

Brighton Corporation, generally located approximately 1/4 mile north of W. Chinden Blvd. at the north end of N. Levi Ave. on the north side of W. Waverton Dr.

- A. Request: Modified Development Agreement to the existing Development Agreement (Inst. #2019-060655) for a new agreement for the residential portion of the development with an updated development plan
- B. Request: Rezone of 14.90 acres of land from the R-8 to the R-15 zoning district.
- C. Request: Preliminary Plat for 157 building lots and 32 common lots on 19.76 acres of land in the R-8 and R-15 zoning districts

Lorcher: The next item on the agenda is for Pollard North Subdivision for a modified development agreement, a rezone and preliminary plat. We will begin with the staff report.

Allen: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. This project was previously heard by the Commission back on December 5th. The Commission recommended denial to City Council based on their opinion the proposed rezone to R-8 and TN-R would create too much density for the area and not provide enough transition to lower density development to the north. Following the Commission hearing the applicant submitted revised plans to address some of the concerns raised by neighboring residents and the Commission, which included a reduction of 20 building lots and increase in the width of lots along the northern boundary between Pollard Lane and Schwenkfelder Avenue from a minimum of 50 feet to 60 feet and replacement of some internal single family attached and paired units with detached units and open space resulting in an increase of 3.4 percent of qualified open space and additional pedestrian pathways. The applicant also changed the rezone request from TN-R to R- 15, with R-8 remaining along the north and east boundaries of the site. Due to these changes the Council remanded the project back to the Commission for review and an updated recommendation. The applications before you tonight are a request for a rezone and a preliminary plat. There is a development agreement modification as well, but it does not require Commission action. The site consists of 19.76 acres of land. It's zoned R-8, generally located a quarter mile north of West Chinden Boulevard at the north end of North Levi Lane on the north side of West Waverton Drive. The subject property is part of a larger area annexed with R-8 zoning in 2019 and included in a development agreement and preliminary plat for Pollard Subdivision. The property was approved to develop with 74 building lots for conventional single family residential homes, independent living units for 55 and older, and an 88 bed assisted living facility. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation for this property is medium density residential. As I mentioned the applicant is requesting Council approval of a modification to the existing development agreement for a new agreement for the residential portion of the development with an updated development plan. The approved plan is for the development of 74 building lots for

conventional single family residential home, independent living units for 55 and older and an 88 bed assisted living facility. The proposed plan is for 157 single family residential detached and attached homes. A rezone of 14.9 acres of land is proposed from the R-8 to the R-15 zoning district. I'm going to skip by that slide. That shows the approved concept development plan on the top versus the proposed development plan on the bottom there. A preliminary plat is proposed consisting of 157 building lots and 32 common lots on 19.76 acres of land in the R-8 and the R-15 zoning districts. The plat is proposed to develop in two final plat phases as shown there on the phasing plan on the south -- on the south -- bottom. The minimum lot size proposed in the R-8 district is 4,350 square feet, with an average lot size of 4,805 square feet. A minimum lot size in the R-15 district is 2,238 square feet, with an average lot size of 2,801 square feet. The gross density of the development is 7.95 units per acre, with a net density of 13.33 units per acre, which is at the high end of the density allowed in the medium density residential future land use map designation. A mix of single family residential detached and attached units are proposed with front-loaded and alley-loaded options. Conventional front-loaded detached homes are proposed along the perimeter boundary to the north and east, which will transition to the existing and future homes with alley-loaded attached and detached units on the remainder of the site. A 20 foot wide street buffer is required along the portion of West Waverton Drive designated as a collector street east of Levi Lane. Off-street parking will be required based on the number of bedrooms per unit. On-street parking is also available along internal streets. A minimum of 15 percent or 2.96 acres of common open space is required to be provided with development that meets the quality and qualified standards listed in the UDC. The applicant proposes a total of 3.94 acres or 19.94 percent qualified open space consisting of several grassy areas exceeding 5,000 square feet in area, linear open speed space, the street buffer along the eastern portion of West Waverton Drive, designated as a collector street, and parkways streets as shown on the open space exhibit, which complies with and exceeds the minimum standards. Amenities totaling a minimum four points are required to be provided based on the area of the development. The applicant proposes a small dog park with a waste station for 1.5 points and a picnic shelter area on a site 5,000 square feet or graver greater in size for two points from the quality of life category and a tot lot with benches for seating, which is one point from the recreation activity area category, which complies with and exceeds the minimum standard. The amenities are required to comply with the associated standards for such in the UDC. Several conceptual building elevations were submitted as shown for the two-story attached and detached single family residential homes. A variety of materials are proposed, including vertical and horizontal lap siding, board and batten siding, stucco and fenestration with masonry accents in a variety of colors and design element and features with the varying roof profiles and wall modulation that demonstrate the high quality of development proposed. All single family residential attached structures are subject to the residential design standards in the architectural standards manual. Written testimony has been received from Eli Benski, Brighton Corporation, in agreement with updated staff report conditions. Only one letter of testimony has been received since the Council meeting from Aaron Kwan. He is against the proposed rezone from R-8 to R-15 and the additional homes and density that would be allowed through the R-15 district. Prior to that last hearing there were four letters of testimony that were received

that are included in the public record. Staff is recommending approval with the provisions in the staff report. Staff will stand for any questions.

Lorcher: Would the applicant like to come forward?

Wardle: Good evening. For the record my name is Jon Wardle. My address is 2929 West Navigator Drive, Meridian, Idaho. 83642. And I work for Brighton. I would like to share with you tonight an overview of the Pollard North project. We -- as noted we were here before in December and there were comments made and items that we wanted to address. We took that to Council and they recommended us to come back to you tonight to go through the project another time. So, if you will indulge me here. So, this represents what we originally had proposed that was in the file with 177 lots. We had proposed a rezone of the entire Pollard North project as TN-R with an underlying zone -- original zone of R-8 and so the density of that project was about nine units to the acre and about 17.86 percent qualified open space. Based on the feedback from the Commission, felt like the density was too high and also that there wasn't enough given from a transition from a zoning perspective to the north -- the areas to the north and, for that matter, the area to -- to the east along Fairbourne. Some other items that were taken that we received as feedback was the amount of open space on the original proposal. There was concern about TN-R. While it was not our proposal there was concern that a TN-R would allow multi-family by right and so some mentioned that and also there was a question regarding traffic over to Fairbourne on Waverton, which is a collector road. So, what we have brought back before you tonight is a -- is a revision of the plan and I will get into these details, but we are proposing to maintain the existing zoning of R-8 along the boundary about -- along the north and along the east. So, there would be no change to -- to the zoning. We would change the internal piece of this to R-15 as a transition to the C-G zoning to the south of Waverton as you can see here where we go from R-8 to R-15 to the salmon color, which is the C-G. We also increased -- made wider lot sizes along Block 1 and Block 2. We did reduce a number of the paired units and finally we also increased the common area overall. So, let me get into some of those details. The future land use map for this area is medium density residential, which is a range of three to eight units per acre and we were trying to accomplish that of -- although we are at the top of the range we are in that range now of three to eight, instead of over the eight units per acre. Further, we also heard that, you know, the importance of the transition and by transitioning to the north and to the east where those zones already exist or could be changed in the future of R-8, we maintained that to the R-15 as a transition back to the C-G zone that is part of the Pollard project. Just a side-by-side comparison so you can see the numbers. We now have 157 homes, which is a mix of housing types. There are 27 common lots. Our density is 7.95 units to the acre. There -- the qualified open space is now 19.94 compared to 17.86 and we also are showing in these areas -- and I will go to this next one -- where these changes have happened. The top is up above and, then, the bottom is showing where we are. Starting with number one originally those lots were 50 feet wide, which were similar in size to what Alden Ridge had to the north in their preliminary plat. We have modified those so they are 60 feet wide now in the pink area. In the yellow area we have now converted those to detached carriage lane or alley homes here, number two, and, then, numbers three, four, five and six are where we have

expanded and added more open space throughout the project, so each block has its own open space that's available with a larger common area in the middle. This also shows where the amenities are throughout the project. We are also adding pathway connections, micro paths to the north in locations that when those projects develop that those connections could be made. In there we also have a micro path over to Fairbourne and the common areas throughout the entire project with connectivity, with pathways. At intersections and locations where those pathways are hitting the road we will have chokers, so the roadway section will be reduced basically eliminating parking in that location, but allow for pedestrians to move across the street without competing with a wider pavement section. As we mentioned, Pollard does offer a variety of housing opportunities. We looked at this pretty closely. We looked at where this community is. It is -- it has evolved from when we brought the project through in 2019. Back in 2019 Highway 16 was not on the map. There was no funding for it. And things have changed and we know that by late 2026 that whole Highway 16, 20-26 intersection will be two major state highways connecting in this location. With that in mind we tried to address the transition to the north of the single family like for like and internally where we have carriage lanes or alleys we also are offering some paired homes and some detached alley homes as well. This kind of shows you where those different homes are within the community. We have four different home types, which offer four different profiles for individuals who can live there. The carriage lanes are both -- the carriage lane B where would be the paired units. The carriage lane C would be detached and here is some examples of both of those. We have conventional homes. These are what we are showing on the north in the pink, conventional areas of the 60 foot lots and is removed to the east. Those become 66 and 72 foot wide lots, which actually are similar in size to what was on the boundary. I think this is important as touched on about where the traffic will go. This is representative of the roadway system that's out here today. We have -- we have completed Waverton from Pollard Lane on the far left-hand side of this picture and it does connect over to Fairbourne in the middle of the screen. Levi Lane are -- it's a five lane road. It was actually only required to be a three lane road as a collector, but we worked with the highway district knowing that the intersection of Levi Lane would be important and it's a five lane road. We have also paid for the signalization of that. It has not been signaled, because ITD needs to finish some of their other improvements, but those have been paid for and just waiting for them to -- to do that. The rest of these lines here are the local streets and how the local traffic will move from their neighborhoods to the collector system. The collector system is the dark blue, which is Levi-Waverton over to Black Cat. Then we have the teal, which are the local streets. The purple in Alder Ridge, which are local streets and the orange, which are also local streets. Those are how all of those homes will get to the collector roadway system. In reality everybody is getting two points. It's to Levi and it is to Black Cat. People will have choices. But the reality is if somebody is trying to get from our project or even Alder Ridge for that matter and they want to get to 20-26 or Chinden, they are going to go to Levi Lane. There may be some that would find going to Fairbourne. This is -- might be an easy way there and vice-versa, but there is a collector roadway system that's in place that we have designed to that we have built to and it's intended to -- to take the traffic from the neighborhoods to the collectors out to the state highway and this kind of gives you an example of the final improvements that are proposed. The flyover is being built right now with this turn -- with

this circle -- the off ramp there as well. These improvements are all in place and expected to be done in late 2026 and you can kind of see here in the background of where the Pollard North project is in relationship to this and Levi Lane is just right here. With that we do concur with the staff report. We did take the comments given to us from this Planning and Zoning Commission and from the public -- well, we took those comments to Council and presented those and even presented this idea of the change in zoning to R-8 and R-15 and they felt it best for us to come back. The reason we are back is we did listen. We did take the recommendations that were given. We have spent a lot of time looking at this. We re-noticed the neighborhood as well letting them know the changes and outreach, so it's not been done isolated, but wanted to let you know the process that we have been through and we do request commission approval of the preliminary plat, the rezone and the modification to the development agreement and Council will address that. So, I stand for any questions that you might have tonight.

Lorcher: Commissioners, do we have any questions for Mr. Wardle at this time? Thank you very much.

Wardle: Thank you.

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

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. We have Jake Jensen.

Jensen: Hello.

Lorcher: Good evening.

Jensen: Good evening. Jake Jensen. 5011 West Caragana Street in Meridian, Idaho. Part of the Fairbourne community. Appreciate you all taking your time to be here and listening to our concerns that we have. I think it's important to note that, you know, they present the original print plan as the 177 homes. The original plan was the 50 some homes or 74 homes in this area. That was the original plan with the senior living; right? That's the original plan. So, it's not like they are giving in on taking away from the 177. No, they are still asking to add 80 some homes to this area, which is a huge ask. Fine, I understand things change, you need to get rid of the senior living, but how does that justify 80 more homes in this area? To give you an idea of Fairbourne, there are 175 homes covering 66 acres. This is asking for 154 homes covering 15 acres of land. You think of that community stress that it puts on. There is going to be a lot of children in this area. This is going to be a place that's great for Brighton that they are doing homes that are good for the community, may be more affordable, but where are these kids going to go play in this 154 homes? They are going to find their way over to the Fairbourne neighborhood, put strain on our community. I understand the need to change plans, but it doesn't seem justified. The other concerns of the roadways people, cross Waverton all the time from where I live in Fairbourne to get over to the community area and the amount of traffic that this increases. That's going to happen. I understand that. But taking it from 75 -- maybe if it's a hundred, but going up to 80 more homes that's just a lot more strain.

And, then, the last point I would like to make is just the strain that the schools are under in this area. I have four kids in elementary schools here, 32 kids in one class, 35 kids in another class and a lot of them will go to the same school where they just had to rezone because they are out of room at this school. You add this many more homes how are the schools going to handle that? We are just all concerned. I understand Brighton has to do what they need to do for their -- their private -- for their -- for their money, for all that kind of stuff, I understand that need to change, but how does it justify 85 more homes in this small area Thank you.

Lorcher: Thank you. Madam Clerk?

Lomeli: Madam Chair, I have Ken Fenwick, who is online

Lorcher: Mr. Fenwick, if you can state your name and address for the record, please. And you will have to unmute.

Fenwick: My name is Ken Fenwick and I live in Sun Valley, Idaho, but I have been in Meridian looking at new homes in the Fairbourne area and became aware that this meeting was going to be held today and my concern is making investment in that neighborhood and immediately seen that investment diminished by the addition of some 80 additional homes above the original R-8 -- R-8 plat that was filed by Brighton Corp. I also think that the other homeowners in Fairbourne will also be facing decreased values in the investments that they have made and I don't think it's fair for Brighton to profit the way they will profit off of the loss these homeowners will take. Thank you.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, Kyle Ensler signed up and indicated he is representing an HOA, but he didn't check wished to testify, so I'm not sure. Did you want to testify? Okay.

Lorcher: Good evening.

Ensler: Good evening, Commissioners. Appreciate your time tonight. Kyle Ensler. 26 -- I'm sorry. Wrong address. 5720 West Old School Lane, Meridian, Idaho. 83646.

Lorcher: And you are representing your HOA?

Ensler: Yeah.

Lorcher: Which community?

Ensler: It's 12 -- it's Alden Ridge.

Lorcher: Alden Ridge. Okay.

Ensler: Alden Ridge. So, this isn't argument against Brighton. I think Brighton's a good developer, a good builder in our community. They have done a lot of really great things

in the community. For me this really comes down to is this the appropriate density for this particular area and I -- I think you can't answer that without looking at the entire project that was brought forth in 2019 that still is yet to be built out entirely. So, in 2019 this was part of a larger parcel and so there is this whole commercial section that's yet to be built with -- you know -- and, obviously, plans can change a little bit, so this could be a little bit -- fluctuate a little bit, but currently it's planned for a 95,000 square foot hospital, at least two 70,000 square foot flex spaces, as well as some other commercial. Just on the -- on the commercial side alone. Currently we have just the one commercial -- it's actually -- they just built a second building, but one commercial use back there, which is Franklin Sensors and when Franklin Sensors lets out at 5:00 o'clock at the end of their shift before their next shift, the traffic is already backed out. Now, I understand that -- Mr. Wardle's comments about the lights not in and that's going to alleviate some of that strain once the light -- light goes in. We have a lot of commercial and so initially when that plan came through in 2019 there was support from the neighbors, because those are my neighbors and so I have talked to them, they -- they were -- they were at the Commission meeting as well. They are also opposed to it and originally, though, they -- they got on board with it, because of this R-8 portion that was presented as the transition and buffer between the commercial and what the city has planned, which is a low density residential and so that original plan included the assisted living facility, which hardly had any traffic at all. That's full-time assisted living. And, then, there were 74 homes, 40 of which were age restricted. So, with -- you know, if you look at the difference between that and what's proposed now, not only is it an increase on the type of people that will be in there as an increase of strain on the schools, but much much more traffic than was proposed before. So, on Waverton my concern is while the plan that's presented is with the front faces -- facing Waverton, esthetically that looks nice, but that also promotes more on-street parking. So, Waverton is going to have parking on both sides of the street all the way down Waverton and, then, in addition to that what's not seen in that picture is the neighborhood to the north had a residential or a landscape buffer rather. It was a 15 or 20 foot buffer that needs to go away in order to fit another row of houses. So, I just think that the strain is too much. I think it's -- it's too much on traffic, too much of the community. To my other concerns, on Schwenkfelder and, then, Woodhead Avenue, which are the two streets that connect to the north, really concerned about that much density and the impact of parking on the roads, especially those two streets that go to the north. I have been in that scenario before where you have through traffic and, you know, in a dense community like that and, you know, kids come out through those -- those cars and you just -- you just don't see them. So, those are -- obviously there is -- there is no designated nonparking anywhere on Waverton. So, you know, currently you can put -- park both sides of the road there. I'm concerned about that on the streets going to the north and just overall I just feel like the question is really is this the appropriate density going from the 74 conventional homes before to 157 and being at the top end of that medium density residential and I do think it's appropriate to consider the entire project that was approved in 2019 without just looking at this one section individually. My only other comment is I think, you know, this is one development. There is still development that's happening in the area as well. There is still more development land here to -- just to the west that also takes access off of Levi and Black Cat, as well as some more property to the north. So, I do think that

whatever decisions are made also sets a precedent for future approvals, which could be more density. So, I -- that's all my considerations. But thank you for considering.

Lorcher: All right. Thank you very much.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, Randall Glenco. I also have Clay Lundgren. No? Okay. Bill and Theresa Henry.

Lorcher: Would you like to speak? Bill and Theresa? No?

Lomeli: And the last name that I have is David Hitz.

Lorcher: Hi.

Hitz: Hi. How are you?

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

Hitz: I would love to. David Hitz. 6669 North Elmstone Way, Meridian. I am in Fairbourne.

Lorcher: Okay,

Hitz: This is the third meeting we have come to.

Lorcher: Okay.

Hitz: We had one that was a slight shift in the schedule, so it would have been four, but my biggest concern is that -- as Kyle put -- well -- and so did Jake is the density doesn't match the general area. I have recently started running again very lightly, but I am proud of that, because it's been about a year and a half and as I have been running I have been paying more attention because of this development of that path down Waverton and imagining what it would look like with cars lined on both sides and, then, imagining if I'm running when businesses are getting out when people are trying to get to work, if it's not at 6:00 in the morning like I normally do, but maybe I want to go with my kids and I have got four of them and my house literally backs up to Waverton and so naturally for us it is popping right behind the house and going down Waverton where we can spend some time, because there is a nice stretch, but when you add that many homes and you add that many cars, the safety kind of goes out the window and -- and, then, I look at the schools and I look at the re -- the shuffling and boundary changes that Pleasant View just went through because of the density of all of the development in the general area and, then, you add this on top of it, there is no other elementary in the area that can support any of this. There is nothing planned to be built and so where are the kids going to go? What's going to happen with the current school system? How are they going to learn in an environment that is conducive for learning when you start already hitting max capacity

only three years into the school being there. Those are my biggest concerns, among the other things that are already on the record. Thank you.

Lorcher: Thank you very much.

Lomeli: No one else has signed up.

Lorcher: Okay. Would the applicant like to -- oh, I'm sorry. Was there somebody else that would like to speak? Okay. Sorry. Jumping the gun. If you could give your name and address for the record that would be great.

Taylor: Sure. Good evening. My name is Chase Taylor. I live on 7000 North Pollard Lane, just northwest of this development, and I -- yeah, I don't want to belabor the point, but density is my -- my issue. I have six kids and we use Waverton to get to the bus stops there and back and concerned about all the cars and, you know, also now we are going to have a development built around us and we knew that coming in and we kind of knew the plan was going to be there was going to be homes built out in front of our development, but it was going to be homes, you know, not -- not high density townhomes I guess you call them, but -- so, it's -- it's still a little disappointing to have an investment and having a -- having a future with plans looking like, you know, they want to be changed. So, my biggest concern is my kids and just us being safe getting in and out of our community. But appreciate you guys time. Thanks.

Lorcher: Thank you. All right. Before I go forward would you like to speak as well? Okay.

L.Taylor: Hi. My name is Leah Taylor. I live at 7000 North Pollard as well and, yes, this is our third meeting as well, plus the one that we rearranged to come and, then, it was continued at the last minute. We have six kids, so it is difficult to get to these meetings, but we are grateful for all of you in your public service and know how important it is to be civically engaged, especially when it can affect our own community so hugely. I agree with what's been said already. I think this density does not match the area and hope that you guys will not allow this huge jump in density and think of it more as still what they are adding from the original plan and not what they are taking away from the plan that has never been approved. The green space for me is a large issue. I know that they will be using the green space of the communities nearby. Traffic is a huge issue. Like was said on Waverton that road just doesn't feel wide enough to have cars parked on either side and you know when kids are needing to cross a road, even if they know how to cross a road safely, when there is cars there it makes it so much more unsafe and, like my husband said, our kids do need to travel down that road to go to the bus stop. Most of the time we drive them, but we will absolutely have to drive them. It's a whole mile to the bus stop. But with this kind of traffic there is no way that they could walk to the bus stop themselves. I -- the -- the largest concern that I have, though, is the schools. Like was mentioned we have two kids currently in the elementary school, two kids that will be going in the next two to four years as well and, then, also high schooler and middle schooler, but the Pleasant View Elementary is already over capacity at 616 students. They have capped any new students moving in or coming into kindergarten and there is an apartment

complex that has already been approved on Black Cat and McMillan that will be within these school boundaries. So, I am not sure how that school is going to sustain it and there is no other -- like it's been said there is no other school nearby. So, I really hope that you guys will not allow this many this high density -- high of density and this many homes to be added from the original plan. Thank you.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Starman: Madam Chair, I want to just note for the record that Commissioner Sandoval has joined us in person. He was previously joined us via Zoom and I saw him watching his phone as he walked through the door, but just for the record, Commissioner, can you just confirm you have -- you have seen and listened to all the testimony to date and you are prepared to act?

Sandoval: Yes.

Starman: Thank you.

Lorcher: Is there anybody in Chambers that would like to speak before we close the public -- or before the applicant comes forward? Okay. I think we are good.

Lomeli: Yes. Madam Chair, no one else is signed up.

Lorcher: All right. Mr. Wardle, whenever you are ready.

Wardle: Madam Chair, for the record again Jon Wardle with Brighton. I appreciate the opportunity to just address a couple of the comments that were made regarding buffers and transitions. The property that we are asking for your consideration tonight on a preliminary plat, the area that we are asking for a rezone specifically is highlighted there in red. If you look at the north Meridian area from Highway 16 over to Ten Mile and, then, down to McMillan, we circled a number of pockets in there that all have R-15 zone and I think if you went through those neighborhoods you would see that those were good transitions for the neighborhood. We are a little unique here. We do have a lot of commercial property, but you do see in other areas where it's either proposed or will come in the future, but the R-15 to R-8 to R-4 are appropriate transition of zoning and this does exist in north Meridian. I didn't want the moment to go by as if this were done in a vacuum and there -- it doesn't exist anywhere else. It actually does. These transitions are there and that's why based on the feedback given to us from the Commission, comments from neighbors during that Commission hearing and our proposal to City Council was to maintain an R-8, transition to R-15, which, then, transitions to the C-G zone across Waverton. Regarding the buffer, yeah, there we did have a -- and continue we will have a landscape buffer, which was an easement. Back when the project was approved there was no Alden Ridge. Alden Ridge -- we actually had worked with Restucci, Hayes, Ernst and Schwenkfelder on that transition between them. Three of those property owners allow -- had Old -- Old School go across their property and Schwenkfelder was at the end of that. When we talked with them we were going to have a fence on the property line

with a 15 foot landscape berm on our side and there was already landscaping that was proposed on their side. When Alden Ridge came forward they actually proposed a 30 foot corridor, which would be the place of Old -- Old School Road. I don't know exactly, but I suppose that that was -- that was held there because they needed to maintain property or access over to the two owners to the east until there was other provided, but that was, in fact, proposed by Alden Ridge and shown on there. Alden Ridge has still not been platted. It's not been developed, but that was part of their plan and we assume that they will maintain that. As it related to Ernst and Panter and Schwenkfelder, we have talked with them, we have provided our plans to them. We can still maintain the 15 foot landscape buffer in an easement, which was proposed before, and make that transition work for both of them until they decide to develop. When they do develop one of the things that was asked was micro paths. So, we have a micro path here. There is another micro path just off the screen. And, yes, we can continue to maintain that, but the buffer between us and Alden Ridge is actually existing through what will be Alden Ridge's common area of a 30 foot landscape buffer that they have proposed. We know that there has been changes. This plan that we brought forward before -- this -- the top one is the approved preliminary plat. We recognize that we have asked for changes. That's why we are back here in a public process and the lots have changed. So, I don't want to minimize that and that's why we are here in this process and based on the feedback that was given to us we reduced the density even a little bit more. I do want to show you what the transitions were. We proposed ten lots compared to 12 for Alden Ridge. Seven and a half lots for nine for Alden Ridge. Six and a half. Previously we had eight and a half. We proposed 13. Previously we had 14. We proposed six now. Previously we had seven. So, we have even reduced those transitions against what is to the north of us from the original preliminary plat. We are hopeful that based on the feedback given to us from this Commission and the opportunity to come back and discuss this with you, that we can receive your approval and recommendation for approval for Pollard North, the preliminary plat and the rezone of a portion this to R-15. Stand for any questions you might have.

Lorcher: Commission, do we have any questions for Mr. Wardle?

Rust: Madam Chair, I have a couple questions.

Lorcher: Commissioner Rust.

Rust: Mr. Wardle, what is the timeline for phase one? When do you expect those buildings to be completed?

Wardle: Madam Chair, Commissioner Rust, the process for us still requires us to submit a final plat and so at this point in time, even the best case scenario, we could start development of that first phase at the end of this year, with maybe home construction happening in the spring or early summer of 2026. Homes usually take six to seven months and so maybe the end of 2026 there would be occupancy. It might even be '27. But it would be at the very end of 2026 if we continue this course.

Rust: Appreciate that. When do you expect Levi to be signaled? Do you have any guidance on that from ACHD?

Wardle: Madam Chair, Commissioner Rust, the feedback we have is currently there are signalization restrictions at Highway 16 and 20-26, Chinden. Until they put final signalizations in there they would do this one at the same time. So, when that project completes these signals can go in, but they felt like if they put a signal in here, especially when they are moving lanes through there, it causes some conflicts. So, it's under -- ACHD has the money and has the equipment for it, but ITD ultimately will be the one who will decide when they get installed. So, my guess it's ITD's process and their timeline continues it would be end of 2026 should -- which should be consistent with when we would have homes completing.

Rust: One more, Madam Chair. Several of the public testimony also mentioned the parking situation on Waverton. I wondered if you could just clarify for the Commission what the parking situation is on Waverton, if there is garages, how much of that is anticipated to be street parking, that was certainly something that was brought up by several of the testimonies.

Wardle: Madam Chair, Commissioner Rust, all the homes in front or face Waverton are -- will be alley homes. So, there are no garages on Waverton. Additionally, we have designed the alleys so that the garages are set back 20 feet from the alleys. So, the city has a requirement in any home -- you get a lot of bedrooms you have more, but the typical is you need two enclosed and two in the driveway and we meet that with all these homes with two car garages and driveways on the alleys. We have no driveways on Waverton. Will there be parking on Waverton? There will be, but if I am a homeowner or a resident I'm going to go into my garage and into my house. There may be a guest or two. There could be several at a time, but it's -- we are not competing with driveways along this area and it does provide a way to calm traffic as well.

Rust: Excellent. Thank you. No more questions, Madam Chair.

Lorcher: Mr. Wardle, originally the application called for a over 55 community. Did you consider that as an option going forward with this application or has that been -- is that off the table?

Wardle: Madam Chair, originally when we had the assisted living memory care facility and some independent living opportunities, that's when we considered it, but as we have looked at it, no, we are -- we are not proposing that in -- with this project. Could there be individuals of that age demographic? Yes, but it's not an age restricted community.

Lorcher: Okay. And the proposed -- or as far as you know the proposed uses of the commercial area one is going to be a medical center of some kind?

Wardle: Madam Chair, St. Alphonsus owns the property there now. They have purchased about 16 acres from us. Their proposal is to build first a medical office building, which would be about 60 to 70 thousand square feet and the long range or long-term plan

would be to have a hospital unit here as well. They feel like that would allow them to serve the community better and provide some hospital services in this. So, they are currently -- I don't know -- I can't say that they will start soon, but they are currently finishing up another medical office building in Canyon county and, then, this would be their next project. But the timing I don't know of their medical office building as of yet.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you. Commissioners, any other questions? Okay.

Wardle: Thank you.

Lorcher: Okay. We are good. Thank you. Can I get a motion to close the public hearing?

Smith: So moved.

Rust: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Lorcher: Well, I'm both ways in this one. In one respect Brighton listened to public comments. Some of that, you know, as much as they could with the product that they are offering, as well as the Commission, to be able to make changes to their proposal for their subdivision. They have reduced the density. The transition is better. But I think ultimately the challenge is is that whenever you live in a community and there is a piece of dirt in front of you, there is no guarantees of what that piece of dirt is going to turn into and even if a real estate agent -- or even a developer might say, well, this is what we are going to do and the community changes as far as the demographics of the economics and the roadways and Highway 16 and all those things kind of put together as players, there is still no guarantee what's going to happen to that piece of dirt. So, as a Commission it's important for us to be able to look at this application, does it fit the code, does it fit the space and to make a recommendation to City Council where they will make more of a judgment call on whether it's the best interest of the City of Meridian. So, on the positive side Brighton has made adjustments to this application to be able to create less density and provided the carriage houses with driveways and -- and parking. I don't think anybody's going to ever be a hundred percent satisfied, but on the other side of it north Meridian -- everything north of Cherry Lane is -- has become high density and the schools will respond and the roads will respond when those organizations are ready to. In the meantime we can't stop everything and need to continue to go forward. So, I would like to hear from the other Commissioners on -- on what they think. I think Brighton's done a good job of being able to make those adjustments. My personal opinion is that density is -- is still too high for that area in general. I think with the medical center and Highway 16 and Chinden being as many lanes as it is, it's going to be a challenge no matter what goes there, even if you turn into R-2 or R-4, it's still going to be busy and, you know, I think being closer to a medical center would attract an older generation possibly, but there

is no restrictions on that. So, families could come in with their small children as well. So, I guess I would like to hear from the other Commissioners, but I'm kind of on the fence.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Yeah. I think a big thing for me -- and I remember when this last came I was actually on the fence and I think I voted against it on a tough decision, just because there were too many things that were just slightly off and I think for me they have addressed a lot of my concerns in the transition space -- that the transition space is super helpful to generally kind of helping ease that buffer to -- to the more dense areas. Obviously, there is -- I think there are a lot of areas here where it's kind of questions of where do you draw the line? How dense is too dense? I heard a hundred thrown out as a number by some of the testimony. I'm sure that students for someone else in the audience and so there is this question I think and, you know, I -- I'm not an economist, I'm not going to find the optimal -- you know, I'm not trying to calculate any of that, but I think as a judgment call in terms of the proximity to major transit corridors to kind of prevent a lot of stress on internal roadways and, you know, the kind of the transitional space, the proximity to the commercial, to a lot of the things that we generally want denser development closer to, I think that outweighs some of the -- like, you know, this could be a little bit better, could be maybe a little bit less dense concerns in the fine tuning. So, I think on net I am supportive of this. Obviously, yeah, I think there are probably some -- some small things I would say maybe on the Fairbourne side of things are there opportunities to improve that transition seeing as there is more kind of transitional space you could -- you could transition just to get to that southwest corner as kind of being the more dense area on Waverton, but -- but, you know, we have heard before, you know, you never know what's going to go in there if this doesn't and I think that some -- I would much rather something that I generally think is good for the community with -- with a couple of maybe nitpicks over something else that could be a bad for Meridian. So, that's -- that's where I'm at. Yeah, generally supportive of this.

Lorcher: Okay. Commissioner Sandoval, comments?

Sandoval: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Sandoval.

Sandoval: I think this is a good compromise and you guys did pretty good at that, so -- I want to hear what Commissioner Rust thinks, but generally I'm in favor of this. You guys sacrificed a lot, came back, so I'm happy with it. Curious to what your thoughts are.

Rust: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Rust.

Rust: Yeah. Would be happy to comment. Passionate about the City of Meridian and I think for the City of Meridian to be healthy we have to have a mix of housing types. That's what's considered in our FLUM and our Comprehensive Plan. I think that's really important that we have a place for teachers to live, for firefighters to live, for beginning starter homes and necessarily those homes have to be built somewhere in our community. When I look at where this project is relative to the rest of the city, two major arterial roadways, highways, I really can't think of a better spot in general for this type of a development. Then you zoom into the micro and there is always concerns on traffic and -- and density for the people that are already there and that have owned homes for, you know, five to ten years, however long Fairbourne has been around. I understand those concerns, but on the whole I really want to see more of this kind of housing and as housing costs continue to rise I want -- I want the American dream to be accessible to a wide array of people and the reality is people are continually getting priced out of the market. We need stuff that's between a single family home and an apartment. Several of the Commissioners have already said if we don't approve this what will come in here next? It will be apartments. And that's -- you know, I don't want to cast fear with that. Apartments are good where they are needed. But I really like the design as it is. I thought that map was pretty revealing, that most of the commercial and the surrounding three square miles is bordered by R-15. I think that that's something that's important to -- to consider, the fact that the entire border of this project is still R-8 and the R-15 is in the interior, this is going to be a really busy intersection and it doesn't matter whether this gets built or not, the amount of traffic coming through here is going to be significant, but that could be a good thing as well. That's a sign of growth. That's a sign of a growing city. As Madam Chair has already spoken to, schools are going to grow and adapt. Roadways are going to grow and adapt. The reality is that for us to grow, for us to have a vibrant community, we have to have more housing development to, then, pay for everything else that's going to be required. I wish it were the other way around, it would make our jobs as commissioners a lot easier, but that's not the way that city development happens in America today. I think it's really important to note that there is going to be four parking spaces per dwelling that's not on Waverton, that's not counting any additional parking on Waverton. I think that's important to note and so for all those reasons the 70 attached homes that are going to fill -- meet demand for a needed demographic in the area, for the health of the city, the general location I'm strongly in favor of this as put forth by the staff and Brighton.

Lorcher: All right. After considering all staff and applicant and public testimony, I recommend to approve to City Council File No. H-2024-0037 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of March -- March 6, 2025, with no modifications.

Smith: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and second to approve the Pollard Subdivision. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? And my vote is aye as well. All right. Motion passes. Thank you very much.