

McCarvel: All that --

Fitzgerald: All that stuff. I have a motion and a second to recommend approval of file number H-2020-0101, Daphne Square Subdivision. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion passes. Thank you all.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

7. Public Hearing for Cache Creek Subdivision (H-2020-0105) by Matt Schultz of Schultz Development, Located on the Northwest Corner of E. Victory Rd. and S. Locust Grove Rd.

- A. Request: Annexation and Zoning of 15.18 acres of land from RUT in Ada County to the R-4 zoning district.
- B. Request: A Preliminary Plat consisting of 41 building lots and 4 common lots on 13.99 acres of land in the proposed R-4 zoning district.

Fitzgerald: Moving on to the next item on our agenda -- first I have to close out my agenda. What's the number? It's -- the next item on our agenda is Cache Creek Subdivision, file number H-2020-0105 and, Alan, is this yours, too? I believe.

Tiefenbach: It is. I'm just trying to get my Zoom to work here. I got to -- there we go. Okay. Sorry. Give me one second here. Okay. Do you got that? That was a thumbs up?

Fitzgerald: Looks good.

Tiefenbach: Okay. Thank you. Sometimes there is a lot of maneuvering going on here, as you already know. Okay. Just a second here.

Grove: Mr. Chair?

Tiefenbach: Okay.

Grove: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Yeah, Commissioner Grove, go right ahead.

Grove: Sorry, Alan, I was just going to ask a question before we jumped in. We are getting close to 10:00 o'clock and I just wanted to see if we wanted to discuss if we will be hearing the -- the last one before we get started or not.

Fitzgerald: Commissioners, what's your thoughts? I -- we have done late nights before, but I -- I want to be sensitive to your -- your desires and requests. So, we have got by 11

people that are online with us still and, then, we have got at least one person in chambers on this one. Do you want to see how it goes or do you want to stipulate that we are going to stop after this one? Comments?

Yearsley: If we have got people waiting I would prefer not to have to have them come back and we just go a little late and get it all finished.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Holland, I know that you are -- may need to leave us, so as long as we have a quorum we can keep plowing forward.

Holland: Well, my kid is asleep. I just get less sleep, but that's all right. I'm used to sleeping on -- or surviving on three hours now, so I'm good. I will power through with you guys.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Commissioner Cassinelli, are you good?

Cassinelli: I'm good.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Seal?

Seal: Good.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Commissioner McCarvel and Commissioner Grove?

McCarvel: Sure.

Fitzgerald: That sounded really like robust. Commissioner Grove, are you okay? I know you are in person.

Grove: I'm good.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Thank you all. I appreciate it greatly. And we appreciate the public sticking with us. Okay. Alan, it's all you, sir.

Tiefenbach: Yes, sir. Thank you. All right. So, this is the Cache Creek -- or Cache Creek Subdivision and this is an annexation and rezoning -- a zoning to R-4 and a preliminary plat to allow 41 building lots and four common lots. So, this property is 13.99 acres of land. Presently zoned RUT in unincorporated Ada county. It's located at 1560 West Victory Road and 2955 South Locust Grove, which is the northwest corner of South Grove -- or South Locust Grove Road and East Victory Road. You can see it's recommended for low density residential. The zoning map showing it's surrounded by R-4 and R-8. See if I can move on here. Okay. So, this proposal includes the annexation, zoning, and platting to allow 41 building lots and four common lots. The property present -- presently contains two existing homes. The one to the south, which would be the one to the southeast, will be demolished and the one to the northeast, up at the top there, will remain. There is going to be two accesses to these properties. Each access will connect to a stub

street in the Capella Creek Subdivision. So, one access -- so, there is a stub here. You can see this. And there is -- oh, sorry. Yeah. So, there is a stub here and there is a stub here. These two accesses will connect to those stubs. These stub streets terminate at South Bailey Way, which is, basically, running north and south here and from that, then, you can either go east up to South Locust Grove or you can go south to Victory. Within this subdivision -- the Cache Creek Subdivision applies a loop road, which you can see here. That's a 33 -- a 33 foot wide road and you have detached sidewalks and eight foot landscaped strips. South Locust Grove on the east currently has two lanes and no curb, gutter, or sidewalk. East Victory Road to the south presently has two lanes with no curb, gutter, or sidewalk. Both of these are going to be widened in the next three years and just like the other project there is going to be a roundabout that's being planned and that's at East Victory Road and South Locust Grove Road. There is also a detention pond or a retention basin that's in the development down here as well. Ten Mile Creek runs right next to the road across the property. You can't see it here -- which I will talk about in a minute -- but it runs right through the property. Sufficient right of way presently exists for widening both South Locust Grove and East Victory Road. However, the applicant will be required to dedicate additional right of way for the roundabout. Because both of these roads are due to be reconstructed, ACHD has requested the applicant pay 38,000 dollars into a road trust deposit. This road trust deposit will be used by ACHD to construct sidewalks that abut the site as part of the future intersection project. Staff has received letters and -- from neighbors and from the president of the Cabella Creek Homeowners Association. They request to not connect to the stub streets to allow direct access, but, instead, they want to allow direct access from South Locust Grove. One suggestion was by lining up with East Sagemoor Drive. As you can see my pointer, East Sagemoor Drive is here, so the request was to see if they could line up an access here and get rid of the accesses there. It's important to note that both the city regulations and the Comprehensive Plan discourage new developments directly connecting to arterials and collectors and in addition to that I talked to ACHD today and they -- they responded that allowing a new access onto the South Locust Grove Road would not meet their spacing requirements. It needs to be at least 1,300 points -- feet. They can't get close to that. Now they could ask for a waiver from our policy, but they have noted that the only time that -- that they will -- that they will grant waivers from the policy is if the roads that they are stubbing to are deemed to be over capacity and in order for that to be happen those roads would have to be serving more than 2,000 trips per day. This proposal is estimated to generate 387. So, ACHD does not support opening up any accesses to this project. Five foot detached sidewalks are proposed on both sides of all the streets within this development. There is also a pedestrian connection, which is here -- oh, sorry. Which is here into this common lot. There is also a pedestrian connection that runs along this retention basin here. This development includes two amenities, which is the playground, as well as a very large open area that's central. Two amenities and approximately 16 percent open space. There is a regional pathway, which is down here, and that parallels Ten Mile Creek to East Victory Road and the Cabella Creek Subdivision. It runs right through this subdivision, although the pathway itself is not on the subject property. There is also a ten foot pathway -- if you can see my pointer -- over here that runs along the Eight Mile parallel lateral and it dead ends right here. So, there is not really a good crossing right now. Although the proposed plat shows that there is a five foot sidewalk

that is running -- if you can see my pointer -- it sort of runs down along South Locust and, then, there is another sidewalk that runs along east Victory, people could come out here and walk down the street and turn. Staff thought that it would be better to actually have an internal connection where you could get a faster way -- cut through to common open space here, if you can see my pointer, and, then, you can either choose to go into the Ten Mile here or you can go and hit Ten Mile and go the opposite direction. We made that recommendation. Yesterday the applicant provided us an updated plat. Hopefully they can show you that, but I have put a picture on here, so that you can see -- maybe not very well. This is the trail -- the trail connection that the applicant is proposing to connect to. This is basically in the area -- if you read the staff report where staff was suggesting that we needed to have that. So, that's what we were looking for. Although the minimum square footage of the common open space is satisfied, one thing that's important to note is that there is an arterial buffer here and this arterial buffer does not meet the minimum 25 foot spacing requirements right here. Hopefully you can see my pointer. This is the existing residence here. Right now there is -- there is several accesses onto South Locust Grove. Those accesses are going to be closed off with landscaping and both of their accesses are going to occur from these internal driveways. There is two, which is a little strange. I thought the applicant could sort of weigh into why they actually need to have two. However, so -- so, we have got a 25 foot buffer, but it goes down to I think around nine or ten feet right here. The applicant has noted that it's not feasible to be able to -- to provide this buffer, because of the engineering and because of the location of the house, but if you look at this very carefully, this is all asphalt here. Paving. We believe that at least some of that buffer, if not 25 foot, could be put there. So, we -- it was our opinion that the application needs to revise these plans to reflect a -- reflect a 25 wide -- 20 foot -- 25 foot wide buffer or as close as they can get or be -- or apply and be granted a buffer reduction through the alternative compliance process. That's an administrative process. So, what will happen is -- is that they would either provide that buffer or before City Council at the Planning Commission they would have to make an application with some specific findings that need to be met and the committee -- the planning director would have to decide whether they would grant alternative compliance. If they did it would be a nonissue. If they didn't, then, that would be something that they would have to talk to the Council about, whether or not the Council wanted to grant that. The other thing I want to mention is that the landscape plan is missing a little piece of the lot. If you look at -- this is the GIS and if you look at the -- these lots were drawn on. So, these aren't existing now. But this is the applicant's lot. If you see the corner of this, this lot goes all the way down to Victory. If you look at the landscape plan, it's kind of cut off here. Ten Mile Creek is a major amenity and our regulations and our Comprehensive Plan talks about preserving and enhancing amenities. So, one of the things that we want to see is that the landscape plan, first of all, incorporates all of the property onto the landscape plan. The second thing is that we recommend that this landscape plan be updated to design this waterway in as a natural amenity and with that staff recommends approval with the conditions as listed in the staff report.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, Alan. Appreciate it. Any questions for Alan at this point? Hearing none at this point, Matt, are you still with us?

Schultz: I am. I just got to get on video here. I'm trying. I'm trying.

Fitzgerald: You're good, sir. If you will re-introduce yourself and your address for the record, the floor is yours when you are ready.

Schultz: Thank you. Matt Schultz. 8421 South Ten Mile, Meridian. I'm here on behalf of Challenger Development. It's R-4, can we just like approve it? Just kidding. Anyway, it does make it a little bit easier. We have a site that, in my opinion, is pretty straightforward. I did look at this site a couple years ago and we were looking at it like, man, maybe we could do R-8, maybe we could have an access off a Locust Grove and -- you know. And, then, last year when it was brought to me again to look at, I said, man, the roundabout is going in, there goes our access, and there is two other accesses into an R-4 sub. Comp plan. There is no step-ups anymore. Even without that rule, because of the access and how it does integrate with Cabella Creek, it really needed to be R-4, like Cabella Creek. It is -- it's pretty straightforward from that perspective and I just told my client it's R-4. So, that's what we did. That's how we did it. We didn't even think about putting an access out to Locust Grove Road, because of the proximity to the roundabout and that roundabout is based on a 99 percent plan approved, ready for bid, ready for right of way acquisition. Our layout completely matches it. They are going to widen both roads. They are going to extend that culvert to the Ten Mile drain. They are going to wipe out everything and if we would have waited another year we could have got some free sidewalk, but as it is they are going to build it next year, so we are going to put up 38,000 for our share of the sidewalk and -- and so be it. It's -- it's good to have that work done sooner than later, in my opinion, so we can have a cohesive integration with the transportation facilities in our subdivision. I do appreciate staff pointing out that a pathway would be a good idea and they were absolutely right, it would be a good idea, and we did that pretty quickly yesterday and without sacrificing our R-4 lot sizes we were able to put a pathway in across -- lining up with that -- across Locust Grove Road into our common central open space. It fits very nicely. Two quirky things about this subdivision and, then, I will -- I promise I will try to stop talking, but the -- the existing home we are keeping, they always present their challenges for setbacks and access and -- and how do you -- how do you reorient them and we are keeping the one. The Carringtons would like to stay there. The reason there is two internal driveway common -- it's just all part of their lot with frontage into our subdivision, is that if you look at the current situation -- there is a driveway on the north property line that goes back to their back shops and, then, there is a circular driveway that goes to their house. Once you cut off those accesses those two driveways don't connect, without wiping out their entire backyard, and so we just did two separate -- one -- one connection to their back shop and one connection to their -- their -- their -- their garage, which does get a little bit close to that front buffer. Like Alan said, we propose a ten foot minimum. I still need to -- I wasn't exact in my -- my alternative compliance application, which I'm going to do so. Right after Christmas I promise to get that in and we will see how it goes administratively, but these houses sometimes beg for some administrative relief. In this case I have done a calculation, we meet the total square footage over the whole buffer, because there is some areas that are extra wide and so we are asking for a little bit narrower and I think it all comes down to landscaping. You know, ten feet or -- ten or 15 feet of landscaping is a lot better than

a 50 foot buffer with weak landscaping. So, I think it comes down to landscaping and how you do that and everything lines up. The other issue is -- and it's the only -- it's the only condition that I would like to talk about, because we do approve -- agree with staff's recommendations and their recommendation for approval and their conditions is item number four -- and Alan talked about it. Down there in our corner -- the reason we excluded that -- and we should have done a better job of showing the -- the Nampa-Meridian hundred foot easement that's there, but really with the -- with the pathway being on the south side already within that easement, the north side is theirs, to not do anything within, so they can get in there and clean it out and do what they got to do to the Ten Mile drain, that's -- that's there -- whatever -- whatever side the pathway is going on, they take the other side for their maintenance and access. In addition, ACHD is going to totally rebuild that entire ditch in that area when they expand the road, expand the culvert, and that drainage lot that we put in there was -- it's theirs. We don't need it for open space, even though it's big enough to qualify as open space, if it's -- if it's landscaped adequately and we would ask that you provide a -- it's almost a recommendation to ACHD that they do landscape this facility to Meridian's landscape standards, because it's for the roundabout. We are not using it for our drainage. It's a roundabout drainage facility. They had one in the general area previously that was a long narrow -- along our west property line. We said, no, no, no, this is a better spot right in the corner next to the drain, we will put a pathway through, it's great. So, they are going back and tweaking their design in that area to use that as -- as a space for theirs. But if you don't encourage them they are -- I don't know what they would have done, but I know the old design was a fenced off no man's land of sterile -- sterile drainage, which they tend to do along these arterials sometimes if they are not directed -- or encouraged, like I have already done, to -- to do the landscaping that -- that's nice and integrates these transportation facility drainage areas with -- with the subdivisions, instead of having a sterile fenced off no man's land. So, that's -- that's what we have shown here. You know, they will be landscaped with a pathway on one side and so with that, like I said, it's -- it's pretty straightforward. A few little quirks. But we think R-4 is appropriate. Good park strips. Good size lots. I know the access in the Cabella Creek is an issue with those neighbors, it always is on these stub streets that we connect to, but that's what they are for is for connectivity and we just don't have a high density subdivision that's going to generate the traffic that's going to cause ACHD to want to approve any other access. So, I think what we have is -- is a really good design. So, thanks.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, Matt. We appreciate it. Are there any questions for Matt at this point? Okay, sir. We will come back to you as soon as we hear from the public.

Schultz: Thanks.

Fitzgerald: Madam Clerk, do we have -- we have people in -- in chambers?

Weatherly: Mr. Chair, we have Mrs. Rita Green joining us.

Fitzgerald: Mrs. Green, thank you for staying with us tonight. We appreciate you hanging in there. Please state your name and your address for the record, ma'am, and the floor is yours.

Green: Rita Green. 37 East South Bailey Way, Meridian, in Cabella Creek. Okay. This -- this propose --- this proposed subdivision is east of my house and they want to use the access roads of Sagemoor and Loggers Pass, which is through our subdivision, and that's going to increase the traffic by 80 to a hundred cars going through right by my house. It's going to -- also there is no access for emergency vehicles. They have to come through my subdivision, get on Bailey or Loggers Pass to access that subdivision, so -- and I have never seen a subdivision built that doesn't have their own exits and entrances. It's just unusual to me. I have never seen it before. I just want to see something provided for those people. They are a different subdivision. They are not paying into our association or anything and it's our responsibility -- I know roads belong to Meridian, but I'm right on that corner and my husband and I are both retired, he's completely disabled, and a lot of noise upsets me tremendously. Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Thank you, ma'am. We greatly appreciate your being here tonight. Is there anyone on Zoom that would like to testify on this application? Please raise your hand via the Zoom app if you would like to testify on this application. Anyone new? Going once. Going twice. Matt, would you like to close, sir?

Schultz: Yes. Matt Schultz. 8421 South Ten Mile. I do appreciate Mrs. Green not wanting any change on that vacant property next to her, but those stubs streets were provided for just what we are saying and, ultimately, because of the roundabout being put in it's probably even better. So, no matter what those stub streets are just going to have to connect, even if we did have another access out to Locust Grove, those would still go through. ACHD never abandons those. It's a good idea for pedestrians or anything else and it is a low density -- I know it's a small cancellation, but it is a much lower density than what it could have maybe been put in there ten years ago even. And, really, it's the design, probably, that would have happened as a Cabella Creek phase two. In fact, Cabella Creek HOA president -- I might get in trouble for this, but he approached me at the -- at the neighborhood meeting and said, hey, you want to join the HOA. Said, well, we will look at it, but -- but we have got the amenities, too, so -- we will look at it, you know, but you know what I mean, it's -- we are matching the detached sidewalks. We are matching the feel. We are matching the size of the houses. We are matching -- we are really just trying to get along out there and not have any -- any kind of transition problems whatsoever. So, with that, yeah, I think -- I think that's the end of my presentation and ask for your approval.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, Matt.

Schultz: Thanks.

Fitzgerald: Any questions for Matt or additional comments?

Seal: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: Just wanted to ask staff real quick -- on the condition four where he explained as far as making the Ten Mile Creek into a natural amenity, was -- was that enough of an explanation to -- that we can basically strike that? I mean it makes perfect sense. I live along a piece of irrigation canal like that, so it makes sense to me. I just wanted to make sure that that was okay with staff as well.

Tiefenbach: Alan Tiefenbach. Community development planner here. I guess my question is what's going to happen -- is that going to become a no man's land or are they going to be deeding that over to ACHD? I guess I'm not -- not exactly -- I'm not exactly sure what's going to happen with that little corner piece. If it's going -- I understand it's within a drainage easement. What we don't want to see is, basically, a no man's land there. So, it either becomes -- it's either retained with the applicant or it goes to ACHD, who I guess we can work with. But I guess we are not sure about how that's going to work.

Fitzgerald: Matt, will you clarify that, please.

Schultz: Yeah. Yeah. Thanks. Thanks, Alan for -- for the -- Commissioner Seal, for the question. That's going to be a common lot owned by our HOA. The Nampa-Meridian Irrigation District has exclusive rights to it and in jurisdiction over what goes in there, given that there are easements that they control in there and so we -- we have to take care of any weeds that may pop up, because they don't -- they don't do that great of a job at it. So, we maintain that access road for them on that other side, but they don't generally like to give us any kind of improvements within their right of way that they might have to replace if they have to go in and clean out that ditch, which they do every once in a while with heavy equipment on the other side and so, yeah, I think it's great just what's out there right now. In fact, if there is an existing pathway and good landscaping -- and if there is a little teeny tiny triangle right there in the extreme corner that we need the landscape just outside of their easement we will. We will get that plotted on there before City Council, so we can see. But if it is it's going to be tiny. I mean it's going to be like ten square feet I think. It's -- it's really -- there is just nothing left down there to do, so --

Fitzgerald: Matt, if you could just make sure it's being platted, so that --

Schultz: Pretty sure --

Fitzgerald: -- in a questionable area --

Schultz: It will be a lot and block and that the HOA has responsibility for.

Tiefenbach: Sir, if I may -- if I may add, I think it would be very helpful if there -- if their landscape plan could just sort of give us an idea of what that's going to look like. Right

now there is nothing there at all. I think that's part of what's making staff a little nervous is we -- we don't want to see something where people are throwing their soda cans in from the road. We would like to know that there is something happening there. They are pretty major -- there is a major trail pathway running right along it, so we want to make sure that that is maintained.

Schultz: We will get it better documented for you, Alan.

Tiefenbach: Thank you, sir.

Schultz: Yep.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, sir. Any additional questions for Matt? And, Mrs. Green, we appreciate you staying with us and -- is she still in chambers, Nick? I just want to be clear that, unfortunately, where your house is located that stub street -- they would require us to connect that almost -- almost guaranteed with whatever was going to get built in that corner or that -- that spot of land and so, unfortunately, that kind of growth has come to that area and -- and so ACHD is required -- requires us to continue that street into whatever is built and so, hopefully, when -- I know Matt will be a good neighbor if this is approved. They always do a good job. But that is the reality of that -- that land connection -- or the interconnection of the roads. So, I just want to make sure we are clear there. If there is not additional questions or comments for Matt, can I get a motion to close the public hearing?

McCarvel: So moved.

Seal: Second.

Holland: Second.

Fitzgerald: Have a motion and a second to close the public hearing on file number H-2020-0105. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion passes. Thank you.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Cassinelli: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Cassinelli, it's R-4. Go for it. Go for it. Go.

Cassinelli: Not a whole lot I can say with -- with everything we have discussed, with the conditions, you know, and to address what you just did as far as the stub streets and traffic flow, they can't access Locust Grove -- it is what it is. It's too bad there wasn't a stub street to the north, instead two out to the -- to the west, but that's not -- you know, that's not this -- this subdivision -- that's not this development's fault, basically. So, it would have been nice had it done that, but it didn't.

Fitzgerald: Well, I think, also, to that point -- and I don't want to cut you off, but to your point, I -- in this situation I'm -- probably for the Greens, it's better that it doesn't connect to Locust Grove, because it would probably be a thoroughfare through the neighborhood into that -- into Cabella Creek. So, hopefully, this is a narrowing of only the people that are in that neighborhood. So, sorry. Go right ahead.

Cassinelli: If you find out. And I think one of the things -- just to maybe -- to put -- to put her at ease a little bit, I think R-4, the price points in here, you are not going to be getting -- you are not going to be getting drag racers.

McCarvel: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Go right ahead, Commissioner McCarvel. I'm sorry.

McCarvel: Oh. Yeah. Yeah, I think this -- yeah. To everybody's point, R-4 -- yea. And I think the -- I would be in for leaving the landscape buffer the way it is, just because I think most of that buffer is for the benefit of the homes that are on the other side to buffer from the street noise and everything and if it's -- that homeowner is -- I can see why they need it to have that swoop around there, but I would be in support of leaving that.

Fitzgerald: Like move that through alternative compliance?

McCarvel: Yeah.

Fitzgerald: Yeah. I'm kind of -- I think it looks good. It was well thought out. The big -- the amenity in the central core is nice, so I -- I don't have any concerns with going through alternative compliance for Matt's client either, so -- I would like to see the landscape plan. I think that's already in our stipulation per Alan's condition, so that isn't something we have to cover, it's already in there. So, any additional comments?

Yearsley: Mr. Chairman?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: I'm actually giving Matt a standing ovation for doing an R-4 finally, so -- grateful for having -- I do -- I think -- I think it looks good. I think for the most part everything is good. I -- I would try to -- like to see that detention basin be grass instead of the weeds and crap that are going to be in there if you don't -- they have got several around here and that's all they become is just a weed catcher and so if we could condition that to be grass I think that would be a much better use of that area.

Holland: Mr. Chair, I'm just giving my thumbs up and saying ditto. Commissioner Yearsley, I think you should make your motion.

Yearsley: Hey, let me see if I can pull it up. Mr. Chair, after considering all staff, applicant and public testimony I move to recommend approval to City Council of file number H-

2020-0150 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of December 17th, 2020, with the following modifications: That the ACHD detention basin be landscaped instead of -- with grass, instead of just the sand that they like to put in the bottom of it.

Holland: Second.

Fitzgerald: I have a motion and a second to recommend approval of file number H-2020-0105 with modifications. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Fitzgerald: Matt, thanks for hanging with us. Look forward to seeing you later, sir. Have a great -- Merry Christmas.

Schultz: Merry Christmas.

8. Public Hearing for Southridge South (H-2020-0083) by The Land Group, Inc., Generally Located South of W. Overland Rd., East of S. Ten Mile Rd.

- A. Request: Rezone of 7.15 acres of land from the R-4 to the R-2 zoning district and 28.89 acres of land from the R-2 and R-4 to the R-8 zoning district.
- B. Request: A Preliminary Plat consisting of 254 buildable lots and 29 common lots on 83.77 acres of land in the R-2 and R-8 zoning districts.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Moving on to our last item on the agenda is the public hearing for Southridge South Subdivision, file number H-2020-0083, and turn this over to Sonya. You survived until the end, ma'am.

Allen: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission. Thanks for keeping this on the agenda tonight. The next applications before you are a request for a rezone and a preliminary plat. This site consists of approximately 84 acres of land. It's zoned R-2 and R-4 and is located on the south side of West Overland Road, east of South Ten Mile Road, and is part of the larger 291 acre Southridge Development currently in the development process to the east. Southridge encompasses land on the south side of Overland Road from this property to the east to Linder Road and to the south to Val Vista and Aspen Cove Subdivisions. Adjacent land use and zoning. To the north across Overland Road is vacant, undeveloped land, zoned R-8 and apartments in the development process, zoned R-15. To the east are single family residential properties in the development process, zoned R-4. To the west and south are rural residential properties in Val Vista and Aspen Cove Subdivisions, zoned RUT in Ada county. So, just to give a little history on this property, it was annexed in -- in -- excuse me -- 2007, with a development agreement that was later replaced a couple of times with new development