

Meridian Planning and Zoning Meeting

July 2, 2026.

Meeting of the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission of July 2, 2026, was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chairman Maria Lorcher.

Members Present: Commissioner Maria Lorcher, Commissioner Jared Smith, Commissioner Matthew Sandoval, Commissioner Jessica Perreault, Commissioner Dom Gelsomino and Commissioner Matthew Stoll.

Others Present: Tina Lomeli, Tishra Murray, Bill Parsons, Sonya Allen and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

_____ (vacant)	____X____ Jessica Perrault
____X____ Matthew Sandoval	____X____ Matthew Stoll
____X____ Dom Gelsomino	____X____ Jared Smith
____X____ Maria Lorcher - Chairman	

Lorcher: Good evening. Welcome to Planning and Zoning Commission meeting for July 2nd, 2026. At this time I would like to call the meeting to order. The Commissioners who are present for this evening's meeting are at City Hall and on Zoom. We also have staff from the City Attorney's and the City Clerk's office, as well as the City Planning Department. If you are joining us on Zoom this evening we can see that you are here. You may observe the meeting, however, your ability to be seen on screen and talk will be muted. During the public testimony portion of the meeting you will be unmuted and, then, be able to comment. Please note we cannot take questions until the public testimony portion of the meeting. If you have a process question during the meeting please e-mail cityclerk@meridiancity.org and they will reply as quickly as possible. If you simply want to watch the meeting we encourage you to stream it on our city's YouTube channel. You can access it at meridiancity.org/live. With that can we begin with roll call, Madam Clerk?

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Lorcher: The first item on the agenda is the adoption of the -- of the agenda. There are no changes to tonight's agenda. Could I get a motion to adopt tonight's agenda?

Stoll: So moved.

Gelsomino: Seconded.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

1. Approve Minutes of the June 18, 2026 Planning and Zoning Special Commission Meeting

Lorcher: The next item on the agenda is the Consent Agenda, which is to approve the minutes of the Planning and Zoning meeting from June 18th. May I get a motion to approve the Consent Agenda.

Smith: So moved.

Gelsomino: Seconded.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

Lorcher: At this time I would briefly like to explain the public hearing process. We will open each item individually and begin with a staff report. Staff will report their findings on how the item adheres to our Comprehensive Plan and our Unified Development Code. After staff has made their presentation the applicant will come forward and present their case and respond to staff's comments. They will have 15 minutes to do so. After the applicant has finished we will open the floor to public testimony. Each person will be called only once during public testimony. The clerk will call names out individually for those who have signed up on our website in advance to testify. You may come up to the microphones in Chambers or you will be unmuted on Zoom. Please state your name and address for the record and you will have three minutes to address the Commission. If you have previously sent pictures or a presentation for the meeting it will be displayed on screen for -- and our city clerk will help you run the presentation. If you have established that you are speaking on the behalf of a larger group, like an HOA, where others from that group will allow you to speak on their behalf, you will have up to ten minutes. After all those who have signed up in advance have spoken we will invite any others who wish to testify. If you wish to speak on a topic you may come forward in Chambers or on Zoom press the raise hand button or if you are listening for a -- on a telephone please press star nine and wait for your name to be called. If you are listening on multiple devices, such as a computer and a phone, please be sure to mute those extra devices so we don't experience feedback and we can hear you clearly. When you are finished if the Commission does not have questions for you you will return to your seat in Chambers or be muted on Zoom and no longer have the ability to speak. And please remember we will not call on you a second time. After all testimony has been heard the applicant will be given another ten minutes to come back and to respond. When the applicant is finished responding to questions and concerns we will close the public hearing and the commissioners will have the opportunity to discuss,

hopefully make final recommendations -- or approvals or recommendations to City Council as needed.

ACTION ITEMS

2. Public Hearing continued from June 18, 2026 for 7Brew Coffee (H-2026-0017) by Core States Group, located at 3570 E. Fairview Ave.

- A. Request: Conditional Use Permit for a Tier two (2) drive-through establishment on 0.64 acres of land in the C-G zoning district.

Lorcher: With that we are going to open Item No. H-2026-0017, request a conditional use permit for 7Brew Coffee at 3570 East Fairview. Just to let you know we did discuss this at our last meeting and we -- we are at a stalemate, but now we have a full commission, so, hopefully, we will be able to decide on this. Commissioner Perreault and Commissioner Sandoval, do you feel comfortable that you were able to read the minutes and the application that you will be able to respond on this application?

Perreault: Yes.

Lorcher: Commissioner Sandoval?

Sandoval: Madam Chair, yes.

Lorcher: Okay. With that we will begin with the staff report.

Parsons: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. As you mentioned, this was continued from the last Planning and Zoning Commission hearing. I just want to get the -- the Commissioners that are present tonight to orient with the site a little bit and, then, get into the details of why it was continued. So, the site does consist of 0.64 acres of land currently zoned C-G and is located at 3570 East Fairview Avenue. It was a lot and block that was subdivided with the CenterCal Subdivision back in 2011. At the time that this property was annexed there is a DA that showed a building on this particular lot and as staff noted in the staff report it is consistent with the concept plan that is approved for that overall development of The Village at Meridian. The applicant is wishing to develop the site. Again a conditional use permit -- seeking a conditional use permit for a tier two drive through. Mentioned -- I believe the Commission knows this, but the restaurant -- the building itself or 7Brew is actually defined as a restaurant use, which is principally permitted in the commercial zoning district. The drive through is accessory to the principally permitted restaurant use and because there is a -- one ordering point, one menu window, one stacking lane and an escape lane, this is classified as a tier two drive through, which requires approval from this body. So, as I mentioned and as -- as the Madam Chair mentioned, quite a bit of deliberation at the last hearing and there was four commissioners present and it was -- it ended in a tie. So, ultimately this was continued, but as part of your motion you did ask the applicant to come back and bring some additional information forward. The applicant does have --

have a presentation for you, so they did provide that additional queuing analysis that you requested and they will share that with you in their response this evening. So, you wanted them to provide queuing data for other city -- other stores in cities of similar size to Meridian and located on major corridors. You wanted them to pursue other options for Village parking in front of the restaurant to allow for overflow parking, see if there was an opportunity to do that and if you can see my cursor here I think the intent was to secure some additional parking, either here in front of the store or along the -- the parking in front of the buffer here for additional overflow parking. So, if -- if queuing does happen on the site there will be an opportunity for those cars to pull forward and -- and get their product and move out of the parking lane to avoid additional congestion on the site. I know some -- one of the commissioners, Commissioner Smith, had brought up some discussion about restricting the hours of operation, making sure that it didn't compete with other businesses in the shopping center. So, that's something that's certainly within your purview to further restrict the hours of operation as part of the CUP process and, then, as I mentioned we had to continue it because we had a tie and you guys wanted to make sure to get this one to the finish line. So, as I mentioned I did add one additional item to the slide that you didn't see -- you did see this particular graphic at the last hearing, but I thought it was beneficial to get you guys up to speed. They showed their queuing -- per the specific use standards for drive throughs they do have to show the amount of vehicles they can stack on the site. So, the graphic on the left does that, but also you wanted to see a mitigation plan for when they open the store and it's -- it's a popular store -- it could be very popular, so you wanted to see if they would address some interim measures to address the newness of the store and, then, hopefully, over time it will go back to a normal operating process. So, this was the exhibit that the applicant shared with you showing you how they plan to route additional vehicles on the site if it is very popular during its opening and not allow vehicles to stack on the primary drive aisle into the shopping center. Again, staff is recommending approval and I will either stand for questions or allow you to get to the applicant, so that they can share their findings with you.

Lorcher: Would the applicant like to come forward? Or are they on Zoom?

Lomeli: Madam Chair, it looks like they are on Zoom.

Lorcher: If you can state your name and address for the record, please.

Gantzert: Hi. Good evening. Can everyone hear me correct?

Lorcher: Yes.

Gantzert: Okay. My name is Mira Gantzert. Address 18215 72nd Avenue, Kent, Washington. 98032.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Gantzert: So, thank you so much for having us. I want to say that -- oh. Thank you. And is there a way maybe I could share my screen just so I can kind of drive it and change the slides and not --

Lomeli: Yes. We will promote you to panelist.

Gantzert: Can everyone see that okay?

Lorcher: Yes.

Gantzert: Okay. Thank you so much. And thank you so much for being so flexible with allowing some of our team to be virtual and some of our team to be there in the Chamber. So, I kind of wanted to run through and let everyone know who -- who is here this evening on behalf of the applications. And myself Mira Gantzert, I'm the project planner with Core States Group, who is a civil engineer. Anthony Merlino is virtual as well. He is our senior civil project manager online with us. We also have Bill Burton principal with Fehr & Peers. They are our traffic consultant here to answer any traffic study related questions. They are in the Chambers with you. We have Russ Orsi. So, he is VP of construction of Forza Development. They are the developer for 7Brew, especially with their expansion here out to the west. There are in person as well. We have Brenton Jackson with the Harman Group. Notably they are known for their KFC franchisees and they will actually be a 7Brew franchisee. Brenton will be one for this particular store in the City of Meridian. And, then, we also do have members of the CenterCal property management team. I believe Hugh Crawford is there. We have been working very closely with them on making this project come to life. So, they are also available and may come up to speak just to say a few words once I'm kind of done going through some additional data. So, as Bill had mentioned kind of the three points we wanted to add additional insight on would be the hours of operation, the stacking queuing, as well as any traffic data we can present. So, I will hit on the 24 hours quickly. Our intent is to not pursue the 24 hours. We want to pursue just our standard 5:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. hours of operation. I think that will help alleviate any concerns, since the shopping center typically doesn't open until 10:00 or 11:00 and even with the gym opening earlier I think that will alleviate a lot of traffic and just queuing concerns and, then, any after hour concerns that hopefully the Commission had. I will jump into next kind of the stacking and queuing. So, in our last commission obviously we presented that we have the main drive lane, so that has seven cars, which meets the six car code. Since that hearing we have been coordinating with property management and we have been able to allocate six additional parking spaces specifically for the use. So, they are located here kind of at the exit of the drive through. They will have signage to delineate that it is kind of ten minute customer pickup delivery, so that customers know they can use these spaces and people using the shopping center for long term shopping will not be able to utilize those spaces. We do still have the bypass lane as an emergency overflow. I'm going to go through some stacking data that will show that we don't anticipate to use that on a regular basis. It will truly be a bypass lane, perhaps maybe just some of the beginning opening, but we should be able to contain our queue with cars in the main lane and the six parking spaces. I'm going to show just kind of

high level zoom out. I know everyone knows the shopping center, but most of kind of the stacking queuing will happen in this area here, with being able to utilize these spaces, kind of the stacking we were showing here as worst case scenario will probably be less than this. So, with 7Brew opening earlier than the rest of the center, as I mentioned before, it is likely that most of the employees coming to work will probably utilize some of the spaces right in front of the store. So, any stacking concerns that are happening here won't impact any customers coming to either the gym or the shopping center and it really will only kind of be more of a limited area. So, there are plenty -- plenty of room for cars to circulate the site. There is multiple access points to the drive aisles to circulate and be able to find parking and go around drive aisles. So, our intent is to, obviously, impact as little as possible of the rest of the shopping center during our operations. I will dig into a little bit of traffic data. So, we talked briefly at the last hearing about pass-by traffic. So, with data that's been taken by Kimley-Horn study across a few sites, most pass-by traffic will generally be at about 72 percent. So, again, pass-by traffic is considered someone is already on this roadway, they are going from point A to point B, they happen to be passing by 7Brew, so they will make a stop on their way. The shopping center being a destination itself. We anticipate that most of the traffic is already there and so they will just utilize the drive through, get their 7Brew and either go to shopping or go home. So, that leaves about really only 28 percent of actual new traffic coming for the 7Brew. And as we had previously talked as well, as new stores open up in the Meridian market that 28 percent for this particular site will decrease as people are able to go to other locations and kind of alleviate that little pressure point. So, we do not anticipate a large amount of new traffic being generated to the center and to this intersection. Next slide here I have starts to break down a little bit of peak hours and gets into details of some of the data we have on the stores. So, the peak hours of operation for 7Brew are the morning hours. They are that 7:00 to 9:00 or 7:00 to 10:00 a.m. The next small peak that we have is kind of what they call that afternoon slump. So, it's more of kind of like the 3:00 to 5:00 or 4:00 to 7:00. So, the data we have here shows trips coming in 7:00 to 10:00 a.m. and, then, trips coming in 4:00 to 7:00 p.m. So, I will caveat this with saying we do not have detailed data on the 6:00 p.m. to 11:00 p.m. Any cities that have requested traffic studies have never requested that late afternoon time and evening time, just because that's not really typical peak hours at all for coffee drinkers and so really these are the two peak times that we find and what this is showing is 160 overall trips in the morning, 67 overall, and if you kind of look -- a little bit hard to see -- in the breakdown even further it's really 81 plus or minus trips in and kind of the same trips going out and, again, it's significantly less in that p.m. peak of the 4:00 to 7:00 based on the Colorado and Texas site data that we found. Okay. We did talk at the last hearing as well just about putting a little more insight on the stores that we did run data on and tagging on just population. So, one point I do want to make is that population doesn't always correlate exactly to queuing. It is definitely a metric that we can use, but some high populated cities may have a smaller queue, because there are multiple sources let's say of coffee shops there versus maybe a small population is going to show a higher queue because they only have just kind of the one -- the one source. So, it's just one metric to use. It's not a complete picture of what happens. But this kind of breaks down what the cities were like in their populations. What this chart is showing is a max total queue and what I

want to point out is that this is not on a regular basis where this is the max queue. This is data that occurred for very short periods of time and that was five minutes or less across a given period that it was studied and so the rest of the day is typically much smaller than this. This was just kind of peak hours, what the maximum could be for five minutes or less. So, then, we took some of that data and we put it more in graph form, so it's a little bit easier to see. The first couple slides are going to show kind of that 7:00 to 10:00 peak time, because that is truly the peak time of 7Brew. So, what we are showing here is the green line is just our actual order lane of the seven cars. The orange represents utilizing the six additional parking spaces for the pull forward and, then, the yellow symbolizes if we were to utilize the full bypass lane. So, this particular site you can see during the peak times that you would be utilizing kind of the six pull forward spaces and they were very small windows, so you can see kind of let's say from 8:25 to 8:50 where there could be one, two, three extra cars utilizing that bypass lane. Another example here, Independence, Missouri. Here is kind of the population. Same idea. You can kind of see there is 15 to 20 minute windows where cars would be stacking or using that bypass lane, but everything else would really be contained during that morning peak time within the main lane and the pull forward spaces. And I have a few more just to kind of show -- again they all kind of represent the same picture. There is kind of the 15, 20 minute window at 7:00, 8:00 and 9:00 a.m. where it peaks above the 13 spaces and we would utilize the bypass lane for just that short duration. One more here for South Carolina. This one wouldn't be using the bypass lane. Site in Utah. Again wouldn't be using the bypass lane. Everything's contained through the main lane and the pull forward spaces. And, then, we do have the two sites, one in Texas and one in Colorado. So, we have the peak morning times and, then, we have kind of the next peak, which is that late afternoon, the 3:00 to 6:00. You can see here, obviously, the morning peak times are higher than the afternoon peak times. Coffee usually equals morning. And so in this scenario everything would kind of be contained within that original order lane. And, then, on the Colorado site, same idea. The ratio you can see morning peak time significantly higher than the afternoon peak time and so everything is typically contained within kind of that pull forward space and the original spaces. And I will go back just very quickly to the site plan, so just we can look at it operationally. So, again, the intent is cars would be stacking here. If a car gets their order they leave. If a car gets the order taken and their order is larger it's taking longer, employees can direct cars to pull forward to the spaces. If car let's say three, four and five have gotten their order taken and they just want to leave the queue, they, obviously, just use the bypass lane and free up room here. If car three, four and five have gotten their order taken, but they have not received their order yet and all six parking stalls are full, they could also use the bypass lane just to pull forward and employees can use these two sliding doors to come out, deliver the orders in the striping, get the cars out of the bypass and continue getting cars into the main drive aisle lane. And that's operationally. Obviously every scenario is a little bit different, but we would try not to actually utilize the full bypass lane, maybe just portions of it just to get cars through and out of the main drive aisle. So, that was a lot. I will say -- I just want to make one kind of closing argument before you have any questions or comments. Obviously just to recap. We do meet the tier two code with the six car stack. We have seven. We have the designated bypass lane per code. We did go back and add additional parking stalls

for designated pull forward spaces that will be marked. Obviously with all the data we have seen we also understand new opening is usually a lot busier, so it's very common for new businesses to have that initial surge, but that really only typically represents a very temporary period, rather than a long-term operating condition, and so once 7Brew becomes established, the customer traffic will stabilize in a more predictable pattern, kind of like we have seen on these other sites and so for that reason we feel it's important for you to evaluate the project based on the expected long-term operations, rather than that temporary excitement with the grand opening. And we have been working very closely with the property management team and we will continue to and have a traffic management plan in place to work through any of those beginning issues that arise. We all want the business to succeed and we all want the -- the shopping center to succeed and be safe and enjoyable and easy to navigate for everybody. So, we are really looking forward to being here in the beautiful city of Meridian and we really appreciate your time.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Question for the applicant. Looking at kind of those -- those generation and stacking numbers kind of over those different sites, are these averages -- I guess what is the -- what is the period we are looking at? Is this just a single day? Is this over the course of -- could you help me understand how representative these are of the norm?

Gantzert: Sure. So, they were taken over multiple days. Again, we focused on the peak hours. So, the 7:00 to 10:00 a.m. and the 4:00 to 7:00 p.m. hours.

Smith: And, then, for these studied locations is there any -- did you do any investigation or any research or any number crunching on the actual corridors? Obviously, with -- with trip capture being kind of a significant driver of traffic to the site. Do we have any numbers regarding average daily trips, you know, along the corridor that these businesses sit on, anything like that?

Gantzert: So, we don't -- we don't have that much in-depth data. I mean all of the sites are a little bit different, but, no, we don't have corresponding traffic generation data for each site. This was mostly focused just on the queuing and stacking and, then, some of the sites, again, just the trips in and out.

Smith: Okay. And Madam Chair? So, for these sites we have these kind of max total queues. Do you have any numbers for the amount of stacking lanes that -- the non-emergency stacking lanes and parking spots, et cetera, available at these locations?

Gantzert: So, we can take a look -- and Bill, I believe, is also on -- he is the traffic consultant as I had mentioned. They -- they were all varied. Some of the sites were

smaller sites, so they only really had one stacking lane. Some did have two. It was completely varied. I don't have that data in front of me.

Smith: Okay. Is there -- sorry. Just to be clear. Is there someone -- seems like they might have --

Gantzert: Mr. Burton's raising his hand, so he could possibly answer your question.

Lomeli: Chair, do you want me to allow him to talk now or wait for that testimony?

Smith: If that's kosher.

Lorcher: Yep. Mr. Burton, if you could just state your name and address for the record, please.

Burton: Yeah. Bill Burton with Fehr & Peers. I'm at 100 Pringle Avenue, Suite 600, in Walnut Creek, California. Yeah. I guess the -- the question here is do we have the -- are there two lanes or are there one lane and what is the total amount of stacking. The answer to that question is yes. I do not have that -- I do not have that answer here on the tip of my tongue, but all of that data is available and just to answer two previous questions. So, the queues that you are looking at here -- this is the maximum queue that was ever observed at these sites. So, when you see the -- the 24, the 14, the ten, that -- that's -- some -- the amount of data that's collected at each is -- varies. Some days it's three days, some days it's for a whole week. It all depends on -- on what a particular city is interested in looking at. But this -- this number and this table is basically the maximum queue ever observed. So, it's fairly conservative. And, then, on the question of the ADT, again, we have some of that information, not all. I don't have it at my fingertips. All of these sites are -- are located on fairly -- fairly well traveled arterial or collector roads I would say in kind of similar traffic conditions to that which is present at -- at this site.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Yeah. I guess to -- to help clarify -- and maybe this can be, you know, for Information for, you know, when you come back up at the end. What I'm specifically, you know, looking at is -- so, we saw through these kind of -- when we looked at these, you know, column charts, you know, we saw -- you know, there is some -- some -- some locations where, you know, we rise above kind of where -- where we would need to be using that emergency lane; right? There are some locations where that happens maybe once, some locations happens none, some locations it happens somewhat regularly. I'm trying to understand -- you know, we have this max total queue. I'm trying to understand for these locations what that number is kind of relative to the -- the stacking spaces available for these locations. So, for Aurora, max total queue is 23. Are there 24, you know, stacking -- stacking spots or, you know, parts of -- places in the

queue or is it 18? And, you know, we can be confident that 7Brew is able to get through those, you know, extra five pretty quickly. That's what I'm looking at, because, obviously, we have in the code you -- you are not able to use that emergency lane consistently, because that would be consistent with the tier three in Meridian. I'm trying to understand how often that usage would actually be. So, I don't know if you have any information on -- on hand or if that's just I guess helpful for later on, but that's specifically what I'm looking for.

Gantzert: Sure. And -- and, Commissioner Smith, I'm sharing my screen just so I can hopefully get you a very quick answer here in front of me by pulling the study and I do understand your question. I will share that information here in just a minute. But I think with the six pull forward spaces really we are able to capture kind of most of the max queue that we anticipate during the peak hours of that 7:00 to 9:00, 7:00 to 10:00 and I think that's just something I want to highlight where -- where that will really be where we see those maximum queues and hopefully given the fact that most of the center is still closed if there is slight spill over kind of into that drive aisle for a very very short period of time, like we said, it's five minutes or less, that is not impacting, you know, people going to park or using those drive aisles for the gym that's open at that time.

Smith: I understand. That's helpful. Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: One question for Bill. As you are listening to kind of this -- kind of the discussion of frequency of maybe having to use that emergency aisle, does that align with staff's understanding of what could stay within a tier two of a couple times per day or is it something rarer or more common?

Parsons: Yeah. Madam -- Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, I -- I think we are in alignment with the applicant on that. I -- I actually like the sound of that. If car five or six is in the back and they only ordered one coffee and they can get it to the customer quicker and they still have that lane open for that car to pull out, to me that just helps them operate -- operate the drive through more efficiently. So, I think the first time I have kind of heard someone say they have used their -- their bypass lane that way or seen them do that, because I have been to many other coffee franchises and I haven't gotten that opportunity to do that. Usually you are stuck in that queuing and you wait until you get to the window and get your order. So, the fact that they can accommodate that and I appreciate the fact that the applicant got the overflow parking as well. I think that is going to certainly help alleviate that escape lane being used more than it should be.

Smith: And so -- so, that would be the occasion -- a few -- handful of times per day would still stay under the threshold for a tier three, is that --

Parsons: I would say so, yes. I don't think staff would have any concern with that.

Smith: Okay. Thank you.

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: I just want to reassure the applicant that I have read through everything actually twice and watched the video from the last hearing. So, I think I'm pretty up to date on this. Could you pull up the site plan again? I have some questions about the actual flow of an individual vehicle through the site. It looks like most vehicles will be heading north in that entrance there and, then, make a right into the site; correct?

Gantzert: Yes.

Perreault: And, then, there is a little bump out there that says that exists -- that's asphalt that exists I assume for access to the waste. Is that raised or is that flat?

Gantzert: It is not. That's just a concrete hatch. So, it's just flat.

Perreault: It's flat. Okay. So, vehicles can drive over that?

Gantzert: Yes.

Perreault: Okay. And, then, they -- they continue east and, then, they make a right and, then, they make another right here?

Gantzert: So, if -- if they are coming through the main drive aisle, right, they go into the site, they make a right and, then, make another right. Correct.

Perreault: Okay. So, the -- the vehicle that -- that enters the lane --

Gantzert: Uh-huh.

Perreault: -- is that a really sharp right that they are going to have to -- are they going to have to kind of swing around towards the vehicles parked to the east to get into that lane? There is a -- there is a coffee shop here in Meridian where that has to be done and the vehicles consistently take the planter out and they have destroyed the curb and it's really hard to get into that lane and it actually causes stacking problems into the parking lot. So, I'm just curious how that flow is actually going to happen around there, because it seems like it's a very sharp turn.

Gantzert: Sure. And -- and this particular island actually gives us a little more radius, so a car is able to go ahead and make the turn and get into the lane and one thing I want to point out -- I know in the picture it kind of looks like, you know, a small car, but this truck turning template is designed for like an F-150 truck. So, this accounts for a pretty big car. So, it's -- it's a little bit deceiving when you look at the picture where it

just looks like a small car, but this anticipates a pretty big car being able to make the turn and we have run truck turns and they are still able to clear that island to get in.

Perreault: Okay. Thank you.

Gantzert: Sure.

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

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. I have Russ Orsi. Brenton Jackson.

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

Jackson: Sure. Brenton Jackson.

Lorcher: Oh, move the microphone a little closer to you. Thanks.

Jackson: Brenton Jackson. 595 Millets Drive, Suite 106, Campbell, California.

Lorcher: Okay.

Jackson: I represent the operator who will be operating at this site.

Lorcher: Okay.

Jackson: We currently have one other open stand that is in Denver. It is not the Aurora stand that was referenced earlier, it is actually in Denver proper. We have been operating it for two months and I pulled our recent traffic data from last week. We had one visit last Thursday that was longer than three minutes and for most of the hours all of our visits were less than one minute. So, Commissioner Smith, you were asking earlier how quickly we could get folks through. I think we can get folks through very quickly and that is certainly one of our operational goals, as well as one of the seven corporate operational goals. So, it doesn't help us. We don't want folks to come and hang out with us. We want them to get their coffee and move along. They are a lot happier after they get their coffee.

Lorcher: I'm sure. In regard to your -- you said Denver proper; correct? So, is it in a similar situation where it's in kind of a destination mall type thing where there is other restaurants or drive-throughs surrounding the business?

Jackson: It is in a Costco development.

Lorcher: Okay.

Jackson: And so certainly the Costco drives a lot of traffic and -- not as much in the morning, because they aren't open. It would actually be very similar to here. And they are looking at adding additional restaurants and drive throughs to that shop -- to that parking lot, because we haven't been a problem for them in their parking.

Lorcher: Okay. Any other questions for this -- all right. Thank you very much.

Jackson: Thank you.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, I have Hugh Crawford.

Lorcher: Hello, Mr. Crawford.

Crawford: Hi.

Lorcher: If you can state your name and address for the record.

Crawford: Yeah. Hugh Crawford. 3597 East Monarch Sky Lane, Meridian, Idaho.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Crawford: Yeah. My name is Hugh Crawford. I'm the vice-president of property management with CenterCal Properties. I have been managing The Village at Meridian since 2012 when it first opened. I'm very, you know, involved in the traffic and the parking and the impact that the shopping center has and the neighborhood. We are very passionate about making sure we are a good neighbor and so when we are looking at this pad on what we wanted to bring to The Village at Meridian -- we were very conscious about the demands that our other tenants had for parking and the flow in the parking lot and we strategically selected this tenant because of two reasons. One, it's a very low impact parking tenant. They are drive-through concept, so there is not a restaurant where people are coming and parking for an hour and eating and taking up a parking stall, it's not an office tenant where -- which is another concept that we are going to put where people park in a parking stall for six, seven hours a day. Very low impact. I don't know if anybody would -- is planning on parking maybe one or two cars a day would park and walk up and get a drink and, then, it also -- the timing of the flow of -- we consciously said, well, a coffee shop would be ideal, because their demand is in the morning, the demand for our parking is low in the morning, except for some gym users and, then, as the shopping center starts picking up the coffee shop demand balances out and tapers off towards the afternoon and the evening, which is when The Village at Meridian hits its peak. So, we strategically went out and -- and marketed and merchandised this site for a concept like 7Brew and they are a great brand that is very responsible and understanding of what is being asked and we have had a lot of conversations with them about working very closely to create a plan. I'm sure you are all aware when we opened In-N-Out. It was a huge demand, we worked tirelessly for months with the tenant, with the City, Meridian Police Department, to create a strategy and a plan that worked flawlessly. No impact to city streets. The parking in the middle

of Christmas in December worked fabulously. Flow continued. We continued to have great sales. It shows that CenterCal and our tenants work closely to come up with a very strong plan and a very strong strategy to make sure we are not impacting others and -- and 7Brews is on board with that. We will make their grand opening impact very minimal and work with them to, you know, make sure that they are a great tenant and meets the needs of the shopping center and the surrounding community.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much.

Crawford: Any questions or --

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Yes. I had one question. It is specifically regarding kind of what I tend to see in that area kind of in the evening -- evening hours. I know this is a -- you know, the In-N-Out and kind of the radiating out from there seems to be a good kind of magnet for high school age kids to come and hang out in their trucks, et cetera, which I -- you know, I don't -- I don't know what the line between loitering and third spaces are, but, you know, I'm generally okay with that, but I have seen times where like there is -- circulation is -- is being, you know, limited because of, you know, there is cars that are gathering or people are stopping in the middle of the drive aisle to have a conversation, et cetera, and I see a lot of that around here. This location. I guess are there plans -- I'm happy to see these -- these six kind of parking spots being dedicated. You know, what does kind of enforcement look like on that? What -- how do you kind of balance making sure people feel welcome to visit the center while keeping, you know, traffic flowing, especially during busy hours?

Crawford: So, how is like the -- the impact of In-N-Out radiating out into --

Smith: Yeah. For -- for other clients and for -- for the rest of -- of the -- the -- for the rest of the locations nearby, how do you kind of manage keeping traffic flowing?

Crawford: We -- through use of our security, communicating with the -- you know, we have a no loitering. If you are not, you know, visiting one of our businesses, then, we ask you to move on. So, kids can't just come and sit and hang out in front of In-N-Out unless they are dining at In-N-Out and we have worked closely with Meridian PD and if we have a problem Meridian PD comes and helps and support keeping the -- you know, the parking lot free of loitering. We don't just let car clubs hang out, we don't just let groups of kids hang out in the parking lot, we have -- we -- we have them move on or they -- if they are not shopping or dining at one of the businesses at The Village at Meridian and we have been learning as the traffic at In-N-Out -- so, you may have seen it, but it's also something that's being addressed on a daily basis with increased security patrols in coordination with Meridian PD and keeping cars and -- you know, not just sitting and gathering.

Smith: So, you -- you mentioned increasing -- is there -- have you found there to be a problem in -- or have -- have you had trouble enforcing this?

Crawford: I wouldn't say we have had trouble, it's just something we deal with and address it every day.

Smith: Okay. Thank you.

Lorcher: Any other questions? Thank you very much.

Crawford: All right. Thank you.

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

Lorcher: Is there anyone online that would like to speak? Is there anyone in Chambers that would like to speak? Mira, would you like to make any other comments in regard to testimony this evening?

Gantzert: No, I don't think so. I just want to say again thank you for kind of listening to the additional facts we have and, again, I just want to point out that our intent is that our peak hours are that morning time and we will not impact the center as heavily after the 6:00 p.m. time and operation -- operationally we are -- we are much different than kind of the In-N-Out or, you know, maybe fast food restaurants with food and so we just have very quick turnaround times and we want to be a good neighbor and the operator and the Center will do what they can to keep everything running smoothly and not impede traffic or other customers for the shopping center. So, thank you again.

Lorcher: Thank you very much.

Gelsomino: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Gelsomino.

Gelsomino: Just one final question for the applicant. May I -- just a quick final question. I know you can't have a full crystal ball, but how soon would a new location -- or do you predict a new location would open in the Treasure Valley area or surrounding areas that you mentioned earlier that would alleviate that eventual congestion?

Gantzert: So, we are actively looking at sites. I mean we want to be in the city as you guys have mentioned before, as well as the Commissioners mentioned, it's a -- it's a growing city, we want to be here, so we are actively looking to see what locations are possible and when we find the right one the -- we -- we want to be here, you know, as soon as possible.

Gelsomino: Thank you.

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

Smith: So moved.

Stoll: It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing for 7Brew Coffee. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Lorcher: I -- I will first admit I am not a coffee drinker, so going through some of these lines -- my kids are, so I have been through them and we have plenty -- we have many choices here in the Treasure Valley. I do visit The Village on occasion. It is not in my circle -- daily circle, so I don't always go there, but I think they have been -- answered the questions that we had asked of them from our last meeting to provide those extra spaces, to be able to show a flow chart of how the traffic is going to go. The fact that they have runners moving their product, as opposed to always having to go to the window like some of our other businesses do I think will definitely help move things through and especially if they are predicting a three to five minute window -- even less. You said three minutes I think in Denver was the average time that somebody was in line to be able to get their product and having that escape lane just in case that they have a big order. So, I was in support of this at the last meeting. I am in support of this again. I think it's a good addition, especially since the hours are staggered with some of the other businesses.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Yeah. So, at the last meeting I was not in support of this and I appreciate the work that the applicant has done. I think there was some -- some questions that I had that are still not fully answered, you know, still -- still some things that maybe give me a little bit of heartburn around, you know, not understanding kind of average daily trips on the -- you know, the adjacent corridor -- transportation corridor and kind of the -- the average queues and understanding kind of those -- those ratios, you know, I think there -- my mind would be more at ease with those, but I do really think the addition of these six parking spots with them being dedicated and enforceable to be for 7Brew, I mean that nearly doubles our -- our -- the allowable stacking space and I -- I don't think that there was a way that I could have supported that -- this application without this -- without that change. I still do have some -- some -- some nitpicks and some qualms and I still do have a little bit of unease about this, but I -- I'm much more open to supporting this and so I think I will be in support of this. I just -- I would really -- I appreciate the work that The Village, you know, has put into keeping circulation flowing in this area and I just -- I would encourage them to -- to, you know, keep those efforts up and to -- to redouble those efforts, because I have seen plenty of -- of gathering in the area and, again, I'm not opposed to -- you know, I'm also not a business owner in the area, I'm not opposed to some kids gathering and meeting together in space. That's

certainly something that I think is good to see, so -- of -- of kids outside of their homes. But I just -- the circulation still gives me some pause. I don't think it's enough to oppose this anymore. But just wanted to get that on the record.

Lorcher: All right. Thank you.

Gelsomino: Madam Chair?

Perreault: Madam Chair.

Lorcher: Commissioner Gelsomino.

Gelsomino: Madam Chair, thank you. I will echo -- being that I was the only other voice of opposition on the application in the last meeting, I will echo a lot of the sentiments that my fellow Commissioner Smith voiced tonight. I do appreciate the applicant's efforts and the -- the data, the information, the adjustments and the flexibility that they have shown tonight with these. I -- of course I still do have my hesitations as well. My mind has dwelled on the thought of -- on two thoughts. On what is the impact going to be on -- on the citizens and the -- and the other visitors and tenants of The Village and, then, does a drive through coffee shop make sense in that particular spot and I have gone back and forth with that knowing that the property manager and someone who has had more experience and the team at The Village has, you know, done their due diligence and has actually marketed for this business to be in this particular location, that does add a little bit more ease of mind, because that means that there has been a strategic plan behind this and -- and the work done behind it. Like I said the traffic, the congestion still does give me pause, but I also am no longer in a position to be in opposition to this applicant.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you, Madam Chair. I do want to say thank you also to the applicant for working really diligently on this. I know you do this in front of many different cities and they all have different expectations and requirements when you come to these meetings. So, thank you very much for working on this. I won't repeat what my fellow Commissioners have shared, because I -- I do absolutely agree with them. I would have significantly more hesitation if it weren't for those additional parking spots and we will make sure we put those in as a condition of -- of approval. One thing I wanted to just follow up on with my fellow Commissioners is is there any -- any thought on whether we sort of give a probation time on the tier two, like do we -- do we say, hey, in six months maybe we should reassess whether this is really operating in a tier two level. I don't know if that's something that's permitted and I don't know who exactly would be obligated to -- to do that follow up, but just with something that came to my mind from the -- the last hearing when -- when our attorney had mentioned, hey, you know, make sure that you -- you offer -- if there is concerns make sure you offer different opportunities or -- or ways to sort of mitigate those versus, you know, voting in denial of an application. So, just curious my fellow commissioners thoughts on that.

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault, Bill Parsons can answer that question.

Parsons: Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, certainly with the conditional use permit you can control the duration of it. So, that's certainly within your purview to say do X, Y and Z. Now, do I think six months is the right number? I don't know. They still may be in their introductory period at that point. I mean we could even -- I don't know how popular 7Brew is. This is the first time I have ever heard of this franchise as well. I have younger daughters and they told me it's very popular. So, I know it will be a hit with the -- with the younger generation and I'm sure they are going to be very successful here. But, again, typically when we do things -- if we do limit a use for a while it's usually, you know, a year, three years, five year period. I don't know if we need to go to that extreme. Certainly that is within your purview to do that.

Lorcher: How long is this conditional use permit? Three years?

Parsons: Well, not necessarily. A conditional use permit runs with the land, unless you add a condition of approval that says you come back in another five years or -- for example, you would say come back in six months or three years and we will evaluate you then. You get another conditional use permit. We have done it before. It's rare. It's usually -- it's a tool that we use to allow someone to operate for a finite time, because they have other visions for the property. I think the applicant is here for the long term. I don't see them going anywhere if they were to operate if there were an issue -- code enforcement issue and that stacking lane or that bypass lane became an issue certainly we could reach out. We have a good relationship with you, no doubt about it. I know I hear his name quite a bit. We would certainly reach out to them and say, hey, how can you help us with this situation and they would be more than willing to come to the table and figure out a solution to either, one, maybe say you need to amend your CUP to go to that tier three where you -- again, you would have a bite at that apple to be a recommending body and it would move on to City Council to convert it from a tier two to a tier three. So, I don't want you to think we don't have that ability to do that. We do. But as staff I wouldn't -- I would caution you to say come back in six months and let us reevaluate it. It's just -- it's -- I don't think it's going to be enough time.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: To kind of opine on -- on that from my end. I think -- I think on the tier three aspect I think I'm okay with that being more of a -- kind of complaint driven, you know, or issue driven kind of process. I'm not opposed to it. If we want to say, hey, in two years come back. Honestly, if they come back in two years and traffic's flowing fine, I'm okay with it being 24 hours. You know, I have never been opposed to -- my issue has never been between the hours of 11:00 p.m. and 5:00 a.m. Those have not been the hours in question for me. So, also getting that on the record of, you know, if this is flowing fine I'm okay, you know, if we want to bake in something to say, hey, let's revisit this in two years or whatever. I don't -- I don't feel super strongly about it either way.

But I think there is also areas where it could be useful not just for saying, hey, does this need to be a tier three, but also saying, hey, they wanted to do 24 hours, is that still something they want to do. This could be a good time to review that. Just food for thought.

Stoll: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Stoll.

Stoll: I was supportive of the application last time we heard it. I think they met the criteria that the city has laid out for a CUP. I wouldn't be supportive of adding a review period to it. I think if there is a problem let the in enforce process take care of it and working with you and if they wanted to redo the CUP at a later date, then, let the staff bring it back at that point in time. But I'm supportive of the application as presented. I think they have addressed additional questions that were raised at the last meeting and I would vote to move forward.

Lorcher: Commissioner Sandoval, do you have any comments?

Sandoval: Madam Chair, nothing else to add. Thank you.

Lorcher: So, with that, after considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to approve File No. H-2026-0017 --

Stoll: Second.

Lorcher: Well, let me finish.

Stoll: Oh, sorry. Oh, you paused.

Lorcher: I did, because I was double checking my numbers.

Stoll: Okay. Sorry.

Lorcher: 0017 for 7Brew on the hearing date of July 2nd, 2026, with no modifications.

Stoll: Seconded.

Smith: Madam Chair, just as a point of clarification. I -- I think we would need to modify to require the six parking spots.

Lorcher: Is that in the staff report?

Parsons: Madam Chair, it is not, so I was going to also have you -- maker of the motion add that as a condition and any direction on the hours of operation if the Commission feels like they need to restrict them to 5:00 -- 5:00 a.m. and 11:00 p.m. and, again, if the

applicant wanted to go 24/7 they could come back at a later date and apply to amend that condition.

Lorcher: All right. I will do this again. After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to approve File No. H-2026-0017 as presented in the staff report, including the six designated overflow parking spaces and the hours of operation from 5:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. on the hearing date of July 2nd, 2026.

Stroll: Seconded.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to approve 7Brew. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries. Thank you for your patience. We appreciate it.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

3. Public Hearing for High Desert Veterinary Hospital (H-2026-0022) by Travis Butterfield and McCarter Moorhouse, located at 3147 W. Belltower Dr.

- A. Request: Conditional Use Permit for an Animal Care Facility on approximately 0.397 acres of land currently zoned L-O.

Lorcher: All right. We are going to move on to Item No. 3, 2026-0022, High Desert Veterinary Hospital, for conditional use permit on Bell Tower Drive and we will start with the staff report.

Parsons: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. As you noted, this is a conditional use permit to operate an animal care facility from an existing 3,200 square foot office building that is under construction or nearing completion. It's going to be getting certificate of occupancy fairly soon. So, the site here -- it sits on roughly .4 of an acre. The land is currently zoned L-O and the property is located at 3147 West Bell Tower Drive. A little history on the site. In 2025 this one lot was subdivided through a short plat process to subdivide one parcel into four parcels. This property sits on one of the four platted parcels, which is highlighted here on Lot 1, Block 1. Also the certificate of zoning compliance and design review has been approved for the entire site, so not only are the pad sites done, but the applicant's also installed all of the parking that you see here and the associated landscaping that's in front of you. So, really, this conditional use permit is required, because a vet clinic -- and we define it as an animal care facility -- does require a conditional use permit in the L-O zone. So, again, the building is done, they are just trying to get a tenant to go in there and move in. You can see here on the site plan with animal care facilities there are specific use standards that the applicant has to comply with and really there is two. One, make sure there is no odors and, two, make sure the animals are in a secure location and being supervised at all times. So, you can see here on the exhibit here where there is going to be a small area for the tenant to allow the animals to go out and use the restroom, but the intent is to keep animals inside the facilities at all times and under supervision. Also mention to

the Commission that there is a condition of approval that the applicant is not proposing to have any boarding or killing of animals overnight. Again in the L-O zone not allowed to operate a 24 hour facility. It's prohibited. Hours of operation in the L-O zone are between 6:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. And, then, just as that -- on that side note the -- this facility is also proposed to operate between 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. So, they are well within that hours of operation allowed in that L-O zoning district. Had a chance to look at the public record. There was no public comments on this application. Staff is recommending approval with conditions of approval and I will stand for any questions you may have.

Lorcher: Would the applicant like to come forward? Are they here tonight? Are you the applicant?

Butterfield: Yes.

Lorcher: Oh. Can you come up for just a second. Not to put you on the spot, but we are going to do that. If you can state your name and address for the record, please.

Butterfield: All right. My name is Travis Butterfield at 17438 North Newell Avenue in Nampa. 83687.

Lorcher: Do you have anything to add to the staff report for your application this evening?

Butterfield: No. Mr. Parsons covered it perfectly.

Lorcher: Commissioners, do we have any questions? All right. That's all I needed you for. Thank you.

Butterfield: Thank you very much.

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

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. We have Tony Nicholson.

Lorcher: Good evening. If you can state your name and address for the record, please.

Nicholson: Tony Nicholson. 4167 North Montellano Way, Meridian, Idaho. 83646.

Lorcher: Okay.

Nicholson: And on this site plan I live directly to the right-hand side where the -- the road comes out. I just have a couple of questions and concerns. One probably for Bill. Was the building soundproofed per the CUP requirements?

Lorcher: Okay.

Nicholson: And also he verified the hours, which was my other questions. I would like to see a restriction on the hours.

Lorcher: What -- the hours are during business hours. What was it, Bill? 8:00 --

Nicholson: 8:00 to 6:00.

Lorcher: 8:00 to 6:00?

Nicholson: Which -- which is great, because it was 10:00 p.m. before, so --

Lorcher: Okay. So, 8:00 to 6:00. And is that Monday through Friday?

Nicholson: Monday through Friday --

Lorcher: Okay.

Nicholson: -- is what they proposed.

Lorcher: Okay. So, the soundproofing and you got the answer for your hours.

Nicholson: Yeah. And, then, my second one is he mentioned the odor. Did they submit a specialized plan for detailing how they are going to handle clinical and animal waste? How it's going to be stored and disposed of?

Lorcher: Okay.

Nicholson: If that's part of the CUP requirements.

Lorcher: Okay. We will ask the applicant to address those. Thank you. Madam Clerk, do we have anybody else signed up to testify?

Lomeli: Madam Chair, we have Jenny Nicholson.

Lorcher: You are good? Okay.

Lomeli: No one else has signed up.

Lorcher: Anybody on Zoom? Can the applicant come forward again? I'm sorry. I don't remember your name.

Butterfield: Travis Butterfield.

Lorcher: Travis. Thank you. Travis, can you address Mr. Nicholson's concern about soundproofing and animal waste?

Butterfield: The animal waste -- the biohazard stuff, they do have a plan for that. They have a freezer. They have all the proper necessities. They already work at a vet clinic. They are a husband and wife team. They have been doing this for a lot of years and now they are going out on their own and so they have everything that is needed for an animal clinic for their specialty.

Lorcher: Okay. And the soundproofing as well?

Butterfield: The soundproofing. Our standard is that we insulate all walls, every single wall inside the building, so all the animals will be in the back, which is closer to the Ten Mile Road than the neighborhood and so it would have to go through several layers of walls to cause any nuisance.

Lorcher: Okay.

Butterfield: So --

Lorcher: Thank you very much. Any questions -- commissioners, do you have any questions for --

Gelsomino: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: -- for Travis? Go ahead.

Gelsomino: Excuse me. Travis. And quick question. Did we specify if they are -- sorry, Bill. First for you? Did we specify there is any surgical procedures that are done at this particular clinic?

Butterfield: Yes, they will do surgeries there.

Gelsomino: Okay. Perfect. So, with that, you know, I have two dogs and one of them just out of nowhere a couple weeks ago fractured his dewclaw, so unexpected, you know, so things happen with pets that are unexpected and especially during surgeries. What is the clinic's plan -- because being that the conditions expressly prohibit overnight boarding and kenneling, what is the clinic's plan if a patient requires emergency overnight care, for example, post-surgical monitoring?

Butterfield: So, if they have to do that they will refer it out to one of the animal hospitals that are 24 hours. They have the ability to board it overnight. Really, they don't want to -- if -- if they know up front that it's going to be this big a deal they will immediately refer them to someone that can take the animal overnight. Otherwise, their intent is to just manage what they can during the day. But, yes, stuff does happen, but they -- they refer that out. They don't want to hold any animals at all.

Gelsomino: Perfect. Thank you.

Lorcher: Any other questions for Travis? Thank you very much.

Butterfield: Thank you.

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

Gelsomino: So moved.

Stoll: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Lorcher: This seems pretty straightforward. It's an in-fill project of a group of buildings that are already there that will be retrofitted to support this animal care facility. It sounds like that they are taking the care to make sure that the animals are closer to the busy side of the street, so it impacts the neighborhood less. All the landscaping and site requirements have been -- have already been established, so I'm in support of this project.

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: I just want to say that I live very close to a veterinary clinic and it has a very small -- small parking lot, even more opportunity for animals to get out on the road, but I have never seen an escaped animal and I have never had any smell issues and so I -- as somebody that has that scenario fairly close to my house I think it's doable in a neighborhood. I think it adds a lot of benefit to have those kind of services near so many residences in the community.

Lorcher: Any other comments or a motion?

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to approve File No. H-2026-0022.

Stoll: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to approve High Desert Veterinary Hospital. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much. Appreciate it.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

4. Public Hearing for Victory Stake Center (H-2026-0016) by Johnny Watson, generally located at the northwest corner of W. Victory Rd and S. Linder Rd.

- A. Request: Annexation of 5.81 acres of land with the R-8 zoning to construct a 22,630 sq. ft. church.
- B. Request: Conditional Use Permit for a church in the R-8 zoning district.

Lorcher: Item No. 4 on the agenda is the Victory Stake Center, which is a request for annexation and a conditional use permit at Victory and Linder and we will start with the staff report.

Parsons: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. As you stated, this is a request for annexation and conditional use permit. The subject site consists of 5.81 acres of land, currently zoned RUT in Ada county and is generally located at the northwest corner of Victory Road and Linder Road. You can see the future land use designation of this property is low density residential. The other thing that I would mention as part of tonight's discussion is typically when we have an LDR designated property residents -- or the Commission and Council usually typically sees an R-2 and an R-4 zoning district associated with that designation. However, in this case churches are not allowed in the R-4 or R-2 zoning district, so in order for them to annex this in and develop it with the stake center as proposed, the code requires them to request an R-8 zone and that's why you see a little different zoning than what you would typically see in an LDR designated area. As staff noted in the staff report, the church use is still generally consistent with the low density residential. We anticipate residential, but, again, through the zoning ordinance there are allowances for some nonresidential uses, which a church is one of those. There is the annexation boundary there and, then, their concept plan or site plan required with the conditional use permit, they are proposing to develop an approximately 22,000 square foot LDS stake center or church on the site, place of religious worship I should say. One of the unique things with this project is access. You can see with the -- the overall configuration of the property and with the future plans of a roundabout at that intersection of Linder and Victory, the applicant's location of a church is very limited in how it can be placed. One of the challenges that came with this project was the number of access points that would be allowed to -- for this property. The applicant worked very closely with the Ada County Highway District and just based on the influence of that roundabout and the limited -- and the limited frontage on Amity Road -- sorry. Not Amity. Linder Road. ACHD was very concerned with access and so they only allowed the applicant -- they have only approved one

access to this subject property, which is -- and it's located here. So, that -- this is the one access point that will serve the -- the church. Also in the applicant's narrative they did state that they could have up to 300 occupants at this church at any one time, but, again, the intent is for it to be mostly Sunday worship. There are some limited activities during the week, but the majority of the activity will be happening on Sundays, which is off during -- which is not your most peak travel times, like your -- your typical work week. The applicant's also agreed to try to work on traffic mitigation or somebody to help with traffic services on Sunday if that does become an issue, to help move traffic in the area if congestion does become a problem. Staff doesn't anticipate that. I don't think ACHD anticipates that either. Here is the -- the proposed landscape plan that the applicant has set forward. Because access is limited -- so, the site here is consistent with UDC standards. The applicant will work with staff on some drought tolerant waterwise concepts and try to minimize water resources as they develop the site and work with staff. Stepping back a little bit for the access, because access is limited, we are requiring that they provide cross-access to the west and to the north. The flexibility that we gave the applicant is we don't want to define a specific location at this time, because as you look at the overall area of -- the vicinity of the area, there are some estate -- large estate lots that surround this property and so they may redevelop in the future or they may not, but if they do redevelop and other local streets are provided near proximity to the church, then, there will be an opportunity for them to tie into that street network or potentially a common driveway in the future to help alleviate and move traffic in the area in the future. At least that's our hope and our goal with that condition of approval. Here is the proposed elevations. One thing that staff did mention in the staff report was the height of the steeple. So, under the code there are some exceptions to allow taller appurtenances for churches and when there is not occupiable space. This particular drawing is over what the height is allowed in the -- by the zoning code. So, the applicant will have to work with staff and adjust his plans accordingly and lower the height of the steeple to -- I believe the staff report called out a maximum of 55 feet. So, they have been conditioned to do that. They have to do that to meet the height requirements of the zone. So, I did look at the public record. I did not see where anyone had provided public testimony on this application. Again, staff is recommending approval of both the annexation and the conditional use permit with the provisions of the DA and the conditions of approval and I would stand for any questions you have on this application.

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Can you bring back up the -- the -- there you go. So, it looks like most of the parking there being on that east side, vehicles are going to have to go behind the building to get to that and there is a real slim area there just on the north. Curious how -- if you had conversation with the applicant about how the vehicles are going to move past one another, is that wide enough for two vehicles, whatnot?

Parsons: So, Madam Chair, Commissioner Perreault, yes, it -- per code the minimum is 20 feet to allow for two way traffic. So, that is more than adequate to -- to allow for two way traffic.

Lorcher: Would the applicant like to come forward?

Watson: Thank you, Bill. Johnny Watson. 1152 Bond Avenue, Rexburg, Idaho. I don't -- I'm not going to bore you with a whole bunch of details, but Bill hit the nail on the head when he said we have worked on a lot of different scenarios to try to make this fit. You know, ignorance is never an excuse or is -- or the city's, you know, problem to -- to resolve, but when you are working with a big corporation a lot of times these properties are just sitting in a database and somebody says, oh, we have got five acres in Meridian and we desperately need a building. It will work great. But the reality of this particular parcel -- I think, Tina, if I just arrow down that's going to get me where I'm going?

Lomeli: Try the left or right arrows and there is a little bit of a lag, so if you give it a second.

Watson: Okay.

Lomeli: There you go.

Watson: So, they don't always really dig into it deep of what -- what's going to -- what the effect is. So, it looks like you have this nice big lot, but, then, when you actually boil down to it and you talk to our friends or dreams guy at ACHD, that we all of a sudden -- you know, they give us this roundabout to put on there and you really -- we start to give back 50 feet of right of way on two sides. Then we add the footprint of the roundabout and we had to wait until I think in December when they had a hearing or something to decide if it was going to be two lanes or one lane. Found out it was going to be two, so that crunches us a little bit. And we have -- we have had two application -- or pre-application meetings with staff and they were just very helpful and we did our very best to try to get this building to address the roundabout and it's -- I mean the owner uses a standard building and without doing a custom building it becomes way too wide and too -- too much to -- to get it towards that roundabout and -- and -- and comply with the -- let's say the -- the feel good portions of our -- you know, of -- of the unified code of let's get the parking behind the building, let's give the building nice street presence, you know, and so we -- we did a number of -- I mean a lot of scenarios that we presented to the owner and -- and in order just to get their patrons in this building this ended up being the -- the very best we could do. Now, we recognize that we have a lot of parking on that east side and so what we did is we went -- we looked at the landscape ordinances for the 25 foot buffer and our initial approach may be incorrect, because Bill mentioned that we need to work maybe on some more drought tolerant things, but we really tried to boost up that buffer to help make that still a very pedestrian friendly, very nice buffered area around the landscape -- around there and still give you a really good streetscape and get close to the -- I have some just really quick, you know, images, but -- and we will still work with staff, you know, but our intent, you know, is -- I just wanted to show you is that we -- we recognize that we have challenges to overcome and the city has objectives that they want to achieve in this kind of streetscape for their citizens and visitors and our goals are aligned, it's just we are trying to get this -- this thing to fit and -- and get you a roundabout, too. The one in question -- and -- and I probably should

have asked Nick or Bill beforehand -- that's a little puzzling to me is we do have -- we are allowed 55 feet is a maximum height and your -- your unified code actually allows a appurtenances. I never can say that word, Bill. An exemption of 20 feet. So, I actually could put a steep -- I could actually build a building 55 feet tall with a -- an appurtenance 20 feet above that, which is shorter than what we are proposing. So, we will work through -- I will work through that with Bill. But at least -- it seems to me that I could actually go higher if we wanted to by -- according to your ordinance.

Lorcher: Is that true?

Parsons: Madam Commissioner, Members of the Commission, I -- I don't have the code memorized, but the maximum height in the R-8 district is 35 feet and typically when we have appurtenances they can go up to 20 feet above the maximum height. So, that's where it's 35 feet to the building and, then, an additional 20 feet for the appurtenance, which gets us the 55. That's how we get there.

Watson: So, I -- I have the -- because I -- in Nick's staff report he said 55 feet was the maximum and I read that as --

Lorcher: Yeah. That's at the top of the steeple.

Watson: Right. So --

Parsons: Sorry. That is the top of the appurtenance on the building.

Watson: So, I -- I was incorrect. So, I retract that. So, thank you.

Lorcher: Are you committed to this 65 feet or can you -- or 69 feet or are you amiable to the 55 feet?

Watson: We are dying to build the building.

Lorcher: Okay.

Watson: They -- they really need a building. So, that -- that's probably the least --

Lorcher: Worry?

Watson: Least worry that they have. Yeah.

Lorcher: Okay.

Watson: Yeah.

Lorcher: Did you have any other comments?

Watson: No. I'm good.

Lorcher: I do have a question for you before I pass it on to Commissioner Stoll. Did you have a neighborhood meeting?

Watson: Yes.

Lorcher: And how do your neighbors that are adjacent to your backyard feel about your property?

Watson: Well, we had it back in March and I just barely got out of the hospital, because I was beat to death by them and -- no. I'm -- I'm kidding. We did have a neighborhood meeting and most of them I recognize that are here. I thought it was a really good meeting. We had some really good dialogue. Talked about, you know, concerns. I think -- most of us all share the same concern, which is the impact of the roundabout and I felt like we did our best to show that we were going to be a compliment to the neighborhood. We do understand that, you know, on Sunday we -- we do create a lot of traffic compared to maybe a little more quieter use or something, but we don't have much on as -- on the weekday and we recognize that there already is currently a traffic issue. So, we apologize for that, but we did -- I appreciated the time to be able to talk and meet with them. So, we will -- we will see if they agree.

Lorcher: And, then, until there is actual different access points is -- is your client open to having traffic control to be able to move people in and out of that building --

Watson: Yes.

Lorcher: -- after Sunday service?

Watson: That is correct. The other question is I -- we don't know what the schedule is for the roundabout. If it's three years, four years; right? If we would be able to have an access that we could then -- when the round -- you know, maybe one on Linder to help disperse the traffic right now until the roundabout comes and, then, we remove it as per their guidelines.

Lorcher: Got you. Commissioner Stoll, did you have a question?

Stoll: Excuse me. So, are you amenable to staff's recommendation regarding cross-access if --

Watson: Yes.

Stoll: -- development occurs at a later date?

Watson: Yes. That -- really, I mean based on the ACHD's documents their -- you know, their requirements, it's -- that's really our only option of future relief.

Stoll: And have you brought up the idea of temporary access to ACHD?

Watson: At this stage we are not getting past what the manual says.

Stoll: Okay.

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: So, given the site constraints can you just show -- just out of curiosity share a little bit more about why this is such an ideal location versus finding somewhere else for -- for the church?

Watson: Your community is growing at such a rate and I'm doing another facility that I wish was annexed in -- that I would be annexing into your community that's in the county just right over on the -- where McDermott used to be that I'm going through sewer and water -- you know, well issues in a NP study area and it is a disaster. These types of facilities need -- really need to be on municipal systems and to find property like that available in the area that it's -- the facility is needed is nearly impossible.

Lorcher: Was this land donated?

Watson: I don't know that. I'm sure it was.

Lorcher: Okay.

Watson: But --

Lorcher: Because the one on -- at McDermott that's across the street from my house, the Rice family -- elder Rice donated those five acres to the -- to the church and that's why that one's there. I don't know Victory and Linder if that land was donated specifically for the church.

Watson: Right. We had our neighborhood meeting at the one over on -- I can't think of the -- the road. A mile to the east or whatever. But, yeah, this stake, what they call it, is just busting at the seams and --

Lorcher: Right.

Watson: -- they are just begging me to get this thing built for them, so --

Lorcher: Okay. All right. Any other questions for the applicant before we take public testimony? All right. Thank you very much. Madam Clerk, do we have anyone signed up to testify?

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. We have Cindy Bird.

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

Bird: Thank you. My name is Cindy Bird and --

Lorcher: Just in the microphone, please.

Bird: My name -- thank you. My name is Cindy Bird and we live at 1570 West Victory Road, Meridian.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you.

Bird: And we are straight across there from Linder to these guys and so my concern is that -- and I understand that they are losing part of their -- their property for the roundabout. Eventually myself and our other neighbor apparently would lose our homes.

Lorcher: Oh.

Bird: And so, you know, I understand Mortensen -- Steven Mortensen deeded the property to the LDS people.

Lorcher: Okay.

Bird: And like I said to the LDS people -- you could -- you could have sold it to the county or to ACHD. But they -- I understand that they want to build their church, serve their people and I do understand that, but we don't like losing our homes after 30, almost 40 years.

Lorcher: Right. Have you talked to ACHD?

Bird: When this all started we did. We sent letters. We did. And we thought they were doing the roundabout with just one, but it actually cut -- with the two it cuts the corner of our house off.

Lorcher: Okay.

Bird: So -- and if that's something that we need to do again -- we came to City Hall when they first started all this --

Lorcher: Right.

Bird: -- and -- five years ago when they were going to do it in 2025. So, in 2020 and we pleaded our case and so did our neighbors.

Lorcher: I -- the city is not in charge of the roads, so --

Bird: Right.

Lorcher: -- unfortunately the fight has to be with the highway district and continue to do so. We had eminent domain at our place as well, because I'm on Ustick and the improvements were six inches over the -- our house.

Bird: Yes.

Lorcher: And so the house was ready to be demolished. Mr. McDermott's house, a historical house here in Meridian --

Bird: Yes.

Lorcher: But we were able to negotiate with -- at this time ITD. If we took off the front porch we would be able to be outside the right of way, so we were able to save the house. Now, the disadvantage is the road is right there; right?

Bird: Yeah.

Lorcher: But we were able to save our house, so don't give up because they -- I'm not sure you will get what you want, but they could listen and this could be years away as well, so --

Bird: Oh, good. Good.

Lorcher: It's just hard to say when that might happen, but our role as Commissioners in this case it's -- because it's annexation will go to City Council -- is to make recommendations for the building and the developer is not in charge of the roads either.

Bird: Exactly.

Lorcher: So, we are a little bit limited there as well.

Bird: Thank you. So ACHD and did you say ITD?

Lorcher: So, for me -- I'm in the impact area of Highway 16 --

Bird: Oh.

Lorcher: -- and so ITD owns half of it and, then, ACHD owns the other half of it --

Bird: Okay.

Lorcher: -- and so eventually ACHD will have everything except Highway 16. So, all the local roads along Ustick and Black Cat and McDermott will all be ACHD. But in the meantime we get to deal with all of them and so -- but we were able to save our house by just adjusting the -- our front porch of being able to take that back. But it was years of negotiations. Not weeks. Many letters. Many meetings, so --

Bird: Was that with the roundabout?

Lorcher: No. The widening of Ustick to support Highway 16.

Bird: All right. Thank you.

Stoll: Madam Chair, if I may be clear?

Lorcher: Commissioner Stoll.

Stoll: So, it's ACHD in this situation. ITD doesn't have anything to do with --

Bird: Sorry.

Stoll: ACHD does not -- it's ACHD that you have to work with on the roadways here. It has nothing to do with ITD. ITD doesn't have anything to do with that. But the other thing I want to -- I believe -- and Bill can correct me on this -- the roundabout is not being caused by the applicant. So, the --

Bird: I know. I know.

Stoll: The applicant has no influence on the roundabout.

Bird: We talked to them.

Stoll: Okay. I just wanted to be clear.

Bird: I understand that.

Stoll: Okay.

Bird: Okay.

Lorcher: Thank you very much.

Bird: Thank you. Madam Clerk?

Lomeli: Madam Chair, we have Ed Bird.

Lorcher: Hi. If you can state your name and address for the record, please.

E.Bird: Ed Bird. 1570 West Victory.

Lorcher: Thank you.

E.Bird: Meridian, Idaho. I have two things. Number one, all these pictures show two entrances -- exits and -- in and out and I understand you have only approved one and, number two, how unusual or usual is it for the city to annex in something that's not adjacent to city property?

Lorcher: Oh. We will look into that.

E.Bird: Because everything else is county, except for the big Corey Barton development on the southeast corner that you guys brought into the city.

Lorcher: So, you are across the street and you are county.

E.Bird: Yeah. Forty acres of county.

Lorcher: Okay. And you are saying that the parcels behind the church are also county?

E.Bird: Yes. That was 80 acres and they developed that into five acre lots.

Lorcher: Okay. So, if it's adjacent -- there could be a street in between the adjacency.

E.Bird: Okay.

Lorcher: So, it doesn't have to be property line to property line. There could be a street in between. So, are you saying Corey Barton has a parcel across the street?

E.Bird: Yes. It's cattywampus to it. It's southeast -- yeah. Southeast. And where theirs is northwest.

Lorcher: Okay.

E.Bird: Okay?

Lorcher: We will double check on that.

E.Bird: But the thing that gets me is which one do we believe, the one entrance or the two? And if you have only approved one, then, make them put the plan show one.

Lorcher: Okay.

E.Bird: Okay?

Lorcher: Yeah. And that will be done before City Council.

E.Bird: Okay? Any questions?

Lorcher: No.

E.Bird: Thank you.

Lorcher: We are good. Thank you very much.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, we have Robert S.

Lorcher: Good evening. If you can state your name and address for the record, please.

Schoelkoph: Just Bob. Or Robert Schoelkoph. 2690 South Ariel Lane in Meridian. I'm here to represent about seven people here today, not with a bone of contention, but simply an issue that happened in 2025 during the excavation of the Steve Mortensen property. The owners of the five acre parcels that you see up on the map here were a little north and just slightly west of that. During the deconstruction or up -- leveling out of the property they damaged the irrigation pipes. The unfortunate part of this property is there is an irrigation line that runs diagonally almost I think where that church is about to be built and we all have five acres some of it is product -- produced with animals, some of it's farming -- a mild farming and we are concerned about the water. During the de -- or the excavation of the property the line that feeds our irrigation was destroyed. We couldn't -- in no fault of anybody that I can -- that I'm aware of, I heard that there was a neighborhood meeting. We weren't aware of it. But we were without water for about a month. At our expense we put replacement irrigation pipe in so we could get water. We would like to get reimbursed for that. It's about 18,000 dollars. The other primary or major issue is we are long term residents. I have been there for 32 years. Plan on staying there. Access to water is going to be important when they do that construction. What we put in there for a line is not going to be adequate for what they are planning on building. It was -- it was to get us by for the season. So, I'm requesting two things. I'm requesting to get reimbursed for the cost of -- that is incurred because of the demolition and also we would like to be part of the planning of the routing of that irrigation line and the construction of it, so that we can get access to our water. And that's all I have.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much.

Schoelkoph: Thank you.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, we have Thomas L.

Lorcher: Hi. If you can state your name and address for the record.

Lemenager: Sure. Thomas Lemenager and I live at 2114 West Aspen Cove Drive. And I'm kind of talking about the same thing that Robert did. We were without water last spring for about -- I think it was over a month and I'm more concerned about what's

going to happen in the future with this. You know, what -- can there be perhaps a condition put on the CUP that recognizes our line and that it will be recognized in whole and that it be maintained as well. So, we don't want this to happen again basically. You know, we went through this a month and a half without water last spring, so I think everybody's really concerned about what's going to happen and the drawings show a parking lot over the diagonal layout of the pipe and how is that going to be maintained, how is it going to be operational and how are we going to live without irrigation if it's hit again during construction and during the planning it should be recognized.

Lorcher: And is the irrigation for the land, it's not for your home, your own well and septic?

Lemenager: Right. It's for the land landscaping, trees and bushes and -- and that kind of thing.

Lorcher: Okay. We will address that. Thank you.

Lemenager: Thank you.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, we have Patrick -- is it Marone? No one's here. John Fitzgerald.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you.

Lomeli: Rich Thayer.

Lorcher: You are okay? Okay. Thank you.

Lomeli: And Meg Thayer.

Lorcher: You are good? Okay.

Lomeli: No one else has signed up.

Lorcher: Anybody online? Would the applicant like to come forward to address some of the neighborhood concerns, please.

Watson: Thank you. The images that -- that they are seeing on the screen were from our pre-application meeting. It was before ACHD chopped one of our legs off and so if you look at the images that are actually in the packet they only show one access. I also have given my personal contact to Bob and I'm not -- on behalf of the owner, but as a -- as a consultant for the owner I will take care of their -- the needs. I will make sure that they are smiling when we are done.

Lorcher: Okay. And if you can make sure you give your card to Thomas as well, because he has irrigation concerns.

Watson: Yep.

Lorcher: And so what is the -- what is the plan for managing irrigation if there is going to be a parking lot on top of it?

Watson: So, if you -- in our -- in the packet the irrigation canal also has their comments and we have to address those items also. So, if they have a -- I mean if it's actual -- a deeded ditch or whatever we can't impede their water rights --

Lorcher: Right.

Watson: -- and so we will work with them to make sure that that's legally established back to where it needs to be.

Lorcher: Okay. And, then, my only other recommendation is when you go to Council that the pictures of your application are current with just showing the one entry.

Watson: Will do.

Lorcher: Okay. Any questions for the applicant before we close the public hearing? Thank you very much, Johnny. May I get a motion to close the public hearing, please?

Stoll: So moved.

Lorcher: How about a second?

Gelsomino: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and second to close the public hearing for the stake center at Victory and Linder. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Lorcher: You know, I -- like I said before, the stake center at McDermott Road and -- and Ustick is being built right now and that's a challenge as well, because McDermott is a dead end. I'm actually kind of excited for a church to be my neighbor. I -- I am not worried about a huge impact on traffic, because it is short term and it is sporadic, you know, limited to certain days. So, knowing -- I am not a member of the church, but I -- I have gone to different stake centers over the years and I feel that the way they landscape and -- and manage their property and how they -- how they build everything has been very thoughtful and they want to be a good neighbor. So, they are challenged with the restrictions that ACHD is putting in front of them, so I don't feel that they should be held accountable for road improvements that they don't have control over. The ultimate question for City Council is that is this in the best time for the city to annex this property and build this church. That's going to be the question when you approach City Council. So, because -- is this one going to be on sewer and septic or is it city water?

So, sewer and septic. So, you are annexing in from the county when there is not full services out there, so that will be the ultimate question from -- from Council. The fact that they are going on septic and sewer by us and staying in the county is -- is fine. I know you have challenges as a -- as a builder, but I do know that most of the stake centers are busting at the seams and they do need more facilities to be able to manage their congregation as well. So, I'm in support of this project to forward it to City Council for annexation and hopefully some of the questions from ACHD can be answered by the neighbors and, neighbors, if you do have questions you are also invited to go back to City Council and address those as well.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Yeah. I'm also in support of this. I think there is also something to like -- to -- to -- that I want to make sure we speak to regarding some of the -- maybe requested conditions that generally fall outside the purview of -- of the Commission, things like reimbursement and, you know, kind of legal recognitions, et cetera. The -- those are all things that I hope are handled, you know, appropriately, et cetera. But -- but this isn't really the forum that can decide -- you know, we -- we can't make anyone reimburse anyone in this -- in this venue currently. So, obviously, you know, that can -- I encourage the applicant and the neighbors to -- to work that out. You know, but that -- that kind of belongs outside of this forum or God forbid in a court of law, rather than -- than here. The same goes for the actual, you know, property lines, et cetera. Those are things that we have the code and, you know, platting and the law to -- to set forth that this body can't actually decide. You know, those kind of more legalistic issues. As for the -- the -- the property itself and the application itself I think -- you know, I have -- I have some slight concerns with the traffic flow, you know, I -- I don't love the risk of it backing up onto -- you know, I don't love the single failure point with just having that one entry-exit that goes into -- behind the church. I don't know that there is anything the applicant could change about the actual application to -- to mitigate those -- those issues. I think that's -- this is an ACHD issue. This is a surrounding development issue. So, for those reasons I'm in support of this. I know it's -- it's a little bit -- you know, there is -- there is some questions around timing, but I don't think the issues are sufficient enough to -- to make me feel this is not the right time.

Lorcher: Right.

Perreault: Madam?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: I really appreciate the applicant's willingness to receive feedback and work with the neighbors. Sometimes we don't get that much -- that much of willing attitude. So, yeah, I realize that Boise-Kuna Irrigation District didn't send their conditions until about less than a month ago, so probably not a lot of opportunity to reach out to the

neighbors with that, but those conditions are pretty clear about how to, you know, work with the neighbors in regard to whether their irrigation services are being compromised and I think that City Council will likely want to have a further conversation to make sure those conditions have been substantially figured out before they make a decision on annexation and -- and so I do want to say in terms of timing, once the Linder Road overpass is completed I think that there is going to be a lot more pressure on Linder Road and I think you are going to see that roundabout then. There is going to be some movement to get that done. I mean nothing happens fast; right? So -- but, that being said, that roundabout is going to allow for that traffic -- because now you don't have a stop there, you -- cars are just going to, you know, flow through and it could back up in that entrance, especially since -- as Commissioner Smith shared, you have to kind of go around this small little space in the back to get to the -- to the east parking. I'm not as concerned about the kind of stacking on Victory Road, because even when this area develops with subdivisions -- and it will once the Linder Road overpass is open, that's going to like literally open the floodgates. It's still a Sunday morning and I think even with a lot of cars that's just like the lowest traffic time, with the exception of overnight that there is. So, I'm not that worried about that. So, that's everything.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Stoll: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Stoll.

Stoll: I'm generally supportive of the application. I appreciate the neighbors coming out and testifying. I think the areas on irrigation as pointed out are covered by the irrigation companies district's conditions. The traffic flow internally does cause me concern, but we live with the limitations that are provided to us by the highway district.

Lorcher: Right.

Stoll: So, with that I will support the application.

Lorcher: Okay.

Gelsomino: Madam Chair, I can't add more to what my fellow commissioners and yourself have voiced, so --

Lorcher: You can add a little more. Give a motion.

Gelsomino: Absolutely. Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Gelsomino.

Gelsomino: I would like to make a motion for the -- or excuse me. After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council

of File No. H-2026-0016 as presented in the staff reports -- report for the hearing date of July 2nd, 2026, without any modifications or conditions; right?

Stoll: Second.

Lorcher: Bill, we don't have to add any modifications; correct? All right. Then we have got a second. It's been moved and seconded to approve the Victory Stake Center. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much, everyone.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

5. Public Hearing for Meridian Office Building (H-2026-0020) by CSHQA, located at 3514 E. Louise Dr.

- A. Request: Conditional Use Permit to construct and operate a 5,000 sq.ft. office building on 0.54 acres in the L-O zoning.

Lorcher: Let's do one more and, then, we can take a little bit of a break. So, Item No. 5 is H-2026-0020. CSHQA requests a conditional use permit for a 5,000 square foot building at 3514 Louise Drive and when you are ready we will begin with the staff report.

Parsons: I'm ready. Are you ready to keep listening?

Lorcher: We are ready.

Parsons: Perfect. Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, last item I'm covering this evening before I turn the mic over to Sonya is the Meridian Office Building CUP as you mentioned. This is one of those instances where we have zoning in place, but a previous approval has required your action tonight. So, the CUP that was approved in 2000 -- this property was approved through a PUD planning development back in 2005. As part of that requirement every lot within this area -- this development is required to get a detailed CUP approval. So, although we have zoning in place, the use the applicant is proposing is good, the DA and the CUP requires your -- your consideration tonight. So, that's what we are here to talk about. As you -- as you mentioned -- or you see here on the screen the future land use map does show this area is designated as mixed use community. Again, this is part of a larger planned unit development that has a mix of uses. The office, the employment that is proposed on the lot this evening is consistent with the overall land use designation. Access to this site is provided from a shared driveway that ties into the local street network, which is Touchmark. I think -- believe runs along the southern boundary there. So, there is a cross-access -- cross-access easement in place for that. Here is the applicant's proposed site plan. You can see here there is a 5,000 square foot building, along with the associated parking and landscaping. One item that popped up in the staff report -- when this property was subdivided in 2005 the -- the plat created a 20 foot wide public utility and irrigation easement along the west boundary of the site. As you can see here on the site plan the

building is encroaching within that 20 foot per the easement and so the applicant is going to be required to vacate a portion of that easement in order to allow that building to be constructed as it's proposed in front of you. So, staff has conditioned the applicant to do that. So, they will have to go through a public hearing process and go to City Council for them to take action on that reduction. The site -- the parking for the site does exceed the UDC standard. So, it's -- it's a 5,000 square foot building. So, ten is required and they are providing 15 on this -- on the site. I did look at the public record before I came to the hearing tonight. There was no public testimony on this item. Staff is recommending approval with conditions in the staff report and I will stand for any questions you may have.

Lorcher: I do have a question. So, this is a conditional use permit. This building has not been built yet; correct?

Parsons: That is correct. They need your permission to start construction.

Lorcher: Okay. And so what are they going to City Council for? For utility --

Parsons: Yes. If they -- they have been conditioned to vacate that easement and as part of that -- a vacation application requires Council action --

Lorcher: Okay.

Parsons: -- so nothing you have to worry about tonight. The condition is in there. They are just accepting of that condition and realize there is another application they need to process with the city in order to encroach or provide a ten foot setback along that boundary.

Lorcher: Okay. But this Commission is approving the conditional use permit?

Parsons: The conditional use permit and they will come back with an application at a later date.

Lorcher: Got you. Okay.

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: I didn't notice in -- in the file any indication of what the end user would be, but if by some chance those parking spaces are not enough is there any overflow area in that general vicinity for some other of the office spaces or Touchmark or --

Parsons: Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, not that I'm aware of. I know the easement that goes around the -- the road there is an only for ingress-egress easement and utility easement. So, again, these are each individual lots. Usually when we act on

this we make sure that the site is adequately parked per UDC standard. So, I am not aware of a shared parking agreement and I'm not -- I'm not sure if the applicant does either. But most of the lots that -- they are -- over the last couple of years we are starting to see this area pick up. There has been a couple CUPs and each one that this body has acted on has met the minimum parking standards, if not exceeded the parking standards.

Lorcher: Okay. Would the applicant like to come forward. Hi. If you can name state your name and address for the record that would be great.

Hart: My name is Ryan Hart. I'm with CSHQA. We are located at 200 Broad Street, Boise, Idaho.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Hart: As stated before, we are on 3514 East Louise Drive. We are in a low impact business and the occupancy of our business -- of the building is a Group B occupancy, falling in line with the -- the zone. Like stated before, we have 15 parking stalls. One of those being an ADA, whereas code only requires us to have ten of those. So, we are already exceeding the parking standards, as well as on the floor plan we have ten office -- ten offices. So, we are not expecting to see more than the anticipated 15 people coming in, even if people are visiting the office itself. We are currently working through -- talking with the public utilities to get their vacation letters for all of the utility and we are seeking to relinquish 11 feet of that 20 foot easement for our building.

Lorcher: Okay.

Hart: And, yeah, I want to thank again for the Commissioners taking the time and I will stand for any questions.

Lorcher: Commissioner Gelsomino.

Gelsomino: Madam Chair. Ryan, thank you for your -- for coming up tonight. Do you know how far along the process -- is the process of obtaining those relinquishment letters?

Hart: Yeah. We have reached out to all of the utility companies. We have received a number of vacation letters already and we are seeking to get the rest of them soon.

Gelsomino: Thank you.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much.

Hart: Thank you.

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

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

Lorcher: And no one online. Ryan, did you want to add anything else or are you good? Okay. Can I get a motion to close the public hearing, please?

Smith: So moved.

Perreault: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Lorcher: It seems pretty straightforward. It's an in-fill project of -- of land. It seems like there is a pre-requirement from years ago that any building that's going to go into this area has a conditional use permit. It sounds like they are going through the motions to make sure that they get the utility issues squared away before they start construction and you are, obviously, aware that you have to go to City Council for that condition or waiver as well. Anybody else have any concerns with this application or comments?

Stoll: No concerns.

Gelsomino: No.

Lorcher: Commissioner Sandoval, I keep -- I don't keep forgetting you are there, but out of sight out of mind. Do you have any comments in regard to this application?

Sandoval: Madam Chair, nothing further on this one. Thank you.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you. Well, with that in mind after considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to approve File No. H-2026-0020 as presented in the staff report on the hearing date of July 2nd --

Stoll: Second.

Lorcher: -- with no modifications.

Stoll: Still second.

Lorcher: Okay. It's been moved and seconded to approve file H-2026-0020. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

6. Public Hearing for Regency at River Valley Phase 3 (H-2026-0010) by Bach Homes, located at 3270 E. River Valley St.

- A. Request: Modified Development Agreement to the existing development agreement (SGI Inst.#113005608 & Bach Storage Inst. #2020-062947) to remove the subject property from the existing agreements and enter into a new agreement with a change to the conceptual development plan and use from an indoor self-service storage facility and retail store (Option A) or drive-through restaurant (Option B) to two (2) multi-family buildings with 88 dwelling units.
- B. Request: Conditional Use Permit for an 88-unit, multi-family development on 2.57 acres of land in the C-C and C-G zoning districts.

Lorcher: We have one more application, but why don't we take a three to five minute break and, then, we will finish the last one. Thank you.

(Recess 7:55 p.m. to 8:01 p.m.)

Lorcher: All right. Are you ready? All right. Let's -- let's finish our last application. If everyone's ready. Item H-2026-0010, Regency at River Valley, requests a modified development agreement and a conditional use permit for phase three of their development and we will start with the staff report.

Allen: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. The application before you tonight is a request for a conditional use permit. There is a concurrent development agreement modification application with this, but that does not require Commission action, only City Council. This site consists of 2.57 acres of land. It's zoned C-C and C-G and is located at 3270 East River Valley Street, northeast of the North Eagle Road, State Highway 55 and East River Valley Street intersection. I will go through a little history on this property. There are two existing development agreements in effect that govern future development of the subject properties. The existing approved development plan for the northern portion of the property is a three story cell service storage facility and the existing approved development plan for the southern part of the property is retail, which is Option A. So, the storage facility here and the elevations -- they are included in the development agreement here on the left. The ones for the property on the southern portion of the property, the Option A retail building is here in the middle and, then, the Option B is on the right side. The Option B is the -- is for -- the western portion of the southern portion of the site has developed with a small retail building as shown on that concept plan, but the drive through restaurant that's also shown has not developed and that is where the southern portion of this site is located. There are two previous development agreement modifications for Regency at River Valley phase three multi-family development that were denied for this property in 2021 and 2022. The application in 2021 -- it's shown there on the left -- was for one 134 unit

five story multi-family residential apartment building with podium parking on the first floor. This application was denied by Council due to not having the access with some of the contiguous properties to the north adequately flushed out, issues with traffic and parking and associated traffic circulation and their belief that it wasn't the right time for the city to approve the modification. The application in 2022 is shown on the right there. It was for one 128 unit five story multi-family apartment building with podium parking on the first floor. The City Council found this application was not in the best interest of the city, because the proposed multi-family development would exacerbate existing traffic access and circulation issues affecting the adjacent apartment complex, nearby roadways and emergency response. While the applicant failed to demonstrate that the proposed change from the previously approved self-service storage facility use was a superior development or justified modifying the existing development agreement. The Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map designation for the property is mixed use regional. The purpose of this designation is to provide a mix of employment, retail, residential dwellings and public uses near major arterial intersections. The applicant is proposing a modification to the existing development agreements to remove the subject property from the existing agreements and enter into a new agreement with a change to the approved development plans and use to an 88 unit multi-family residential development in two four story buildings. Forty-four units in each building. A conditional use permit is requested contingent upon Council's approval of a modification to the development agreements for approval of an 88 unit multi-family residential development in the C-C and C-G zoning districts on 2.57 acres of land. This development is proposed to be constructed in one phase and be an expansion of the existing Regency at River Valley multi-family development directly to the east of this property. A right-in, right-out access is proposed at the southern boundary of the site via East River Valley Street with shared access with the multi-family development to the east for access via Records Avenue and the full access on that site via River Valley. So, I will just show you real quick here. This is the access that's proposed with this application right-in, right-out and, then, this is an overall plan showing the existing development and proposed development. The existing full access driveway to phase one is right here. And, then, again, this is the proposed driveway here. If approved an emergency access easement will be required through the property to the north for access via Eagle Road due to the height of the proposed structures, which will likely reduce parking for the site below the minimum required amount, necessitating additional changes to the site plan. Alternatively, fire department may determine that this existing access that runs from Eagle Road down through here and goes in here may be adequate. Discussions are still going on with the applicant and the fire chief on that matter. So, not sure if he will accept that or not. The last comments to me were that they needed access from the north here. A 35 foot wide street buffer is required along Eagle Road and State Highway 55, which is an entryway corridor, with a ten foot wide detached multi-use pathway. The buffer is -- am I -- am I being halted? The buffer is required to comply with the enhanced buffer standards in the UDC for entryway corridors. Noise abatement is required by the UDC for residential uses along a state highway. An eight foot tall precast sound wall is proposed within the street buffer along North Eagle Road, State Highway 55, on top of a two foot tall berm. A cross-section of the street buffer was submitted as shown there on the bottom right. Because the berm and wall will not

be tall enough to buffer the second, third and fourth stories from the adjacent state highway, staff is recommending the structures incorporate sound attenuating construction materials and design features to decrease the interior noise levels inside the building if the use is approved. Common open space is proposed as shown on the plan on the right there consisting of half the street buffer along Eagle Road, linear open space containing a pedestrian pathway and a couple larger open space areas. The UDC requires at least one common grassy area to be integrated into the site design allowing for general activities by all ages and that all common areas are not less than 400 square feet in area and have a minimum length and width dimensions of 20 feet. The large common area at the north end of the site -- it's that kind of green turquoise area -- appears to meet the 5,000 square foot requirement. However, it's encumbered by a dog park, water feature and sitting area and is not an open grassy area as required. Other linear open space areas appears to be under the minimum 20 foot dimension requirement. If approved staff recommends an overall open space exhibit that includes phases one and two as submitted that demonstrates compliance with this standard for the overall development, since residents will have access to all common areas and amenities through a shared use agreement. Site amenities are proposed consisting of a dog park from the quality of life category, a water feature with a seating area from the open space category, walking trails from the recreation category and two charging stations for electric vehicles are proposed from the multi-modal category in accord with UDC standards. Offstreet parking is required to be provided based on the number of units -- excuse me -- bedrooms per unit. A minimum of 143 spaces are required and proposed to be provided. With the changes to phase one to allow for cross-access drives, nine spaces will be removed. A parking analysis prepared for the overall site indicates a total of 11 fewer spaces than required -- will be provided in the existing portion of the development if this development is approved. If approved staff recommends revisions are made to the site plan to accommodate the additional required spaces on this site in order to comply with the minimum parking standards for the overall development. Conceptual building elevations were submitted as shown for the proposed structures with building materials consisting of stucco and fiber cement board and batten siding with stone veneer accents. Final design is required to comply with the design standards in the Architectural Standards Manual. An exhibit was also submitted showing the west facade facing Eagle Road with one year trees and fence with ten years and without trees and fence. No written testimony was received from the public on this application. Staff is recommending denial due to many of the same circumstances still existing that were previous reasons for denial by City Council of a multi-family development on this site, including intensification of existing traffic. Access and circulation issues along East River Valley Street. Other reasons for denial are the proposed four story building height and form doesn't adequately transition to existing single story commercial development along the Eagle Road corridor. Concern pertaining to appropriateness of high density residential uses immediately adjacent to a state highway and major transportation corridor. Related to quality of life and the health and well-being of future residents due to vehicle emissions and noise exposure and inadequacy of the buffer to residential uses along a state highway due to the height of the structures. For these reasons staff is of the opinion the current entitlement of an indoor storage facility is a more appropriate use than the proposed multi-family

development and is of the opinion it's not in the best interest of the city to modify the existing development agreement as proposed. Staff will stand for any questions. The applicant is here to present tonight.

Lorcher: Would the applicant like to come forward? Hi. If you can state your name and address for the record, please.

Jordan: Cedar Jordan. 11650 South State Street, Draper, Utah.

Lorcher: Oh, sorry. What's your first name?

Jordan: Cedar.

Lorcher: Cedar. Okay. Thank you.

Jordan: Thank you. Yeah. So, really, Sonya's been involved with this project much -- I'm fairly new with this company, but she has been involved and all of these have gone forward and I think a couple of things that have changed since we have come along is the property to the north is now developed and we have a cross-access easement now and it's paved access to get out to Eagle Road from that -- that north side now. I don't think the fire marshal is -- we just got a letter from the fire marshal saying we had some concerns there. So, we are not sure that he is aware of that access or cross-access easement, so that is a change -- or a condition that was new now. I think that also part of -- you know, this property stabilized and there was at the time interest obviously with the storage units and all the other things, but with the growth of your city I think that's why a few years ago they started looking at, hey, let's increase the -- get more units on this phase and keep going and when we look at the traffic -- there is a traffic study which -- we do have a traffic consultant online if we need to have specific -- any technical questions. But one of the comments was that the use of the residential is less impactful than if it was actually a true commercial resident -- or a restaurant. For example, a 2,500 square foot drive-through restaurant would increase ADTs and all kinds of other impacts, a.m., p.m. type of thing. So, just from a traffic standpoint converting it back to an apartment complex would reduce traffic, compared to the approved use. Although I will have to say that storage units also have a kind of an odd traffic pattern than most commercial. But the transition -- you know, the Eagle Road is a corridor -- I think the current -- we have measured the height I think of the current facade or the parapet for the three story and I think we are at 42 feet. I think this building is at 52 feet and the -- and the adjacent buildings next to us or at least the Mattress Firm with the parapet is at 26 feet or 25 feet. So, there is a -- there is a transition that jumps, but does now to the parapet of the storage units from 25 to 42 and this would also just increase it up to the 52, so -- if there is any -- anything I can answer.

Lorcher: Okay. Do we have any questions for the applicant?

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Did I hear you correctly that the -- you have access -- physical access to the north and -- and legal access to the north and so is that going to be a right -- like a right turn only onto Eagle Road from there?

Jordan: Yes.

Perreault: Is that going to be a public -- that goes in --

Jordan: It's existing now.

Perreault: -- road to --

Jordan: Sorry. Go ahead.

Perreault: Is that a public street that comes from Eagle Road into the development?

Jordan: That I don't know. We -- there is a cross-access easement put together with BGI, which I think is a developer at the time and ourselves for that. I'm not entirely clear on if that's a -- it's not a public -- but there is an existing required cross-access easement between both property owners. Is that the question?

Perreault: Not exactly.

Jordan: Okay.

Perreault: And I'm kind of -- had a little bit of a hard time hearing you. Sorry.

Jordan: Oh.

Perreault: So, you have -- you have that, you know, kind of drive aisle that comes -- that -- that goes along the east side of the property; right? And it doesn't really go up into another -- it goes up into another development, but there is intended to be a road that runs to the south of that development and in the last application it wasn't determined whether that would -- that road -- if it was a public road, if it was a private road, if that road would even be there and whether, you know, there would be access for this property or not and so I just want to understand specifically is there an intention of that applicant at least -- it's been a while since I have been there, so from the photos that's on here it still shows bare land up there.

Jordan: Okay.

Perreault: And so I want to understand if you have physical access and is that a private road that just exists for the -- yep. So, if you were to head straight north on that drive aisle to the east will there be access to the left if you were to be able to turn left there

was a -- at the last application there was supposed to be a determination of whether there was access there on the north side of Copper Canyon.

Jordan: The Copper --

Perreault: Is that what you are referring to? Are you --

Jordan: No. No. There is one further to the -- there is one further to the east. If you -- can I point, Sonya, or -- okay. Okay. So -- sorry for the lag. So, this is the northern access that I'm speaking of and that that created -- once this property to the north developed and has developed the parties entered into a cross-access easement for cross-access for both parties to come through that north access, not from -- there is not a north access from this phase if that's your question. They would egress out of this parking lot, go north and, then, east and out here and could go out here or go out --

Perreault: You won't be able to go directly north?

Lorcher: It looks like you have to kind of S curve around.

Jordan: That's right. That's right. Yeah. I think -- that's right. So -- is my cursor showing? Okay. So, yeah, you have to come out this -- this building. You will have to egress here and can go right and go south and go to River Valley or it will go north, wrap around here and, then, come back out here out to Eagle.

Perreault: Okay.

Jordan: Does that --

Perreault: That makes sense. Thank you.

Jordan: Okay. Sorry.

Lorcher: Is the property that's developed north, is that the Copper Canary jewelry store and the Raising Cane's and the oil change place?

Jordan: It is.

Lorcher: It's all there now?

Jordan: Yes.

Lorcher: And, then, are those apartment buildings or is that a hotel behind there at the -- at the east side of that property behind -- behind the second phase of -- of --

Jordan: Yeah.

Lorcher: -- Regency.

Jordan: Those are apartments.

Lorcher: Apartments. Okay. All right. Any other questions for the applicant before we check with public testimony?

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Yeah. So, some of the staff analysis -- or the staff report talks about being under parked and some of the modifications needed will actually -- I think maybe remove some parking on phase one or two next -- immediately adjacent. Can you speak to that? Can you speak to the parking plan how you are going to address that parking need. Not be under parked.

Jordan: Yeah. I think so. Part of the -- the specific code that -- I haven't talked to Sonya about or understood how it's calculated -- is the -- for the -- if you -- if you are located near mass transit kind of facility, which there are bus stops there and I didn't know if that's a -- if that's a calculation that could come in and help reduce the 11 deficit.

Smith: Okay.

Lorcher: Did you have any more?

Smith: I guess I did have one question regarding the walking trails. Can you -- can you help me understand where those walking trails are in this application? I ask because I -- I don't -- in --

Jordan: Yeah, it's --

Smith: I don't necessarily think --

Jordan: Is there a way to go to the renderings?

Allen: Cedar, did you have those in your presentation?

Jordan: I think -- yes.

Allen: Okay. Let me switch back to yours. Sorry. Just a moment.

Jordan: The trails mostly wrap around to the west and north side. This -- this is the northwest side. Does that make sense?

Smith: Got it. So, it's just -- it's general interconnectivity between --

Jordan: That's right. That's right.

Smith: Yeah.

Lorcher: Okay.

Smith: Go for it.

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: So, talked about the sharing of amenities --

Lorcher: Have to turn your mic on.

Perreault: I apologize. I have a question about the sharing of the amenities. So, just the -- the type amenities that they are and the location that they are, I don't anticipate a lot of residents from the other two phases coming over and using these, but yet those residents will be going over to phase one and phase two and using theirs. So, there is really not like a good reciprocity there. So, the phase one and phase two residents, how will they be impacted in the use of their amenities? Because I just don't see them coming over and using these like kind of in that back corner.

Jordan: Yeah. I don't think that the property management -- so, we have a property management division in the company that manages all of our properties. So, it's my understanding that they are -- they aren't worried about the cross-using or the impact of the existing pool and the fitness center there. They are comfortable with what they are proposing to add the 88 units back in -- or add another 88 units wasn't a concern to property management.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: I have a question for Sonya regarding the -- kind of mass transit part of code that was referenced regarding the impact on parking calculations. I -- could you comment on that or fill me in on -- is that a possible solution to be compliant or what does that look like?

Allen: Chairman, Commissioner Smith, Commissioners, there is a section of code parking standard alternatives 113-C-7. It lists favorable conditions for parking alternatives to off-street parking. One of those includes that there is a transit stop within a quarter mile of the use. So, there -- there may be some options there.

Jordan: Yeah. There are two bus stops. One on the north -- on the south side and one on the east side.

Allen: It says that when alternative modes of transportation are available off-street parking may be reduced by an equivalent amount to the demand that is met by the alternative transportation mode as documented in a transportation plan prepared by a registered engineer.

Smith: Okay. So, we wouldn't be able to figure that out -- those numbers out tonight?

Allen: No.

Smith: Okay. Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: I do have -- sorry. I'm kind of going down a checklist. I do have one question that came up which was regarding the use of -- of trees for sound abatement, et cetera on the side of Eagle. Is that accounting for the power lines that are currently there? It's hard to kind of understand from that 2D perspective. Is there adequate depth for those or -- can you help me understand?

Jordan: Well, I think there is adequate height. I'm not sure that we -- where exactly underneath we sit under that transmission line.

Smith: Yeah. Well, I ask because I think the transmission lines -- they don't seem super high up and just in reference to this being a four story building. You have trees that are shown to go three or four stories tall -- seem to be pretty sizable --

Jordan: Yeah.

Smith: -- landscaping. So, I wanted to just make sure that we are accounting for those power lines.

Jordan: That's fair. I think we -- I would have to look at the overlay to see how the power line runs underneath there or where it runs in the right of way.

Smith: Okay.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much.

Jordan: Thank you.

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

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. We have Perry Coles.

Lorcher: Yeah. If you can state your name and address for the record, please.

Coles: Good evening, everybody. I'm Perry Coles. I represent East River Valley Street, the owner of Copper Canary property. To give you a little bit of history behind this, it may help you a little bit. We -- we originally owned the piece of property next to The Mattress Firm and that's where we were going to build Copper Canary originally.

Lorcher: Okay.

Coles: What we found is that the access was so bad coming off of East River Valley Street, because there was a median that was put in for that -- because of the highway. It literally was impossible to get anybody to our property, except to go through the Regency property and do a U-turn or go all the way to Records and try to come all the way around. So, the reality is it would be nearly impossible to get our customers to come to our -- our -- our -- you know, our property and our store. So, we thought long and hard -- we actually had plans set up, but we just couldn't seem to get over the access problem and getting people in and out of the property easily. So, we, then, took over the -- the Chinese restaurant and, then, rebuilt it and -- and here we are, you know, three years later. I totally understand what Bach Homes is going through with this property. It's a very very difficult property because the access is so bad. What I would like to -- first of all, I am in favor of them in this project and I will tell you several reasons why. One is now they are not five story they are four story. Four story is exactly what is behind us with the new apartments --

Lorcher: Okay.

Coles: -- behind the Raising Cane's, behind now the new vet building and there is two lots left that originally were -- they were talking about putting a hotel in and I think that went away and I don't know what's going there now. But they are four story right there. So, it's really not out of line for what's in the neighborhood right now and, yes, it's a little bit bigger than us. I'm absolutely fine with it. The fact they have gone to 88 units in two buildings and if you look at the architecture it's beautiful. I mean they did a really really nice job and the way they fed the traffic and everything back into their development makes a lot of sense. Now since we redeveloped our property there is a right turn lane, okay, coming off of Eagle and I think that's the access -- or some connection to that road that goes all the way back that meets both apartment complexes to the right and to the left, you know, going east. So, the access is really good now. Traffic is -- is minimized and trying to put any other business in there I think -- it's just going to sit empty. I think they have owned it for ten or 15 years. There is no buyers. Nobody wants it and yet they are now developing a third phase that fits beautifully into what they already have. The amenities are there and, believe me, I have nothing to do with Bach Homes. So, they didn't pay me to stand up here.

Lorcher: Okay.

Coles: Okay. But it just seems to make common sense what they are developing. Okay? And, yeah, I would like not to have dirt -- dirt there anymore. It would be -- it would be kind of nice. The -- the other -- you know, basically, like I said, I'm generally

fully in favor of it. I find very few problems with it. The one question I had -- and I wasn't sure -- and I heard something, Sonya, that you had mentioned that the buffer wall -- is it eight feet or ten feet? Ten feet. Because they are elevated about two feet above us, too.

Lorcher: Okay.

Coles: The -- you know, the elevation of the -- of the land. So, it puts a 12 foot wall there. So, aesthetically and visually to our building it kind of blocks us out pretty well. I would like to see maybe some kind of change that -- if that is possible, if you guys decide -- or the City Council decides to approve it.

Lorcher: I need you to finish up, please.

Coles: I'm sorry?

Lorcher: Your time is up, so can you finish up.

Coles: Oh, it is? I'm sorry. Okay. Then that's -- that was my only objection.

Lorcher: Okay.

Coles: Thank you very much.

Lorcher: Thank you very much.

Coles: Any questions or --

Lorcher: Not at this time.

Coles: Okay.

Lorcher: Thanks.

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

Lorcher: Would the applicant like to come forward and address Perry's comments or are you good? You are fine? All right. Can I get a motion to close the public hearing?

Stoll: Move to close.

Gelsomino: Seconded.

Lorcher: It's been moved and second to close the public hearing for Item 2026-0010, Regency at River Valley Phase Three. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Lorcher: I was by here today. I went to the Habit for lunch today, so I drove down south on Eagle Road to turn on River Valley to go into that development and, you know, went by it. It's a very shallow parcel. So, you have your challenges ahead of you. As well as there is no direct access from Eagle Road, which means you have to kind of meander through. Driving from McMillan to River Valley today I did notice that there are no apartments directly on Eagle Road. Everything is set back for retail more on Eagle than any residential straight up on Eagle Road at this time. That doesn't mean that it couldn't happen in the future, but at this time. I think the other challenge is is that this is probably considered in-fill and when you are the last guy, you know, in line everybody's taken up your traffic; right? So, you are -- you are subject to the traffic conditions that already exist, even though that isn't -- isn't your problem, but now it is because it's already there. Extending the residential from what the storage was going to be from three stories to four doesn't seem very drastic, but the transition -- I agree with the city planners, the transition from the single story of Mattress Firm to a four story seems very dramatic. The open space concept you have in the corner in the back for one of the buildings -- so, if I was in the building that was further south compared to the north I wouldn't even feel that that was part of my open space. It seems like it's private for them. And, then, to cross the parking lot to the pool for the other portion of the property going east seems kind of like a pretty far jaunt. You know, it's a tough spot like Perry had mentioned because of the access and maybe residential might be the answer here, but having it abut against Eagle Road, even with a buffer wall, with the power poles and trees, I don't feel like I can support this particular -- the design of this particular project. I think it could be flipped a little bit and maybe the parking closer to Eagle Road and the building closer to Regency's, so that you are right not -- not right on top of it with the transition for the Mattress Firm, you know, so that it seems like a different transition knowing that there are three story or four story apartment buildings right behind here. So, overall the concept is interesting. I -- I don't feel like it's quite there yet. I lived along Highway 84, you know, and that white noise of that constant traffic is a real thing and it -- and Eagle Road really doesn't stop and there is just really -- how many soundproof walls you have you will never be able to block it out, you are never going to be able to have your window open, because you are always going to have that kind of infestation of -- of whether -- if it's noise or something from a motorcycle or a car or backfire from a vehicle, it's always going to be there and even though it has the ability to be close to mass transit I just think if it was flipped a little bit more it might be a little bit better. But the way this sits right now I am not in support of this project.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Yeah. I think I have a lot of issues with this and I think some of them are actually kind of the inverse of yours. I don't know that flipping certain things around would -- would address a lot of the main concerns.

Lorcher: I don't know.

Smith: I think for me it's, you know, the -- the ones that jump out are obviously parking. There is parking issues and there is open space issues. I think the location of open space, the current design of open space is inadequate. It doesn't -- doesn't -- it doesn't fit the -- the overall design of the -- of the rest of the development it's trying to integrate into. I think we have parking issues that maybe we can address, but, you know, by being near transit. I think there is a big issue with sound mitigation, not knowing if it's going to conflict with power lines, because if -- if it does that -- we lose a big component there on Eagle of being able to mitigate sound. I'm not against residential being more on these kind of large arterials. I think -- and I know -- I know we had some disagreement earlier internally of whether this is technically transit oriented development, but, you know, either in spirit or in letter I am in support of this kind of development for those reasons, either being directly on mass transit or being so close to Kleiner Park and, you know, walking -- walking distance to other commercial amenities and retail amenities. I think this is -- this is a fine intention to put residential here. I think this existing concept -- this existing plan is -- is not fully baked. It's not fully developed. So, for me I can't support it tonight. I don't know if that looks like continuing to a -- kind of significant extent. If -- if the applicant feels that they are able to kind of rework this and a, honestly, somewhat significant manner or if this looks like denying it and letting them take another swing when they are fully ready. I think this is closer than past residential applications on this spot, but I still don't think it's in an area where it's -- you know, I don't think we are just a few tweaks away from this being workable. I'm very in support of this residential of -- of transit oriented development and very -- not to get ideological and very -- I like this kind of development and concept. I just -- this -- this existing plan just doesn't quite fit. I think that also one thing that I started to -- sorry. Commissioner Stoll, for holding me hostage. One thing that I also would like to see more is better interconnectivity to the north to -- to Copper Canary if that's -- if that's workable. That would address a lot of my concerns around circulation having ins and outs, obviously, that -- if that's functional, but -- so I can't support it tonight. I don't know if that looks like a continuance or if that looks like a denial that I think -- I would love to hear the rest of the Commission's thoughts on that.

Lorcher: Okay.

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: So, I have probably heard in the hundreds of applications at this point and there is just those that just -- you never forget and that's this one. I remember the two hearings and continuances so well on this application and all the conversation that we had about access and, you know, it was denied the first time, because there wasn't any access to the property to the north. Nobody knew what was going on. Nobody knew there was apartments that were going to be there and, then, they came back in and they said, hey, there is going to be apartments that are going to be here, we are still working on

whether we have cross access with that and even if we do is it going to be physically able to get -- to go through the north to get out to Records and we just -- we fleshed out every possible scenario with it. I do appreciate the applicant putting in very clear walkways through the parking lots, because that was something that was entirely missing. There was no obvious way to get from phase three over to phase two. So, that's an improvement that they have made. And I think breaking up the buildings into two buildings was really a good thing, but I agree with Commissioner Smith on the -- the -- where the amenities are. It's very isolated. And I don't think that that really benefits the -- the residents from the other two phases. So, I see so much improvement from -- from what was discussed the last time. Significant improvement. And I think that any other -- any commercial user that would come in there is going to -- it's going to be more complicated for them, because, you know, not being able to get to your -- your storage unit or imagine having fast food in there, like we just had this conversation about drive throughs. So, I don't think that the -- the current entitled use is feasible either. I -- I know phase one and phase two have been in -- in that apartment community quite a bit. For the most part people drive slow through there, like it's not -- nobody's racing through. I don't love how little space there is between -- like in the drive aisles they are very narrow, so if somebody's backing their car out and you are coming down the drive aisle there is lots of opportunities for accidents and wrecks. All that to say I see significant improvements in this and I'm not entirely opposed to this based on -- and I'm not just comparing, you know, what they had -- they have a better plan, I'm comparing to really are they using -- are they doing the best that they can with the -- with the site constrictions that they have and I don't see any other way that they could make an improvement. I mean we -- we -- we worked this and reworked this and reworked this and I don't see any other way that they can make any improvements. I -- I -- I don't know if anything's changed, but I remember that Copper Canyon wasn't willing to give them a cross-access and they didn't want folks, you know, parking in -- in their parking lot and they really didn't want to have a lot of involvement in -- I don't know if that's changed or not, but that was something that was a pretty much like off -- off limits kind of thing. My hope is that -- was that the -- that drive aisle just very -- there to the east would be able to go completely through by Raising Cane's and not have to make a right or go east and head back through and kind of go to the north. But it doesn't sound -- like that was something that we -- we -- we basically told the applicant -- like that that would be the -- I mean if you could get that done that would be huge -- a huge step towards getting approval and I -- it doesn't sound like that that was an option either, but I think for the site constrictions that they have I -- I'm not entirely opposed to it. I do think there is some tweaks that need to be made definitely with the amenities. One of them specifically would be -- I think that the -- the water feature is great, because there is some sound mitigation. I mean that's nice it does -- it does kind of cut through some of the road noise, but I think it would be better to have more of like a gathering area, like a covered gathering area type of feel where people could, you know, have friends over for a graduation party or something, instead of just it being like a -- something that's a visual or, you know, kind of -- kind of situation. So, I agree I don't -- I'm not comfortable voting in favor right at this moment, but if there was some reworking done on the amenities I think it would be worth a good second look.

Stoll: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Stoll.

Stoll: Generally I like the concept of what they are proposing as far as residential. I have -- as Commissioners have pointed out -- concerns regarding connectivity and internal circulation. I would like to see this continued to allow the applicant to work with staff to come up with some conditions or reworking what they are proposing to come back to us later, as opposed to an outright denial. But that's my two cents, to keep it short.

Lorcher: We will have to reopen the public hearing to see if the applicant is open to that or just wants to go on to City Council, so if that is what the Commission would like, may I get a motion to --

Perreault: Madam Chair --

Lorcher: Oh, did you want to add --

Gelsomino: I was going to say I'm -- I'm pretty much in line of giving them another option, so if a continuance is the consensus then --

Lorcher: Okay. Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Do we have to -- this is a question for staff. Do we need to give them pretty clear specific things that we want them to bring back? If we are going to continue do we need to say, hey, these are the things that we want to see when you come back here?

Allen: Chairman, Commissioner Perreault, Commissioners, yes, please. So, that they have clear direction on what to work on between now and then. And, please, give them adequate time. We do need revised plans within 15 days prior to the hearing. So, it will take them a bit to do it and, then, we will need it 15 days prior.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Move to open the public -- reopen the public hearing.

Stoll: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to reopen the public hearing for Regency River Valley Phase Three. All those in favor say I aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Lorcher: Cedar, can you come back up, please? What is your preference? Do you feel like if we gave you some direction for a continuance that would be something that you and your team would be interested in or do you want to just go forward to City Council?

Jordan: I would to continue -- I would like the continuance.

Lorcher: You would like to continue. So, can we give him some direction of things to be able to work on and, then, we can look at dates. Does that sound okay?

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: So, I mean just kind of going off my list and some others that I heard, some were, you know, the landscaping, power lines on Eagle that conflict. Figuring out parking. If we can find a way to meet parking. Reworking the open space. To integrate better with the rest of the Regency. To -- so, there is -- also the issue of northern cross-access to Copper Canary or to another parcel if that's feasible. I also imagine there are kind of draft conditions that we are not considering the staff has in mind. So, I would also imagine allowing some time in there for staff to -- you know, coordinate with the applicant on any other issues. I don't know if there is any other that I missed.

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: In the reworking -- potential reworking of moving -- I know that they have done -- I don't know how many plans on this, but the idea of moving the parking more towards Eagle Road -- I think one of the issues it created was pedestrian access, then, over to phase two where you are trying to like make it feel like this is a cohesive development and so, then, if you put the building towards phase two, then, pedestrians are walking kind of around the buildings to the north and the south to get over to the amenities and more people are getting in their cars. So, that was kind of one of the things. But I would like to see -- you know, I know -- I know we have asked for so many iterations of this and it's been a long time, but I would like to see more possibility of moving the building away from Eagle Road. I think -- you know, anybody that's going to rent there, they are going to know there is noise. Like they are going to make an educated decision about whether they want to live there, because they are going to know they are on Eagle Road.

Lorcher: Right.

Perreault: I do think that there will -- you will find a lot of limitations. I think there might be enough people that want to live near The Village and stuff that you will get that. As far as the height of the building goes, I feel like that if you are going to put buildings that high that's the road you put them on. I don't love it, but I understand you have parred

down these buildings like 50 units and making that pencil is -- is really hard to do. So, I would like further -- further work done not only on the location of the amenities, but also on the type of amenities. I don't think that's too big of a change. But I know having done multiple hearings that you all have already thought through a whole bunch of these scenarios before you even get to us. So, we are really really not trying to make it hard on you, but we do want -- this is -- you know, anywhere along Eagle Road right now is like a really critical space for our community. So, I just remembered -- like stuff's literally coming back to me as we are sitting here about -- I don't think that there is a connection that could be made to -- like straight north, because there was only one way to get over the South Slough and there was only one way it was going to be bridged and that was by doing it here in the center part of the other -- like the apartments to the east. So, I think that -- I just answered my own question with that. But, yeah, just -- just more information, not only like the design but more information on how the amenities are going to be used between the two complexes would be helpful.

Lorcher: All right. That was a big laundry list. How much time do you think you might need? Madam Clerk, what does our schedule look like for the next couple meetings?

Lomeli: Madam Chair, July 16th there is already seven hearings scheduled.

Lorcher: Okay. That's not an option.

Lomeli: August 6th there is only one and, then, the other dates after that would be August 20th or September 3rd.

Lorcher: So, August 6th or -- what was the second date in August?

Lomeli: August 20th.

Lorcher: So, August 6th or August 20th. So, basically, August 6th is just shy of -- a little bit over a month and the other one looks like about six weeks.

Jordan: Yeah. Let's do the latter.

Lorcher: The August 20th?

Jordan: Yes.

Lorcher: Okay. Can I get a motion to continue Phase Three to August 20th.

Perreault: So moved.

Smith: Do we need to list the reasons in the motion? We are good? Okay. Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to continue application 2026-0010, Regency River Valley Phase Three, to August 20th. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed?

Motion carries. Wait. I did that wrong, didn't I? Do I have to close the public hearing? No. We are good. Okay. All right.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Jordan: Thank you for your time.

Lorcher: Thank you. We are good.

Allen: Oh, I -- I just remembered one thing I was going to ask you. Were you directing staff to prepare conditions of approval? Commissioner Smith -- or Commissioners?

Lorcher: I don't think we did. We asked the applicant to come forward to fix some things --

Allen: Okay.

Lorcher: -- between now and August 20th. Is it appropriate to ask for staff for conditions of approval to work with the applicant?

Allen: I would recommend seeing what the applicant brings forward before you make a recommendation and direct staff to prepare conditions of approval. But that is up to you.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Just to clarify on my end, I -- we -- it wasn't in the motion, but my intention was anything along those lines that tend to find their way in conditions of approval or things that, you know, we can resolve that come to mind, I wanted to leave space for you to -- anything that you think while we are in the process of these other things that you can resolve I wanted to leave that kind of space. So, you don't need to do conditions of approval. We can look at the rest. But that was kind of the -- the theme of things that I was saying feel free to work.

Allen: Okay. Thank you for that clarification. Appreciate that.

Lorcher: Okay, Cedar, so --

Jordan: Thank you.

Lorcher: So we are good. August 20th. And if you can't remember what we said this is on public record and you can pull up the minutes and be able to get Commissioner Smith's comments.

Jordan: Thank you.

Lorcher: All right. Thank you. Can I take one more motion.

Gelsomino: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Gelsomino.

Gelsomino: I would like to make a motion to adjourn tonight's meeting.

Stoll: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to adjourn. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:52 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS.)

APPROVED

MARIA LORCHER - CHAIRMAN

_____|_____|_____
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK