

Public Hearing for Rolling Hill (H-2023-0070) by JD Planning and Consulting, located at 1560 Rolling Hill Dr.

- A. Request: Annexation of 6.90 acres of land from the R-1 zone in Ada County to the C-C (Community Business District) zone to develop two (2) vertically integrated residential structures featuring 90 dwelling units and 20,134 sq. ft. of commercial space

- B. Request: Conditional Use Permit to develop one (1) multi-family building consisting of 64 dwelling units on 5.89 acres in the proposed C-C zone

Lorcher: Okay. Let's resume. The last application before us is Rolling Hill Subdivision requests annexation and a conditional use permit for a multi-family building. We will begin with the staff report.

Parsons: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. So, as you can see on the screen before you this was an application that started with us in 2023. So, I have been working with the applicant on many months trying to get this aligned and get in front of you tonight for the annexation and conditional use permit. You can see here on the future land use map in front of you that this property is part of a larger mixed-use regional Comprehensive Plan designation. I think in the staff report I think we have done a pretty good job laying out some of the concerns and some of the lack of integration that this project has and I will get into that more into my presentation. But the applicant is here to discuss with you annexing 6.9 acres of land from -- excuse me -- RUT in Ada county. I think it's from R-1 and Ada county to business community or C-C zoning district in the city. It encompasses five parcels. The center parcel here that you see with my cursor is not included. It's basically creating an enclave around this piece, which was -- had a staff concern in the staff report that we raised for you. The other unique part about this is conditionally this particular project has a vertically integrated component and a multi-family component. So, in the C-C zone a vertically integrated project is principally permitted and a multi-family use requires a conditional use permit. So, although you are seeing the annexation of almost seven acres, the conditional use permits only for 64 units of multi-family and the other two buildings are vertically integrated, which would be principally permitted if the applicant is successful with the annexation and conditional use permit request. So, here, as I mentioned, the two westernmost buildings here with the -- on my cursor those are the vertically integrated buildings and that will contain 90 dwelling units and approximately 20,000 square feet of commercial space on the ground floor and, then, this is the one multi-family building with 64 units. The other unique component -- as I mentioned to you this is mixed-use regional and so the -- and, then, as -- also as I have mentioned to you here is that county enclave that will be carved out around this particular development. It's important to note the applicant -- we -- you know, the -- we have met on this with many different developers over the years and staff has always requested that they try to bring this -- this particular property in and I think the Commission recognizes that we can't force annex people in and this gentleman is happy to stay in the county and so that is one unique challenge that this developer has to face. The other unique part of it is the adjacent property to the east, which is owned by Corey Barton and,

then, to make it even -- complicate it even more is you can see the red line on the map here, well, that's a future designated collector street that's required by ACHD's master street map in this -- in conjunction -- in coordination with ACHD and this road alignment was predicated on this location due to the fact of Movado Subdivision on the south side of Overland Road. So, you can see -- we are starting to kind of starting to put the -- the recipe together why this may not be the best time to annex. But although staff has recommended approval of the project, because there are good things about it, too. But, again, with mixed-use developments we try to encourage or we do require integrated mix of uses. If I can step back to that site plan you can see currently, a lot of the property around this is still in the county and this -- these are the first -- a lot of the first properties on this side of the road to come in minus the one C-G portion across the street and, then, two -- so, in order to show that -- how the enclave could redevelop in the future, the applicant has provided a concept plan for you on the right. So, that's -- you can see here maybe another future commercial building, maybe another multi-family structure, some consolidated open space and some parking. Also in the staff report we noted both ACHD and staff is asking the applicant to work with the adjacent property owner to close his access to Overland Road and see if he is willing to take access internal from the site. I don't know if we can get him to do that or not, but that would be nice, because if we don't, then, the other issue with the enclave is we don't get the street frontage improvements or the sidewalks. So, now we have a gap along a major arterial in the city. Good things about this project is that it does take access from Rolling Hills Drive, which -- East Rolling Hill Drive I should say, which is a local street. The applicant will be required to improve that street frontage. Currently it is a substandard street section. So, it will become a complete street as part of this project and, then, also as I mentioned to you there is a cul-de-sac that runs here, but ACHD has the right of way for that to be improved. So, rather than having the applicant build this entire road, which isn't -- which is cost prohibitive, we have -- and they do touch the right of way, we are requiring them to build a crossing across the Five Mile Creek and, then, ACHD is requiring street frontage improvements along that roadway as well to bring that into the -- into master street standards -- or ACHD standards I should say. Then also there is a little bit of -- there is a little triangular piece here in the northeast corner of the site where the applicant will have to dedicate that right of way for future expansion of the collector road when it comes in. The other piece with the road being offset somewhat from this eastern boundary as you see that it creates this strip of land between this development and the property. It's approximately 40 feet. And so if someone's going to have to be very creative how that develops or it's going to end up just being undevelopable and maybe open space in the future, just don't know at this point and that's -- that's kind of those puzzle pieces that we are trying to put together here. You have got this project wrapping around a county enclave and, then, you have a street potential on adjacent property with no idea what they are going to do on that site and it's all mixed-use regional, which is why we want all of these pieces to come in and integrate with one another on the front end and not try to piecemeal development. The other unique piece about this particular project is vertically integrated projects don't have open space requirements like a multi-family development and their patio space requirements are smaller than a multi-family development and so for a vertically integrated project you have to provide 50 square feet of private patio space or outdoor space. Multi-families is 80 square feet. Now, certainly if this -- if the applicant is successful with getting his project

approved we want it to be a cohesive design theme. So, if the -- we will put on the developer -- or at least we have it pretty flexible in the conditions of approval. The applicant can either go through alternative compliance to reduce the patio space for the multi-family or just increase the patio space on the vertically integrated project. So, we will -- we will leave that up to them on how they want to do it, but we have some flexibility in that condition. Also mention to you that additional right of way along Overland Road will also be necessary in the future, which the applicant's plan does show -- take that into account as well. So, Overland Road is planned to be a seven lane roadway in the future. So, it's a pretty major roadway through this area, which makes some sense for high density residential for -- along that corridor. So, the plan before you tonight does meet the parking requirements of the code. I think we called out there were some substandard parking as far as dimensional standards, but I think the applicant has enough room to -- to mitigate for that. The other unique piece about this in the open space as I mentioned to you, they are just shy of the required open space. If we were to review this as an entire multi-family development. So, we are not actually holding them to that standard, they are just slightly under, so they actually are providing 1.45 acres of common open space and if this was an all multi-family project it would be 1.47. So, we are not too far off on what would be required by code. And, then, we also mentioned that if the project -- if the enclave were to develop in the future that would add additional open space to this -- this development as well. Again, we can't hold the applicant to that, because they don't control that property, but at least there is a way that -- they are trying to demonstrate how it could integrate. So, the planned amenities for this consist of swimming pool, fitness center and, then, ten foot multi-use pathway along the creek, which the applicant will have to work with Nampa-Meridian to allow that to happen. So, that is per the -- the city's Master Pathways Plan that is an amenity for this development to go in and the creek is to remain open as required by the code. So, parking spaces, as I mentioned, there is 281 and 125 of those are covered and only 222 are required. So, they -- again, they do meet the -- exceed the requirements. Here is the open space exhibit as well, just displaying compliance with the code. Pedestrian circulation plan for you to show you how they can move about the development and, then, here -- here is the architectural theme for the development. So, you can see it looks more like a Brownstone style apartment complex, a more urban style I should say. I like it. So, it looks like it's going to have a mix of metal siding, bricks, stucco and fiber cement accents. So, that's how I was touching on my point about what they do with their patios, whether they keep the 50 or the 80, I think whatever they do it would be nice to -- to have that consistent design theme here. So, looking at the public record there was no public testimony on -- provided on this application and staff, again, is recommending approval with the conditions in the staff report. I will go ahead and conclude my presentation and stand for any questions.

Lorcher: Commissioners, do you have any questions for staff at this point? Would the applicant like to come forward? Hi. Please state your name and address for the record.

Thomas: Wade Thomas with JD Planning and Associates. Sorry. Kids brought home a cold so I apologize. That's Wade Thomas with JD Planning and Associates.

Lorcher: Okay.

Thomas: My address is 12300 West Fireweed Street in Star, Idaho.

Lorcher: Okay.

Thomas: 83669. Bill does a great job reviewing the project, so I won't rehash any of -- any of what he stated. Actually, that was the slide I wanted to -- to talk about. I think the biggest issue with this particular project are the site constraints. We did try to work on that -- kind of that in-fill piece. Tried to work with that owner. In the midst of all this he moved to Tennessee and still was unwilling to participate in some form or another. So, I do think that there might be a high probability that that might join into the project at some time in the near future. But, unfortunately, I couldn't get the deal done. So, I did want to clarify that. I think the other really big issue that drove this -- and Bill mentioned this earlier, just trying to -- this prolonged discussion with staff really resolved -- revolved around the collector road and how to kind of access that and how to have kind of continuity through -- throughout the project. Obviously, we had the design constraints missing that middle piece, so Bill talked about the over parking, that's really what's driving that. We just couldn't -- couldn't really design the buildings around it. Ultimately we did do the mix of the vertically integrated with the multi-family use. That was really driven by staff. I think it's a nice balance. We did try to kind of front load the project closer to Overland to pull some buffer into the homes to the north, which I think you will hear a lot about tonight. I think the other thing to consider is the impact of that collector road in the future. We will continue to kind of -- as those other parcels are developed how that will also create a natural buffer to that as well. The other last comment was really when you look at the mixed-use regional this really is a complement to the surrounding properties and the surrounding zonings in that area and you look to the north there is the Eagle View Landing Apartments. That's R-40. You have all the C-G with all the Topgolf area. I think this creates that nice transition for that property. As far as access you have tons of -- of access. There is a new bus stop going in two parcels down. It's just in the Boise city limits, but that was approved for a very similar project. So, I think, you know, public services are going to be available for people to come to and from this site and I think that's -- oh, I also wanted to comment on the Brownstone design. That was very intentional on our part. We are finding in the multi-family space that there is this transition to full time living in apartments. So, we really wanted to design this as it's kind of own community, but also that it integrates appropriately with the surrounding community, but to create a sense of home for people, so when they come home they don't feel like they are coming to a box. That's just a place to, you know, sleep. It's a place to live, it's a place to enjoy the surroundings, it's a place to interact with the different amenities between the pool, the plaza, with the commercial space we expect that that will be things such as, you know, coffee shops and its proximity to a lot of the healthcare services we expect and there has been some interest in -- that there -- there is a good chance that a lot of that commercial space will be doctors' offices, things of that nature. Chiropractors. Dentists. It seems like there is never enough dentists even though they seem to be everywhere, but that's -- that's one of those things. So, that was intentionally done and - - and to Bill, to answer your question, even with that commercial piece we will -- we will stick with that community feel and that -- kind of that Brownstone feel and incorporating all those elements to really make this someone's home, as opposed to just a box that

they live in. I hate to come make the comparison, but when I drive down Ten Mile and see a lot of boxes and so we are really trying to drive that, we are really thoughtful in our landscape plan to really drive a lot of those elements again with a lot of the amenities and make them interactive. So, I will stand for any questions. Again I apologize I'm starting to lose my voice, so --

Lorcher: Okay. Commissioners, any questions for the applicant? Commissioner Grace.

Grace: Wade, what -- so that county land -- their enclave in the middle, if it's not purchased by you or what -- what -- what becomes of it? What would it --

Thomas: Well -- so, it -- it -- there is a single family residence on it. It's been used primarily as a commercial space. Lots of small engine repairs. I actually went by it the other day and I -- I don't know what they have transitioned it to, but they were also using the back piece of it as a lot of storage. So, it looks like it's still some type of mechanical shop in the back with some storage, but I -- I can't confirm exactly what it is. I think maybe where you are going with it is there are going to be some constraints with this project as built out, what they can do with it in the future. I do know that they were really keen on maybe putting in a Starbucks. Without access to Overland I'm not sure that that would be very realistic, irrespective of this project. So, there -- there would be some probably limitations, especially with access would really have to come off of Rolling Hill or through the future collector road.

Grace: But on some level whatever it becomes -- and maybe this is a city question, I apologize. Whatever it becomes it's -- it's got a transition into what -- what you are doing around it. It's -- on some level; right?

Thomas: Yes.

Grace: Okay. It just -- it just really sticks out there. Thanks.

Thomas: It's -- it's made the project very difficult to design around it.

Lorcher: I do have a question. So, Bill, you alluded to the collector road and I can't read this even with my glasses on, but where -- I guess this is north. It goes north and, then, west I assume. The little -- the little white spaces between your property and the collector road, is that no man's land? Is that what you mentioned or is -- does that belong to you?

Thomas: So, no, it -- that is -- the property line on our property on the east stops at basically about five feet past the -- the parking stall.

Lorcher: Okay.

Thomas: So, that's just a space. It's not driven necessarily by what we would prefer or would want, it's really we were just trying to align the road with the Movado Way that is directly on the other side of Overland.

Lorcher: Okay.

Thomas: And so it was more of an alignment issue than anything and getting those to line up. The other issue on that road is ACHD did require that we work in the entire 70 feet of right of way, since it hasn't been determined how big that future collector road will be, so that's the maximum right of way that would be needed for the largest collector road you can put in.

Lorcher: Okay.

Thomas: Whether that's what they do or not is -- remains a question.

Lorcher: So, you are going to landscape the one that goes this way?

Thomas: Yes. That's --

Lorcher: What about the one that goes this way.

Thomas: The white space?

Lorcher: The white spaces. You don't -- that's not yours? Who belongs -- who owns that?

Thomas: Corey Barton owns that particular property.

Lorcher: The little strip of land between the road and your development?

Thomas: Yes. And that's -- that's about -- it's a little over three acres parcel and right now it's just an empty field. It's vacant.

Lorcher: It looks really tiny on the screen.

Thomas: So -- so think of it --

Lorcher: Oh. Okay.

Thomas: Yeah. There is a whole -- so this would represent maybe a third of that entire parcel.

Lorcher: I got you.

Thomas: Maybe a little more.

Lorcher: Okay. Okay. Thank you. Thank you very much.

Thomas: Thank you, Madam Chairman, Commissioners.

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

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. We have Alicia Eastman.

Lorcher: Hi. Please state your name and address for the record.

Eastman: Alicia Eastman. I live at 1485 Rolling Hill. My -- the first notification I got of this was nine days ago when Meridian Planning and Zoning sent me this card and I had trouble accessing this on the website and I -- the only information I have gotten really was from my neighbors sending e-mails back and forth and now that I'm looking at this I see that there is going to be a four story building directly across the street from my house and if the road is modified I'm going to -- my wells -- they are going to have to replace my well and, then, my neighbor also who that -- somebody is renting that house. So, there is a bunch of people there living. So, I don't know that that owner is involved in that or really realizes what's going on. But 36 years ago I purchased my home in a rural subdivision with a -- it was a dead end because of the traffic. Okay? And so now we are being boxed in. We are -- we are on wells, septic. Well, most -- a lot of my neighbors have farm animals. They have horses. They have chickens. They have sheep. Okay? And this isn't really a good integration of this property right now in -- in one of these Planning and Zoning meetings a couple years ago -- or maybe a year and a half ago I -- I think the committee here said that there were going to be no modifications on Rolling Hill until all the homes were gone. We realized -- they -- you folks said, yes, all those homes are going to be gone and I thought, well, really? Who -- nobody asked me. Okay? But my husband died two years ago. Yeah. Eventually I'm going to have to move, but I think it's too soon and it's not being done well. It's not integrating with the neighborhood. We are still very rural where we are. So, my -- my -- it's just poor timing. This traffic issue -- the December 3rd meeting, 2021, we brought up the traffic issue of the trucks coming up and down Overland because of the BVA project that aligns next to the freeway. The next day after the meeting -- and I was working at the time I had a spreadsheet open and I -- I marked between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. 184 trucks went past my house and my house shook every time and so we got the truck traffic to stop, they put signs, you know, that the truck traffic had to go around to Silverstone. But this is directly at my front doorstep, which I don't think at this point in time it's not a good -- good time to do it. If you are going to do it, okay, when the -- when the neighborhood goes -- like buy my house, buy the neighbor's house if that's what you are going to do. But right at my doorstep a four foot -- a four story building, I -- I -- I don't think that that's livable for me and it's the water issue also about my well that I'm concerned about my well water. I don't -- I don't want to annex to Meridian. If that whole area is going to go, why -- why would I? And -- and why would somebody redig my well -- and if you will give me one of two more seconds, please. Or 20. Our neighbor, Robert on Overland, annexed because his well went dry and he -- he said he -- he couldn't get a new well dug because no one could drill. They said they were three years out.

Lorcher: Right.

Eastman: Okay. So, where does that leave me? Thank you very much.

Lorcher: Thank you. Madam Clerk.

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair, the next person is Mike Flowers. It looks like he is online, so just one moment.

Lorcher: Okay.

Flowers: Yes. Can you hear me?

Lorcher: Yes. Please state your name and address for the record.

Flowers: Mike Flowers. 1325 Rolling Hill Drive, Meridian, Idaho. I will let others talk about other issues. I want to point out a couple of things that aren't addressed in this document or proposal. One that collector route that they are speaking of north of the property -- I don't know if anyone's able to zoom in on that. Since our last meeting in 2022 with the BVA apartments that went in north of us, there have been four properties that have been available for developers or anyone to purchase well over 30 days. One of those happens to be where this collector route lies. That has been purchased by a homeowner that intends to build a home there. I don't know why this is still part of the proposal whatsoever. It seems to -- I don't even know why it's even part of the discussion whatsoever. I don't -- I don't know what purpose it serves. Beyond that -- and I'm not even speaking for us, because it's been apparent that the residents on Rolling Hill Drive do not matter. So, I'm speaking on as an advocate for the apartments in BVA north of us and for the future apartments south of us. Rolling Hill is completely pitch black. There is no sidewalks, there is no lights and people now are walking up and down the street. We have motorcycles, we have cars going around the barriers north of us and, anecdotally, I know you probably won't believe me, but they go in excess of 60 miles an hour on a 25 mile per hour road, because it's a straight dead away. This is in a pitch black street and so you are going to have people walking to Topgolf, to the brewery, to the workout place from these new apartments and they are going to be doing it in the middle of the street and no one knows -- everyone assumes, oh, it's just on a street, like this is a residential street. It's safe. No, it's not, because there is a bunch of idiots that like to drive up and down this thing as if it's a race zone. We have talked about it before in the past. In 2022 we were dismissed. This is all in conjunction with the fact that no one's even talking about a stoplight with Movado. We don't even have -- the apartments north of us aren't even open yet. The ones that are listed in the report in July, those weren't even open at the time. So, you have all the apartments north of us that aren't included in the information included in this report I mean they are not even listed on this map. They are not even built. And so there has to be a light at some point, but if that property is going to build a home there I don't even know why it's being considered, let alone the -- the enclave that's being built. So, part of the reason why I'm not even here in person is because I thought this project was so absurd that I didn't even think it was going to come to fruition, let alone the fact that we only have half of the Council here representing us in -- in person, so I

decided not to show up. So, I do not understand how it could possibly like go forward without a continuation at the very least.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much. Madam Clerk.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, we have Chris Maiocca. I'm sorry, I'm -- I know I'm not pronouncing that correctly.

Lorcher: Hi.

Maiocca: Hello. Chris Maiocca. 4160 East View Circle, Meridian, Idaho. 83642. Bill, could you zoom into that where you just were on the map. So, we are using the term collector road. That's -- it's my street right here. This is my -- this is my garden. This is where I have raised my kids and that's all going to -- the collector road destroys my way of life. The collector road is where my kids play. They hunt, because we are in Ada county. It's where my neighbors walk their horses. When I heard about this project I immediately called P&Z and I spoke to staff and this was their response: Given all the apartments across the street and behind you I cannot possibly imagine us approving this proposal and yet here we are. Commissioner Grace, you -- you -- you made a comment on the last session or the one before that -- you said we really need to think through some of these things as a city. I want to quote something that Commissioner Seal made at a meeting on December 2nd, 2021. He said there have been a couple of mistakes Meridian has made. One of them was eliminating the rural designation altogether. This, speaking of our community, is a small rural community that is right in the middle of a large area of development. I think if we don't have some input on this how it will impact these folks, it would be yet another mistake we would be making as a city. I think there are a whole lot of things that could be done here for us to be better neighbors and to bring this project in with a little more tack, speaking of the Rackham Apartments. This is a hundred times worse. This literally just puts 500 new neighbors in my front yard and in all of our front yards. When -- when ACHD said you cannot make Rolling Hill a thorough way for Topgolf, Commissioner Steve Yearsley said I applaud Brighton and what they have done to try and minimize the impact to the homeowners on Rolling Hill. I have read the staff report and I -- I just can't believe what -- the quotes in the staff report that the recommendation is to move forward. Here is one. The lack of integration may hinder interaction, disrupt cohesive infrastructure and prevent coordinated land uses causing a sense of isolation, particularly for the county enclave -- that's us -- from the overall broader regional growth dynamics. I just want to read one last quote from the report. Furthermore, with approximately 760 multi-family units already within the vicinity, Commission and Council should evaluate whether the city necessitates additional multi-family housing in this area. I ask you respectfully, Commissioners, what are we doing? This plan is ill-conceived. It may be wonderful in ten years when Overland is extended, just not now. Thank you.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, Robin Maiocca.

R.Maiocca: Thank you, Madam Chair and Commission. Robin Maiocca. 4160 East View Circle, Meridian. 83642. My -- my main concern is traffic studies. I appreciate your story tonight, Madam Chair, as you personally related to commit -- or a situation coming before you tonight. Your neighborhood, your area, that's me right now. I have four -- I have four children three of them teenage years, all driving -- soon to be driving. When we exit our neighborhood from Rolling Hill to Overland it is constant sirens all the time and I would challenge you to look at the accidents that take place right there on Overland right in front of the new Zamzows where that intersection with the light. It's not just bumper to bumper accidents, it's crashes that are taking place and -- and I look at what we have invested in this home over the last six years and it's heartbreaking to think even now with apartments just south of us -- or north of us where Topgolf and, then, even west of us -- east or west of Eagle, those new apartments are not even occupied yet and to think that we are going to bring in another apartment complex in this very confined space is unfathomable to me as a homeowner and I -- I expect better from my city to protect people who own land, who have really brought the heart of Meridian. Like was stated earlier we own livestock. We walk horses. Like this is the heart of Meridian and I'm asking you to, please, consider that. There -- you can go to my house site outside of this diameter -- parameter and do whatever you want, but preserve what is still here. But I challenge you to, please, look at the traffic studies for the sake of our children as a mom. Thank you.

Lorcher: Madam Clerk.

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. We have Amy Wattles.

Wattles: My name is Amy Wattles. My address is 1360 Rolling Hill Drive. My property would be slightly north of View Circle. So, it's on that corner there. Tonight's meeting is not about the growth. Tonight is just one stop along 15 year history of residence on Rolling Hill trying to work with the city to figure out a logical way to integrate this community and to annex it into the city. Our last process we went through BVA, Topgolf, and the comments were made from the city -- for some reason the city approved development from the interstates and, then, they are like, okay, it makes sense to move forward from there. But now what's happening is that development has happened, now there is a proposal on the other end, which is completely boxing us in with two developments. Within that area, like my neighbors have talked about, we all have livestock. We have our -- it's a small rural road. I'm not sure if you guys are familiar with the road. It's a small road. Our road is crumbling, because of the traffic, because of the heavy machinery that was coming down the road to build Topgolf. And, fortunately, at some point they shut it down. We are not built to be handling this influx of traffic through our -- our subdivision. I encourage you all to go back and read hearing meeting notes, comments from City Council, highlights that stand out where Planning and Zoning and City Council determined there would be no more road improvements on Rolling Hill until the homes were gone. That includes sidewalks. That includes replace -- replacing the road, any of that. This was an opportunity for the city to do right by the residents and we are acting behind us a four story apartment was approved. The residents were not aware, we were not part of that process. Had we known that that was an agenda item we would have been there, just like we are here tonight. And the comment made at City Council

was, well, I wouldn't want it in my backyard, but nobody's here to object to it. We are here. We are objecting. We are saying this is completely inappropriate for where we live and what the current status is at this time. At the neighborhood meeting we tried to share concerns. We were actually shocked based on every indication we had previously had that development would move forward, not backwards again, that this was even on the table and talk about any concern falling on deaf ears. We weren't happy when BVA came in, Topgolf came in, but at least they listened. We said, you know, these are kind of the no go. These are the issues we were having. At this meeting it was like, sorry, that's what we can do. We have got to do better than that. You have got four story apartments overlooking a pasture with two goats and a pig. Is -- is that integration? The neighbors don't want connectivity to this development. The neighbors don't want sidewalks. The neighbors just want to be until a developer comes in and has a clear logical plan to develop the area in a way that makes sense.

Lorcher: Thank you very much.

Wattles: Thank you.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, the next person that signed up is David Ellis.

Ellis: Hi.

Lorcher: Hi.

Ellis: David Ellis. 1395 Rolling Hill Drive. And, then, I also own other property, 1300 Rolling Hill Drive as well.

Lorcher: Okay.

Ellis: My biggest concern is, obviously, the infrastructure. As it goes right now -- Mike brought up a good point. They had the opportunity to buy a parcel of land over there. They did not. So, the collector road that they are talking about, who -- is Corey Barton going to sell it? Like what is the chances of that actually end up happening in the future? I don't see it ever happening and especially if someone builds a house right in the middle of it, how is it going to happen? Are you going to tear down the house? I mean it's going to be a brand new construction house in a rural subdivision. That's the first thing. Second thing. He talked about new sidewalks and everything else up to the point of entrance getting into the apartments. So, from that point to the end of Rolling Hill where it is a turnaround what's going to happen between A and B? Because there is nothing happening there. It's already been pointed out there's no streetlights. It's dark. People haul butt down that road and what we can do about that? Second thing. How are we going to get out on Overland? There is no way to get out on Overland as it is. I don't know if you guys drove down there, but if you go between 3:30 to 6:00 at night you are lucky -- you are probably going to be sitting there a good five or ten minutes just to get out onto Overland. So, what -- what's going to happen with that whole thing? I don't know exactly when Overland's supposed to get widened. What I was told was 2026. I

don't know if that's correct. Well, that's two years from now. So, what's going to happen from now until then? That's all the questions I have. I think these guys have already got everything else. We have animals. We have kids. I don't want any of it to happen.

Lorcher: Thank you.

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

Lorcher: Would the applicant like to come back and address some of the concerns?

Thomas: I just wanted to cover a couple of items. Excuse me. First, Amy -- is it Amy? I apologize I was not at the neighborhood meeting. I did receive copious -- a lot of notes that we did try to incorporate into the project itself, but I apologize that I was not there. The second one is the collector road. This is obviously an issue. I would agree there are a lot of practical implications on whether or not the road will ever be built. Recently had an application in Garden City and I called it the road to nowhere and ultimately maybe that's what we are really talking about. Notwithstanding that, it does have to be considered. It is in the master street map. It's not on the five year plan. But it is in anticipation that it will be developed and built at some time in the future. There was the comments on the staff report, as well as brought up tonight, was the integration of this -- this project. I do think that the comments with regards to the enclave project were specific to the parcel in the middle. Notwithstanding that, I did take some issues with this concept of integration. You know, it -- we do have paths that go throughout the project. But I think more importantly when you look at the mixed-use regional, sometimes we want to get really myopic on a project; right? Well, when you look at -- in the comp plan in the mixed-use regional it really talks about that whole brown area that's highlighted in the -- in the - - in the FLUM, the future land use map and when you really drill down onto it you have to take that into account with all -- everything that's in this area and I make the argument that this is actually in line with integration and it's in line with the comp plan and it's in line with the code. It does fully integrate with all those others. You look at, again, you had a lot of C-G, you have R-40 just to the north. Now you have R-1. Now you have this C-C which is complemented by the commercial that's on the south side of Overland. I think you also look at that major intersection is also within that mixed-use regional area and that needs to be kind of -- needs to be considered -- not kind of considered -- needs to be considered as part of that integration. I think this is a natural evolution into the fully development of that -- of that mixed-use regional designated area. That's all the comments I had.

Lorcher: Do we have any -- hold on. Did you have a question for the applicant?

Grace: Yeah. Madam Chair, I had one question. If that enclave wasn't there and you had access to that whole site, would you have designed it differently? I mean you talk about potentially chiropractors and dentists and things being in that -- that commercial space. Would you -- I mean would you have designed that differently?

Thomas: Madam Chair, Commissioner Grace --

Grace: So that they are not –

Thomas: -- looking at it, so -- so, the issue is with the limited access off Overland. You know, my -- my initial response is I would design it differently, because I would -- I would -- my inclination is to front load the commercial onto Overland Drive, but, then, you have access. So, you kind of have to make these natural buffers from that commercial aspects of the -- of the project and kind of insulate it from what I deemed kind of the multi-family aspects of it. I would probably -- on the -- the Building C there is 7,000 some change commercial space, I would probably make that a full multi-family building and shift as much of that commercial down onto Overland. I think aesthetically it looks good now. I think you can pull that traffic -- keep that traffic kind of -- that commercial -- that commercial traffic on the south side of the project.

Grace: I asked the question just because -- so some of the comments -- the public comments and I wondered if that would alleviate any. All right. But -- okay. Thank you.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Thomas: Thank you.

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

Rust: I move to close the public hearing.

Grace: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Sandoval: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Sandoval.

Sandoval: Well, I can start here. I will try to keep this brief. You know, I believe the project does integrate some of the components of mixed-use. I also believe that additional multi-family with the current 760 units in the vicinity right now is excessive, not necessary. To me the public testimony -- you know, I do agree with many of the concerns and issues and it feels -- and I really don't like how subjective that word is, but it's definitely applicable here. Like we are forcing the current homeowners to deal with the four story complex directly adjacent to their property itself. So, the overall transitional space, you know, that's a -- that's a real issue. My biggest issue is the enclave this makes. You know, it's nonsensical to approve something that isolates and surrounds a small property like this. What precedent would that be setting? I understand the project does have these constraints. However, the constraint, the roads, the enclave, the collector road, the

neighbors are prime reasons for denial. Now, as such I am in favor of denial and I can't be in support of the project as is.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Yeah. I think there is -- there is some -- there is some big problems with this here and, you know, there is -- I -- I would honestly say a lot of them I don't -- I don't fault the developer for. I think there is -- there is certain realities with this property and with this timing that just kind of make this really difficult. I -- I agree with some of what Commissioner Sandoval says -- said about, yeah, traditional space and things like that. I think, obviously, I think some of this location is -- is too small to really have a ton of great transitional space. I think the thing for me mostly is the -- the -- kind of the general need for some -- some larger thinking about how we address this entire property or we address this entire -- this entire neighborhood in reality, but I think we are just looking at kind of ten, twenty years from now, but you can anticipate a lot of this in-fill starting to happen and I would like to see some -- some more interconnectivity and integration planned out from the start and I think generally speaking just getting this enclave taken care of and getting this -- we can't force annex anyone, obviously, but just getting -- annexing this property as a whole and helping develop it as a whole can probably help us create a better site plan that is more conducive to future integration with the rest of that mixed-use residential as it becomes the mixed-use residential that it is in the FLUM. So, I -- I -- whereas some -- some previous ones I can -- I can easily say this is not the time. This one I -- I have some heartburn over. I -- I feel like the developer is -- did a great job with kind of what the cards they were dealt. I just -- I just don't know if that's enough for a winning hand at the moment to -- to be quite frank.

Lorcher: Thank you. Commissioner Grace?

Grace: Madam Chair, yeah, I -- I -- I could go into a lot of the details, but the -- the bottom line for me is it just doesn't fit. It doesn't -- the transition doesn't work here. I -- I'm trying to justify in my own mind, you know, why I approve -- why I go for other projects in this project -- and for me the reason is it -- it doesn't fit here. There is a history here of homes and -- and a -- you know, we are bringing this in from the county. It's not like it's already -- it's, you know, a portion of this. It's not like it's already here. There is a history of city meetings and -- and statements on this that it indicates some acknowledgement of -- of this being a little bit of a challenging area. So, I -- I give some deference to that. This county piece in the middle and I think makes it problematic and I agree with Commissioner Smith, I think the applicant has done a great job based on what he has got and -- but I do feel like the -- the -- the citizens here -- the neighbors here deserve probably a little better than what -- what this is based on the history and where this -- you know, what this property is. So, those are my thoughts.

Lorcher: I -- I do appreciate the fact that we take each application individually and just because we say yes on one and it might be an identical project to another, but the land is different, the roads are different, the space is different, the neighbors are different and so we try not to set a precedent saying if we said yes here we have to say yes there. So, in that regard I'm the same way. The enclave has kind of thrown me and the transition - - to have a one acre or three acre parcel with a pasture, even if your house is a little bit off site, you know, away from this, to be able to have to pass an apartment building every day would -- would be a struggle for me as well. Commissioner Rust, do you have any comments?

Rust: For a first Commission meeting you guys sure gave some doozies out tonight.

Lorcher: Yes, we have.

Rust: I resonate with a lot of that. I -- I think this area -- the trajectory is very clear. The developer made some good points. I -- I do think that this integrates into the long-term plan, even the mid-term plan. The reality is this ground -- the highest and best use, just looking at the surrounding square mile, it's not going to be farm ground, which, as somebody who grew up here in rural Meridian, that's -- that's a sad transition in a lot of ways. I do question the timing and I honestly think that I would support this if it wasn't for the enclave, but the enclave just adds a whole other dimension of complexity and that's not the developer's fault, but I just -- all things considered I don't think this is the right time.

Lorcher: I will take a motion.

Sandoval: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Sandoval.

Sandoval: After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend denial to the City Council of File No. H-2023-0070 as presented during the hearing on October 3rd, 2024, for the following reasons: By the enclave it creates, as well as the transition to neighboring homes.

Lorcher: It's been moved to decline the conditional use permit and annexation for Rolling Hill Subdivision due to the enclave and lack of transition. Do I have a second?

Grace: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded for application number 2023-0070. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Lorcher: Commissioners, I will take one more motion.

Grace: Move to adjourn.

Rust: Second.

Smith: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 10:02 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS.)

APPROVED