy the property as far as -- we bought the property with full knowledge of what the Comprehensive Plan is and -- and what we could do with that and worked with the city all the way through that to do that and with full knowledge to transition to the neighbors is an appropriate thing to do and with the full knowledge that the city wants us -- wants to see us provide a lot of

good quality open space and they want us to also see specifically a variety of housing types, because that's good for the community. To have those variety of housing types within a single community is even better for the community; right? And that's what's espoused in your plan and it's what I follow when I lay the subdivision out and propose to the developer here is what I think we should do with this property and it's not a here is what I think we can get out of this property, it's here is what I think we should do to this property -- do with this property to make this a quality community and we have really tried to do that in that end of it. I will make a little sidebar at the -- at the -- at the expense of getting in trouble, is that I think you have a lot more power over the schools and the roads than the P&Z says and, then, sometimes I hear that City Council say and that power is that you passed your Comprehensive Plan. I have sat three different times on the long range capital improvement plan for the highway district and the first thing they do is take your Comprehensive Plan and say here's how much road we have to -- how much traffic we have to plan for. They spent a lot of money building a long -- a long -- a really large traffic plan and, then, every time a traffic study is done for a project says is consistent with the plan or we already planned for this. We have 30 year plans for what the development that Meridian says you are going to do along Eagle Road we will do to Eagle Road and when we will do that. Unfortunately -- fortunately the -- the policy of public is to build -- not build overcapacity. The public won't pay for it. Okay? And so you can't build great roads before there is a need for them. In fact, they plan all these roads to expand them when they -- when they open the new expansion for it to still be at level of service E. That's the long range planning as done nationwide with that end. That's frustrating to everybody. You know, it's frustrating to us, too. But someone's got to pay for the roads and the public gets to pay for them. The schools are the same way really. They are supposed to take your Comprehensive Plan and plan to take that many students into the schools and they certainly have struggles with the -- with the financing side of this thing, so I will leave it at that end. But -- but I think the cities have more power on both of those than -- than -- than you give yourself credit for.

Simison: Council, questions?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: My first question tonight when we were talking about this was to our -- our Deputy Chief and asking about fire service, because that's important infrastructure and certainly it -- we would probably agree that if our fire station couldn't support this development we probably shouldn't approve it. Are we in agreement on that?

Bailey: Agreed.

Cavener: Excellent. Certainly, again, if -- if we couldn't serve this neighborhood with water or wastewater we probably shouldn't approve it.

Bailey: Agreed.

Cavener: So, I -- I look at roads and schools much like critical infrastructure and one of the things that I look at when an application comes before us is, again, can the road support it and can our schools support it? According to the highway district it looks like the roads can support it. That's a greenlight to me. The question is the schools and I guess my question to you is if -- if the schools can't handle the capacity, we probably shouldn't approve this project then; right

Bailey: I would agree. If you had a letter from the school that said they can't handle the capacity from this project specifically, then, you should not approve it.

Cavener: Okay. Thank you. I appreciate your honesty on that.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you, Mr. Bailey. Okay. Probably the biggest thing it seems like you could do to help with neighbors' concerns would be to lose some density in your development, particularly along the north side along The Keep. Are you open to that?

Bailey: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, we are opening to -- we are open to increasing -- or decreasing the number of lots along that transition border, specifically for that one lot that has four on there, subject to the caveat that we think we are well within the density requirements. We are in the middle of the density requirements for the overall subdivision. So, we would move that lot within there to within the subdivision. So, we'd like to provide a better transition, no change in the development otherwise, and I could certainly do that.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Okay. So, it sounds like what you are interested in doing is not decreasing the density overall, but you would like to increase density in a different part of your project. Yeah. It's hard -- it's hard to envision what that would look like. I have a hard time believing that your business plan would be so fundamentally altered by losing, you know, a couple of lots along that north boundary. I mean -- so, along -- and maybe, Mr. Parsons, do you mind, Bill, just bringing up that lot line -- and you knew we were going to -- we were going to go into this lot line conversation, so you are like clairvoyant on that. Yeah. Like -- so, here on the -- on the -- on the northeast piece it looks like you are almost a one to one. Those are more narrow. It's really -- I do think that the Millers appear to be the most adversely impacted out of all of the neighbors in The Keep. Like I -- I -- if I -- if I were a neighbor I could stand if I had a large lot, I could stand like facing two neighbors. That wouldn't bother me. Facing four neighbors seems like a lot. You know, are you -- you know. So, I -- kind of a suggestion from me at least is that you consider dropping, you know, two of those units -- two of those lots, consolidating the --

you know, a couple of them together maybe in a way that -- that would help with that transition. I think that would help a lot with the transition here and, then, the school piece is such a bigger issue and, boy, we have -- we have tried -- we -- it wasn't easy. I mean two years ago we literally paused developing -- paused our annexations while we have worked with the school district to try to help, you know, with a -- with a strategy and a projection model. What's interesting, the school district has capacity in other parts of Meridian; right? And so, then, you are -- what we are asking our school district to do is to really more actively manage their student population with busing and it is -- it is rough in south Meridian right now with the school situation, especially the high school and the middle school. So, I -- I don't think there is an easy answer for that. How -- can you remind me what your phasing plan is in terms of the breakdown of the number of lots that are coming in each phase?

Bailey: Like 71, 60 and, then, 50 and 40. So, they are about 60 average. So, we are talking having 120 homes in here in the next four years probably. Four years from now we would be seeing about half of the -- half of the development build out with homes.

Strader: Mr. Mayor, do you mind? I'm sorry, I'm really going on here.

Simison: Yes.

Strader: Mr. Parsons, what is the student generation rate? What is the math that we apply? So, every year what -- how many students, then, are we looking at realistically?

Parsons: Yeah. Here is -- so, Mayor, Members of the Council, Council Woman Strader, here is the numbers here for -- it's broke down for multi-family unit and single family unit. So, it looks like if they go to Mary McPherson we are using .49. If they go to Hillsdale or Lake Hazel, then, it's a little different ratio. But we have based it on our assumptions that the students will -- would be going to Mary McPherson. So, that's where we came up with 120 students that were estimated from this -- this development. Again, not an official school district response, but it's something just -- we wanted to share with the Council.

Simison: Yeah. And typically when the school district does it they just -- you generate the numbers and you just spread that out over 12 grades. You don't dump them into one school at one time.

Parsons: Correct.

Bailey: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, to answer a little bit of what you asked before -- should I or should I wait?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Go -- go for it if you have further comments.

Bailey: Yeah. The one about the transition stuff is -- is that -- as I said before, I can -- I can certainly remove one or two lots if you think that's appropriate in that area there and then -- but I would move them within the LD zone, we still wouldn't approve -- and we are not talking about increasing density. We are just not talking about decreasing density and those -- those lots we would provide a better transition for that one lot there; right? And, then, we would just move that probably just down south of that within the low density area; right? Because we would still have the same number of units within that and the density is -- as you pointed out and Bill's pointed out -- is the gross number of units over the gross number of acres, you know, within that area. So, changing lot sizes or moving -- taking a lot out here and putting in a lot down below that smaller size ends up with the same density, just another smaller lot for one of our residents.

Simison: Just -- I know this isn't like drawn to scale, it's -- it's just a rough drawing. Just from -- you know, my spatial beliefs. If you take out two on that top, you are still going to have a minimum of three homes that are going to be on that back one, because it takes up 50 percent of that entire line. You know, I think practically if you took out one you can limit it to three. If you take out two you are still going to have at least three. There is just going to be offset. So, you know, it is -- it's going to displace the entire situation. It's not a clean one to one. But that at least gets you somewhere -- I think is what is an acceptable number. If your answer is two, I don't think that you can achieve a reasonable expectation for this subdivision, because those two lots are going to take up 50 percent of that block length to try to do a one to one on -- or two to one even on that one property by itself. I don't know if that's -- if that's good or bad for the other side of the street where you have such long blocks to make that accompanied. Is -- I guess the only other option if you are going to go to four, which, then, you have got one on the end, two in there and, you know, that would -- at least that would align'ish, but -- so that would at least be my recommendation. Remove one or remove four if you want to try to -- try to find a way that would work, but where they go after that -- I'm not saying it's -- that Council can decide if they want to -- want them to go someplace else within the thing, but that's at least from a number standpoint.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I do think -- you know, it looks like if you merged a couple of these together it would match up much better, but I do appreciate that you sort of have to -- it has a ripple effect. So, I -- I can't design it from the dais. I know we definitely need a little bit less density up there for sure. I think that's fair. I think that would work out better for the neighbors. I think that speaks to our Comprehensive Plan's importance on transition. I also think we want to hear from West Ada. I don't feel that it's fair for our own planning staff to do the job of speaking for West Ada. I very much appreciate that you took a stab at it. I think West Ada needs to provide feedback on how they plan to accommodate these students. I know there are other Council Members that -- that have that feeling,

too. We feel terrible. Two for two on continuances. That's tough. But I think -- I do think we should hear from West Ada. I don't think it's acceptable for a large development like this to come through without having heard from them and I think maybe taking a little bit of time to -- at least rework the density on the transition could -- could be very positive as well. That's just my feedback.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I tend to agree with Council Member Strader. For both the applicant's benefit and the public here, we try really hard to not make decisions after 10:00 o'clock. We all get a little rummy. I appreciate the nonverbal feedback there. It's been a long day for all of us and we want to make the right decision and not make a rash decision. To Council Member Strader's point, my -- my question for you is, you know, I look at our education like critical infrastructure and I live in south Meridian. I know the impact in Mountain View. I know the impact in Victory Middle. I want the school to tell me that my perception is wrong and those schools aren't already at over -- over capacity. They tell me that, I think what's likely some reduction of -- of lots, I could be very very supportive of this project. Those schools are over capacity. I'm not going to put more kids in a school that can't already handle it. So, I think a -- a continuance gives us the opportunity to make sure that the information that I believe to be correct is correct or wrong. It gives you an opportunity to respond to the feedback from Council and the public. I don't think we need to continue this for a long period of time. I would almost ask the applicant if there is a time certain that would be beneficial to you to come back with some of these answers. Recognize we have got a meeting with West Ada on Monday. To the Mayor's point I know Superintendent Bub has been working with their new staff to get student generation letters to us. I think with a specific request about this I think we can hopefully have that in a week or two weeks, but I want to make sure that you have got ample time as well to take the feedback that you have heard from Council here tonight.

Bailey: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Cavener, I'm fine with that. Looking at that. So, again, just looking for specific direction on this is that -- and I agree with the concept, that you shouldn't have to make the decision on what to do without the feedback from your experts, such as the school. They are working for you. They are supposed to be working for you, you know. They follow your lead, as I said before, but -- but, nonetheless, the -- you know, I -- I get that and I certainly understand that and we want to get things done right. I get that. On the issue of the density on there -- so, I will -- I will be looking at increasing -- making a better transition there and -- and -- and moving those lots in a different spot within that area to show how that's accessible with the whole thing. So, I'm probably intending to keep with the same number. You know, if we drop in two lots from the -- from the numbers here they don't change the schools, nor do they change the neighbor's experience, nor do they change the traffic any from my -- from my position on that end. So, I will present that to the developer and tell him what you have asked on that and take that action that direction.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I won't drag the night out any further, but I -- I do think you did a good job striving to address the challenges beforehand with the transition. I think you are going above and beyond what you are asked to do by maybe moving some of those lots around, but I think that's -- that's great. Like that's sort of the collaborative spirit where -- we try to have with the development community and people who have purchased property and spent money and put their hopes and dreams in areas. I totally understand it and get it. I had a -- I could hit a nine iron to a piece of property that was county land and now is going to have 256 units on it. It wasn't my plan when I bought it, so I totally understand the Millers' concerns. I didn't love it, but I accept that as part of where we are with Meridian. It's just a hard, hard thing to do and as we were presented with the idea of whose property rights trump whose in this, right, that's a very challenging situation, so as long as nobody's harming someone's enjoyment or value of the property that's kind of what I look at. So, I -- I do -- I agree with my Council Members, I would like to get the feedback from West Ada. I don't think that would take us necessarily too long, but I do think you are -- in my -- from my perspective I think this is a good project. I think you have done your part to accommodate as best as you can with what you have and I know we are -- we don't all have magic wands to do what we want, but if you are willing to take a look at that northern part, I commend you for that, because I think you are not required to, but that you are willing to I think is great and we really appreciate that.

Bailey: Thank you.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: David, we have got three hearings on -- on April 16. Nothing currently scheduled the week after. You have been with us all day today, so I'm -- I'm happy to ask if -- if you want to add on to an already lengthy meeting I'm supportive of that. If you would rather be on an agenda where we don't have a lot, I would appreciate that, but I certainly want to kind of yield to what -- what you -- the direction you are going to have, so -- oh, the 9th. Excuse me. The 9th we have got three hearings. Thank you to our amazing clerk. On the 16th -- no -- no current public hearings.

Bailey: I think that the 16th would be fine. We probably need more than just a week.

Cavener: Okay.

Bailey: I think that -- that's my --

Cavener: Sincere appreciation for that and I think for the public that have been here all night, too, also appreciate that, so -- all right. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Before we turn into a pumpkin, I'm going to move that we continue Item 12, the public hearing for Reveille Ridge Subdivision, H-2023-0050 to April 16th.

Taylor: Second.

Simison: Motion and a second to continue the public hearing to April 16. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye --

Parsons: Mayor, Council, did you -- Councilman Cavener, were you intending to just hold it over for two specific topics, transition and -- oh. Okay.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, appreciate staff asking about this. With this particular application. I think keeping the public hearing -- if someone wasn't able to be here and there was sizable participation in the Planning and Zoning Commission, continue this -- they weren't able to be here tonight, I want to give them the opportunity to weigh in.

Simison: All right. I have a motion and a second. Is there discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the item is continued. We will see you back here.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

ORDINANCES [Action Item]

- 13. Ordinance No. 24-2049: An ordinance (Cole Valley Christian Schools Pre-K-12 – H-2023-0011) annexing the west half of the southeast quarter of Section 29, Township 4 North, Range 1 West, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit "A"; rezoning 71.28 acres of such real property from RUT (Rural Urban Transition) to R-15 (Medium High-Density Residential) zoning district; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; repealing conflicting ordinances; and providing an effective date.**

Next item up is Item 13, which is Ordinance No. 24-2049. Ask the Clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. It's an ordinance related to Cole Valley Christian Schools, Pre-K-12, H-2023-0011, annexing the west half of the southeast quarter of Section 29, Township 4 North, Range 1 West, Boise meridian, Ada county, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit "A"; rezoning 71.28 acres of such real property from RUT to R-15 zoning district, directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps, as well as the official zoning maps and all official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; repealing conflicting ordinances; and providing an effective date.

Simison: Thank you. Council, you have heard the ordinance read by title. Is there anybody that would like it read in its entirety? Seeing none, do I have a motion?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I move that we accept Ordinance No. 24-2049.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Motion and a second to approve Ordinance No. 24-2049. Is there any discussion? If not clerk will call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

FUTURE MEETING TOPICS

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

Strader: Mayor, I move that we adjourn.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 10:36 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON

_____/_____/_____
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK