

Meeting of the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission of April 18, 2024, was called to order at 6:12 p.m. by Chairman Andrew Seal.

Members Present: Commissioner Andrew Seal, Commissioner Maria Lorcher, Commissioner Jared Smith, and Commissioner Matthew Sandoval.

Members Absent: Commissioner Patrick Grace, Commissioner Enrique Rivera and Commissioner Brian Garrett.

Others Present: Tina Lomeli, Kurt Starman, Bill Parsons, Sonya Allen and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

<u> </u> Brian Garrett	<u> X </u> Maria Lorcher
<u> X </u> Matthew Sandoval	<u> </u> Patrick Grace
<u> </u> Enrique Rivera	<u> X </u> Jared Smith
<u> X </u> Andrew Seal - Chairman	

Seal: All right. Good evening. Welcome to the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting for April 18th, 2024. At this time I will call the meeting to order. The Commissioners who are present for this evening's meeting are at City Hall. We also have staff from the city attorney and clerk's office, as well as the City Planning Department. If you are joining us on Zoom this evening we can see that you are here. You may observe the meeting. However, your ability to be seen on screen and talk will be muted. During the public testimony portion of the meeting you will be unmuted and, then, be able to comment. Please note that we cannot take questions until the public testimony portion. If you have any question -- process questions during the meeting, please, e-mail cityclerk@meridiacity.org and they will reply as quickly as possible. With that we will begin with roll call. Madam Clerk.

Seal: All right. First item on the agenda is the adoption of the agenda and there are no changes to it. Could I get a motion to adopt the agenda as presented?

Lorcher: So moved.

Smith: Second.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded to adopt the agenda. All in favor, please, say aye. Opposed nay? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Seal: Next item on the agenda is the Consent Agenda. We have one item on the Consent Agenda, which so to approve the minutes of the April 4th, 2024, meeting of the

Planning and Zoning Commission. All in favor -- sorry. Can I get a motion to accept the Consent Agenda as presented?

Smith: So moved.

Lorcher: Second.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded to adopt the Consent Agenda. All in favor say aye. Opposed nay? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Seal: All right. At this time I would like to briefly explain the public hearing process. We will open each item individually and begin with the staff report. Staff will report their findings on how the item adheres to our Comprehensive Plan and Unified Development Code. After staff has made their presentation the applicant will come forward and present their case and respond to staff comments. They will have 15 minutes to do so. After the applicant is finished we will open the floor to public testimony. Each person will be called on only once during the public testimony portion. The Clerk will call the names individually of those who have signed up in advance to testify. We will need to have you -- we will need to have you -- sorry. We will need to have you state your name and address for the record and you will have three minutes to address the Commission. If you have previously sent pictures or a presentation for the meeting it will be displayed on the screen and you will be able to run the presentation with assistance if needed. If you have established that you are speaking on behalf of a larger group, like an HOA, where others from the -- that group will allow you to speak on their behalf you will have up to ten minutes. After all those who have signed up in advance have spoken we will invite any others who may wish to testify. When you are finished if the Commission does not have any questions for you you will return to your seat in Chambers or be muted on Zoom and no longer have the ability to speak. And please remember we generally do not call people back up. After all testimony has been heard the applicant will be given another ten minutes to come back and respond. When the applicant is finished responding to questions and concerns we will close the public hearing and the Commissioners will have the opportunity to discuss and hopefully be able to make final decisions or recommendations to City Council as needed.

Seal: So, at this time I would like to open File No. H-2023-0073 for Ultra Clean Carwash and we will begin with the staff report. It appears we lost Sonya.

Parsons: Apologies, Chair. We are getting some feedback down here at the station, so we are seeing if we get it corrected. Mr. Chair, we have someone from IT on the line. Can we just take a quick technical break and, then, get things -- he is asking us to log out of Zoom and then --

Seal: Okay. We will go ahead and take a five minute break and fix our IT issues and let everybody else in the back get signed in.

Parsons: All right. Thank you.

Seal: Thank you.

(Recess: 6:05 p.m. to 6:08 p.m.)

Seal: All right. We will go ahead and call the meeting back to order. I will not read back through everything that I do to call the meeting to order and we will go ahead and open up File No. H-2023-0073 for Ultra Clean Carwash and we will begin with the staff report.

Allen: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission. The first application before you tonight is a request for a conditional use permit. This site consists of 3.13 acres of land. It's zoned C-C. It's located at 715 East Fairview Avenue. The history on this property. It was rezoned to C-C back in 2001. The rezone ordinance requires conditional use permit approval of all future uses on the site. The Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map designation is commercial. The applicant is proposing a conditional use permit for a vehicle washing facility on 3.13 acres of land in the C-C zoning district per requirement of the rezone ordinance. A conditional use is not required by the UDC for a vehicle washing facility in the C-C district typically. The rezone ordinance also included several other provisions, all of which have either been previously addressed or are being addressed with this application. Vehicle washing facilities are subject to specific use standards for such in the UDC. Staff finds the proposed site design is in compliance with these standards as noted in the staff report. Vehicle washing facilities are subject to specific use standards for such in the UDC staff finds. The proposed site design is in compliance with these standards as noted in the staff report. Access to the site is proposed by one right-in, right-out driveway access at the northern boundary of the site from Fairview Avenue, an existing arterial street. The driveway location depicted on the site plan complies with ACHD's requirements. Because access is only available from an arterial street, the UDC and ACHD requires a driveway to be constructed and an associated easement to be granted to the adjacent property to the east for future access and interconnectivity and access to the west is not required because of the Five Mile Creek that's located along the west property boundary. Off-street parking is provided in excess of UDC standards. A minimum of 11 spaces are required. A total of 24 spaces are proposed, exceeding the minimum standard by 13 spaces. Due to the nature of the proposed use, the proposed parking will mostly provide parking for use of the vacuums, but will also provide parking for employees. A minimum 25 foot wide landscape street buffer is required along Fairview Avenue. A 40 foot buffer is proposed. The UDC requires a minimum 25 foot wide landscape buffer to be provided to residential land uses. Residential uses exist to the southwest of this site in Creekside Arbor Subdivision. A 50 foot wide Irrigation district easement exists along this boundary for the Five Mile Creek. The easement may count toward a portion of the required buffer as it provides a spatial separation between the uses. However, an additional buffer should be provided outside of this easement along the entire southern boundary of the site at a width necessary to accommodate a berm

and/or wall and fence -- wall or fence with dense landscaping that includes a mix of materials consisting of evergreen and deciduous trees, shrubs, lawn or other vegetative ground cover, allowing trees to touch within five years of planting. The application -- the landscape plan has been revised to reflect this requirement. Staff feels this is necessary due to the orientation of the carwash with the entry facing the residential neighborhood, which will likely funnel noise from the carwash directly to the residences. The applicant submitted a revised plan, as I noted, that's here on the right. It does include a two foot tall berm and also depicts the existing wrought iron fence, along with the added landscaping. An attached ten foot wide sidewalk exists along Fairview Avenue at the northern boundary of the site and a ten foot wide multi-use pathway exists along the western and southern boundaries of the site along the Five Mile Creek within a 20 foot wide recreational easement in accordance with Pathways Master Plan. The creek lies within a 90 foot wide irrigation easement, 50 feet of which lies on this property. As I mentioned, a wrought iron fence exists along the east side of the pathway. No other fencing is proposed. The proposed hours of operation are from 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. Because the entry to the carwash directly faces the existing residences to the south, which could be negatively impacted by the noise from the carwash, staff recommends a condition of approval that prohibits the carwash from operating before 7:00 a.m. and after 10:00 p.m. Conceptual building elevations were submitted as shown for the proposed carwash that depict modulation and articulation on all facades with belly bands, awnings, metal cladding designed to look like cedar. Glazing and other architectural features. A mix of materials are proposed consisting of burnished CMU, natural stone, cedar rendition metal cladding and other natural materials with metal roofing and canopies. The color scheme will include various browns, tans and other warm earth tones. The final design is required to be consistent with the design standards listed in the Architectural Standards Manual. Written testimony has been received from Connor Lindstrom, KM Engineering, the applicant's representative. They are in agreement with the conditions in the staff report and no public testimony has been received. The applicant is here tonight to present. Thank you.

Seal: Thank you very much. Would the applicant like to come forward? Good evening, sir. We will need your name and address for the record, please.

Lindstrom: Good evening. Connor Lindstrom with KM Engineering. 5725 North Discovery Way, Boise. And I am representing Ultra Clean here for this -- this project. Thank you, Sonya, for your presentation. Like Sonya said, we don't have any concerns with the -- you know, the staff report. We agree with the conditions of approval. I have just a brief slideshow here. I will probably just fast forward here to the -- the landscaping plan. As Sonya mentioned, we did update this and revise it to include that dense landscaping there on the -- the southwest boundary to make sure we are screening from the apartments there that are across the pathway. There is also a berm that was added, you know, alongside that landscaping and there is a wrought iron fence there. We do have some other landscaping that was added, additional trees that were required by the staff report on the western boundary there. We did choose to group them together just to give a little more visibility to the -- to the structure that's going to be

there and we will work with staff further as we go into CZC design review for the -- for the structure. So, that's really all I have. If you have any other questions feel free to fire away.

Seal: Just a quick question, just more for an education on -- for me. The -- the water reclamation that happens here, does that involve the reclaiming the water that's there and, then, you use regular sewer for disposal?

Lindstrom: Chairman Seal, you know, I am -- I am not certain on that one. Yes. That -- you are -- you got it right.

Seal: Okay.

Lindstrom: That's correct.

Seal: Just wanted to make -- I wasn't sure. There is -- there is a lot of different things in the LEEDS buildings where they do water reclamation differently. So, I just wanted to make sure that was the way it was being done there. So, Commissioners, do we have any questions for the applicant? None? Madam Clerk, do we have anybody signed up?

Lomeli: Mr. Chair, nobody has signed up to testify.

Seal: That's -- that's what all these people are here for I'm sure. The car wash. I will ask the audience is anybody here that would like to testify on this? Please raise your hand or indicate so. No? That's kind of what I thought. Unless you have any final comments, we will go ahead and thank you for your testimony and I will take a motion to close the public hearing for File No. H-2023-0073.

Smith: So moved.

Seal: Thank you.

Lorcher: Second.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing for File No. H-2023-0073 for Ultra Clean Car Wash. All in favor, please, say aye. Any opposed? Okay. Motion passes. The public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Seal: Any comments? Okay. I was going to say if -- if there is no comments -- I mean this seems pretty straightforward to me, so -- it's kind of an interesting lot with the path next to it, so it's nice that that will be uninterrupted and kind of like that. So, other than that, there is a little bit of history on this. So, the CUP is where we are at and it will be --

the motion needs to be to approve or deny, since we are the approving body on it. For whoever wants to make the motion.

Lorcher: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Go right ahead.

Lorcher: After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to approve File No. H-2023-003 as presented in the staff report on the hearing date of April 18th, 2024, with no modifications.

Sandoval: Second.

Seal: Got the file number wrong.

Lorcher: Oh, I did?

Seal: Yep. It's H-2023-0073.

Lorcher: Okay.

Seal: Does the second --

Lorcher: H-2023-0073.

Seal: Second still stand.

Sandoval: Yes.

Seal: Okay. It's been moved and seconded to approve File No. H-2023-0073 for Ultra Clean Car Wash. All in favor, please say aye. Opposed nay? All right. Motion passes. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Seal: All right. And with that we will open File No. H-2024-0005 for PebbleBrook Subdivision and we will begin with the staff report.

Allen: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission. The next application before you is a request for annexation and zoning and a preliminary plat. This site consists of 13.94 acres of land. It's zoned RUT in Ada county and it's located at 5725 North Meridian Road. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation is medium density residential, which calls for three to eight dwelling units per acre gross and it also has a park designation on this property, which the Parks Department has determined that a park isn't feasible in this location. The applicant is requesting annexation of 13.94 acres of land with an R-8 zone to develop 54 building lots and six common lots.

Proposed lots range in size from 5,420 square feet to 15,482 square feet, which will accommodate the variety of dwelling sizes proposed ranging from 1,574 square feet to 3,195 square feet. The subdivision is proposed to develop in one phase. The existing structures will be removed upon development of the property. A revised plat has been provided by the applicant after the print date of the report to address staff's comments pertaining to the lot transition along a portion of the southern boundary. And that is -- let's see here. These lots right here. ACHD is requiring Meridian Road to be improved with 17 feet of pavement from center line with a three foot gravel shoulder and a ten foot wide detached sidewalk. Only six feet of pavement and a three foot wide gravel -- excuse me -- three foot wide shoulder is required at this time. Curb and gutter will be added later when Meridian Road is fully improved. Access is proposed from the extension of existing North Garbo Avenue at standard street sections at the north and south boundary of the property. Local public streets are proposed for internal access. No access is proposed or allowed from Meridian Road. A stub street is proposed to the county parcel at the northeast corner of the property for future extension. That is this piece right here. Bulb outs are provided along Gleason Street as traffic calming in response to ACHD's comments requiring Gleason to be redesigned to reduce the length or include passive design elements. A 35 foot wide street buffer is required along Meridian Road, which is an entryway corridor, measured from the ultimate back of curb. All fencing is required to comply with the UDC standards. A minimum of 15 percent or 2.09 acres of qualified open space is required to be provided within the development. An open space exhibit was submitted that depicts 16.16 percent or 2.25 acres of open space that meets the required quality and qualified open space standards and exceeds UDC standards. A minimum of two points of site amenities are required to be provided. The applicant is proposing two sports courts, pickleball, which are eight points and two dog waste stations, which is another point, which total nine points exceeding UDC standards. Per the UDC dog waste stations must be installed in the ground and include waste disposal bags and trash receptacles and sports courts are required to have markings and include benches for seating. Five conceptual building elevations were submitted as shown for the proposed one and two story homes, with two and three car garages. The homes are Craftsman style with building materials consisting of a mix of board and batten siding, lap siding and optional masonry accents. The applicant clarified that optional masonry accents depicted on the elevations is incorrect, that all homes will have masonry accents consistent with the Paramount architectural guidelines. To ensure that -- this is -- to ensure this for a higher quality of development staff is recommending masonry accents are required on all structures in the development agreement. Written testimony was received from Ben Semple, the applicant's representative, in agreement with the conditions in the staff report and a voicemail was received from June -- I'm going to slaughter this last name Apology-Goveya. Concerns with school overcrowding and density. Staff is recommending approval with the conditions in the staff report. Thank you.

Seal: Thank you very much. Would the applicant like to come forward. Good evening, sir.

Semple: Good evening. Ben Semple with Rodney Evans and Partners representing the developer. My address is 1450 West Bannock Street, Boise, Idaho. 83702. Thanks to Sonya for the staff report and all the help we have been getting up to this point. I want to reiterate we are in agreement with the conditions of approval, all the agency letters within the staff report. I just want to touch on a couple of things. So, as you are aware we are requesting annexation and zoning of the 13.94 acres. Does this move this forward? Oh, there we go. At 5725 North Meridian Road for a preliminary plat with 60 total lots, 54 buildable and six common, for the construction of 54 single family homes all detached. There we go. The current zoning of the parcel is RUT in Ada county, hence the annexation request and the -- the properties proposed to be annexed with an R-8 zoning designation to accommodate the overall density of the development. The R-8 zoning designation meets all surrounding Paramount zoning, other than one out-parcel or enclave parcel that's still RUT in the county. That's at the northeast corner of the property. The existing homes and the outbuildings on the site will be removed as part of the project, along with some of the existing trees and shrubs primarily located along the Meridian Road frontage. Those will be -- a full arborist report was provided with the application that identified 158 caliper inches for removal that would require mitigation. We will be fully mitigating for that tree removal. There will be 101 trees planted on the site, 181 caliper inches of deciduous trees and 198 vertical feet of conifer. So, six feet per conifer. Two hundred and forty-five shrubs are added to the common area spaces of the proposed project and additional landscaping will be installed with every home that gets built here, further increasing the number of trees and shrubs on this site. Currently it is a farm field with a couple of farm houses -- old farmer -- farm houses there. We feel that the requested annexation and zoning and preliminary plat consistent with the staff report is appropriate, as the land use and the zoning designation is appropriate for the future land use map within Meridian. All future construction will comply with the density lot size setbacks and other applicable provisions of Meridian's UDC. Our density is three point -- 3.97 units per acre, so we are at the bottom end of that R-8 -- with the R-8 would allow for density. Additionally, care was taken with the site design, lot sizes and open space to ensure compatibility with the adjacent Paramount Subdivision. The architecture and materials will conform with the Paramount architectural design standards, which include specific provisions regarding the exterior elevations, colors, accent materials, lighting, masonry, fencing and landscaping. All existing perimeter fencing will be retained and protected or replaced and our fencing will match that of Paramount. Actually, the -- the developer, who is here tonight to answer some questions, too, if necessary, has taken Paramount CC&Rs and their architectural standards and is incorporating those into the CC&Rs and architectural standards of Pebblebrook Subdivision. So, for all intents and purposes we are matching exactly what Paramount would allow with all their -- their structures within their subdivision. Public roads are proposed to access the homes with 33 foot back-to-back road section and five foot attached sidewalk. Trees will be installed behind the sidewalk within a 47 foot right of way that conforms with ACHD standards for local roadways in this area. The roads were stubbed to the site, always anticipated to be extended through this site with a development. Sorry. Let's see. We will stub to the northern property boundary at the northeast as is a standard of zoning code and ACHD standards for potential future redevelopment of that site. It is currently privately owned

so not sure if anything will happen there, but potential is there if possible. We are not proposing any connection to Meridian Road. That was not allowed per ACHD standards. Anytime you redevelop a piece of property your access comes off the lesser classified roadways or a roadway stub to the site, which this has. So, we are closing any accesses off of Meridian Road and installing the buffer along their roadside drainage swale, slight pavement widening and, then, a ten foot wide detached multi-use pathway. Sidewalk will be installed at Long Meridian Road and are measured from the back of curb. Our buffer is 47 and a half feet wide and contains class one, two and three trees, along with shrubs and perennials and lawn designed to be drought tolerant. Open lawn areas will be included within the interior common spaces, which will provide active and passive recreation. The total qualified open space is 98,188 square feet or 2.25 acres. That will be memorialized in the development agreement, ensuring that 2.25 acres of qualified open space remains with this development upon completion. And as Sonya mentioned, that is in excess of the UDC standards for open space. Two full size pickleball courts will be provided. This is that open space exhibit that's shown. You can see kind of in the central area there two pickleball courts. They will be striped -- you know, painted, striped. We will provide some benches next door to them -- or next to them for seating and, then, the dog waste stations will be installed with in-ground installation. That is a detail that's included in the landscape plans that were submitted in the packet. Additional open space and micropath amenities provide additional amenity points that we didn't call out here. There is a connection from the ten foot wide pathway into the subdivision through the buffer and, then, multiple micro paths through the subdivision for passive or active recreation. Walking of dogs. The Paramount HOA has agreed to allow the project irrigation system to connect to the Paramount Subdivision irrigation system and this project will transfer their water right to Paramount, so that they can have -- it's actually -- we -- we did an evaluation of the irrigation and we have about just over one gallon per minute in excess of a water right for this to be able to effectively irrigate this site and so that excess would be usable by Paramount. Basically the entire water right will go into their system and, then, we would utilize that as part of the project to irrigate the common area spaces within this project, as well as the home sites. During the neighborhood meeting we had approximately 30 attendees. The discussion including concerns about traffic during construction and after build out. We had parking. Privacy. Property values was a big one. And, then, cohesiveness with existing homes from a size standpoint and aesthetic standpoint. One of the reasons that we adopted the Paramount architectural guidelines for this project was to increase the cohesiveness with that -- with the existing Paramount to -- surrounds it on three sides basically. Let's see. We -- although we are restricted -- you know, one of the issues came up of construction traffic. We are really going to apply with ACHD to have a temporary construction access off of Meridian Road for the overall subdivision improvements, so that large truck traffic isn't going through on the local roads through Paramount to get to the site. Obviously upon completion of all of the landscaping and subdivision installation improvements there would be no access for Meridian Road, so home building would occur through traffic through the local roadways as occurs in Paramount when any other new homes are built there. The surrounding Paramount Subdivision has a range of home sizes that are one and two story. They vary, depending on how far you get from this site, anywhere from 1,500 square feet to over 5,000 square feet for

homes. Originally the proposed plan for Pebblebrook was to do one and two story homes with a range for 1,574 to 2,968 square feet. After the neighborhood meeting the developer and home builder went back and looked at their models and increased the maximum size by a couple hundred square feet, so that we have a range of 1,574 to 3,195. It feels a little bit more cohesive in terms of home sizes there. It really reinforces what this commission has had a desire of for a variety of home sizes within subdivisions in order to appeal to a wide range of home buyers. It also allows for generational living within this subdivision. So, if someone moves in as a young family to a smaller home, as their family grows they may need a larger home. They can move it into a larger home and, then, when their kids grow and leave they can have another home. So, they can continue to live throughout their years within the Paramount Subdivision, which is a very positive place to live. Or Pebblebrook Subdivision. During the planning process and the lead up to the application we had multiple conversations with the Paramount HOA board. All the feedback that we received was very positive. The desire of this developer, excuse me, is actually to have Pebblebrook Subdivision brought into the Paramount HOA. The board has indicated that they have some support of that, although it does require a full HOA vote to allow Pebblebrook to be annexed, if you will, into Paramount HOA. The HOA board has indicated they don't to make a decision on that until after we get through the city process to see how this all shakes out. But ultimately we feel very positive about what this could do and be another addition to Paramount. If that happened HOA dues go to the overall Paramount Subdivision that would help maintain their existing amenities and facilities, as well as maintain the proposed amenities. It would also allow for Paramount Subdivision residents to use the amenities within Pebblebrook and vice-versa. One of the reasons we picked the amenities that we did on this project was because during our meetings with the HOA board they voiced a desire to have pickleball courts and stuff that they don't have in Paramount right now. So, we pivoted away from some of the other typical ones you see in -- in subdivisions and decided to fulfill that desire with the proposed amenities here. We really feel that that will provide a really good enhancement of their current facilities. So, residents -- I talked about the construction access and -- and traffic. You know, the developer will be required to implement a traffic control plan during construction, as well as during construction of homes and erosion control measures during construction to minimize dirt and dust that blows around to -- to the surrounding homes there. We did have positive feedback during the neighborhood meeting, as well as some, you know, concerns and I received multiple phone calls and e-mails from residents in this general area that were supportive of this, because it was a single family residential home development and wasn't looking at townhomes or -- or higher density here. I think that there had been some maybe preliminary conversations about this being a higher density type of project in the past, so they were happy to see that -- that that's the direction that this was going. I know that that's not everybody, but some of what we got was positive, too. You know, ultimately we do feel that the proposed single family residential homes will provide a positive addition to this area, whether or not it's brought into the Paramount HOA. The developer has committed to utilizing the CC&Rs and architectural standards that they have worked to develop while using Paramount's direction and that will remain whether or not it goes into Paramount. So, this will be the same project whether it becomes part of Paramount or remains Pebblebrook as an

independent subdivision and we think it's a very thoughtful in-fill redevelopment of this area that's a very desirable area of Meridian. I would stand for any questions you may have.

Seal: Thank you very much. Commissioners, do we have questions for the applicant?

Smith: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Go ahead.

Smith: I do have one question, either for the applicant or for staff, just kind of in terms of integrating with Paramount. Do you have an idea what the units per acre -- or the density is for Paramount? That -- for that HOA for the surrounding subdivisions.

Allen: I do not have an exact calculation, but it's in the same future land use map designation, medium density residential. So, it would have been three to eight units per acre. So, it -- it could be just a tad less than this, but this is -- this is low as -- as proposed. So, it's very similar.

Smith: Great. Thank you.

Seal: Quick -- quick question on the -- the lots that have the paths in there. Is this a stipulation that there will be visibility fencing provided where the paths are? The walking paths?

Seale: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Go ahead.

Seale: I can answer that. Yes, every common area space will have an open vision five foot fencing incorporated along the boundaries of them.

Seal: Okay.

Seale: That was a slide. I skipped over it too fast, though. We have addressed a couple of different conditions of approval, including the -- the fencing, as well as the two-to-one lot ratio that Sonya had mentioned, too. We brought that into conformance with the UDC standards there.

Seal: Okay. Other questions? All right. Thank you very much.

Seale: Thank you.

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

Lomeli: Mr. Chair, the first person on the list is Andrew Pietala.

Seal: Good evening, sir.

Pietala: Good evening. My name is Andrew Pietala. I live at 417 West Broderick Drive, Meridian, Idaho. That is immediately south of the proposed Pebblebrook development in the Paramount neighborhood. As has been noted here by the applicant and others, this is not simply a neighboring development of Paramount, it's -- it's quite integrated into Paramount. It's surrounded on three sides with no access for Meridian Road. So, the only access to the development will be through Paramount streets and I don't need to revisit what was said about the intent to become part of the Paramount neighborhood and -- and do their best to match the Paramount standards. However, what I would like to testify to is that last Wednesday the 10th there was an HOA meeting in the Paramount neighborhood to -- on -- and on that agenda for that meeting was to approve or disapprove the addition of this development into the Paramount HOA. Due to the kind of overwhelming response from the owners with concerns regarding the density of the housing, lot sizes, designs of the houses, common areas, that vote did not go -- did not take place, but suffice it to say there was somewhat overwhelming opinions that the plat or the development as proposed was not compatible with the Paramount neighborhood. Aside from that, I think we need to consider the -- the broader area concerns here. In addition to being compatible with Paramount, which the applicant has indicated they desire to be part of, there are other open areas around the Paramount neighborhood currently, such as the Orchard -- Orchard Park or Orchard Hill that's just to the north there where there will be some other high density housing projects possible. So, others may testify to concerns regarding traffic and school capacity and things of that nature, but my main concern tonight is that there seems to be a disconnect between the applicant's position in having this development part of Paramount and the Paramount owners who are not satisfied with the plat as proposed. So, my recommendation is that the plat not be approved until such time that the Paramount HOA has accepted the plat.

Seal: Thank you very much.

Pietala: That's all I have.

Seal: Appreciate it.

Pietala: Thank you.

Seal: Uh-huh.

Lomeli: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Go ahead.

Lomeli: Next on the list is Patrick Murphy.

Murphy: Patrick Murphy. 513 West Broderick Avenue in Meridian. And, again, like the other gentleman stated, I live in that vicinity and this seems to be more of -- they mentioned all these amenities that they were going to include and this and that and that's great, but this -- what gets down to me is a quality of life. What is the quality of life going to be like with this development in there with no access to Meridian. To access Meridian they are going to have to come through my neighborhood, which is already crowded. It took me -- to drive three miles here from my home it took me an extraordinary amount of time. Meridian is way too crowded. Widening it is -- may improve some, but it's just -- you have got two schools there, two churches, some businesses at the other end. Traffic there is horrendous. I noticed this gentleman he said he lives in in Boise. I don't know if he has ever taken the time or anyone's taken the time to drive Meridian at any time during the day to see what traffic is like on Meridian. It's horrible. It's -- my main concern is the additional traffic in my neighborhood, not to -- and I would like to voice my opposition to this. I -- thank you.

Seal: Thank you very much. Madam Clerk.

Lomeli: Mr. Chair, Zachary Tanis.

Seal: Good evening, sir. Need your name and address for the record, please.

Tanis: My name is Zachary Tanis. I live at 493 West Broderick Drive. I was there since August of 2021, so I'm relatively new. Not necessarily opposed to development of that area. In fact, we will probably welcome it. I have a view into that area from the second story of my house through the east facing windows. That said, I disagree that the plat as it's laid out complements the current neighborhood. If you look in particular at the 500 foot vicinity map and the homes in the immediate surrounding area, they are not closer to that higher end density, they are, in fact, closer to the lower end of -- of three homes per acre. All the homes on my block in Broderick are a quarter of an acre or larger and most of the homes in the area are quarter acre and if they are not they are more than 9,000 square feet -- or about a fifth of an acre or more and I believe that if there is to be development in that area they should be consistent with that and not the higher density as proposed. Gentleman mentioned homes in the 1,500 square foot range on those smaller lots and that's not consistent with that area of Paramount bordered by Director Street to the north, Producer Drive to the south and Fox Run to the west and so I don't think it's consistent enough with that current area to be approved as it is. I think as it it will negatively impact the traffic flow as mentioned, both in the neighborhood and onto Meridian Drive. I believe it will negatively impact enrollment at Paramount Elementary, which is inside the neighborhood and I believe it will also negatively impact the existing amenities that the neighborhood enjoys, namely, the pools and other open space and I think lastly as the other gentleman mentioned, this does not take into account the other proposed development to the north end of that neighborhood in Paramount and Orchard Park and so this cannot be viewed in isolation. So, I will summarize by saying I'm in opposition to the zoning as it currently stands with the plat density of 54 homes. It's excessive for the area and will negatively impact the rest of the residents in Paramount. Thank you.

Seal: Thank you very much.

Lomeli: Mr. Chair --

Seal: Uh-huh.

Lomeli: Lee Cooper.

Seal: Good evening, sir. Need your name and address for the record, please.

Cooper; Good evening. Lee Cooper. 150 West Broderick, Meridian. I would like to tell you just a little bit about the Paramount neighborhood. I thought it was interesting in the staff report the reference to an enclave and at first I thought that didn't give it justice, but as I looked at the definition it might be close, defining that as something -- a place that's different, separated from the surrounding and character. We moved to -- to Paramount specifically for the feel. It's -- it's a neighborhood that really does care about each other. It goes above and beyond for each other. Friends are all based near to each other in -- in the Paramount neighborhood and so Paramount is -- is just something that's quite different and quite special to the City of Meridian and when I think of -- kind of the situation we have got, I -- I think -- I think of just friendships and -- and kind of how this is feeling a little bit like a forced friendship with -- with something that maybe we don't want. The -- the neighborhood is known for shoveling sidewalks for each other, kids riding bikes, kids playing in the front yard, playing in the street. Kids walking to school. We have got three of them in walking distance. It's -- it's unique. I -- I don't know that you can compare any other neighborhood in Meridian that offers a high school and middle school and an elementary school and a neighborhood surrounding like what Paramount offers to us. It really is an enclave or something different. It's -- it's -- it's a family friendly place and so in the spirit of friendship I just want to point out that. The elimination of a requirement for a traffic study I think doesn't give the residents of the Paramount neighborhood a good enough understanding for how many trips 54 homes may create. My rough math, because I don't have a manual that I can access easily, is somewhere between 6.6 and just over seven trips per home, which would be in the ballpark of 400 trips if you approve 454 homes. Looking at the route that they may take to get to Meridian Road, most of them are going to come down Broderick where my kids are playing, walking to school, riding their bikes. It doesn't feel family friendly to offer 300 plus trips a day in front of a house that does that. I think kids are at risk. I think walking the neighborhood becomes questionable. Back when Chinden was having work done our street became a thoroughfare for people cutting through, because they didn't want to deal with the backup on Chinden. Feel like it's going to get about the same. So, I think -- I think at least us residents who will have to deal with this forever are owed some sort of additional thought process on -- on how many trips will our neighborhood be impacted by an addition? Existing homes, existing kids playing in the street. Four hundred trips seems like a lot to ask of us and the -- the elimination of access to Meridian Road was entirely beyond our control. We didn't have that opportunity. Long ago Brighton looked to acquire the land, but it wasn't given as an

opportunity and that's why it's not even in the City of Meridian; right? There was an opposition to development and once the landowner passed and his land changed twice, we end up with 54 homes being proposed on the land that nobody ever wanted developed. If I -- I think I understand the city map well enough there is an indication that a park was planned there and I think even today that map still shows a city park. I can understand the city not wanting to take it on, but if we have a city document that indicates that -- I'm guessing that's my time limit. All right. So, my ask is in the spirit of friendliness and friendship and a forced friendship from a group that's getting paid to be a friend, I think that, one, the landscape strip between the sidewalk and the street needs to be adhered to just like the rest of Meridian has. I think the set back from every house that's new needs to be equal to the set back of the house on the other side of the fence. I think the lot size needs to be equal to the house on the other side of the fence. I think the landscaping needs to be completed at the time of construction both front and rear yards to accommodate those of us that live adjacent. I think that we have understood that the construction methods and facades will match that of the neighborhood and I think that's a requirement that should be nonnegotiable and I think that we were misled a little bit in the city meeting -- or the developer meeting. We were -- if you went through to the meeting notes you will see that they from a majority of the homes.

Seal: Have you wrap it up here.

Cooper: -- majority of the homes were indicated to be single story and I think what we just saw was not that. So, the ask is that if -- if we want to insert something in the middle of the neighborhood it becomes really similar to what Paramount already is a family friendly place. Thank you.

Seal: Thank you.

Lomeli: Mr. Chair, Kyle Loveland.

Seal: Good evening, sir.

Loveland: Good evening. Kyle Loveland. 390 West Heston Court, Meridian. And I guess I just have a couple of questions or points of clarification that hopefully the applicant can answer this evening. So, one question I have is it sounds like they were willing to make the commitment to adopt the Paramount CC&Rs and architectural guidelines and regulations, regardless of whether they are annexed or not, which I agree that they should match that to maintain consistency with the neighborhood. I was at the same neighborhood meeting that someone spoke about earlier where the majority of the people there did not seem to be in favor of joining our HOA and the vote was delayed until some of these approvals are worked through and, then, I guess the other question I have is they have indicated that they have an agreement to join our irrigation and I guess it was my understanding that there had been discussions, but there -- as far as I know there hasn't been any agreement inked or executed, so I guess has -- is this development able to stand on their own irrigation wise, pumping wise or whatever pressure they need if they do not join the Paramount irrigation system. So,

those are the two questions I have that I would be interested in getting a response to. Thank you.

Seal: Thank you, sir. Madam Clerk.

Lomeli: Mr. Chair, the next person is Christine Huber Arnold.

Seal: Good evening. Need your name and address, please.

Huber-Arnold: Christine Huber-Arnold. 928 West Deer Crest Drive, Meridian, Idaho. Okay. So, I just have a couple questions or statements. I do oppose this annexation, because we have been in Paramount since 2009, we have seen a lot of development. We started on Producer Drive. We downsized to a smaller house from a 5,000 square foot home to 2,700 square foot home. In these years that we have been there we have seen a lot of changes and, obviously, our home prices have gone up quite a bit in the last five, six years and there is -- you can't get a home in Paramount right now. If it -- if you do get one -- and there was one that went on the market yesterday. It's already pending. It -- they are 800,000 dollars. From what I understand with Hayden Homes is that their prices are around the 450 mark, maybe 500,000, but if they say they are with Paramount it's going to go up more, but their quality is not more. Just because the outside facade is our standards doesn't make the inside a home a quality home and I don't mean to any disrespect, there is a lot of people who like Hayden Homes and that's great, but they are not in the Paramount standards. We -- we have been there, obviously, for a long time and we have -- we are not going to leave, but we do not want our neighbors having 54 homes going into this neighborhood and bringing down the value of our home and I think that's something that we all need to really discuss. Is there a way that they could -- at the meeting -- at their Paramount owners meeting last week they said they could not put in a pool on their property in their neighborhood and my thought was is why don't they take out a couple homes and, then, they would have the space for a pool. Pickleball is not going to be a loved sport if you are living next to it. It's loud. It's very loud. So, people that are going to end up moving next to a pickleball court are not going to be very happy, just -- I mean you go listen to pickleball all day and you will know that it's just -- it's pretty loud. So, that's all I have to say. Hopefully you will take this in advisement. We appreciate your time.

Seal: Thank you. Madam Clerk.

Lomeli: Mr. Chair, Audra Quinlan. Lori Billaud.

Seal: Good evening, ma'am. I need your name and address, please.

Billaud: Okay. Well, good evening, Mr. Commissioner and thank you very much to everybody on the Planning and Zoning. I appreciate your time. I know this is a voluntary position and you are one of us and I appreciate the time. I'm going for the Parks and Rec Commission next week. So, I understand and -- and I will be understanding what it's like to be on your side as a regular citizen and not a politician. I

am here representing Cheryl Heard, who is our precinct committee person for our district. Unfortunately, Cheryl slipped and has a fractured ankle right now, so she was not able to come and speak herself. Three things that I would like to delve into. Oh, I'm sorry. Lori Billaud. I should say that. Lori Billaud. And it's really French. It really should be B.O., but I was a retired teacher. Can you imagine? Mrs. B.O? Anyway, thought maybe I would get a smile. Got a smile. Thank you. Yeah. Kindergarten teacher being Mrs. B.O. was probably not a good thing. So, he said I could go by the American Billaud. Anyway. The first thing I would like to bring up is when the Hayden Homes bought the property they knew what they were buying. They purchased into an area that was more of a Brighton Homes type of area, which is a higher level of building. So, I'm not exactly sure why they bought this property, knowing that they are moving into an area that is not really conducive to the houses that they build. So, part of the buy back that they have done is well deserved, because they bought in some area that is not really suited for their houses. I appreciate how they are changing the front of the houses, but, then, again, when I was in my 20s, saving up for my first house. 1,200 square feet, I did not expect to move into Beverly Hills. Now, I know that Paramount is not Beverly Hills and I'm not trying to say that at all, but it's a middle upper class area. I had no presumption that I was going to be able to buy a house equivalent to back in California a Canoga Park house versus middle upper class. So, they seem to be out of their place in purchasing these homes and the second thing is people have talked about the traffic. I have been going to the council meetings, either in person or watching them on Zoom, so I'm well aware of what's been happening with the City Council. The traffic is horrendous. Two weeks ago I was at the council meeting for the school board that they had on a Monday. A joint meeting for the school board and the City Council. Unfortunately, here they do not do school board planning first before the houses. So -- and I have a picture if you would like to see it. Up on that screen right there it showed that Heritage Middle School is already 70 students over. So, right now they have no room for 70 students and they want to put more students in. At the -- I mean I know they are going to build, but to the degree that they are building I'm not -- I'm not trying to say don't, but it's already 70 students over. Paramount is at the brink. They have little less -- maybe a classroom left to go. Rocky Mountain has already had to put in and bring in bungalows. So, what's happening is we are putting in houses where we don't have the infrastructure and I guess -- I know that was my thing. So, my -- my last hurrah would be how can a plat be approved without a place for the school children? Do we really want more busing, because that's what they are having to do with some of the kids now when they are overbuilding in developed areas. They are already -- West Ada School District is already busing kids out of their local schools because of developments like this. So, we just appreciate your time and consideration and thank you very much.

Seal: Thank you much.

Lomeli Mr. Chair, no one else has signed up.

Seal: Would anybody else like to come up and testify? If you would like -- yeah. Go ahead. Come on up. Good evening, sir. Need your name and --

Dela Noche: Good evening. How are you? My name is Fernando Dela Noche and I live at 5757 North Arliss Avenue in Paramount community. So, thank you very much for allowing me to speak tonight. I'm going to be very blunt about how I feel about it. I'm a pretty simple guy and, honestly, I don't like it. I come from California as well as Lori and I didn't come all this way to see what's happening to the community. It's something that I came from and I don't particularly like what's happening, because this is how neighbors get destroyed in California. I lived in northern California, the San Francisco Bay area. They are expensive, high retail, very dense community wherever you go and you have the nice neighbor -- a neighborhood that's been there for a long time. A lot of character, a lot of people that have lived there, generations of people; right? Businesses. And, then, developers will come in -- what they will do is they will piggyback off a community and they will build, you know, very dense housing up against, you know, neighborhoods that they are just not designed to take that kind of impact and so what ends up happening is more traffic, more problems, more headaches. People get upset. It interrupts with the flow of the community. And, yeah, I -- I strongly oppose this development and I realized that these gentlemen over here, you know, they would represent their company and they are -- they are trying to build -- they are trying to progress. I -- I understand that. But it's -- it's a lot. It's a lot of living units all at once; right? I would like to humbly suggest either they take into account what the people are, you know, talking about tonight, what's going on with the neighborhood and find a way to make it more of a lower density project that could involve going back to the drawing board. I understand that, but I was at the HOA meeting and I can tell you that overwhelmingly most of the homeowners are not happy about it. They are very upset about it, including myself, and, like I said, I just wanted to be able to share that with you folks tonight so you can make a determination based on how we feel as a community. So, thank you very much.

Seal: Thank you. Appreciate it. Would anybody else like to come up? Sir, go ahead.

Gillen: Hi. My name is William Gillen. I live at 319 West Lockhart Lane. That's in Cadence at Paramount, which is on the border with the Paramount -- Paramount community. Two things I had a question -- or wanted to bring up. One gentleman already did -- is the irrigation issue. I think that if they cannot -- the proposed development cannot be part of the Paramount plan, can they -- can they do this on their own? Do they have enough water to do it on their own? And, secondly, if they don't have enough on their own, do they actually -- is it one more straw into the pool that we have for us basically between McMillan, Chinden, Linder and Meridian Road. The second concern I have is the traffic on -- and traffic in general, but also traffic during construction. I look at last year -- maybe the last four or five months of 2023 -- the Catholic church there built a new rectory on the west side of Meridian and there was a lot of construction traffic and that was just building one house. Often from -- next to La Mirada there were trucks and cars parked all up and down the street and that was just bringing enough construction workers and equipment in to build one house. I can't imagine that it's possible to build 54 and get all that stuff -- I can't imagine the problems that would come up if you brought that much traffic in, that much equipment, that much lumber, concrete, everything else and that is a -- a sensitive issue to me, because in my

home I have the picture of a child who was killed. He would be my brother-in-law, but when he was a child he was killed by a construction -- a truck that was going through a neighborhood to get supplies to do construction. So, it's not a -- you know, I'm not saying that happens all the time, but it's -- it's -- it's enough that it's a sensitivity and I saw the issues with the construction of that rectory and I think this would be that rectory on steroids, on steroids, on steroids and I think that has to be addressed that -- a proper way to get that -- if the development goes through to make that happen in a way that's safe for the neighbors, minimizes the impact on noise and things like that and, then, also just -- I don't think it's an option to bring it in the to Garbo Street at all. So, I -- I don't know how that can all happen. So, I appreciate -- I appreciate you listening to my comments and thank you. Thank you.

Seal: Thank you very much. Anybody else like to come up and testify? Sorry, ma'am, we have already called you. Thank you. Hold on a second. Is this stuff we can put on the public record?

Starman: Yeah. Ma'am, if you want to just give those to the city clerk and she can put them in the record. Thank you.

Seal: Would anybody else like testify? Sir, come on up.

Beckman: I'm Bob Beckman. 324 West Broderick Drive. I would just like to reiterate what folks are saying here. I agree wholeheartedly with things that have been said. This is not an apples-to-apples comparison of development. The homes adjacent to the Pebblebrook are a much higher quality and I would say a much larger -- larger. Size that 1,500 foot -- square foot home size that they stated, I don't know where you find that in Paramount. Maybe at the front end where the elderly housing area is, but beyond that in that horseshoe area I would mention to guess all those homes are 3,000 feet plus. So, again, not an apples-to-apples comparison of development. The only benefit I see is to the developer. There is really no benefit to the Paramount community with this development. One gentleman did ask about traffic. I am a traffic engineer by profession. Fifty-four lots will generate about 540 trips a day. So --

Seal: Okay. Thank you very much.

Beckman: I oppose -- I oppose it like everybody else here. Thank you.

Seal: Thank you. Anybody else? Good evening, ma'am. Need your name and address, please. And please speak into the microphone there. Thank you.

Lajoie: Hi. Good evening. My name is Jamie Lajoie. I live at 5757 North Arliss Avenue in Paramount. I'm coming up here -- she has started a petition and she hasn't had very much time to collect signatures within our neighborhood. I concur with -- I think it was the first gentleman who said that we were all kind of left out of the loop and blindsided. I was also at the HOA meeting last week and I just also feel that there is a real disconnect in what their representative is saying, that our HOA board has told them that

we wanted and what we actually want. So, I guess if there is any way to connect this to where the community can be built in a way that's more suitable and agreeable with the people that already live there and the children that already go to school there, I think that that would be good if we could have more time to collect more signatures. I just wanted to say that I concur with those statements. There is a disconnect. And I don't approve of the high density housing. It doesn't match up. If you drive by the lot and look I can't picture 54 homes there. It's not going to look like the rest of the neighborhood. So, that is it. Thank you.

Seal: Thank you. Sir, go ahead. Come on up.

Doss: My name is Don Doss. I live at 381 West Dreyfus, Meridian. 83646. I am the president of the HOA for the Paramount Homeowners Association. There is some misrepresentation going on this evening as to what the board of directors actually said to the developer and I would like to clarify it. The board gave its recommendation to the developer. We did not approve the development. We did not concur with any type of consent as to density, zoning, traffic or anything else. That recommendation was predicated upon two things. One, the development --

Seal: Sir, if you could address the Commission.

Doss: I'm sorry?

Seal: If you could address the Commission by speaking into the microphone I would appreciate it. Thank you.

Doss: I'm not sure if they can hear me or not.

Seal: Yes, I can.

Doss: Thank you. I have got to calm down a little bit here. The developer gave a presentation to the board of directors approximately a month ago. Based upon that presentation the board in a subsequent meeting gave its approval to recommend to the association that the development precede predicated upon the CC&Rs, the ACC, and other types of regulations within the community be adhered to. It was our understanding that since they owned the property they could pretty much do what they wanted to do with it. We had concerns as to density. We had concerns regarding traffic and we felt that those concerns were going to be addressed by the planning and eventually by the City Council. If, in fact, the homeowners do not want to proceed with an approval, it's our understanding that the Planning Commission most likely is going to approve this particular development within the Paramount community. If that's the case the reason we gave our recommendation was so that subsequent homeowners after the initial purchase had to adhere to the CC&Rs and all of our other rules and regulations that we have adopted over the past seven years and I just want to clarify and just make it perfectly clear that the board's recommendation was not a recommendation to proceed with a vote at the annual meeting and the annual meeting -- we were never

given an opportunity to clarify what the board's position was and if there is any questions on that this evening I would be more than happy to take questions and respond as best I can and I thank you for your time and I thank the other attendees here for their time as well. Thank you.

Seal: Thank you, sir. Is there anybody else who would like to testify? All right. Going once. Going twice. All right. would the applicant might come back to respond?

Semple: Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission, again, Ben Semple with Rodney Evans and Partners, 1450 Bannock, Boise, Idaho. Yeah. A lot to kind of breakdown here. So, I want to I guess start with the last commenter. We were not trying to represent that the HOA had approved this project for us, we had multiple meetings with their HOA board. During those meetings we discussed some changes that could be made to help comply a little bit more with the Paramount HOA CC&Rs and architectural standards and after multiple meetings, not only with the board but their representative or the -- the management of their HOA, we came away from that with the feeling that they appreciated the changes we had made and that they were supportive of us to pursue, as a private land developer, something that they could eventually take to their HOA full membership for a vote. That being said, some of the other points -- the main one -- this project does not need to be a part of Paramount. We were trying to comply with their standards and thought, you know, this is kind of in Paramount, so if it could be another addition to Paramount and provide some additional amenities to those residents there that's a great thing. These are other neighbors. These are going to be homeowners that move in here. They may or may not have children. They could be retirees that are looking for a smaller home that currently live in a 3,000 or 4,000 square foot home in Paramount. The irrigation we -- as I stated during my presentation we have one gallon per minute more than we need to irrigate this property common area and homes completely independent of Paramount. If we need to install a pump station off of our water right it's absolutely doable and it will be done. Again looking for a way to consolidate infrastructure, a way to actually provide a benefit to Paramount, because I know that there is some issues with irrigation water in Paramount at certain times of year. So, we thought, well, if we put our entire water right in there that is more than we need that should probably help Paramount, but it doesn't -- again doesn't need to be there. Not very far from this site -- actually, just south of -- or south and east of Paramount Elementary there are patio homes within the Paramount Subdivision that range anywhere from 1,400 square feet up to 2,500 square feet. I don't know if the residents of Paramount came out in opposition of when that phase of Paramount was developed, but those are comps within this neighborhood that are maybe a quarter mile from this site and we definitely feel like the proposal of Pebblebrook Subdivision is in conformance with not only Paramount and the overall density within their subdivision, but per the UDC we are at 3.97 dwelling units per acre. That is less than one unit per acre above the lowest range of the R-8 zone, three to eight units per acre. We are at 3.97. This is not a high density project. I do a lot of projects around Idaho, outside the state. I live in Boise. I have lived in Meridian. I have lived in Eagle. I have lived here since 1991 and high density looks like a project I did in Boise that's 36 townhomes on three acres, not 54 units on almost 14 acres. They are all detached single family

homes. ACHD did a full staff report. They indicated we do not need to do a traffic study on this project, because it's 54 homes. Typically their threshold is a hundred living units. Every road in Paramount, other than some common drives here or there are public roadways and to allow the public to circulate throughout these subdivisions or get from one subdivision to another or from one collector to another collector or to an arterial -- this developer, my client, is very sensitive to construction traffic. Again, I stated in my presentation we are going to be doing a traffic control plan to ensure as great of safety as possible during construction, not only of the subdivision improvements, which is why we are talking to ACHD about a construction entrance off of Meridian Road to keep all large grading excavators, all the larger equipment that's associated with pipe installation, everything else to not be on local roadways within Paramount Subdivision. Once all of those improvements are installed, which includes all of the common area landscaping we can't drive across that landscaping from Meridian Road to build homes. Fifty-four homes aren't going to start getting built at the same time, so it will be staged slightly. They are still trying to figure out which pods they are building first, but are definitely going to be noticing all around this property and doing traffic control plans and having very high standards for their contractors that are building these homes. Hayden Homes I know has some I guess reputation in Idaho. They have done some entry level homes. They also build communities in Oregon and Washington and other states in the Pacific Northwest. They specifically designed this project and this architectural design to comply with Paramount. That includes interior and exterior finishes. That includes the materials they are using to ensure high quality standards. They have developed this luxury product. This is not what they would do at another higher density project that is geared towards first time home buyers. This is something that's geared toward the type of resident that lives in Paramount. Again, I want to state the development agreement will ensure that those architectural standards are with -- are upheld. The CC&Rs -- whether or not this goes into Paramount Subdivision it will be the same. They will comply with Paramount CC&Rs for fence type, color, materials on the homes, architectural design and those will be incorporated into the CC&Rs, as well as their development agreement and if it's in Paramount that's great and if it's not that's great, too, because it's going to look the same. The amenities that we are proposing exceed the standards of UDC. I know that there is concerns about pool use and people that don't like pickleball, but everything that we heard during the lead up to this was that they wanted amenities that were different. We were trying to respond to what the Paramount HOA was telling us. Hayden Homes and the develop of the -- overarching development company here is looking at providing some amenities that are appealing to the people who are moving into this community, as well as existing residents if they want to use it. If they don't want to use the pickleball they don't have to. Not everybody that lives in here again is going to have kids. They are not all going to go to the pool every day. Let's see. I want to touch on -- there was a statement on an enclave. I think that's actually in reference to this piece of property. An enclave is a piece of property within the county that exists within the city's area of impact. Yeah. It wasn't developed by Brighton Homes because the previous owner did not like Brighton Homes. She didn't want them to develop her property. So, that's why we are here today and that's why Hayden Homes has the property and Brighton doesn't. I think I

have touched on everything that I wrote down here. I would stand for any additional questions.

Seal: Yeah. Honestly, the question that I have is on the -- the four parcels that are in the -- so, then, the bottom -- what would it be, the southeast corner. Have you put any thought into, you know -- and I understand this is a hard -- it's a hard ask. You are -- you are trying to match up with something that's acres with something that's, you know, sub. Have you put any thought into how to address that differently and -- everybody up here will probably laugh when I say this, because I hate shared driveways, but have you thought of a concept with shared driveways that would help with that or something along those lines? I mean that's -- that's one of the concerns I have about this. Or at a minimum keep those properties to, you know, one story.

Seample: Mr. Chair, actually we did have our initial pre-plat had to shared drive in that corner for lots -- ACHD and the City of Meridian, planning staff said they didn't want a shared driveway there and they would rather have a knuckle --

Seal: That's because as they listen to me sometimes, so I -- I'm -- the irony of this is not lost on me.

Seample: Oh. I -- I will state that we did revise the preliminary plat to meet the two-to-one standard. The properties immediately in that corner there were divided -- -- I think through a short plat process. They have access from Producer to the south I think. Right there. And so we are trying to be as sensitive to those lots as possible with this development, but, ultimately, yeah, we looked for a shared drive and it wasn't like --

Seal: Okay. Understood. Would you be willing to submit to having single story on those -- on those --

Seample: I can't commit to that for my client at this point.

Seal: Okay.

Seample: I know that those lots are very large. They have some larger setbacks. They are all two-story -- at least from what I have seen being built there right now. So, yeah, I can't commit to one story there.

Seal: Okay. Commissioners, any other questions, concerns?

Lorcher: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Lorcher, go ahead.

Lorcher: So, the -- the comments I'm hearing tonight about traffic is in order to approach your subdivision of Pebblebrook the only access is through Paramount; Is that correct?

Semple: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Lorcher, that's correct. We have two public roadways, one that stubs to the north and one that stubs to the south. Always intended to be extended into this property for access and ACHD will not allow us an access to Meridian Road.

Lorcher: So, regardless of the Hayden Homes or Brighton Homes or whomever homes decides to go in here, it ultimately will always go through the exiting subdivision so they are all connected; correct?

Semple: Mr. Chair, commissioner Lorcher, that's correct.

Lorcher: And you said the majority of the streets that impact your area are all public roadways anyway. There is no private drives, is that what you are saying?

Semple: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Lorcher, my understanding is every road in Paramount is public. There may be a couple little common drives or some private accesses here or there, but -- it's public ACHD property.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you.

Semple: Thank you.

Seal: Commissioner Smith, go ahead.

Smith: Mr. Chair. One, this shared drive -- yeah. I hardly recognize you --

Seal: I know.

Smith: No. But one question just to just to clarify and I only ask this because I know it was a question that was brought up, but just to make sure we are on the same page, if you are not part of Paramount or connected to their water system this -- this subdivision can stand entirely on its own; is that correct?

Semple: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Smith, correct.

Smith: Thank you. That's all I have.

Seal: Okay. Anybody else? No? All right. Thank you very much, sir. Appreciate your time. With that I will take a motion to close the public hearing for File No. H-2024-0005 for Pebblebrook Subdivision.

Smith: So moved.

Lorcher: Second.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing for File No. H-2024-0005. All in favor, please, say aye. Opposed nay? The public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Seal: Who would like to go first? Commissioner Lorcher.

Lorcher: I will start.

Seal: Okay.

Lorcher: In-fill projects are always challenging and because as homeowners from the Paramount Subdivision, whether it's Brighton or Hayden, you know, you don't own that space and sometimes you need to be careful of what you wish for. If it doesn't go -- if Hayden Homes doesn't build these 54 houses it could be another developer building townhouses because -- or some other product that is allowed in the R-8 zoning district. R-8 is the exact same measurement of density that currently is in Paramount Subdivision. So, I'm actually a little bit surprised on the hesitancy from the neighbors about this particular proposal. Even though the houses are a little bit smaller, the developer is suggesting that they follow exactly the same codes of materials as currently available in Paramount, except that the lots are a little bit smaller. In regard to the schools, you have got not only the public schools, but you also have St. Ignatius, Challenger and Ambrose all within your area over there as well. Seventy students above capacity at Heritage is something that's going to happen every year anyway. My kids went to Chaparral. They went to Meridian Middle. They went to Meridian High. I live near Owyhee High School. Unfortunately, in our community people are first and schools are second and since the city does not have any authority over the school district and how schools are built, we really can't change their methodology as far as that is concerned. As far as a layout of this subdivision and the comments made by the developer, I feel that they are -- they are trying to listen to you as much as they can. within being able to develop this property. I'm actually kind of surprised that there is so much objection to it, because it is thoughtfully laid out and I think they will continue to work with the HOA and if the HOA doesn't want to work with them, then, it sounds like that will be a standalone project anyway. So, I hear what you are saying. There is going to be traffic and it looks like they hopefully will apply and be approved for a construction, so that you won't have those big trucks coming through your neighborhood, but your homes were built the same way and I could only assume back in the time that your homes were built the same objections had come up. There is over 700 homes in the Paramount Subdivision and, you know, this adds a small number and, you know, I'm -- I guess I'm just really trying to be sympathetic to what you are saying, but I'm also struggling, because out of a lot of applications that we get here in the City of Meridian this one's actually halfway decent and I would have a hard time not making a recommendation to City Council for annexation.

Smith: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Thank you for saying what I'm thinking much more eloquently. So, I'm, frankly, kind of surprised, though. I mean I -- I don't know. I mean -- I -- yeah, I'm a little surprised by the -- the resistance or the hesitation to allow this to come in here. I mean this is a piece of property who's -- you know, ironically it's -- I don't think that the last owner didn't like a specific builder. They didn't like you. They didn't want you in there. They didn't want homes in there. They didn't want growth in there. That's what they didn't want. And now you don't want homes in there and growth in there. You know, love thy neighbor. That's -- that's kind of as simple as it gets to me. Don't look down your nose as somebody that can't afford something that's bigger fancy as you, especially when somebody's trying to make it to that standard. I mean we have had a lot of applications in here that come in where they try and cram everything they can on every square foot possible and they don't care about the surrounding area. They don't care about integration. They try to hit the minimums and nothing else and you can tell that. That's -- that's kind of as simple as it gets to me. Don't look down your nose at somebody that can't afford something that's bigger fancy as you especially when somebody's trying to make it to that standard. I mean we have had a lot of applications in here that come in where they try and cram everything they can on every square foot possible and they don't care about the surrounding area. They don't care about integration. They try to hit the minimums and nothing else and you can tell that. That's not what this is. I mean this -- this is a -- you know, to me this is a good application. It's laid out thoughtfully. The walkability is nice. The open area is way beyond what they need to provide. I mean they could -- they could put more houses on this very easily and they are not. So, this -- you know, I mean they have been thoughtful about the layout of the property, so that they have a two to one. There is one -- it's very hard to get that when you are going up against a multi-acre site, you know, in that bottom corner, so -- I'm just -- you know, again, I'm a little taken back by the comments in here. So, I mean we -- we all need to be good neighbors. You know, property like this is going to continue to be develop. That probably includes everything around it, so hopefully you are as lucky to get something like this to go in here, because, again, if you -- you know, careful what you ask for, so -- you know, my mother-in-law was part of a -- a whole bunch of people that absolutely positively didn't want some stuff going in by their house and they got their way and what went in was much worse. So, you know, this is part of what will blend into the -- into your community and hopefully the people that live in there are, you know, just as passionate about their homeownership and, you know, their need to keep their community, you know, a good community where they take care of their kids, where they watch out for their neighbors. So, I would look at that as an opportunity to welcome them in, not to be bad neighbors, so -- sorry, a little bit on the soapbox tonight, but, again, kind of taken aback by that. Commissioner Smith, go ahead.

Smith: Mr. Chair, I want to thank you and Commissioner Lorcher for stepping on the soapbox. So, I -- I -- I don't have to. So, I know their -- I want to -- I'm trying to be sensitive to the idea that we are sitting up here on a dais and the -- I have actually lived a very similar experience to this. I come from southern California originally and I kind of laughed at the idea of Canoga Hills home or Beverly Hills home. My wife and I were starting out, we couldn't afford to purchase a home in my hometown of La Habra or

Downey or any of the other areas that are, you know, affordable in southern California and that was part of the reason why we moved to Idaho is -- is great people and in a life we could afford, so I -- I have lived in the shoes of people who would potentially be living in these houses. Honestly, starting out we probably couldn't afford these houses. These are -- I think -- I agree really nice houses. I think they are really nice product. I have a lot written down here and I'm just going to try to keep it -- keep it short. But one of the things -- one of the reasons -- you know, I worked in housing policy a little bit in California and one of the comments about the San Francisco area -- that area is one of the lowest start -- housing start rates in the country. There are plenty of reasons -- plenty things you could say about the Bay area, but I think that they build too much housing currently and this is probably not one of them and so when I come from this -- this background of living in an area that has immense sprawl and still no -- no affordability and I look at other areas that have no housing starts really, no -- no new housing and the affordability crisis that I think some of my fellow California -- former Californians -- don't worry, our secret is safe inside of this room, but I think that that affordability crisis -- I don't want that spreading to Idaho. I -- you know, I'm thinking about -- I don't have children yet, but I'm thinking about their future. I'm thinking about my nieces and nephews and they are thinking about other people and I get there is a concern about housing prices and how this will affect housing prices. We -- we had a house down the street in our neighborhood that went up for sale and I commented, hey, that my drive our price up -- our housing price up, because it was a -- it was listed for a nice amount. My dad, who used to be a realtor, said, no, their house is a lot nicer than you. It's not going to touch your comp at all. And I think that's another thing to consider is that these are different houses. There are -- I understand the intention to build something very similar, but there are different matrix that go into housing prices and -- and comps and things like that, so I think there are a lot of concerns here that maybe through discussion -- continued discussion and continued conversation with the developer, with the HOA, with -- with the community -- I think a lot of them are -- are things that maybe are perceived inconsistencies or perceived disagreements that are actually really just small marginal things. I agree, I think this is a really good project. I think this is a really good -- I think it's a really decent project for this and I think there are three things that you will probably hear the most common if you -- if you -- most frequently if you come to these meetings. One is Chairman Seal opposing common drives. Two is that in-fill is hard. And three is that be careful what you wish for and I think those latter two are really important here. I think you have a developer who is trying really hard to be a good neighbor. They don't have to do those things. They don't have to have CC&Rs that comply with yours and so I think this is -- you know, I -- I would be hesitant to look a gift horse in the mouth and so for the -- the same reason that Commission Lorcher and Commissioner Seal -- that you have expressed, I'm fully in support of this.

Seal: Okay. Commissioner Mr. Zandoval, do you have anything to add? Unless anybody has anything further, I would take a motion. I do want to say I would -- and -- and I mean we can let City Council figure it out, but if anything in here I would like to see those larger lots that are more than a two-to-one held to a single story. That's -- and -- and we have asked that of -- of other applicants for the exact same reason. So, just --

that way at least, you know, how -- you know -- and I -- you know, I understand there might be a two-story on the other side of it just in the -- you know, the premise of trying to continue to be a good neighbor. That's the only thing that I would say. Yes.

Allen: Excuse me. The revised plan showed everything being a two to one at a maximum. There are no higher than that now.

Seal: Okay. So, the -- oh. Got you. Sorry. I thought the -- I thought there were four on the bottom, but with the -- I see the line now, so --

Allen: Yeah.

Seal: Got it.

Allen: Right. This -- this area they -- they changed that, so it's two to one here, one to one, one a half.

Seal: Okay.

Allen: A little bit over, so --

Seal: Okay.

Allen: Does that change your -- your comment?

Seal: That changes my comment.

Allen: Thank you.

Seal: But I am sometimes ignored anyway, so --

Allen: Just wanted to clarify.

Seal: Thank you very much. I appreciate that. Okay.

Lorcher: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Go ahead.

Lorcher: After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I do recommend approval to City Council for File No. H-2024-0005 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of April 18th, 2024, with no modification.

Smith: Second.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded to approve File No. H-2024-0005 for Pebblebrook Subdivision. All in favor, please, say aye. Opposed nay? The application is approved. Or recommended for approval.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Lorcher: Move we adjourn.

Smith: Second.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded to adjourn. All in favor, please, say aye. We are adjourned. Thank you much.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:42 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS.)

APPROVED

ANDREW SEAL - CHAIRMAN

_____|_____|_____
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK