

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:00 p.m. Tuesday, February 24, 2026, by Mayor Robert Simison.

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

Other Present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Sonya Allen, Nick Napoli, Mark Ford, Steve Taulbee and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

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

Simison: Council, the meeting will come to order. For the record it is February 24th, 2026, at 6:00 p.m. We will begin tonight's regular City Council meeting with roll call attendance.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Simison: If you would all, please, rise and join us in the pledge.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

COMMUNITY INVOCATION

Simison: Okay. Up next is our community invocation and tonight that will be delivered by Jenifer Cavaness-Williams with the Baha'i Faith. If you would all, please, join us in this community invocation or take this as a moment of silence and reflection.

Cavaness-Williams: Oh, God, we are weak, give us strength. We are poor, bestow upon us thine unlimited treasures. We are sick, grant us thy divine healing. We are powerless, give us thy heavenly power. Oh, Lord, make us useful in this world. Free us from the condition of self and desire. Oh, Lord, make us firm in thy love and cause us to be loving toward the whole of mankind. Confirm us in service to the world of humanity, so that we may become the servants of thy servants, that we may love all thy creatures and become compassionate to all thy people. Oh, Lord, thou art the Almighty, thou art the merciful, thou art the forgiver, thou art the omnipotent.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND RECOGNITION

Simison: Thank you very much. Council, anything under announcements and recognition -- recognition?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Real quick. It's been a busy week in Meridian and I just wanted to take a quick moment to thank, recognize and appreciate the fine men and women of the Meridian Police Department and our many partner agencies. I don't know about you, Council, I -- I slept better last night knowing that our community is in a safer place and it's due to exceptional police work and exceptional partnership agencies. So, on behalf of myself and the Council I want to thank the Police Department for their great work this last week.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Simison: Okay. Seeing nothing else we will move on to our public forum. Madam Clerk -- oh, Mr. Overton.

Overton: Sorry. We should approve the agenda.

Simison: Yes, we should. Councilman Overton.

Overton: Mr. Mayor, there are no changes to tonight's agenda. I move that we approve it as published.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Motion and second to adopt the agenda. All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the agenda is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

PUBLIC FORUM

Simison: Next step is public forum. Madam Clerk, anyone signed up under public forum?

Lomeli: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. No one has signed up.

PUBLIC HEARINGS [Action Item]

- 1. Public Hearing (continued from January 13, 2026) for Latitude Forty Three Subdivision (H-2024-0059), by Rodney Evans + Partners, LLC., located at 675, 715 and 955 S. Wells St. Continued to April 7, 2026**

- A. Request: Annexation of 17.27 acres of land with R-8 (13.78 acres), R-15 (2.42 acres) and C-N (1.07 acres) zoning districts.
- B. Request: Preliminary Plat to re-subdivide lots 7, 21 and 22, Magic View Subdivision, Amended into 79 residential lots, 1 commercial lot and 11 common/other lots on 15.97 acres of land in the R-8, R-15 and C-N zoning districts.

Simison: Okay. Then with that we will go on to our work for this evening. First item up is a public hearing continued from January 13th, 2026, for Latitude Forty Three, which is H-2024-0059. We will continue this public hearing with comments from staff.

Allen: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. Since the last hearing revised elevations were submitted for the first phase of the development, which is the portion north of the Five Mile Creek. These were the elevations that were originally submitted with the application and the elevations that the Commission recommended approval of in their action. These are the proposed elevations that were submitted by the applicant. Several -- ten to be exact -- letters of testimony have been received since the last hearing for a total of 28 and those are included in the public record, as well as these elevations. The applicant also submitted proposed concepts for the future east-west collector street where it crosses this site that's been the topic of discussion with this application. And Caleb Hood is present to speak more to that here tonight if you have questions. That's all for staff. Thank you.

Simison: Okay. Council, any questions for staff for follow up?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Could you go through the elevations again? I just wanted a chance to look at that.

Allen: Yeah. Again, these were the ones that were approved by the Commission.

Strader: Okay.

Allen: And these are the proposed elevations.

Strader: Thanks.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for staff?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Sonya, apologies if I have -- if I have missed this. I know this is kind of an older staff where there is a long application.

Allen: Uh-huh.

Cavener: I didn't see anything anywhere about student generation, where students are set to go if this were to be approved. I know we didn't get a letter from West Ada, but I know sometimes in our staff reports we include that information. I just need to know if I have missed it or if we have that information.

Allen: If you want to give me a moment I will take a look at that. I don't remember off the top of my head. It's been a while.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: What I might suggest -- and I think my point was -- I know we have got a lot of public testimony tonight. That would be something that I would like to get some clarification on maybe when we get towards the end of public testimony.

Simison: Okay. All right. Any additional questions for staff at this time? Okay. Would the applicant like to come forward.

Semple: Good evening, Council. Ben Semple with Rodney Evans and Partners. 1450 West Bannock Street, Boise, Idaho. 83702. We are back. First I want to thank staff, as well as the -- the city in general. The consultant report that we received regarding the -- you know, we are here primarily to discuss about an east-west collector road that was kind of the topic of discussion. They really necessitated that deferral about ten months ago or so. I did provide a presentation. I'm not sure if you guys can pull that up. Maybe you have got it? I have a thumb drive also if that is easier. While Sonya is pulling that up, just to touch real quickly on this so to refresh everyone's memories. It's about 17.27 acres, located between Magic View and the freeway or Wells Circle and -- on the west side of Wells Street, just west of Eagle Road and the request is to annex the 17.27 acres and assign zoning designations of R-8, R-15 and C-N zoning to the subject parcels. That consists of about 13.78 acres of R-8 zoning, 2.42 acres of R-15 zoning and 1.07 acres of C-N zoning. The -- the -- the request is also for a subdivision. So, real quickly here -- here is the -- my presentation is open. Just the project site here. Just to get everybody oriented, Five Mile Creek kind of bisects the project. Phase one that you will hear us talk about is north of Five Mile Creek. Phase two is south of Five Mile Creek. The current zoning is RUT in Ada county. We are requesting that the annexation complies with the future land use of medium density residential, as well as the mixed-use neighborhood designation on the southern portion. The preliminary plat that we presented earlier -- or I guess towards the middle of last year has not been changed at this point. We still have 59 single family lots in the first phase. We have 20 single family lots in the second phase and the one -- approximately one acre

commercial site that would follow along Wells Circle. A phasing plan that we have here. And, then, this is the preliminary plat. I'm going to take a minute to talk about this a little bit more. Our open space of 2.96 acres -- that 2.28 acres is required, 15 percent of the overall development. We have 2.47 acres of qualified open space, which calculates out to 16.3 percent of the site of qualified amenities required for this development would be three points based on the one point per five acres of gross development area. We have 12 amenity points proposed. That consists of a picnic area, a tot lot playground, two sports courts and multi-use pathway. The amenities in phase one constitute four points. That's a picnic area, the tot lot playground, multi -- multi-use pathway and, then, the open space. The amenities for phase two would consist of some additional open space and the two sport courts. So, this gets us kind of the timing of these applications. So, we had submitted these applications kind of late 2024 and we are here middle of 2025 with a unanimous recommendation for approval from Planning and Zoning and at that point in time it was brought to our attention that there was some inconsistencies with long-term east-west collector location to get from Eagle Road over to Locust Grove. There is -- I know there is some other extents of that, but that's primarily what's impacting this project. At the time we requested to defer, so that that -- the consultant that was hired by the City of Meridian could do their study and determine what the best locations for an east-west collector were. They presented those alternatives to the Council. I'm going to go ahead and skip to that real quickly. So, this was a month long study. January 27th this Council reviewed those alternatives and selected either D or E as the preferred locations of that east-west collector. This is concept D. It's a little difficult to see here. If you can see my cursor here, D runs along Freeway Drive, kind of hooks north where Wells Street currently is and, then, followed Wells Circle and, then, led west through some county property. Concept E was very similar, other than it -- when it hit the western boundary where the county property is it -- it jogged south. This would be concept D. As overlaid you can see on the right side of this image is where concept D would follow Magic View Circle, kind of move north a little bit and, then, continue west towards the bottom of the screen here. You can see where concept E similarly follows Magic View and, then, jogs south. Yesterday we had some additional conversations with staff and we were presented a third option that follows a little bit further north. Our phase two can still accommodate that right of way. It will take a few additional moves with the pre-plat to land that right of way in the correct location. Effectively we are here saying that if Council prefers us to run it a little further north that works for us. This really only impacts phase two. As you can see here we could retain concept D or E. There is no real additional steps required on our end. A little bit of a tweak at the southwest corner of phase two. If there -- if the third option is selected we feel like with a revision to the preliminary plat we would -- we would want to come back to show you what that looks like. This is where that concept D -- or, sorry, I guess we will call it the new concept that we were provided yesterday -- generally falls. You can see that it kind of aligns with what we are calling Equator Drive that is part of the -- the proposed subdivision. That would be just to the left of this on screen. That being a collector there is some moves that would have to happen with the uses along the collector, some buffers for residential uses down there, but ultimately still really preserves about one-third commercial, two-thirds residential in phase two. As you can see in these slides -- and I will just jump back to these other ones. If you look at phase

one, which is north of Five Mile Creek, our entry into phase one would be here off of Wells Circle and all the traffic would go north into the subdivision of phase one. The alternatives for the east-west collector are down here on the south edge and even here we are still -- we actually still meet ACHD spacing requirements for offset from collector roadways. So, what I want to talk about is a little bit more of what we have gone through this process. After we have kind of adjusted -- or looked at adjusting the south phase two here we have determined that phase one really has no impact with the east-west collector. Again, can fully retain that right of way as was the Council's direction when we were deferred originally to find an ability to accommodate that east-west collector roadway through the site. Excuse me. And actually initially this is not the first adjustment that would come out of this project. All of the other adjustments that we have made were based on original neighbor comments and concerns. We have eliminated a direct vehicular connection to Magic View Drive, which is at the northwest corner of the project. Right here. We have converted that to a shared driveway that's bollarded so it could be an emergency connection only. That would allow for pedestrian, you know, connectivity, but we are not allowed direct vehicular connection. We did this to respond to the neighbors' concerns, really trying to push traffic over to Wells Street as far south as we can in phase one to try to encourage the traffic to either turn south and go to Freeway Drive to get to Eagle Road, they can turn left and go on Wells to get to Allen Street to Eagle Road. There will be traffic that turns left and goes through Woodbridge as currently happens right now. But we really feel like this responded to those -- kind of those concerns. One of the other things I do want to point out is when we came in at our pre-app for this project we had 90 residential lots proposed between both phases. When we went to our neighborhood meeting we had reduced that to 85 residential lots. When we went to our initial submittal, again based on some feedback from the city, as well as looking at neighbor concerns, we reduced that to 81 residential lots and through working with the city, some tweaks that we needed to make to where the right of way falls, some landscape buffering, that has been reduced to 79 residential lots. That is over both phases of -- of the project. Fifty-nine lots, again, would be in phase one north of the canal -- or the -- the Creek. Twenty, roughly, will be south. Additionally we made some changes to the lots along the western boundary of phase one, which directly abuts the Woodbridge Subdivision. We brought those into conformance to a one-to-one lot ratio. We have 15 lots on our side. We have -- there is 15 existing lots on the Woodbridge side. We also substantially tried to align those property lines in corners with those properties, while also being sensitive to the developer and -- and future build out, trying to keep our lot widths pretty standardized, so we didn't have a lot of different lot widths. Additionally, we have setbacks along the western side of phase one. That would be an R-8 zone. We are requesting a 12 foot setback, which is the R-8 standard. We have talked to the developer and the developer's builder and they are comfortable that a single story home would have a 12 foot setback -- rear setback. A two story home would have a 20 foot setback, which exceeds -- far exceeds the R-8 standard. I think, actually, it's in excess of the R-4 standard for a rear setback. We would like to retain -- and this is similar to the conversation we had before -- retain the option of providing a covered or uncovered patio space behind those two-story homes that could go to that 12 foot setback. Whether a one-story or two-story home we would not encroach into that 12 foot

setback. I would like to mention that in talking with the builder they have indicated that 60 percent of their lot sales their buyers are selecting single story homes. We anticipate that that would continue through this development as well. We are in agreement with all the staff report and conditions of approval. We feel confident that this will provide a high quality project to this area and that it has responded to the city's requests for the east-west collector location for future, which will help alleviate traffic concerns that the neighbors have that we have heard. We also wanted to make sure to just reiterate that this developer and their builder now will be working with the neighbors to make sure that the fences along that western property boundary are on the property line and in good condition. That is not something that was able to be addressed in the last approximately a year, because we were delayed. I will mention that this is a different builder. You will probably hear about that from neighbors tonight. I have seen that in the comment letters that were provided. When we were deferred the builder that was selected before that had committed to this project felt like they could hang around for a little bit. Unfortunately, that time frame got too long for them to feel comfortable with committing to closing on the property to be the builder. It happens. They have -- this developer selected another builder. I know that that builder is different than the ones that the neighbors have talked to. We feel like they are still going to build a very high quality home. These are very cohesive with this area, as well as most other areas in the City of Meridian. Again, single family homes. We are really comfortable that this project meets all of the UDC standards, all of the Comprehensive Plan future land use standards and really does set up the city for success in finding a way to create this east-west collector between Eagle Road and going as far as Locust Grove and I think even further west than that as well. So, I would stand for additional questions you might have. Council Member Cavener, I do not have an answer for you about the school, -- but because we -- as you stated we didn't get a letter from West Ada. Hethe Clark here with the development team he does have some information about that if you would like to hear that, too.

Cavener: Great.

Semple: Thank you.

Simison: Councilman Cavener, would you like that to be your first question for the applicant?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, thank you. Hethe Clark, if you have got some information on schools I know our staff would probably appreciate that and I sure would as well. So, any insight to share I would be happy to hear it.

Clark: Yep. Mr. Mayor, Council Member Cavener, Hethe Clark. 251 East Front Street in Boise. So, I thought that might come up. I have been around a minute. So, I -- I did just do a little research looking at the assigned school areas and relying on the West Ada website to do all this, because, obviously, there is not a letter to confirm it, but it appears that it's Centennial that's the high school. Current enrollment is at about 1,700. The prior high was about 2,100. Middle school is Lewis & Clark, just shy of 900 current

enrollment. Prior high of about 1,125. Elementary schools. Meridian. And that looks like that enrollments pretty stable at about 400 and, then, as -- as we have talked about in the past, you know, district wide you have got about a thousand fewer first graders than you have seniors. So, hopefully, that -- that's amount -- that's what I can give you now without specific direction from the -- from the school district.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener,

Cavener: Hethe, thanks. That's one of the reasons why I asked the question. I did a little research myself this weekend and I certainly saw that Centennial popped up and it was a little bit of a head scratcher for me based on the location. So, I appreciate you sharing some of the information that you found as well.

Clark: You bet.

Simison: Council, other questions for the applicant?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Talk to me a little bit about your open space and why you determined to put it there. Usually we do like open space to be kind of central to each phase and it was a little bit like it's not. So, I just want to understand that choice.

Semple: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Strader, thank you for that question. So, I wanted to bring up the open space exhibit. I kind of skipped back past it pretty quickly, because I wanted to talk about that -- the roadway. We have located the open space in the floodway area or floodplain area of Five Mile Creek, which basically restricts us from being able to develop single family or really any building within that space. What it does is it allows us to utilize the -- what is a -- a benefit or a -- an amenity for the overall city of open Five Mile Creek. The south -- or sorry. The north side of Five Mile Creek has a very low slope approach to that creek and so what that allows us to do is really get some nice picnic areas, that tot lot area, and incorporate some passive recreation. Additionally, the -- the multi-use pathway that is associated with the City of Meridian's pathway plan and ties into the pathway that comes through Woodbridge -- is located -- I don't know -- can you guys see my cursor on this screen? Okay. It runs right along here, which is the north side of Five Mile Creek. It will stub here in case -- in the event that this parcel redevelops, but it does hook north and, then, ties into the Woodbridge pathway there. With that linear pathway and green space that's kind of already established in terms of a location. We have really felt that consolidating a larger area of open space here would better serve this community, specifically because the entry to this -- the -- specifically phase one will be a very landscaped, very kind of -- I won't say wild, but a very landscaped and developed open space area that will really kind of draw

all the residents into that. The additional open space on the south side stands alone for itself. We -- we have enough open space on the north side in phase one to more than accommodate the requirements of the UDC for open space and programming there. Our phase one again has four amenity points, which would be more than the entire development requires. We do have some additional landscape buffers and some other areas for some passive recreation and kind of pedestrian connectivity, but rather than segment that, knowing that with phase two we would also like those residents to be able to enjoy the open space area as well.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Just one more. If you could just confirm. Are you intending to build the east-west collector in phase two or are you flexible on that? Help me understand that. And with staff's third option, which I don't fully understand, so I would like to flush that out, but -- with them. But when are -- when are you proposing to do that?

Sample: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Strader, at this point it would be built in phase two. I know that there is some pretty substantial work to secure additional right of way for the extension of that, both to the east and west of our site, but we are ready to dedicate wherever that needs to fall. You know, we are -- we feel like if this third option we were presented yesterday is really where that collector needs to go, we are going to be back here talking about what that really looks like in terms of the final location and, ultimately, I -- if it falls along Magic View Circle, I will have to confirm with my client, but it makes a little easier to do that earlier. Currently that's set up as just a local roadway. It would take an expansion of that right of way -- redoing that roadway of Wells Circle that currently serves a couple commercial areas and some residential properties.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Maybe just some early feedback. With really contentious applications where we have real infrastructure issues usually I'm looking for developers to come with a solution to the problem and really contribute to the solution and so I -- I can tell you right now, just from my own perspective, that solving the problem in phase two already feels problematic to me. I'm going to chew on it during the meeting, but it's -- you know, I can think of some other examples where, you know, we have had like nonstarters on McMillan Road where the developer, for example, puts in a roundabout at their own cost or does something that really moves the needle in terms of the infrastructure and here I -- I'm not really seeing that in your strategy. So, I just wanted to flag that for you so you have a chance to chew on that during the meeting. Thank you.

Sample: I appreciate that.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Ben, I think we are going to have a lot -- much longer talk this evening about that preferred roadway, but for all practical purposes I just want to make sure we put one part of it on the record as we go forward, just out of fairness to you and fairness to everyone else. The preferred roadway was what this City Council decided on as our future roadway to alleviate and reduce traffic through the Woodbridge Subdivision, with full knowledge that it would require complete rebuilds of the subdivision to the south of Woodbridge now. It's not something that we look forward to having happen in the next ten to 15 years. There is no current applications that would help us do that redevelopment at this point, but we as a city are tired of not protecting those roadways for the future and having developments come in and reduce our ability to fix a problem that we have had for 20 years. So, as we continue to talk about this I want to just tell you we are going to talk about it with staff a little bit more as we go through this hearing tonight. We just need to make sure that this isn't something that the applicant's offering up, we are -- we are basically requesting them as a city -- we have already sat down with ACHD and said this is where we want our preferred roadway to go. It makes the most sense for them, it makes the most sense for us for the future, we just don't know when that future is. Mr. Mayor, one quick follow up.

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: On a different note, a question I really need to have answered now is in your application, going all the way back to almost the beginning, you have a letter from ITD requesting that you provide a traffic impact analysis and I'm talking the date on that original letter is February 10th of 2024, I believe. So, it's over two years ago. The language requesting that TIA, Traffic Impact Analysis, appears in every single document that Planning has put forward on page two and page eight as we have gone through this process and gone through all of these other hearings. But we are sitting here tonight over two years after that was requested and I don't see that we have that analysis in hand.

Semple: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Overton, you are correct, you don't have that in hand. When we were deferred, not knowing where or how an east-west collector may impact this development, it was hard for us to provide -- or to have a traffic impact analysis completed that would meet all the standards that ACHD, ITD, and the city are looking for to be able to fully determine that. We do have a scoping memo that's been approved. We do -- that -- the process is in process to get that traffic impact analysis. I -- I thought that the condition was -- had something to do with final plat for that traffic impact analysis regardless of when it is in process in order to inform us as to whether there are impacts. In nonformal discussions with ITD they indicated they can't really expand their right of way on Eagle Road. There really isn't a whole lot in terms of improvements, so that the -- the Eagle Road area that could be done currently, other than, you know, maybe some signalization, timing, some changes to that. We are fully

open to -- and anticipate some mitigation requirements from ITD to come out of that traffic impact analysis. I think that finding a -- finding out where exactly that collector goes now that we have that information, we feel very confident that our project right now as presented would retain both D and E preferred alignments for that east-west collector. We are ready to commit to dedicating that right of way for that east-west collector right now, you know, with this application. If this third option that we were presented yesterday by staff ends up being the new preferred location, if that's the way that the Council dictates that that -- where that road goes, Equator Drive, which you can see right here substantially aligns closely with that, kind of line that was drawn on the master street map, in which case we would just dedicate that as our collector right of way for future east-west. I think that that protects the city, because that would be enshrined in the development agreement that is entered into, even if that is a to be determined location that is something that the developer is willing to commit to, to really make sure that the city knows they are ready to dedicate the right of way for that. If it is Wells Circle that becomes that, I believe that those improvements could be done earlier than later, because it's already a partial road section, so it makes it a little bit easier to develop. For phase two if it had to move further north, the right of way would be dedicated with the plat and, then, when that construction came along that would be built as a collector roadway. At this time, even east of here, if it is that third option there really is a lot of work to find and negotiate with those private property owners to get that alignment to work. If it's Freeway Drive and Wells Circle, we really have no issue with finding that right of way at this point or really aligning it with what the city's vision is for that.

Overton: Mr. Mayor, follow up?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I think you kind of got off my topic.

Semple: Okay.

Overton: Woodbridge Subdivision has been concerned about -- the foremost has been traffic.

Semple: Uh-huh.

Overton: When Idaho Transportation Department states that because State Highway 55 corridor is already congested and this project will increase the number of vehicle trips and they request a study, so that we can see what that study looks like for what that impacts going to be on Highway 55, it becomes very important to me that I have that study in hand before we try to make a decision, because what concerns me the most is if we are going to push that much more traffic towards 55, how much of it's going to turn and go back west through Woodbridge and I think that's what most of the folks in this room are concerned about is we don't have those pieces to look at tonight. Now, I understand that there was a concern over the driveway, but that was not an issue

for the first year and we still didn't see that that was supplied as part of this application. We didn't bring that forward. But now we are sitting two years late, it's overdue, we don't have it, I'm having a hard time making a decision in favor without having all the pieces in front of me that say what the impacts are going to be with this project.

Semple: Okay. Mr. Mayor, Council Member Overton, I -- I appreciate that. I think that we were trying to figure out is this development going to change completely because of the consultant's study for an east-west collector? Was it going to run it through the middle of our phase one where we would have to fully adjust that and move stuff around, which at that point it had -- we started a TIA, Traffic Impact Analysis, at that point it would be invalid, because it wouldn't be responding to this design. I do know that they have provided us, as I stated, with some feedback that other than some minor changes to some timing of signals to try to move traffic out of those intersections at Eagle Road, State Highway 55 and Allen or where -- I think Freeway ties in as well, at this point the Highway 55 corridor there is not a lot that could be expanded there, regardless of what this project looked like. Now, that we have a little bit more understanding of where that east-west collector will go, I think that that traffic impact analysis can get completed pretty quickly. So, I would -- I will talk to my client after the Q&A here, see where we sit with that, see what I can provide for additional information during the rebuttal.

Simison: And, Council, if I could -- I want to thank staff for maybe bringing up my comments essentially, but after our -- our joint meeting we looked at D a little closer and, really, the way the DLM comes, you come down Freeway, you take a hard right and, then, a hard left in order for that alignment to work. So, what we really looked at is say if we are really trying to move traffic through this area quickly you have to take away those turning movements. So, we -- I'm not -- we don't know if it would even work, but we haven't had time to analyze that if you were to realign and take the road behind one of the hotels and push it up through that direction, which is why that was brought up in this context. I think that from -- when this was originally continued we at least understand the difference between phase one and phase two of this project is -- we are likely not going to build a road in phase one, based upon the -- the comments that have happened. Phase two, if we stay with D or E, is not impacted, you know, because it is on the -- on that southern edge of the property through that. But, again, I think that there is a little bit more refinement on whether or not that road should be evaluated to be straightened or not to achieve the goal, because the more turns we have in it -- it's no different -- it would be like going down past -- right up down at the state patrol and you take that hard right and take that left again, that's not a very good thoroughfare if that's what you are trying to create and that's almost identical to what we have created that point on the D alignment if it were to remain the -- the choice. So, I just want to put that out there. That's why you are hearing about this. It's not as if, though, there is any decision points. It was just -- we should at least explore that opportunity if we are going to try to do this right long term. So, just want to put that out there for everybody. Council, additional questions for the applicant? Okay. Thank you very much. Madam Clerk, do we have anyone signed up to provide testimony on the item tonight?

Lomeli: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Yes. The first person is Robin McCulley. She's indicated that she's representing an HOA.

Simison: Can you say your name and address and you will be recognized for ten minutes.

McCulley: My name is -- good evening, Mayor, City Council. My name is Robin McCulley and I live at 728 South Woodhaven Avenue and I have been a resident of Woodhaven -- of Woodbridge for about 11 years now. While I support the growth in the -- of our community I do have several specific concerns that I want to address with you guys tonight. First, the issue of the fence on the west side. I spoke of this originally about nine months ago and I submitted a letter, as well as pictures to you of that fence directly behind my home and you addressed it with the homeowner -- or the owner of the property and asked him if he was willing to work with the residents and make sure that we came, you know, to agreements on that and he agreed that he would work with us. To date we have not heard anything from him and it's been over nine months at this point. But I noticed when he submitted just this last week the new information I was online and I looked at the survey, which is on page 37 on -- under department report update dated the 18th -- February 18th, it actually says on the report -- it says existing privacy fence to remain. This makes me question whether or not they were actually generally -- there were any genuine intentions to address any of our concerns. I'm also confused about whether a new fence can be legally constructed directly adjacent to our existing fence. I reached out to Planning and Zoning three times and I was told three different answers. So, that inconsistency alone -- we need clarification I think before moving forward with that. There are also matters of ownership of trees back there. That, again, the property line was not established in the survey and he brought that up. Also you guys mentioned that you thought that their addition with Pacific Lifestyle Homes presenting their homes would be a good fit for Woodbridge, saying in terms of size, quality and value they were very comparable to Woodbridge. They no longer are in this case with the new elevations that he is proposing. Previously they were in 500 and -- 500 to 600 thousand dollar range, estimated over 2,000 square feet. They are not at that price point anymore. We, as the residents of Woodbridge, were working with Pacific Lifestyle Home, the builder. We were having open discussions. As of last Wednesday he was unaware -- he thought he was waiting on traffic studies. He had not heard anything else from the owner. He did not receive anything until the next day from their lawyer saying he was no longer a part of this. So, that's confusing to us. Finally, the traffic impact. As you all know with the several projects that have already been approved on -- coming to Locust Grove area, ACHD has already estimated 5,000 cars a day coming to the area of Locust Grove. Adding Latitude Forty Three is only going to cause burden -- more burden and congestion that we are already seeing problems and puts our families and pedestrians, children at risk. We don't think our infrastructure is ready yet. It's under strain at this time and until we can clear some of that up we think adding more vehicles is just cause for possible serious consequences. I know that he just -- I just wanted to respond to him saying that he was waiting for the traffic study to see if it was going to run through phase one. Woodbridge aligns adjacently to phase one. I mean he -- he told you that it is platted out to match us. So, the only way that

that would have ever happened is if you were going to run another road through Woodbridge, which you have all told us that you were trying to wait, because you are trying to help us and -- and get that congestion out of there. We all think that we need to be proactive as all these things -- the ICOM, the State College, West Ada's new technical school has all been approved. It's coming. We know that it's coming, but we need to move that traffic and figure out a solid way to move that around Woodbridge instead of through Woodbridge to keep our families safe. Given this concern, the unresolved fencing issues, uncertainty about property rights, change in the scale of development, significant traffic impacts I respectfully ask you all to vote no to the Latitude Forty Three until some meaningful resolution -- resolutions and clear protections are in place for all of our affected homeowners and we have several residents here -- they don't like to speak, but they are here to back the HOA and our vote of no to Latitude Forty Three. Would the residents, please, stand up that are here to vote no. Thank you. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Robin, thanks. I want to say I read all three of your e-mails over the past year and change, so I appreciate you kind of putting a face to the name. My one question really stems with how you ended your presentation tonight on behalf of your fellow residents, which is -- you touched on -- you would want the Council to vote no until there is meaningful resolution. What does meaningful resolution look like for the neighborhood?

McCulley: I think we have to have real open -- not just ideas, but movement in that area for -- we have to have at least something on the ACHD's five year plan or sooner. We have all these other things moving in on Locust Grove, all these cars that we know are already coming and before we continue to add to it on the east side I think that we need to have real meaningful things in place and seeing it progress. At this point we have no progression. We have ideas. We have presentation. I don't know if you all have met with -- I think Mr. Overton said that you met with ACHD already to put your ideas in place, but to really have it on the five year plan it's going to happen, give us some hope that we will see some relief. That West Ada technical school with those high schoolers coming and going all day, they are going to cut through Woodbridge to get to the fast food areas. We know this and that's going to be all day long and our community is already under so much burden with the traffic as it is now, if we add 79 more homes with an unknown amount of cars to each home it's just going to be even more of a burden.

Cavener: Mayor, can I follow up?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Robin, this process is really designed to be collaborative; right? And Council is trying to hear from everybody and I think you have a unique opportunity representing your HOA, you have got the applicant here and so what are -- I heard a lot of kind of like, okay, we -- we want to see some action from the highway district. Outside of that what are the specific things you are looking for from the -- from the applicant when you talk about meaningful resolution? What are those specific things that you are looking from the applicant to be able to provide for you?

McCulley: From the applicant we have always been open to discussions with the potential builder and the applicant to speak with us about what they are trying to bring in behind us. We like to work with them, give them ideas, discuss what we know you all are looking for as well. I mean we know this area will be developed at some point and so we are -- we are not oblivious to that. We know that. But we also want them to work with us. This setting change in builder, it hasn't given any of the residents that the, quote, bait and switch, it feels very much like that to our residents, because we had worked with this builder this entire process, to then find out last week that it had completely changed builders. We have now changed elevations. It's like -- everybody was very surprised. We hardly had enough time to get all the information out to the residents.

Cavener: Sure. Mr. Mayor, maybe one more. And -- and, Robin, I apologize, I'm not trying to go back up with you --

McCulley: Yeah. No. Go ahead.

Cavener: -- we as the Council have an opportunity to impose conditions if the Council were to generate approval and part of the reason we take public testimony is we were trying to get some insight as to what those things are. My assumption is if the Council said, hey, applicant you have to adhere to the previous elevations that were presented, that wouldn't necessarily change that your neighborhood would be opposed to the application and so when you -- when you said you want meaningful resolution, I -- I apologize that I'm -- I'm really looking for specific things, which I -- I haven't really heard and so I guess I will give you one more opportunity. If there are specific things that the neighborhood has presented to the applicant that you believe need to be addressed by the applicant that they have refused to address, those are the things that I'm looking for.

McCulley: Well, unfortunately, our HOA and the residents haven't had the opportunity to even meet and come up with these things, because all of -- this has just happened in a very -- the initial change was done three business days ago, only six days before this vote. So, it was -- we haven't had an opportunity to meet as a group out of the residents, we haven't had a chance to even discuss anything, so they have written letters, you know, talked to us as much as they can, we have put it on our website, that type of thing, but they really haven't had an opportunity to talk to the owner and that type of thing about the amenities for, you know, deciding to just go forward with phase one. Phase one doesn't -- I mean I heard that it meets the three points or four points that it is, but, honestly, the pickleball courts were in phase two. That was the biggest

amenity. That was what all these 79 houses, you know, something big that they could do. That is no longer. So, those types of things. Talk about amenities. Talking about elevation. Talking about just all that in general, like having -- having discussions when -- when originally they said they would work with Woodbridge and they wanted Woodbridge to be a part of it and they wanted us to, you know, have nice good discussions and, you know, work with them, which we completely have. We have been on board from the beginning with them and now six days ago, three business days ago everything changed. Like we will not be using this builder. We will not be using these elevations and so we were quickly trying to gather information and get it out to everyone.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor.

Simison: There will be -- not -- right here.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, just -- Robin, thanks. I know it's a very hard job, a very -- the job doesn't come with a lot of thanks and appreciation serving on your HOA board. Just on behalf of the Mayor and Council, thanks for serving on your HOA and appreciate you being here tonight.

McCulley: Thank you. Thank you for listening. Thank you.

Simison: Robin, you may -- you are probably not done yet, Robin.

McCulley: Oh, I'm not done yet.

Simison: I know I --

McCulley: Okay. Sorry. I'm not done yet. Just kidding.

Simison: Council, other questions? I do have one question.

McCulley: Yes.

Simison: So -- so, you talked about the road a little bit. I'm not -- we are not ACHD, we don't get to decide when roads are built, but I don't think this road is going to be built at all unless it starts with development one piece of the property at a time. So, I guess my question is -- and on behalf of your association as best you can --

McCulley: Yes, sir.

Simison: -- would you rather have the current road situation you have for the next 30 years or would you rather start the process piece by piece, knowing that it's going to maybe get incrementally worse before it gets better at the end? Because it's -- I don't see ACHD going in and doing eminent domain and purchasing up properties in this area, it's going to only happen over time as developers or others buy homes and

redevelop their properties with it -- where a road will eventually get extended through that area. That's my crystal ball for you. So, I'm going to ask you for what would you rather see on -- see happen.

McCulley: Well, I would like to see that it's presented to ACHD as a problem that's been a problem for many many years and even though it may only be placed on the five year plan, that maybe it could be -- because it's -- it's grown so quickly and there has been so many issues and things have happened in that area, that they could put us closer to the top of the list than 30 years out. I -- the piece by piece -- I understand that ACHD does work more retroactively than proactively, but in our case we already know, because the projects have been approved on Locust Grove, the three -- there is several projects on Locust Grove, that it's coming. These -- these are coming and so we know this already. I just -- I think our community just doesn't want to add any more. Like what's the cutoff? At what point -- we are going to be so bogged down that getting out of -- onto Eagle Road, whether you are at the light by the -- at McDonald's or whether you are at the light at St. Luke's, is backing up so far now and it takes so very very long to get out and that's without these things being in effect yet. Those -- the ICOM and the West Ada, they are not there yet. Latitude Forty Three is not there yet and we already have substantial backup. So, I think -- I wish we all had a crystal ball. I know when I stood up here in front of you ten years ago pregnant with my son talking about this very issue, I said, you know, the traffic then was bad and I just wish that we could figure out a way to take care of it and help the residents of Woodbridge and keep -- say no to these things that we can still say no to, since the ones that have already been said yes to we don't have any recourse for that. We can't -- we can't take those back, so -- but this one we still have the opportunity to say we have to figure some things out yet. We are not quite there yet and we need to get there before we can allow anything else to come and -- and I just -- I think all of the residents would say that. They would say, you know, we have had a child hit in our neighborhood. We have speeders. We have so much congestion and traffic that they are just looking for safety. Safety for our residents. Safety for our children, the pedestrians, everyone, and just adding more traffic -- 79 homes with potentially two drivers, it's just going to add so much more to that whole entire area. Not just -- you know, just for everyone's safety, so --

Simison: Okay.

McCulley: Does that answer your question?

Simison: Not exactly, but I will -- I will let you get off with that. There is no right or wrong answer, but it -- you know, it's just the reality of the situation that is there, that if you want another road to bypass, development is going to have to help bring it. Otherwise there probably won't be a road in the near future and we will have to look at what we have and make adjustments into this Woodbridge area if you want to do traffic mitigation on that. But that's for a separate conversation, not for this application.

McCulley: Yes. I understand what you are saying and I think -- yes.

Simison: Okay. All right.

McCulley: Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Okay. Madam Clerk, next on the list?

Lomeli: Mr. Mayor, no one else has indicated they would wish to testify. Do you want me to go through names or --

Simison: Well, since we -- yeah, you -- everyone -- don't worry. We will just -- I just want to make sure that no one else has said they want to testify.

Lomeli: Correct.

Simison: Okay. Then just come on up one at a time and you will be recognized for three minutes. You can state your name and address. Don't worry, everyone will get their opportunity.

Pieper: My name is Afton Pieper and I live on Bowstring, 2228 Bowstring. Sorry. So, I see it all. So, you wanted a proposed solution; right? There is just no way you can allow that volume of homes to be developed. So, if you want to allow something just don't allow that volume. That volume is huge. It is a huge, huge problem for not only our neighborhood, but like she was starting to indicate getting out onto Eagle, get -- either way it's a problem. Getting into our neighborhood from Allen Street off of Eagle, that's a problem. It's already backed up to where if you take a left on Franklin -- if you are on Franklin, take a left onto Eagle, that backs up into the intersection, because everybody is trying to get in that right lane to get onto the interstate, so we can't get into the right lane to get into our own neighborhood. That's just going to add more and more. So, not just a problem in our own neighborhood, you have got a problem with the hospital. You have got a problem with the entire intersection of Eagle and Franklin. I have seen two car wrecks on Locust Grove turning into Woodbridge and the problem usually is people ride that middle lane because they say, oh, I have got to take a left all the way up there. So, they smash into someone else who is also trying to take a left. So, we already have real problems. Two kids have been hit, not one. Two. One kid, huge scar on the back of his -- on his back; right? He didn't tell anybody. He showed some neighbors, but he didn't -- he didn't say anything about it. He was hit on a scooter. Another kid he was on the sidewalk and got hit. He was not in the street. Sidewalk. So, if you have got kids getting pushed -- like this car, he was on the sidewalk waiting for his turn. They rode and won't -- go up -- went up on the sidewalk and knocked him off his scooter. Those are real problems. They are not just, you know, oh, well, that -- that kind of thing happens. No. We have homes, you know, horns honking every single day, people, you know, they are honking because we are not going fast enough, honking because we are not going in and out of our driveway fast enough, passing us on the left when we slow down to go into our driveway. That's happened so many times like I can't even count anymore. It's -- it's bad. So, beyond our

neighborhood, which I get it, you have got development, neighborhoods are kind of going to degrade with development, things are going to get nicer and we are going to get worse, because that's how it is, but are you okay with two kids being hit? Are you okay with extra car wrecks? Are you okay with actual backed up traffic into intersections for the -- not just Woodbridge, but the rest of the community. Eagle is -- I mean what -- what are you going to -- I know you have got this --

Simison: If you could wrap up, please.

Pieper: Okay. STAR is coming. That's going to help maybe a little bit. But you can't allow that volume of homes. So, you asked what solution do you want to propose? I'm proposing you cannot allow that volume of homes. Maybe you can allow one acre lots there --

Simison: Thank you.

Pieper: That's it.

Simison: Thank you.

Pieper: Can't allow more.

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

Rice: Good evening, Mayor Simison, City Council Members. My name is Karen Rice and I have been a resident of Woodbridge for 11 years. My address is 2324 East Bowstring Street. Over this time I have observed a consistent increase in traffic. You just heard from my neighbor. Last summer a car hit a child while he was on his scooter. The driver did not stop. Fortunately, a neighbor helped the child get home. Recently I witnessed a speeding car pass a neighbor that was walking their dog and they speed past them before they could finish crossing the street almost hitting them. Two weeks ago my own son's basketball was hit by a speeding car and the driver did not stop to express concern, nor did they address the incident and it's very alarming to be in the house knowing that your children are on the street and you hear a very loud, right, a basketball popping under that pressure. It was a -- I was very fortunate that my children were fine, it was simply a basketball. These examples underscore the urgent need to prioritize our children's safety through responsible decisions. The current traffic situation in Woodridge is deeply concerning. We frequently experience near misses and fear a severe incident will occur. Our subdivision is already overwhelmed with traffic and I urge you to address these issues before we add more. With current approval -- the approved development, such as the West Ada CTE Center, ICOM expansion and ISU expansion, we anticipate a significant increase in traffic that we dread. The proposed Latitude Forty Three will further exasperate this problem. As an administrator in our school district I often say 90 percent of student issues start as adult issues and as educators we strive to support our students by removing obstacles and reducing adult issues that negatively impact students. I say this because the traffic

situation is an adult issue that is negatively affecting and impacting our children's safety. The Latitude Forty Three development is too dense and adds more traffic to an already overloaded situation and I know that we are addressing traffic and it's really about Latitude Forty Three, but it's really a -- it's really a together situation. I urge you to take responsibility and halt further development until current traffic situation is addressed, ensuring the safety and needs of existing residents take place and precedence over new developments. If a tragedy occurs the responsibility will lie with the adults that are making these decisions. Please support Woodbridge by finding solutions to our traffic issues before proceeding with new developments that will continue to -- to add to an already bad situation. I say this as a resident and an HOA board member.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions? I'm -- I'm going to say something that is going to make me maybe the least popular person in the room and I'm going to -- I'm going to put it out there, just because we have a lot of people from Woodbridge here. If we put a bollard into Magic View Circle to stop all cut-through traffic, that it means also residents can't drive out to Eagle Road, would that be acceptable to people in this room?

Rice: Yes. Yes. If -- if our subdivision was able to act like a cul-de-sac instead of a highway we would appreciate it. Because our streets are the equivalent of Overland and -- and Franklin, because people are too lazy -- adults aren't willing to make adult decisions for children to take an extra three to five minutes to get to Overland and to get to Franklin and I do believe that you would have the support of the community to make our subdivision act like a cul-de-sac.

Simison: Okay. Thank you. Sorry, I didn't think I was going to get applause or a pause for the suggestion, but -- anyways, thank you.

Rice: Thank you.

Bode: Good -- good evening everyone. My name is Philip Bode. I live on Bowstring Street in Woodbridge community. I just moved here in November with my family. I have a two year old son and a one year old daughter. Since moving there I -- I know you guys heard a lot about what it is like with the traffic, et cetera. I live in the -- Bowstring has this long stretch of street and, then, two loops. The people speed up really bad on this straight away. They go about 40 miles an hour in a 25 and that's 2,000 -- 2,500 cars in the morning and 2,500 cars in the evening and it's -- some days I'm unable to exit my car. I'm unable to park. There is a lot of issues that come with that. But the safety for the children is the most important to me. What I wanted to answer is the question about solutions and -- and I think one of the biggest solutions is -- I used to live in Boise and there was an area that was the same way, it was a path to a school and what there was there was just speed bumps in the way and it was a 25, same as -- as this location and if there is enough speed bumps it slows down the traffic at least to a manageable speed, so kids don't get hit, because most cars are low to the ground and they will just scrape and most people that cut through, I -- I -- I think they will cut through every day. It's probably the same people or it's people of maps, that just follow Google

Maps because ways will direct them that way, because it's the shortest solution or shortest way to -- to get through there. So, I think an immediate solution that's very very easy and very very cheap is having developers pay for something like that before we move on. I mean that's a simple fix; right? At least we can, then, slow down the cars to see children maybe, because as you all know the faster you go to -- the -- you know, the slower you can react. So, if we can do stuff like that that would at least help. Just trying to come up with solutions, not with more problems, you know. I think -- that's all I have to say for today. Yeah.

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

Seaman: Hello and thank you for the opportunity to talk. I'm Mike Seaman. I live at 544 Trunnel. I just moved into Woodbridge. I'm going to turn around and ask everyone just a quick question. Raise your hand if your home is the biggest asset that you own. So, if you have -- yeah. Like a retirement account that's got a million bucks in it maybe you are different, but -- so, when we talk about traffic, obviously, there is children's safety, all those concerns. My main concern is that the developer is now changing the scope of their homes and while traffic will also deteriorate the value of everyone's home, I think the most egregious thing that's happening right now is the developer is trying to shoehorn these smaller homes in. We had -- I was not part of the discussions. I just moved to Woodbridge. But if we had homes that are five and six hundred thousand dollars, 2,000 square feet, and now we have changed them to 12 and 14 hundred square foot homes and possibly a phase two that may or may not be built, my concern is I live in Woodbridge for the next few decades and my children start driving is that our home values aren't going to be protected. So, the safety for sure is important. But everyone in this room bought a home in Woodbridge or nearby probably, knowing that this is a great place to live and there is homes are built and more people are added to the road, my long term concern is the home values are just going to go down in Woodbridge and all over. Small impact on the tax base, but huge impact on everyone here in this room that has a home that they are counting on appreciation and kind of value holding. Any questions?

Simison: Council, any questions? And, then, Luke, maybe to address that point -- the questions, like what can the developer do? Maybe to start with honoring the initial -- and not just elevation, but the initial plans for the home. Point of clarity, too, on the elevations. My understanding is the elevations are like the look of the home. I don't care about the look, but if we are talking about a 1,200 square foot home, instead of a 2,000 square foot home, that's a big difference in value. Thanks.

Simison: Thank you.

Spencer: Good evening, Mayor Simison, Council Members. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name is Raymond Spencer. I live at 600 South Woodhaven in -- in the Woodbridge development. Most of the homes on my street back up to the proposed Latitude Forty Three development and what I take away from the presentation and some of the materials we have seen is that the developer is proposing to have a

minimum setback of the homes to our property line of 12 feet. So, if you look up at these ceiling squares and you count six of them that's 12 feet. That's not a lot of distance. And I think what we would like to have is some sort of a guarantee that the single -- single story homes backing up to our property would have a setback of maybe 20 feet. That's asking for four more of those squares, because on top of one another like that it creates -- it creates a -- it -- you know, a visual block. It -- it -- it becomes a little bit uncomfortable and I think that's probably the least the developer can do to give us a little bit more breathing room and, then, based on some of the other comments I have heard tonight I do agree with the traffic issues, especially going toward Eagle Road, 55. You have got the Wells and Magic View intersection that forms that funny little jog and, you know, we are going to have some issues there as well and I -- I just wanted to ask you to think about -- think about the setbacks and think about also some of the issues that were brought up in terms of the -- the -- the -- the open space and where that might be located, because we are going to have some ugly fences along Magic View, minimal landscaping. I like to think of Meridian as a place that has greenery and beauty and all of the pieces coming together to create a greater whole and I'm not quite seeing it with this development. So, those are my comments and thank you for the time. Appreciate it.

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

Cavener: Mr. Mayor. Mr. Spencer, thanks for being here and, again, you are one that has been following this project for a long time and I appreciate all the e-mails that you have sent.

Spencer: Sure.

Cavener: And in the one year e-mails I think that you sent about a year ago you identified some concern about a shift in builder and so can you give Council some flavor, to the best of your recollection, the history of different builders that have been assigned to this kind of project? And I think at one point in one of your e-mails you referenced kind of a bait and switch. I don't -- I don't quite come to that same conclusion, but I'm trying to get some of your insight as to the history of different builders being assigned to this project.

Spencer: That's a great question and I may not be able to answer it --

Cavener: Okay.

Spencer: -- completely, because I have only been a resident of Woodbridge for maybe a year and a half now and so I don't have experience proceeding that, but what I do know is that the builder that we had previously that we had really great open dialogues with and -- and the ability to converse and kind of see examples of their work, that led to a degree of comfort in our group that -- that, yes, there are responsible people looking out for our interests. The other -- the other thing that I can say is that with -- and a bait and switch maybe -- I mentioned that in my e-mails and it may not be fair. I don't -- I

don't want to say that, but -- but what I did see in the elevations that I saw a dramatic shift from what was approved to something that is much different in my eye and I have worked in design and I have worked with developers a lot over my, you know, previous career, so I -- I do have some experience with these things and a bait and switch may -- may not be -- you know, I mean that may be a little extreme, but at the same time it's -- it's something to look at, because I have never seen a project that gets approved and, then, a week before a present -- or before a meeting like this the cards get shuffled around and you have got different images. I just don't see it and I have never seen it go through without some kind of extensive look back to understand how we got there. So, yeah, sure. Thank you very much.

Simison: Thank you.

George: My name is Kyle George. I live at 1713 East Pegram Street and I have lived in Woodbridge for 22 years, so I have seen a lot of changes from the time we first moved in to now. But I do have a concern with the traffic. I really believe we should have that study before any final decisions are made and especially in regards to -- there is only two ways in. I choose not to use the Eagle exit unless I have to and at certain times of day I won't even go there. I have to use Locust Grove and we would see -- we see a lot of excess traffic on Locust Grove due to development that's on that end of the subdivision due to the school, the medical school, the high school and the proposed development that's going to be new development there is going to increase that traffic flow as well. So, I'm hoping that that study could be done before any final decisions are made, because we are really impacted by the traffic on both ends.

Simison: Council, any questions?

George: Thank you.

Simison: Thank you.

Henderson: Good evening, Mayor and -- and City Council Members. My name is Deborah Henderson and I have lived in Woodbridge for about seven years. I live at 660 South Woodhaven Avenue. Thank you for the opportunity to review the proposal and provide our input. I think the biggest point that I want to make this evening is that I was -- I was disappointed to not hear a clear resolution from the proposal tonight. I think we can all agree that the traffic concerns and -- and having collaboration on a through street that would help solve all of these safety concerns that we have is a priority, but I did not hear a clear plan of action. In fact, I heard deprioritization of that issue from the applicant in terms of timing, having this be a part of phase two, as opposed of -- as opposed to phase one. That -- that's a really big issue I think for everyone here in this room. At this time we still do not have a completed traffic study or a defined plan addressing access and circulation impacts. I believe it's irresponsible to approve the annexation of over 17 acres without that information and Intel, given that this so significantly impacts safety, emergency access and, you know, all of the concerns that you have heard -- heard tonight. I think that the -- the current zoning is commercial

neighborhood zoning and that serves as an -- actually a really important buffer to these -- these functions that we have all been talking about between having single family homes and -- and future development and changing that designation to higher density residential without a clear action plan for infrastructure and traffic mitigation I think removes that buffer and introduces significant impacts without adequate preparation. Annexation is permanent. Approving this request before these concerns are fully resolved would be premature. So, for these reasons I respectfully ask Council to deny the annexation until we have a completed traffic study and we have a clear actionable transportation solution in place. Thank you.

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

Fox: My name is Celeste Fox. I live at 582 South Woodhaven Avenue, backing up to this development. I just -- if you allow this tonight I would like to ask for some protection in the development agreement. When we worked with the builder who was presented to us at the neighborhood meeting August 2024, we asked him how -- what are the setbacks to our homes that are adjacent. He had the schematics and he showed us. They were 26 feet to 30 feet, because he builds toward the front of the property and I have at home several of his schematics with these figures on them, so that -- on the north end where I live that property is higher than mine, so you have ten feet behind the house that's single story -- I'm single story. There would be at least four feet higher than that looking down on mine. Ten feet is nothing. That just is nothing. None of us on Woodbridge have ten feet backyards and we are asking -- I'm asking if in the development agreement you would at least, for the single stories, have at least 20. I mean we have really liked working with this builder, because he had concerns for our concerns. He showed consideration. He wanted -- he wanted people in his buildings to have good backyards. If you have tiny backyards and you are overlooking a neighbor that's not really a good neighborhood fit. So, I'm just asking for this protection. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions? Okay. Thank you. Is there anybody else that would like to come forward and provide testimony on this item or anybody online, you can use the raise your hand feature online. Seeing no one coming forward and no one raising their hand online would the applicant like to close?

Clark: Members of the Council, Hethe Clark. 251 East Front Street. Ben's got more detailed notes and he is going to kind of go into the minutia, but as I was sitting there I -- I did want to raise one issue and make sure that we have the conversation about this, especially before we close public testimony and just kind of get everybody on the same page in terms of what the city's planning is for this, because I think it really drives a lot of the questioning and the -- and the question -- and the kind of discussion that we are going to have tonight. You know, I -- a lot of what we have heard from the public has to do with decisions that were made many years ago with regard to the configuration of Woodbridge, which, as you guys know, those first few phases are set up with it as a collector, the last few phases are not. So, it created some of these problems that we are talking about structurally. The comment has -- well, let me say that I -- I -- I don't

think that anything with regard to that changes regardless of this application going forward or not. That -- that isn't an existing situation. There has been a number of comments about the idea that we should stop development until there is a solution. Unfortunately, I agree with the Mayor that there is no solution without development, because this property is not going to be eminent domained by ACHD. I just don't see that possibility. So, we do have to work together as a public-private partnership to arrive at a solution to make this -- make this eventually work. So, that's a long prologue to say that I think it would be good for us to have a conversation initially about what solution it is that the city wants to see. We -- we came in to this week thinking it was dere and thinking that we were going to preserve that right of way and make sure that it was available or constructed for the city as soon as possible, so that it can be part of that solution. If we are going with the -- the new alternative, I think we should talk about that, because that will require a deferral to talk about a -- a new arrangement on the -- the phase two portion of the plat and to me that's the -- the key issue is to try to get understanding on that, so that we can, then, have a -- a meaningful conversation about what that partnership looks like to make sure that we are doing our part to make sure that there is an alternative traffic arrangement. So, does Council agree with that or do we want to -- to me I was hoping that maybe we hear a little bit more from Caleb, for example, about that, so that we can understand where -- where this third alternative is -- you know, what the incentives are and -- and, then, maybe we can guide our rebuttal testimony based on that.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I would like to hear from Caleb Hood on those discussions that he had with Mindy with ACHD.

Hood: Mr. Mayor, if you and the Council are good with that I have got just a quick recap history of kind of what's gone on over the last four weeks. So, four weeks ago Kittelson & Associates, who we hired to evaluate -- further refine, if you will, what you see on the screen now is actually from our 2019 Comprehensive Plan. It's one of the three concepts that was developed at that time. So, Mr. Semple mentioned earlier that the -- the -- there was some inconsistencies with their project and the comp plan. I -- I don't know that I would say it that way. It wasn't fully developed from 2019. This has been on the books and we really haven't taken it to the next level -- level to refine and really identify where that roadway network could work and so we hired Kittelson last year and -- and they presented to you on the -- the 27th of last month. Two days later city staff and ACHD staff met to kind of -- they -- they watched it online as they do typically for a lot of our meetings and we talked through kind of next steps, primarily adding it to the master street map. As part of that conversation we talked about maybe not having the -- the way Alternative D was shown by the consultant and based on a lot of the conversation that the -- that the Council had during the presentation on the 27th about making it as direct as, you know, appetizing as possible to motorists to use, instead of cutting through Woodbridge, we said, hey, let's move that -- instead of using the circle --

Wells Circle as the -- the collector, moving that up somewhere south of the Five Mile Creek and north of Wells Circle meeting that offset and that's what was communicated to the development team -- the same day actually. We met with them on -- on Thursday and had a meeting -- Hethe actually I think e-mailed us on Tuesday after the -- the 27th watching that meeting and wanted to just make sure we were hearing the same thing from Council and, yes, it is Alternative D. When we met with ACHD staff said the master street map isn't an engineering document, it's more like our comp plan. It's a guide; right? It doesn't say it has to be exactly right here, but it should paint the picture and the vision for what's needed for the -- the transportation network. So, when having those conversations with -- would you mind advancing the slides on. So, here is some of the original concepts from Kittelson and I'm going to just scroll past that one. So, here is what D looked like. I think you had some version of this in -- in your presentation as well, so I'm not going to linger here long, but this is what was explained to the applicant -- and I will apologize I didn't do a very good job, obviously, because we tried to say south of the Five Mile Creek, north of Circle Drive and -- but somewhere in there you guys can pick, because those dimensions for the lots -- we aren't designing the project for them, so somewhere in there we need a collector roadway. But this is, essentially, what would happen and go between -- north of the existing hotel there and -- and hook up with Allen -- with Freeway Drive to, then, get to Allen and up to the signal or if you are going southbound on Eagle Road. So, anyways, that's -- that was just shared yesterday. So, this is what I think is being referred to as sharing yesterday. This exhibit was just shared with the applicant team. But we have talked about it over the last couple of weeks trying to verbally and even in written explain what this Alternative D modified kind of look like and what we were gearing up to present to ACHD and their Commission next Wednesday. So, staff is prepared, been meeting with their staff even after two days after you heard the presentation and just fine tuning our presentation to go to the ACHD Commission, so -- but, again, this modification to Alternative D -- and Mayor I think did a great job of explaining -- was based on the feedback we heard given consultant and staff when Alternative D was presented to you all here four weeks ago. So, that is staff's preferred location, although, again, this isn't exact, so even the overlay that was shown earlier it could use that -- their local street in that location if that works better for them or even move south a little bit. I will share -- we did talk to Mindy Wallace this morning and I'm not sure if she is online. We are just trying to verify. But it didn't sound like she had logged in yet. But if it's a collector does need to be 330 feet offset from -- if it's a collector -- from a collector to a local street. Local streets only require 125 foot offset. So, that's why it need -- that offset is what we were trying to look forward to. There is a minimum. You can't just butt it right up to Wells Circle Drive. But this generally would be the location to make that as direct of a connection out to the central intersection -- the signalization at Locust Grove. So, hopefully, that kind of gets you up to speed on some of the conversations that have gone on over the last roughly month.

Simison: So, Caleb, since you are answering questions, if -- if we were to make -- and I don't know the name of the street -- but emergency access only coming out, what does that process generally look like? Do you need to ask ACHD on that and -- yeah, I don't

-- I'm not going to ask you to handicap the likelihood of their decision, but what would that look like?

Hood: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, I -- I can let you know that request or evaluation for the -- for that request was submitted to ACHD and they were and are looking at it. It was brought to our Transportation Commission actually here -- it was either last meeting or the meeting before and that is up -- largely up to ACHD. I don't bet too terribly often. I don't think the probability is very high, though, the likelihood of that actually being bollarded or dead end or emergency access only. Now, maybe if you had another road that could be bollarded, but as is now I would not -- I'm not thinking that's a very high likelihood of -- of -- of happening.

Simison: And is there a specific reason to your knowledge? And I -- I look at it this way. I can tell you one place we have never got any complaints about traffic in the City of Meridian and that's from the -- the subdivisions coming off of Locust Grove that can't access Meridian Road through the Waltman property. I'm not going to say they like their drive around, but we don't get complaints and it's a much bigger issue, but they have several exit points onto Locust Grove. So, I didn't know what your thoughts would be on the reason why.

Hood: And, Mr. Mayor, I appreciate the question to a degree, because I'm not a traffic engineer, so I can't give you the -- all the reasons why ACHD may or may not allow it to be bollarded or otherwise closed off to the public, but it is a public road, so a public street generally is accessible by the public and they don't -- I can't think of another case where they have actually closed off a public road with -- absent a vacation. So, if there were a vacation of a portion of that right of way and it's no longer public, accessibility there maybe. I will -- I will throw two more things in there. Why don't I think ACHD will probably support this. One is they are going to probably look to the fire department and go, okay, you are not -- you can still technically get through with bollard or a gate or something, but it is going to hamper their -- their access in -- into and through this area. So, that's one. The other one is we are going to send everybody out to Locust Grove and Franklin, Eagle, which are already congested and through those intersections, which are already a mess. So, if you are forcing everybody, including the Woodbridge neighbors, out to those intersections -- that's why people are cutting through, because it's not easy to get through Eagle and Franklin. Well, now if you have to go through Eagle and Franklin and you are pushing more -- even more people through, that would otherwise have an opportunity to get out to Eagle Road directly, you are just going to cause more delay at those intersections that are already failing. So, I just don't think they are going to -- I'm not -- I don't know for sure. That is a question for ACHD. But I know they have been petitioned to look at that and we are still waiting to kind of see what that -- what that analysis looks like. But the Transportation Commission is tracking as well.

Simison: Okay.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I understand it would be unprecedented. It would be a big shift for them. I'm just brainstorming and away from this application, but I would think if the City Council wanted to send a letter that we would like an emergency measure put in place until such time that we can complete this concept, I would hope that they would be open to that, because that -- that wouldn't tie their hands down the road later to opening it once an alternative route has been established. It's just -- the situation is so acute and I think it's a very productive suggestion that neighbors I think would have to weigh in on it some more to some extent, but I don't -- I -- I -- I'm open to it personally. On this third -- I guess this third option, it's really -- I guess the only difference here is some of the sharp turning movements. What would you suggest in terms of timing of phasing and so forth with this kind of a concept? I mean Hethe has mentioned he is open to a continuance to try to iron this out in further detail. I feel kind of uncomfortable that this work would happen in phase two, although I -- I don't know that, you know, having it earlier really accomplishes much if we can't get that segment completed and so I'm just curious kind of what your thoughts are around timing and, you know, it -- working through this.

Hood: So, Mr. Mayor -- Mayor, Council Woman Strader, I guess it kind of depends on the question. I would like to see, you know, some resolution to this and they do get to set the stage for continuing further to the west to eventually make this condition. I will echo on the last couple of comments, though, on this. I mean this is going to be development driven. This -- this will not be -- we have -- we had -- that was part of our conversation. ACHD at least -- not right now. We could maybe add it to the letter if we are going to ask them to consider bollarding the Woodbridge Subdivision, including this in their programming as well, but it doesn't -- it's not impact fee eligible and it's -- and it's not even a collector right now, it's just a local street. So, they don't fund those. That is on the backs and shoulders of development as it occurs. So, it's not really eligible for their capital improvements plan.

Strader: Okay.

Hood: Unprecedented. So, not saying it could never happen, but the likelihood -- and it's -- that -- it's not -- not a very great candidate for something to use ACHD capital to move the needle on -- on that. So, the timing I think, yes, let's get a design and I think that's -- the applicant, you know, is here today to kind of get that feedback from you, is it, you know, using the existing right of way there -- it -- it can work. Like the Mayor said previously, though, that kink makes it awkward and not as, you know, attractive to use, again, for motorists. With some additional tweaking there, though, maybe it -- maybe it will function fine. That -- that is some of the analysis we don't know staff and some of the next steps that we were going to look at with ACHD and -- and potentially even additional consultants is how do we make this intersection function efficiently. We are not -- we are not with -- absent a government agency stepping in -- and I don't see that happening and going and condemning or working with to otherwise acquire or buy property and build the road, again, we are going to be relying on development to

happen and so the timing of it -- this is a piece of it. Getting the rest of it or the other additional pieces of it is going to take some time.

Overton: Mr. Mayor, quick question.

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Caleb, just to -- sometimes these maps are hard to look at --

Hood: Yeah.

Overton: -- and understand. Just so we are clear with the folks in the audience, when we are looking at that red dotted line right where your cursor is that coming up on what would be south of Five Mile Creek --

Hood: Yeah.

Overton: -- through the applicant's current project. It is T'ing with Wells. It is, then, going behind the hotel. It's -- it's in that corner and, then, the cutback is after that hotel before it hits Five Mile Creek the second time.

Hood: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Councilman Overton. That -- that -- that's a great way to describe it. So, this is -- this is basically the southern boundary of the applicant's site. This is the existing Wells Circle. So, Willamette Dental is right here. Here is the -- the applicant's project is right here. So, yes, it -- and, again, the applicant in their presentation had a line that kind of went through -- and, again, this isn't the exact location, but the way you describe it is great. Going north of the existing hotel. This -- again, this isn't designed exactly, we would need to figure this out with ACHD and engineer it. That Five Mile Creek actually comes in right about here. So, it's -- it's not a simple intersection by any means, but at least it makes that more of a direct connection up Freeway to Allen, gets you to the signal or out to Eagle Road more directly.

Overton: Thank you.

Simison: Any further questions for -- for Mr. Hood? No? All right. So, he's -- so, Hethe, so you got seven minutes left.

Clark: I will go fast.

Simison: Are you making a -- are you keeping going?

Clark: I'm going to go for one second longer and, then, I'm going to hand it off to Ben, because I think maybe I can wrap up what we were just talking about here and maybe give it a little direction. So, the -- we are prepared to develop in accordance with option -- I will call it Option Thee, whatever is up -- what was on the screen. So, to just be clear, in contrast to what we had previously shown, that one does require a

reconfiguration of our Phase Two. So, that would mean that if it's the Council's direction to design according to that, then, we need a couple weeks to come back to you with a flipped Phase Two, so you can know what it is that you are approving. A couple of items along that line, too, just to kind of close that thought out. One is that we would be in support of Council Member Strader's suggestion about, A, trying to reach out to ACHD and tie the emergency access to the -- the creation of the -- of the new roadway. We think -- we designed our project so that you folks would go away from Woodbridge. You might recall that we have just emergency access on the north side and we put our main access all the way down on Wells to push that -- folks that way. So, we are -- we are more than comfortable with that. Also to Council Member Strader's comment about making sure that we are committed to make -- have the solution in place. One way I have seen that happen is that we share -- we share your concern about not putting pavement down that leads to nowhere and is kind of a sunk cost in the short run, but I have seen in certain development agreements where if there is notice from the city that says, hey, we have got that other piece and you give six months' notice that we have -- we are obligated to go make sure that that's dedicated and put in place. So, there are ways to deal with that even with the phasing, so -- and -- and we would be happy to include a condition along those lines in the development agreement to make sure that that commitment is clear, because we do feel that way. So, I'm going to turn it over to Ben to finish out otherwise.

Simple: Thanks, Hethe. Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, just real quickly I wanted to touch on some of the other items. The TIA status in particular. We did talk with ITD. I just checked with our civil engineering consultant that's here. They talked to them this week. We can get that TIA. They said they -- ITD was -- basically had kind of put this on ice just like we had when we kind of got deferred, because of this whole collector issue. We can submit that to ITD this week, like tomorrow or by Friday, so that they can have that to start evaluating. Also because we didn't advance that any further is because we had put this on hold for ten months and we didn't even know if we had a project at this point. If we don't have a project we don't have traffic to evaluate. So, we are -- we are ready for that to happen. I did want to touch on something. The fence on the west side -- the survey shows that it does not follow perfectly the property line there. The project -- those -- that fence will be addressed when this project starts to get built. That builder or the developer, my client, will reach out to those homeowners at that point. We can't go fix a fence, again, if we don't have a project. My developers aren't going to go do an outlay to fix everyone's fences if they don't have a project that they are advancing. Pacific Lifestyle Homes and the developer had an agreement. They had some conversations a few weeks. That agreement didn't work anymore for either party and they both mutually terminated their agreement and so my client selected another builder, because they needed to have a builder, so that they could provide some conceptual elevations. It's our understanding that City Council doesn't review single family design. This is something that -- and you guys also don't dictate a builder on a project. Lots of projects get constructed full subdivision lots with, you know, maybe a couple builders on -- on the line. So, talking to the builder we just got confirmation these homes are an average of 2,000 square feet. They do have a smaller model at 14,178, but they have models at 26,002 square feet. The smaller homes average

400,000 starting, with up to 20 percent add-ons for additional improvements, finishes inside. The 2,000 to 2,600 square foot are going to start around 500,000 plus, with that same additional add-ons. So, these homes are very comparable to the previous home builder as well. I'm glad that we have some direction on this alignment. I think that actually are -- where we have what's called Equator Drive that you can see, it's just to the left of that right dashed line, with some minor adjustments we can make that work. We will dedicate that right of way that will fully accommodate a collector roadway in the future. That, as you heard Hethe say, that we are committed to that and my client is also committed to that. We will continue to work with ACHD. Again as Hethe stated, we would be in support of, you know, some working with a development agreement and ACHD to figure out how to protect the residents of Woodbridge until there is a larger collector roadway to facilitate more traffic. This is not a high density housing project. This is actually a lower density than what the designations of the comp plan would allow within the city's code. So, I appreciate that -- the comment that, you know, it's different than Woodbridge, but I -- I would not classify this as a high density residential project. I want to also clarify setbacks. We are not proposing a ten foot rear setback. We never have proposed a ten foot rear setback. If the previous builder had certain models that worked for him -- that worked for them -- during our previous City Council hearing we did not commit to anything more than a 20 foot rear setback to the main body of the home, with the provision to go to 12 feet with a covered patio. That's in the record. That is in my notes. That was in my presentation from the last time as well. So, I just wanted to, again, commit -- we have talked to the builder. This will be put in the development agreement, 20 foot rear setback to any two-story home, but we would retain the -- the provision for a single story home to go to that 12 foot rear setback as is allowed in the R-8 zone. We feel like that will protect other homes on that side of Woodbridge -- on the Woodbridge side of the fence. There is a mixture of one and two-story homes on their side as well and they have setbacks -- just measuring from Google Earth and, you know, some other aerial photos, between 15 and 20 feet to the back of their homes. Trying to look at other notes real quick. ACHD -- while ITD did request a TIA for the intersections and Eagle Road, ACHD did not request, nor did they require a TIS for this project. With that I would stand for additional questions.

Simison: Thank you. Council, additional questions?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Strader.

Strader: A comment and, then, a question. We have not in the past spent a lot of time reviewing elevations of single family homes, but I take issue with the concept that we could not on an annexation. City councils have a lot more discretion on annexations and whether they are in the best interest of the city. I had an example in my district where elevations actually became extremely important and we ended up with a four story building where we were expecting a three story building. So, elevations are pretty important to me at this point and I will look at them anytime. So just to let you know about that. Trying to be productive, you know, would you like maybe a six month

continuance or something to try to carry the ball and see if you could get the Woodbridge neighborhood to vote or somehow get consensus on whether they would want emergency closure and bollards to their subdivision, work with ACHD -- and I think those of us on the Council that would support that concept could help support you in that, providing letters or whatever is needed to ACHD and try to see if you could come up with some sort of an arrangement like that. Is that the time frame that we are talking about? You are talking about getting ITD rolling on a TIA next week. This doesn't feel like this will be solved in the next few weeks to me. I think if you are able to -- I would love for you to try to see if we could get some kind of solution together in the next six months. But I just wanted your feedback on timing and kind of process from this point. If -- if I had to vote today I don't see a path here, but maybe with time and you working through this maybe there is a way to solve a lot of the issues together. So, I would just like your feedback on that.

Semple: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, Council Member Strader, I'm not -- I -- I can't commit my client to a six month deferral at this point after ten months of deferrals so far. When we came to the initial City Council hearing with no knowledge of this issue of an east-west collector and ten months ago it was brought to our attention at this hearing. We have adjusted our plan. We have worked with staff. We have really tried hard to get to a point -- multiple deferrals to try to work through all of these issues. The TIA my understanding it was a recommendation from ITD to do a traffic impact analysis of the intersections on Highway 55 and how this could impact that. We are going to request that they advance that as quickly as possible, obviously, so we can get a solution. I do know the last time we were here at the full hearing we had a very robust conversation about how the first phase of this project, for one, didn't -- we didn't feel like it really got in the way of this east-west collector, felt like the majority of the Council kind of felt -- at least had made some comments about how they were almost there on the north half, if we could solve for this in the future. So, I think we have shown we are willing to commit time and effort to help the city to work in partnership, public and private, to solve this issue, because it is an issue. All that to say I'm going to need to get feedback from my client. I think that six months -- again, I can't commit them to that. I think that what Hethe has asked for is a two week deferral for us to work on the southern half of this. What I would request is to allow that to occur, so that we can work with ITD, see what kind of information we could get back and at least determine the time frame, so that we could come have a conversation and provide you with a realistic time frame to have an answer for that, because I could say, sure, we will give six months and what if we go six months and, then, still not solved. But if we got it solved in two weeks, then, we would be sitting for six months waiting.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I -- I get where you are coming from. I just -- looking for some direction tonight. So, I think it -- I think that the choices are do you want an up or down vote on this tonight? Do you want a continuance and for how long? Or do you maybe want to

request a break until 8:00 o'clock or something so you could call your client and maybe get a better sense. Because we could -- I mean you could -- it's your right as the applicant, you can ask for an up or down vote tonight, but I -- my understanding is if that occurs -- and sometimes that can significantly delay future attempts. So, that -- that's kind of why I was asking that. And I don't -- I'm not saying six months is the answer, but just trying to get some direction from you on what you would like to do.

Sample: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Strader, I don't have to wait until 8:00. My client's sitting in the audience here. So, if you can give me two minutes I can come back up with an answer for you.

Simison: Well, why don't -- it is -- we have been up here for two hours. Why don't we take a break and we will continue at 8:00 o'clock with that answer and, Caleb, maybe give you -- I know ACHD's contact -- when do you think they might make a decision on the request from transportation -- I don't know if we can do any research on that in the next ten minutes. We will take a break. So recess until 8:00 o'clock.

(Recess: 7:50 p.m. to 8:03 p.m.)

Simison: All right. We are going to go ahead and come back. We -- just once looking for one more City Council Member. Oh, there she is. She's up here. Okay. Do I understand that there may be a request?

Sample: Mr. Mayor and City Council, yes. After conversing with my client we would like to request a six week deferral, primarily to -- for the reason -- the following reasons: We would like to get in touch with ACHD to further the conversation about the request that we have heard from the HOA, as well as what it sounds like the city may have already communicated to ACHD about some temporary bollarding emergency access and the -- the future collector location. We also did -- we were able to get our builder on the phone and they have committed to providing some updated elevations with some new materials, as well as we will be setting up a meeting with the HOA with that builder to work through some of the -- the questions and concerns that the neighbors have on this and that will allow us time to continue the conversation with ITD or -- around the TIA and we can work on the new pre-plat alignment that preserves the future collector right of way through phase two and also resolves what that does to our layout in terms of where our commercial is located, where our residential is located, to ensure that we meet all the UDC standards for buffering, for residential along collectors. My initial take on it and just looking at this and in talking with staff a little bit as well is that most of our open space ends up being consolidated in the center of this full development surrounding Five Mile Creek with still that connected -- pedestrian connectivity north-south through that to allow unencumbered pedestrian activity to get to the commercial from the residential. With that I would stand for any additional questions if you have any.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any additional questions for --

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: So, Ben and Hethe -- and for everybody in the room, full disclosure for those that don't know, because I think there is still a couple people in the room that don't know. I have been a proud homeowner in Woodbridge for 24 years and I have stood up on the side that you are at tonight many many times arguing for Woodbridge, arguing on traffic. It's still very near and dear to my heart and it's a big concern. The reason we stopped ten months ago was because the only possible solution we have long term was not solidified. It was conceptualized and that was it. We could run a road through here. We can try to get traffic out of Woodbridge. And so we made a request. Council honored that request that we have a study done. That study is what came up with the preferred route through the south portion of this project, what's called phase two on the south side Five Mile Creek, where I think we are at now is -- and I appreciate Hethe and Ben for all your patience as we have gone through that, but where we are at now is -- I think the Woodbridge residents had a certain comfortable position with the prior builder. They really need to meet with and get a level of comfort with the new builder and I think, unfortunately, bringing a new builder in at the end and changing the look of the houses -- that didn't work out so well for you and I think we need to do that differently and six weeks should be enough time for us to organize those type of meetings. I'm not going to promise I can support this in the end anyway, because it's a mess and living there 24 years I -- it was still dirt on phase two in Woodbridge and the way they built it to do traffic calming, it didn't quite work out that way. The traffic calming ended up being -- if you were in phase two of Woodbridge, basically I'm talking about the east side of the creek. All that traffic went in front of your houses, instead of how it was on phase one where everybody was in pods. Not our finest moment allowing the developer to do it. It was a council -- shoot, it was 2001 when the council approved that. But we are here today and we have been here for several years trying to mitigate and fix this with whatever thing we have possible in our toolbox. That's been my fight for, shoot, at least 15 of my 24 years in Woodbridge. So, when we try to find a solution to this I need everyone to understand -- and I appreciate the flexibility that the applicants are having going another six weeks. Let's see if we can make headway on not just the possibility of ACHD putting a bollard or gates up, but how that progress is going to go on that preferred route, because we still haven't gotten that finished on our end with ACHD and to see if you can reach that comfortable level again like you had with the previous developer with the HOA and the residents of Woodbridge, because it should be known as we have gone through projects over the years and we have had I think three or four -- we approved a couple of them. This group is not all about the word no. They are all about the word fair and they want to make sure that what's done is done fairly for them and in the best interest of everybody involved. So, I appreciate you coming back. I think six weeks is a good move and I would certainly support that move to come back.

Simison: Thank you. Before I do a motion, Council, I mean we could put this on for next week, but if this Council wants to send a letter to ACHD on this regarding making a recommendation or making an urgency to evaluate the request that is apparently already with staff?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I think it's -- I think it -- to me it's going to be -- it will be twofold. I think, yes, we should be sending a letter to ACHD, but I'm going to volun-tell our good HOA president Robin to also engage and ask this question amongst the residents. I -- I can totally appreciate everyone of you here -- as a quick -- hands went up quick, yeah, we -- we want some of this stuff blocked off. We work for everybody who lives in Meridian and I recognize there are probably people that are home that don't feel that same way and so it's important for us that we want to hear from those as well. We don't want to make a decision in a vacuum. So, Robin, I'm going to ask you to -- to reach out to your neighbors and, you know, ask them their thoughts on -- on blocking it off. I -- I know at one point there was a request about speed bumps. I would like to maybe request that that be -- provide that to us when you come back of what -- how you polled the neighbors and what the response is, so we can have that piece. I think that needs to run parallel while we are asking ACHD, because what I don't want to have happen is we come back and, then, we send a letter, then, we say, well, wait, wait, wait, what do the -- what do the rest of the neighbors think. I'm trying to make -- trying to run two paths at the same time, Mr. Mayor.

Simison: Okay. I will figure out what that means for what our letter will state in our conversations after this evening, so -- okay. With that do I have a motion from anybody?

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I would like to move that we continue H-2024-0059 until April 7th, 2026.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to continue this item to April 7th. Is there discussion?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Because -- I'm happy to speak to the motion. I'm going to support the motion. I think there are some subsequent things that maybe need to happen in terms of communication to the highway district that doesn't necessarily need to be captured within this motion. So, maybe you and I and staff and council president can touch base afterwards, because I think there is some additional follow-up actions that we may want to inquire from the highway district as well.

Simison: Okay. And we will include Mr. Hood in that conversation after this meeting.

Cavener: Thanks.

Simison: Okay. Any further discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the item is continued. We will see you all back hopefully with good resolutions, so --

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

2. Public Hearing for Cielo Azul Condominium (SHP-2026-0001) by Marcel Lopez, located at 3512 and 3526 E. Louise Dr.

- A. Request: Short Plat to condominiumize two (2) office buildings into eight (8) office units for individual ownership within the L-O zoning district.

Simison: Okay. With that we will move on to Item 2, which is a public hearing for SHP-2026-0001 and we will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Napoli: Mayor, Members of the Council, give it a second real quick. Members of the Council, good evening. Next item -- item on the agenda is the short plat for Cielo Azul. The site consists of 1.1 acres of land, zoned L-O, located at 3512 East Louise Drive and 3526 East Louise Drive. So, the applicant requests a short plat to condominiumize two office buildings into eight separate office units for individual ownership. The proposed short plat depicts subdivision of airspace within these two office buildings. They are on two separate properties and are currently under construction. The proposed short plat aims to create the eight separate office condominium units for future ownership purposes and as stated the buildings are under construction and are in compliance with previous approvals. Staff is recommending approval with conditions of this one and has not received any written testimony and I will stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions for staff? Okay. Is the applicant here? Good evening.

Lopez: Good evening.

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

Lopez: Yes, sir. Thank you. Marcel Lopez with Conger Group, 810 East Central Lane, Suite 120, Meridian. 83642. Thank you. Happy to be here tonight. Want to thank Nick for his help in getting us through this process. Yeah. So, Nick explained it pretty well. Super simple. Short plat for condo of the two buildings to create the eight suites for ownership, rather than having these commercial offices as an option, rather than paying for rent. They are currently under construction. Anticipated completion will be in April

this year. So, we are approaching that real quick here. But, yeah, super simple. Appreciate Nick's time and effort and ask for -- respectfully ask for your approval.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I just have a real quick question. I'm really -- really curious about the -- making these condominium style ownership. Is that -- how common is that in sort of this office space in the marketplace? Is it something that is a growing interest or is it something kind of new that you are trying out and just kind of really curious about that.

Lopez: Sure. Mayor, Council Member Taylor, so this is our first endeavor into this condo -- office condo product. There has been a few in the last couple of years here in Meridian. There was a big one done on Ustick and I forget the cross-street, but that one looks like at least -- it sold actually pretty quick and most of those units are currently under ownership, so -- there is also ones that we are seeing happen in Nampa. Not so much in Caldwell. Boise is -- haven't seen much. There is a lot of -- condo -- older condo plats, more residential than commercial, but with the cost of land, the cost of construction, this is an alternative to leasing and really gives the small, medium business owners an opportunity to own, but, you know, helps distribute that cost, rather than buying -- you know, buying a building and -- at a higher expense.

Simison: Any additional questions? Okay. Thank you very much.

Lopez: Thank you.

Simison: Madam Clerk, anyone signed up to provide testimony on this item?

Lomeli: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Yes, I have Mike Seaman. Might have been for the other --

Simison: Maybe. Okay. Is there anybody present who would like to provide testimony on this item, either in the room or online? If you are online use the raise your hand feature. Seeing no one raising their hand or coming forward, applicant, do you waive any final comments? Does the optical waive -- or would you like to make any final comments?

Lopez: No. Thank you. We are just in -- in agreement with the staff report and appreciate your conservation.

Simison: Okay. Thank you very much.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

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

Little Roberts: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I kind of like it when I see new products out there that we are not used to seeing all the time, because it may be they are responding to something that we don't even see happening in the community and -- and it's -- it's refreshing to see. I -- I get tired sometimes of seeing the same old thing over and over again. So, thank you. And with that I would like to -- after considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony I move to approve File No. SHP-2026-0001 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of February 24, 2026.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Item 2, which is SHP-2026-0001. Is there discussion? If not, clerk call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

- 3. Public Hearing for Farrington Heights Subdivision RZ, PP, MDA (H-2025-0016) by Studio H Architects, generally located at the NW corner of E. Pine Ave. and N. Adkins Ave.**
 - A. Request: Rezone of 2.9 acres of land from the R-4 to the R-15 zoning district.
 - B. Request: Preliminary Plat on 4.68 acres of land consisting of 25 building lots and 6 common lots.

- C. Request: Development Agreement Modification to terminate the existing development agreement and establish a new one.

Simison: With that we will move on to Item 3, which is public hearing for Farrington Heights Subdivision, which is H-2025-0016. We will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Napoli: Mayor, Members of the Council, next item on the agenda is the rezone, preliminary plat and development agreement modification for Farrington Heights. The applicant requests a rezone of 2.9 acres of the 4.68 acres of land from the R-4 zoning district to the R-15 zoning district, leaving the remaining 1.78 acres as the R-4 zoning district. A preliminary plat consisting of 24 building lots -- and that will be 21 new buildable lots, with three existing ones that the three existing homes will remain on and seven common lots across that 4.68 acres of land and a development agreement modification to replace the current one with the new one. So, the subject properties were annexed in 2000 as a part of the Farrington Opel application and the zoning granted at that time was R-4 -- would be R-4 zoning district. With the annexation approval the properties were subject to a development agreement that restricts the properties to adding one additional home on the 4.68 acres. This -- this is the reason for the DA modification request tonight. In addition, this application was previously heard by the Planning and Zoning Commission on August 7th of 2025 and was recommended for denial. The City Council, then, heard that application later in September and remanded that application back to the Planning and Zoning Commission to address concerns from the neighbors. During the next Planning and Zoning Commission hearing on December 4th of 2025 the Commission asked the applicant to remove the open space to allow for larger building lots to accommodate some single story homes adjacent to the existing residential homes to the west. The applicant has revised their plan to lose an additional lot, provide larger lot sizes and single story homes adjacent to the western boundary. In addition, they have reoriented the local street at the northern boundary to eliminate single family homes that abut the single family homes to the north and at the January 5th hearing of 2026 the Commission did recommend approval to City Council of this application and as a result of that staff did amend our staff report several times and the most recent amendment to the staff report proposed a provision in the development agreement that restricts Lots 2 through 8 -- so, that would be this western boundary where my cursor is at. So, lots 2 through 8 will be restricted to single story dwellings and Commission did add a provision restricting building heights in the entire subdivision to a maximum of 35 feet, which would be consistent with the R-4 zoning district. R-4 -- the R-15 zoning district would allow them to go up to 40 feet. However, the Commission recommended restricting all heights to 35 feet. So, the surrounding landscape of this subdivision consists of single family detached homes to the north, east and west, while to the south is Pine Avenue. The average density for one mile radius is 6.1 acre -- 6.1 units per acre, which is higher than the 5.12 units per acre the applicant is proposing. Access to the property is proposed from North Adkins Avenue, a local roadway on the eastern portion of the site. This local street is a shared drive between the proposed subdivision and the existing subdivision to the east and north. The applicant is proposing three access points off of

North Adkins, with one being a common drive for access to 14, 15 and 16 of Block 1 and the other two being local street extensions. No open space or amenities are required to do the subdivision -- subdivision being under five acres in size and as I mentioned earlier the Commission actually did direct the applicant to remove the open space and amenities to provide larger lots to accommodate single story homes. So, the main concern from the citizens regarding the proposed traffic at the Planning and Zoning Commission hearing where traffic, parking and building height allowances. The applicant revised their plat to make larger lot sizes, restrict -- wow. I apologize. To make larger lot sizes and restricts lots that abut the existing homes to the west to single story. However, some of the citizens did ask for clarification on building heights and wanted to see them below 26 feet in height. In addition, the citizens had concerns about overflow parking spilling onto the streets. However, most of the neighbors were appreciative of the major changes the applicant has made to address their major concerns throughout this process. I did want to touch on their updated elevations. So, they did provide some updated elevations for you tonight to show that single story and two-story product. So, the single story homes they did provide a few different elevations that will go in the development agreement for tonight and there is some additional two-story elevations as well for the properties that will be able to develop for two-story. So, the Commission is recommending approval of this application and we have not received any written testimony since the Commission hearing and I will stand for any questions that you have.

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

Durtschi: Good evening. Nick's getting my PowerPoint started. Mayor, Members of Council, hello and good evening again. My name is Sabrina Durtschi and I'm here on behalf of the applicant. My business address is 5179 South Bovin Avenue, Boise, Idaho 837 -- 83716 and this evening I am so excited to present to you our application for Farrington Heights Subdivision. So, Farrington Heights has been envisioned as a welcoming, modern and thoughtfully planned community that future residents are going to be proud to call home. In shaping the design and overall theme we layered in clean contemporary elements inspired by the craftsman architecture and modern farmhouse influence. Our goal is to create an in-fill project that feels both timeless and balanced, modern and fresh in character, yet warm and inviting and here is a view from our Adkins approach as you drive down the street for the new community. The site embraces a contemporary aesthetic and provides the opportunity to transform an underutilized parcel into a cohesive neighborhood oriented residential enclave. The homes are thoughtfully arranged to frame the internal street to create a strong sense of place and visual continuity and a blend of architectural styles with craftsman influences, introduces character and variation, while maintaining a unified, harmonious streetscape. Shown here is one of our primary entrances and the monumentation for Farrington Heights. This concept reinforces the modern identity of the neighborhood and establishes a clear, attractive arrival experience as people enter and recognize the community. As Nick has gone over with Farrington Heights we are requesting a DA modification, a rezone and a preliminary plat. Highlighted in white are the three existing homes that are

part of our application and, then, we will have 21 new single family homes and seven common lots. Our gross density will be 5.12 units per acre, with our diverse residential lot sizes ranging from 2,951 square feet up to over 9,078 square feet. So, with this application a portion of the site will be rezoned to R-15. This request is not being made to increase the overall density of the project, instead the purpose of the R-15 designation is to provide the flexibility needs to meet the zoning standards that are often challenging within in-fill development. The R-15 rezone helps us address those complexities by allowing us to create a well-designed and functional, cohesive neighborhood. What -- with a reduced lot count and overall project vision. As the staff report states and Nick had mentioned, our density is at 5.12 units per acre, which is less than the one mile radius of the existing residences, which is at 6.1. So, we believe that the zoning request of R-15 directly supports the creation of a high quality in-fill community. So, to better understand how the site fits in within the broader area I think it's helpful just to quickly review the surrounding context. To the north we have multiple phases of Danbury Fair Subdivision, platted between 1994 and 1996. There is also an enclave parcel directly north to us that is still in the county. To the east we have Maws Edition No. 1 and 2 platted in 1993. To the south we have Pine Avenue that borders the site with industrial and commercial development located directly south, including the weed and pest control campus and to the west we have Danbury Fair Subdivision again and further west is the Avery Subdivision, which was platted back in 2019. So, the subject site is surrounded primarily by established residential neighborhoods that -- nearby subdivisions dating back into the 1990s through the most recent 2019, reflecting a pattern of continued residential growth for this area. So, over the last few months we have worked diligently with the neighbors -- property owners to shape a community that fits well with the surrounding subdivisions. We sincerely appreciate the input, the collaboration and support expressed by the neighbors, including their supportive comments within our last Planning and Zoning Commission hearing. Now, as Nick mentioned, we have made several revisions to our application, so I want to quickly walk you through the changes. The first hearing back in August here was our original application and this included 30 lots. During that hearing the Commission provided direction to revise the plan and incorporate usable open space into the site. The applicant went back to the drawing board. We provided the second revised layout. This layout reduced the lot count by five to 25, included open space. We provided some amenities as the zoning Commission requested. So on our December 4th hearing we were, then, redirected to remove the open space -- to incorporate the open space into the western lots to make them larger. So, after all these directions the applicant has finally made modifications within this third and, hopefully, last layout in which we received a unanimous recommendation of approval from Planning and Zoning Commission. So, what did we do? We relocated the northern road -- alignment of the road to create a stronger buffer between the project and the northern abutting properties. We removed previously proposed open space and redistributed that area into the western lots and, finally, we increased the lot sizes along the western edge to better accommodate single story and improve compatibility. With these significant changes the applicant is also committed to limiting the lots along the western boundary to single level homes in order to help alleviate neighboring concerns and provide an appropriate and sensitive transitioning to the surrounding properties. I share this

feedback to make a clear understanding of the history and the evolution of the project. It is evident that the applicant has made a strong effort to be responsive, to be good neighbors and to create community that thoughtfully balances the needs of future residents and the surrounding neighborhood. Now let's take a look at -- quickly at the elevations for the single level homes. They are a blend of modern farmhouse, craftsman inspired design, emphasizing strong front facing gables and clean lines and varied materials to create a visual interest in curb appeal. We felt these designs support a single level story that feels substantial, yet compatible with the surrounding homes, providing appropriate transition and a cohesive, attractive streetscape. Our two story homes continue that modern farmhouse, craftsman styled inspired architectural theme, offering a balanced blend of clean lines, layered roof forms and varied materials. The massing of the homes is carefully composed to provide the presence of two-story living, while remaining compatible with the surrounding development. Together we feel these designs contribute to a visually rich, yet harmonious neighborhood character that complements our overall vision for Farrington Heights. And to summarize, we truly feel that this is a well-designed, high quality community to offer a balanced blend of modern livability. Situated in the heart of Meridian, this enclave parcel is located near commercial and employment hubs and provides a well-rounded selection of mid-density housing options to meet for a growing population. The City of Meridian's Comprehensive Plan encourages in-fill that delivers of diversity of lot sizes, housing types and densities. Farrington Heights lies with vision by introducing a fresh, modern neighborhood character with an established area, offering new housing choices and a thoughtful range of densities and we truly feel it will be a positive addition to the surrounding neighborhood and a benefit to the City of Meridian as a whole. We agree with the staff report and we did receive unanimous approval from your Planning and Zoning Commission and with that I would like to thank you all for your time, your thoughtful consideration and respectfully request approval of our application this evening. Thank you so much.

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

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Ms. Durtschi, thank you for your presentation. I have a question on the R-4 projects. I'm -- I'm looking at the map. I see some existing structures. Those are just being brought into the city, but there is an empty lot and stairway -- oh, yeah. Go back to the one -- number three when you brought -- yes. The third revision there. So, we are eliminating their driveways off of Pine; correct?

Durtschi: Uh-huh.

Taylor: And, then, giving them access with that stub road, what's the -- what is going to be built on the north side of -- and I can't read the number of the lot, but is that going to be a home? Because that's a much larger lot it looks like than a lot of your other ones

and on the map I'm looking at it looks like it's blank. So, can you just help me understand what you are -- what's going to go there?

Durtschi: Absolutely. Mayor, Council Member Taylor. So, yes, that is another single family residential lot that will take access from the common drive and as you mentioned we are removing, per ACHD's direction, all access off of Pine for public safety reasons. So, that fourth lot will be a single family home.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for the applicant?

Durtschi: Thank you again so much.

Simison: Thank you. Madam Clerk, do we have anyone signed up to provide testimony on this item?

Lomeli: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Yes. We have Raymond Spencer.

Simison: If you would like to provide testimony, please, come forward at this time when your name is called. Okay.

Lomeli: The other one. Rick Salladay.

Simison: Good evening. State your name and address for the record and be recognized for three minutes.

Salladay: Mayor and Council Members. Live at 992 North Stonehenge Way. I am directly behind this subdivision that's been planned. My biggest concern -- I have lived there 35 years. I was one of the first residents of the Danbury Fair Subdivision. The biggest concern with this is my height or my elevation sits about three or four feet below that field behind me. I'm probably one of the lowest lots on my side of the subdivision. I have a three foot retaining wall holding back what used to be a drainage ditch for the farm there. On top of that three foot retaining wall I have a six foot fence. So, we are talking nine feet of elevation. I don't know if that's my feedback.

Cavener: Do you want to -- perfect.

Salladay: Behind my fence there -- sorry -- they have parked a couple trailers. Now, above that nine feet of a retaining wall and a fence I can see probably five, six feet behind me where they have parked a couple trailers five feet above me, the windows of those trailers. Both sides of my fence my neighbors have patios where they can walk up on their patios and my six foot fence hits them about there. So, my concern is these houses are directly behind me and now they have revised their -- their plan for the -- the housing, they took away the green space that was behind me -- they took away the green space that was behind my house to accommodate the road that was abutting the other properties to the north, but I don't object to that, I don't care how that gets built. My main concern is the elevation height behind me. If you put a house and whatever elevation -- you are saying 20, 30 feet they are saying, that's going to be like a three

story house behind me. It's not -- you know. And they are supposed to one level stories, but it's going to be two to three stories above me. That's my concern. I think they need to have some sort of -- either an eight foot fence behind me, some sort of a landscaping, something to help block that view, because I have -- I have experienced 35 years of open field. Like I said, I was the first one in that subdivision. I didn't put a fence up until three years ago when they parked a trailer behind me and I even left that open for two years, because I got along with the people, but at a certain point one trailer turned into two, two trailers turned into three, three trailers turned into four, now it's down to two again. But the point is, as you see, my elevation issues. That's my big point. Okay? So, that's all I have to say about that. Other than that that field is going to be developed no matter what I say.

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

Salladay: Just somebody look at that elevation before they build -- or to require some sort of landscaping. That's all I ask.

Simison: Thank you.

Lomeli: Mr. Mayor, the next person is Stephanie John.

Simison: Good evening. State your name and address for the record.

John: Sure. My name is Stephanie John. 1111 North Adkins Avenue in Meridian. I don't know why it's doing that. Okay. Okay. I will just keep going. I think I turned it off. No, maybe not. Okay. This plan has had many revisions. We have been before Planning and Zoning Committee and you guys a couple times. The development team -- oh, my gosh that is so --

Lomeli: Do you want to take the one on the right off and, then, try this left one for me.

John: Let's see if that -- sorry about that. Sorry. Okay. We will restart. I already said my name. This project has had many revisions. I really appreciate the developer's time and communication. They really did listen to everything we have had to say and we really -- I really appreciate that. The number one concern I still have is height. They did go down to the R-4. I really appreciate that, given that they are going for the R-15 and their heights -- or elevations, as you call them, could be so much higher. The reason I'm so worried about it, as they pointed out, all the houses surrounding them, especially mine on the north property, still in Ada, are very small houses. I just didn't want it to look completely out of place. I think the pictures they show were great. I just don't want those. Is that better? Is it on? Okay. Anyways, I really was just worried about the heights. It seems like they are aware of that and they are going to be conscious of that. They have spoke to us about that even after the Planning and Zoning committee sent it through, which I do appreciate. I would like something maybe in writing. I know they are going to redo that development agreement, so maybe if we could put that in there, agreeing to the R-4. Maybe less height if possible. But they have given some, we have

given some, truly this is a community effort. I think that's something that should be said, given the last group that was before us had a lot of negative things to say and our group doesn't have a ton of negative things to say. They really did listen to us. They were really great members of the community. I can't stress that enough. And even though I may not agree with everything, heights, I do appreciate that they listened to me and so just like I am now, I wanted to make sure that they knew that. I still am against that, but I do agree with what they have and I appreciate their time and your time and Planning and Zoning. A special thanks to Mr. Nick, who answered my millions and millions of questions. I really appreciated that. It gave me a clear understanding of what I needed to know and really how to help my community. So, I appreciate that. Any questions?

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

Lomeli: Mr. Mayor, the next person is Bob Flaten.

Flaten: My name is Bob Flaten. I live at 1111 North Adkins Avenue. I have since 1991.

Simison: If you can hold the microphone --

Flaten: Can you hear me at all?

Simison: Yes. There we go.

Flaten: So, again, Bob Flaten, 1111 North Adkins Avenue. We are the property just to the north of this development. Been there since like '91. Anyways, to kind of reiterate some of what she said, yeah, we did have a lot of bumps along the way just from the very beginning and I feel like the developer and his team have had an open ear to a lot of that. I'm very thankful to that. They are a lot more likable than I would have thought, to be completely frank with you. In an ideal world I would still see things different and I have been open with them about it, too, because I don't want them to think I'm trying to backstab them or anything, but if we could have had a full single level kind of development that was an exact match to everything that is there, that's the ideal world. But as the misses has brought up, it's kind of a give and take thing. They have lost some, we have lost some. I think we have gotten to a pretty healthy point for the most part. Interestingly enough, I have been right here along with you guys for the last couple hours and hearing a lot of the community. I'm seeing a greater issue here than just like this development and this is all kind of before all of you guys, you -- you yourself are living kind of one of those issues, but it seems like Meridian as a whole is kind of trying to cram as many people in as possible in a lot of ways and I think the residents, not just, you know, ones that have been here long term, like myself, but ones that have just moved here from out of state, from other parts of the Treasure Valley and Idaho and in tune -- are all kind of getting the same kind of consensus here and that is wanting our own space. I mean no disrespect to anybody, but, you know, this -- people move to Meridian because of what it was, very respectful not because of probably where it's going. I think we are kind of getting to a breaking point there. So, again, speaking on a much broader spectrum, thank you all for listening, I'm getting concerned,

but, hopefully, you know, you guys being on the front line of that can ascertain kind of what's the most reasonable course of action and I wish you the very best with that. Circling all the way back to this, ideally, yeah, they are all single level, but, again, these people have done great things for us when I thought they would just give us a deaf ear the whole time. So, I'm very thankful for them in that regard. If you have any questions I'm more than willing to answer. I have kind of shot every shot that I can for where we are. In fact, I think I probably wrote -- I know for a fact I wrote to you, Mr. Mayor, and quite a few other people, quite frankly. But, again, that's kind of my spiel for now.

Simison: I think you are not going to get off that easy. I think Councilman Cavener has got a question for you.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor. Mr. Mayor. It's Bob; right?

Flaten: Yes, sir, it is.

Cavener: Thanks. You know, I, too, am a long-term Meridian resident. So, I -- I can appreciate kind of what -- particularly your part of Meridian looked like 25, 30 years ago versus how it's shifted and evolved. I grew up just right down the street from you. So, I appreciate where you are at. I appreciate your correspondence and communication through this whole thing. You know, it's -- it's rare when we get -- I get a sense that you are not necessarily supportive of this application, but you are not necessarily coming into criticize or attack the applicant, which, again, I think that's also the Meridian way, we -- we may have differing of opinions, but we are trying to collaborate as best we can. I feel -- and, again, I wasn't -- I don't attend the Planning and Zoning Commission meetings, so I just -- I read it or I watch it online, but I have read your e-mails. My -- my perception is the Planning and Zoning Commission and the applicant were very receptive to your feedback and you have seen a lot of iterations that have come as a result. So, I would never expect you to jump up and down say I'm so excited for this, but help me understand -- you have a magic wand, you are king for a day, what do you change about this application that's before us to get to a place that you would be supportive? What -- what is it not doing or what is it doing too much of?

Flaten: I mean speaking just very much I have got the crystal ball in front of me, I guess there is two things. Number one, again, just overall density and I -- I understand that they are saying we have the correct density or even less density than already exists. But much like right across the road, the road -- the Woodbridge Subdivision, we are feeling that congestion. I mean we are only a mile to the north of that and there is a lot -- a lot of people and buildings that we are talking about putting in that same little area. There didn't used to be crosses at Locust Grove right there. There is multiple crosses now at Locust Grove and Pine and I fight every day to pray to God that we can keep our children safe and that they never become one -- or that I don't become one -- or that, quite frankly, nobody becomes one, because I think one is too many and I think just with all the people that we are trying to force in these situations -- or into these little areas we are going to create situations that -- kind of like looking back at the -- the vote of 2001 to originally start the Woodbridge Subdivision, we are kind of at the infancy stages of that

just as a whole in that area and I'm concerned that we could be creating just a monster for the residents of Meridian and, again, respectfully to all of its residents, nobody wants to move here to be in Tokyo. You move to Idaho because of the stories you have heard. And those stories weren't married in the last day or the last week, they have been made over decades from people that have lived here long term and have had family members move here and been told all these great things.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thank you. And I'm -- you know, I -- I'm glad you have moved to your home. I missed the drive-in movie theater where you -- where your home now sits and so it's those hard things of like I want to hold on to what I had and you find those things that get whittled away and, then, you get to yourself ten, 15, 20, 30, 40 years later and saying, again, kind of where is the community they grew up, where -- where did it go. So, thank you for your diplomacy and -- and your candidness tonight. I appreciate your testimony. Appreciate you being here.

Flaten: I just realized that maybe I didn't answer your question directly. Magic Wand.

Cavener: Yeah.

Flaten: The center becomes single story, because -- I know there is a couple residents -- the one that really just stands out in my mind, I think about him every night, is Jack Hart. Yeah. Or Jack Harp. Excuse me. He lives just right down the road from us. He is basically -- I guess I can't really tell from this, but point is he is directly across from what will be the two stories and I know that we didn't have a whole lot of neighbors band together on that side. I think a couple are moving. A couple are just, with respect, older, don't really want to mess with it just -- but I just -- the fair word really sticks with me. We are all about fair. That's the part that kind of keeps me up at night. Our issues have been addressed and addressed well and I think they have done a really kick butt job, quite frankly, but there are those neighbors that are still kind of left in the dark. So, magic wand, I make sure that they don't get left behind and we are all in the equal. That's it, but --

Cavener: Thank you. I appreciate it.

Flaten: Absolutely. Thank you all.

Lomeli: Mr. Mayor, the next person is Don Flaten.

D.Flaten: Yes. So, I want to first address -- I do appreciate --

Simison: Can you state your name and address for the record,

D.Flaten: Yes. Of course.

Simison: And put that a little closer up.

D.Flaten: A bit closer?

Simison: Yeah.

D.Flaten: Don Flaten. 1111 North Adkins Avenue. Property bordering immediately north. I do appreciate the accommodation of the developer, their intelligence, experience. Within the context of this plan I see, you know, quite a bit of accommodation and thoughtful planning. However, at the outset all members of the City Council, everyone here, these are very misleading discussions of density. There are 21 homes on 2.9 acres. That's 7.3 per acre. Very simple math. They are averaging the existing lots and what may or may not be done with the vacant lots adjoining this. Immediately surrounding this are homes four to five per acre, all the way around. Everywhere. Casting a net that's a mile wide is absurd. That goes across Locust Grove and includes all the high density housing developed there. The condominium development north of Danbury, the very large homes, very tight separation that were approved and built on Pine Street, all of that's within there. Look at the immediate area. This is completely out of context with the immediate development. My objection is and always has been density. It is high density. Look, for example, at the two-story homes, ten contiguous homes, average lot size 3,200 square feet. Don't tell me this is low density. That's very high density housing. I don't see parking accommodation. That was brought up and -- and kind of dismissed in the planning. It's -- and traffic. We have Adkins Avenue, everything feeding to one -- one and we are very busy. There is no traffic light there. We may -- ACHD may want one at some point, but don't be misled by the numbers and, Nick, you are accurate, it is -- or within a one mile radius it's lower density, but this is much much higher density than the surrounding neighborhood and a very different character. It's beautifully planned for what it is. It's just inappropriately placed. That having been said, if it is within the purview of the City Council, the flexibility, if you were to go ahead and improve the plan I object to it, but if you were to go to approve the plan as it's posited, I would very much encourage -- and this is extremely important given the discussion, objection to neighbors height, that there be prohibition placed on the development for elevated patios, people building out patios at the level of -- of their roof, for example, and proximity of structures, that those being forced for storage. They are often put right against the fence and they will loom over the neighbors, just as they see trailers parked against the back fence and obstructing view from neighbors right now. So, that's about all I had to say. It's just I think we are -- it's very misleading to -- to look at these numbers or talk about. This is a high density development. I object to the density. Simple as that.

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

Lomeli: Mr. Mayor, we have Brian Turner.

Turner: Hello. Brian Turner. 1345 East Shellbrook Drive. My property is one of the properties that are on the -- the north end of this development and I -- as mentioned by

previous individuals, I really appreciate the opportunity to give feedback. The initial plan was -- I think not a good fit for this area and as I have looked at the compromises, both on the applicant's side and a compromise on our desires as existing neighbors, I'm in support of this plan. I certainly -- there would be things that I -- out of my personal opinion I would like to see differently, but seeing the compromises made I'm in support of it. And that's all I have to say. If there is any questions.

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

Lomeli: Mr. Mayor, no one else has signed up.

Simison: Okay. Is there anybody else present that would like to provide testimony on this item? If you are online raise your hand or if you are in the audience if you would like to come forward. Good evening.

Blanton: Good evening. My name is Karen Blanton. I live at 1418 East Sotheby Street in Danbury Fair and I -- I testified during the first meetings. I'm so absolutely grateful for the -- the development that they heard even us, the surrounding neighbors, to go ahead and make something that will be attractive in our community and give -- give space so that there is not going to be people right in front of everybody's home to make a really beautiful development in their community. Development is development and everything might not be perfect for everyone, but I have never -- I have developed property in Washington state and I have never seen anybody put forth so much effort in getting the collaboration from everybody to make it as nice as it could be. We do have the concerns still about getting out into Pine and Locust Grove, the extra traffic that goes out there. So, if you could do something like a traffic light or something to help get people in and out more safely, so that when you are making the turn to get them that would be fabulous. But I -- I have seen all of -- everybody working together on this and I'm so proud to be somebody who is living in Meridian, Idaho. Thank you for your cooperation and your love for the people that are here. That's all. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions? Thank you. Is there anybody else that would like to provide testimony on this item? Then would the applicant like to come forward to close?

Lakey: Good evening, Mayor, Council Members. For the record Todd Lakey, Lakey Villegas Law. Address 141 East Carlton Avenue, Meridian, Idaho. And Sabrina and I are -- are kind of tag teaming tonight. I think you saw a very different picture than you saw earlier and, then, frankly, you have seen in regards to this project in the past. If you look at your P&Z minutes, one of your P&Z commissioners commented they had never received so many positive comments in regard -- and we had a few more people at the P&Z hearing and I have been doing this for 30 years. I have never heard anyone call a project I worked on a kick butt design. So, I appreciate that positive and very honest feedback. It reflects the effort that my clients put into this project and I also appreciated folks describing this as a balance. It's always give and take; right? You give some, you -- you get some and just want to emphasize a couple of the things. The movement of the open space, that was at the request of P&Z and the vast majority of our neighbors.

They preferred those larger lots, those single story homes on that western boundary and that 35 foot height requirement, that was our proposal at P&Z, to make it not R-15, but consistent with the R-4 and, then, we are surrounded by R-8 and that 35 foot requirement really would be mostly applicable to those two-story homes that are tucked into the middle, that are not on that boundary. Commissioners, I would also -- or excuse me -- Council Members, also emphasize that your comp plan that talks about this being in-fill and in-fill is encouraged to be of a higher density than the surrounding properties, but we, again, listen to the neighbors our -- our density is 5.1 dwelling units per acre. Your larger area is 6.12 and the future land use map calls out for three to eight dwelling units per acre. So, we are well within that. We will comply with the ACHD requirements and also would add that these homes will have two car garages. So, you will have two car parking availability within the garages and, then, you will have the driveways that can accommodate an additional two cars. So, Council Members, I would again express appreciation on behalf of my clients for the opportunity they had to work with the neighbors and for the collaborative effort that -- that was. They appreciated that effort. I think both sides benefited from it. You have a great product now before you because of that collaboration and we would ask for your approval. I'm happy to answer questions if you have them.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor. Mr. Lakey, thank you for being here. Is my understanding the third revision is the final, because I thought that all green space was removed, but it looks like there is some buffer there and -- and do all three of those properties have an elevation issue that that green space will help buffer?

Lakey: Mr. Mayor and Council Member Little Roberts, so it is that third revision where they have moved the road to the north and there is still a landscaped area that provides that additional buffer. So, you have got landscaped areas there with vegetation and trees and, then, you have got the road providing that additional separation. So, that is the design and that does help provide additional separation from elevations for the homes that will be built.

Little Roberts: Great. Thank you.

Lakey: Uh-huh.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Mr. Lakey, thank you for all the work that's gone into this to go from no to bringing a proposal that, again, has been characterized as kick butt. I -- I think that that same -- those same accolades need to go to our Planning and Zoning Commission. They worked hard on this to get to a yes and I just want to express appreciation to you and your client for listening to those concerns and coming back with a -- a revision that -- that is much much better and -- and I just wanted to acknowledge our Planning and Zoning Commission and the work that went in. I want to thank the -- the neighbors as well for finding an open ear with you and in your client. That's always good when we have that kind of communication. So, I just wanted to express my appreciation to you for that. As I look at this revision three, again, the transition from the north seems to be addressed with a road and -- and a bit of green space there, even though you are getting to higher elevations and we heard concerns about those higher elevations on those homes. I think this reconfiguration moves those farther to the south and -- and helps address some of those concerns. Rick -- and I didn't get his last name written down, but there to the west where he has a retaining wall that's built and a fence on top of that and still some concerns about the elevation, I don't know if there is a way that his concerns can be addressed on that west side of the property. Do you have any -- any thoughts on that?

Lakey: Mr. Mayor and Council Member Whitlock, before I talk about that I would like to acknowledge your -- I guess acknowledgement as well of the Planning and Zoning Commission and your staff. Both. We -- we appreciate very much the direction and the work that your staff put into it and the direction that we received from the Planning and Zoning Commission that helped redesign this project. I think the gentleman that lives to the west previously lived next to that green space that, again, the majority of folks wanted us to remove and utilize larger lots and single family homes. We do plan on putting in a new fence along that property boundary, but I think the main issue that we did to address that was to make sure that those were single family homes and, then, move the two-story homes further away, not just to the east, but to the north slightly from his property. So, again, we did our best to address the vast majority of concerns and it's not perfection for everybody, but I think it's a very well balanced plan that -- that meets the -- the vast majority of the concerns that were expressed.

Simison: And I think maybe to piggyback on that, one of his comments was this seemed like in not wanting a deck that was up and I -- if it's single family there would, in theory, it's no deck access.

Lakey: Mr. Mayor --

Simison: If I'm tracking single story that --

Lakey: Uh-huh. Yes. Single story so -- correct, there is not going to be any decks on those homes that are up above that elevation.

Simison: Yeah. Okay. Council, any additional questions? Okay. Thank you.

Lakey: Thank you, Mayor. Council Members. Appreciate the opportunity to be with you tonight.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor, I -- seeing no comments, move we close the public hearing.

Overton: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Just make a couple of comments. I think for an in-fill project this is a pretty good one that's been brought to us. These are always really difficult to sort of find a way to plug in something into a place, especially that's been so well established since the 1990s. You know, you have to consider things such as, you know, how do you -- what do you do with the property? Do you leave it there vacant? Do you put it to its highest best use? The owners of the property, how do they want to sell that and move on, develop it, et cetera. I was really pleased to hear how P&Z really worked through this with the -- the neighbors and the -- and the applicant. I think that's a really -- that's a great -- really great success story about how P&Z should work to help get projects ready for approval and work through a lot of the -- the details. So, very appreciative of that. I know we can't always make everything as perfect as we would like to see, but I do think some of the accommodations are -- are well thought out. So, I'm -- I'm -- this is part of my district and I remember walking through there at one point looking at the property and actually wondering what was going to go there. So, I am -- as far as in-fill I think this is a really great project. So, happy to support it tonight.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Just a comment. Just -- it's so rare to see like neighbors and an applicant work together so closely and I just really think that everybody demonstrated the Meridian way and like how to be great neighbors and just really appreciate that. It's so refreshing. You can see what a better project resulted from that. It's just super encouraging. Thank you.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I'm -- I'm always sympathetic to our neighbors who have had part of dirt that's been bare and empty next to them for -- for 30 years. You grow accustomed to that. You grow accustomed to that road that isn't going to go through and, then, it suddenly goes through and it brings traffic and as I mentioned earlier I have -- I have lived here my whole life. I used to be downtown Meridian's paperboy and that's -- your neighborhood was part of -- part of my route. So, I'm always -- I'm always sympathetic to that and I know that change -- specifically change what we feel is going to have a negative impact on our life, can -- can feel different than other change and so to Council Member Strader's point, I -- we see often -- I know you guys are here as kind of a one and done and we often see in these meetings where it's contentious, right, because it is your home and it's your community and everybody cares, everybody's trying to do the right thing, but it feels different and I think Council Member Taylor touched on in-fill is challenging. We as Council wrestle with what we call in-fill development on an ongoing basis and it's because of those challenges it impacts people who have lived here a long time. It feels different than, you know, maybe a hundred acre farm that's now going to be turned into a neighborhood or a commercial development and so to Council Member Strader's comments, I appreciate the collaborative effort. I know there are folks in this room and neighbors that may not like a possible decision the Council will take tonight, but I -- I really want to commend the -- the applicant and their team for really listening to the neighbors. You know, the term NIMBY gets thrown around a lot. We hear that as City Council Members and at -- at no point have I felt this would ever classify or quantify NIMBY conversation. Yet we see applicants from time to time to dismiss the feedback from neighbors is just NIMBY. They just don't want to see any development. And so I want to commend the applicant team for being responsive to the feedback and I know this was a long journey to get here tonight. I remember when we remanded this back I did not love this project at all and I think the great work from our -- our residents and a very receptive applicant that I'm in a space tonight where I will be supportive of this request. So, I appreciate the collaborative nature that brought us here this evening.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: I also think that it's been so impressive to watch the collaboration with this and getting to what is wonderful, in my opinion, in-fill project, because they are the most difficult I think to do and if we don't have any other comments I will go ahead and make a motion.

Simison: Just one quick comment. If you -- you know, I -- I have given Sabrina a lot of comments, but I know it's not just Sabrina, it's got to -- it's got to be the property owner, it's going to be -- like I say, it's a whole team that comes together, but it does start with the -- the public facing person of this and so this is the last comment you are going to get from me in the month of February, Sabrina, but you -- you -- you -- you have -- you have taken a lot of projects and had to -- in a lot of different ways and there is just another great example of the work you do in our community. So, thank you. So, with that --

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to approve File No. H-2025-0016 as presented by the staff in the staff report for the hearing date of February 24th, 2026.

Taylor: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Item 3, H-2025-0016. Is there discussion? If not clerk call the roll.

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

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries and the item is agreed to. Have a good night, everybody. Or stick around to hear some amazing ordinances.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

ORDINANCES [Action Item]

- 4. Ordinance No. 26-2111: An ordinance (Apex Cadence – H-2024-0061) annexing land being a portion of Government Lot 1 and the southeast quarter of the northeast quarter of Section 6, Township 2 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, as depicted in the map exhibit; rezoning 0.86 acres of such real property from RUT (Rural Urban Transition) to the R-15 (Medium-High Density Residential) zoning district; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; repealing conflicting ordinances; and providing an effective date.**

Simison: With that we will move on to Item 4, which is Ordinance No. 26-2111. Ask the clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Lomeli: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. An ordinance Apex Cadence, H-2024-0061, annexing land being a portion of Government Lot 1 in the southeast quarter of the northeast quarter of Section 6, Township 2 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, property from Rural Urban Transition to the R-15, Medium-High Density Residential zoning district; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps, as well as the official zoning

maps and all official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; repealing conflicting ordinances; and providing an effective date.

Simison: Thank you. Council, you may have heard that ordinance read by title. Is there anybody that would like it read in its entirety? If not, do I have a motion?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 26-2111.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and second to approve Ordinance No. 26-2111. Is there discussion? If not clerk call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

- 5. Ordinance No. 26-2112: An ordinance (Apex Cadence – H-2024-0061) de-annexing land located in a portion of the southeast quarter of the northeast quarter and the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of Section 6, Township 2 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, City of Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, as depicted in the map exhibit; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; repealing conflicting ordinances; and providing an effective date.**

Simison: Next up is Ordinance No. 26-2112. Ask the clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Lomeli: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. An ordinance Apex Cadence, H-2024-0061, de-annexing land located in a portion of the southeast quarter of the northeast quarter and

the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of Section 6, Township 2 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, City of Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, as depicted in the map exhibit; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; repealing conflicting ordinances; and providing an effective date.

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

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Whitlock: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 26-2112.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Ordinance No. 26-2112. Is there any discussion? If not clerk call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

- 6. Ordinance No. 26-2113: An ordinance (Apex Cadence H-2024-0061) for rezone of land located in the east half of the northeast quarter of Section 6, Township 2 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, City of Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, as depicted in the map exhibit, rezoning 56.11 acres of land from the R-8 (Medium-Density Residential) zoning district to the R-15 (Medium High-Density) zoning district in the Meridian City Code; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all applicable official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; and providing an effective date.**

Simison: Next up is Ordinance No. 26-2113. Ask the clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Lomeli: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. An ordinance Apex Cadence, H-2024-0061, for rezone of land located in the east half of the northeast quarter of Section 6, Township 2 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, City of Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, as depicted in the map exhibit, rezoning 56.11 acres of land from the R-8 (Medium-Density Residential) zoning district to the R-15 (Medium High-Density) zoning district in the Meridian City Code; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all applicable official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; and providing an effective date.

Simison: Thank you. Council, you have heard this ordinance read by title. Is there anybody that would like it read in its entirety? If not, do I have a motion?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 26-2113.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Ordinance No. 26-2113. Is there discussion? If not, clerk call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

- 7. Ordinance No. 26-2114: An ordinance (Hill's Century Farms Townhomes H-2024-0072) for rezone of land encompassing all of Lots 2-7 and a portion of Lot 10, Block 2 of Hill's Century Farm Commercial Subdivision No. 1 (Book 115 of Plats, Pages 17131-17134, records of Ada County, Idaho) and all of Lots 12 and 13, Block 2 of Hill's Century Farm Commercial Subdivision No. 2 (Book 124 of Plats, Pages 19913-19915, records of Ada County, Idaho) situated in a portion of the northeast quarter of the northwest quarter of Section 33, Township 3 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, City of Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, as depicted in the map exhibit, rezoning 5.45 acres of land from the C-N (Neighborhood Business) zoning district**

to the R-15 (Medium High-Density Residential) zoning district in the Meridian City Code; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all applicable official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; and providing an effective date.

Simison: Next item up is Ordinance No. 26-2114. Ask the clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Lomeli: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. An ordinance Hills Century Town -- Farms -- Farms Townhome, H-2024-0072, for rezone of land encompassing all of Lots 2-7 and a portion of Lot 10, Block 2 of Hill's Century Farm Commercial Subdivision No. 1 (Book 115 of Plats, Pages 17131-17134, records of Ada County, Idaho, and all of Lots 12 and 13, Block 2 of Hill's Century Farm Commercial Subdivision No. 2 (Book 124 of Plats, Pages 19913-19915, records of Ada County, Idaho, situated in a portion of the northeast quarter of the northwest quarter of Section 33, Township 3 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, City of Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, as depicted in the map exhibit, rezoning 5.45 acres of land from the C-N (Neighborhood Business) zoning district to the R-15 (Medium High-Density Residential) zoning district in the Meridian City Code; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all applicable official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; and providing an effective date.

Simison: Thank you. Council, you have heard this ordinance read by title. Is there anybody that would like it read in its entirety? If not do I have a motion?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 26-2114.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve ordinance No. 26-2114. Is there any discussion? If not clerk call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

FUTURE MEETING TOPICS

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

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

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Motion and second adjourn. All in favor signify by saying ayes. Those opposed nay? The ayes have it and we are adjourned.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:16 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

_____/_____/_____
MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK