

Public Hearing for Syringa Crossing Mixed Used Development (H-2025-0007) by Hawkins Companies, generally located at the northwest and southwest corners of S. Meridian Rd./US69 and Amity Rd.

- A. Request: Annexation of 62.43 acres of land with R-15 (9.73 acres), R-40 (16.58 acres), L-O (1.43 + 3.90 acres), C-N (2.07 acres) and C-C (19.60 + 9.13 acres) zoning districts.
- B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 10 building lots on 24.46 acres of land in the proposed R-40, L-O and C-C zoning districts.
- C. Request: Conditional Use Permit for a multi-family development consisting of 302 residential apartment units on 15.23 acres of land in the R-40 zoning district.

Lorcher: All right. Ethan, you ready? Okay. Item No. 2025-0007, Syringa Crossing requests an annexation, preliminary plat and conditional use permit to -- for multi-family housing on Meridian Road near Amity. To give you a little history on this, we saw this application on April 2nd and it was sent to Council. There were some changes between Commission and Council and Council said we would like the Commission to hear those changes. So, Sonya, we will start with the staff report.

Allen: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. As you noted the applications before you are request for annexation and zoning, a preliminary plat and a conditional use permit. The annexation portion of the site consists of approximately 62 acres of land, including right of way to the section line of adjacent roadways, currently zoned RUT and L-O in Ada county, generally located at the northwest and southwest corners of West Amity Road and South Meridian Road and State Highway 69. A little history on this property. In 2010 the future land use map designation on the northwest corner of the property was changed from medium density residential to mixed use regional at the applicant's request. In 2019 the designation was changed to mixed use community with the city's Comprehensive Plan update. In 2021 the property owner of Jessica Condominiums on the northwest corner of the development area along South Meridian Road and State Highway 69, entered into a consent to annexation agreement with the city and an agreement for provision of water service outside Meridian City limits, which states the owner consents to annexation when such units are eligible for annexation and execution of such agreement is a condition of city's commitment to provide water service to the property. The property is currently provided with city sewer and water service. At the request of staff this property is included in the annexation request and that is this area, if you can see here on the center map where my arrow is. That's that small property right there. The Comprehensive Plan future land -- future land use map designation, as I noted, is mixed use community. As noted by the chair, this application was previously heard by the Commission on April 2nd. When the Commission recommended denial to City Council, based on inadequate integration between residential and non-residential uses, lack of prioritization of pedestrian mobility within the

project and proposed open space failing to adequately serve residential and non-residential users as desired in the Comprehensive Plan. After the Commission hearing the applicant submitted a modification to the zoning request and updated development plans to address deficiencies discussed during the Commission hearing that contributed to the Commission's recommendation of denial. City Council felt the Commission should review the changes and provide an updated recommendation. Therefore, the project was remanded back to the Commission for a new hearing. The staff report was updated to include the revised information and plans and removed information that is no longer applicable. The applicant is requesting annexation of 62.43 acres of land with R-15 zoning, which is 9.73 acres, R-40 zoning which is 16.58 acres, L-O zoning, which is 5.33 acres, C-N, zoning which is 2.07 acres and C-C zoning, which is 28.73 acres. A conceptual development plan was submitted with the annexation application that depicts how the site is proposed to develop as shown. On the northwest corner of Amity and South Meridian Road, a multi-family development is proposed consisting of 94 apartment units, at a gross density of 9.16 units per acre, 37,000 square feet of office uses, a 63,000 square foot grocery store and retail shops, restaurants and a bank, totaling 117,600 square feet of commercial space overall. All commercial development is proposed to be a single story in height, while the residential apartment buildings are proposed to be three and four stories in height. The residential apartment buildings are the areas shown in brown here on the northern portion of the property. The brown is the office and the red is the commercial. A mix of at least three different land use types is proposed as desired. The proposed residential density conforms to that desired in the Comprehensive Plan. Community serving facilities, such as hospitals, clinics, churches, schools, civic buildings or public safety facilities are not provided, which increases service and transportation network impacts. Supportive and proportional outdoor quasi-public spaces and places connected by pathways are proposed, consisting of plazas, outdoor gathering areas and linear open space areas that exceed the five percent desired in the Comprehensive Plan. At the southwest corner of the annexation area 30,000 square feet of commercial space is proposed, which is anticipated to include restaurants, retail shops, a coffee shop and gas station convenience store and 7,800 square feet of office uses were added since the last plan you saw. Across the street on the southern portion of the development a 302 unit multi-family residential development is proposed with a gross density of 18.24 units per acre. Commercial structures are anticipated to be a single-story in height. Residential structures are anticipated to be three to four stories in height. The development proposed on the southwest corner is inconsistent with the policies in the Comprehensive Plan for the following reasons: The residential area is 68 percent of the site, which is 18 percent more than the maximum allowed of 50 percent and 3.24 units per acre over the maximum density allowed of 15 units per acre. Commensurate levels of employment and other non-residential elements supporting residents and reducing local vehicle trips are not provided due to the excess of residential area and density provided. Outdoor quasi-public spaces and places, such as plazas, outdoor gathering areas and linear open space are proposed in the commercial portion of the development, which appear to generally meet the minimum standards for mixed-use areas in the Comprehensive Plan. However, they are not functionally integrated with the residential development as desired. Community-serving facilities, such as hospitals, clinics, schools, churches, civic buildings or public safety facilities are not provided, which increases service and transportation network

impacts. The applicant has requested the overall project be considered as one project for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, rather than two individual projects. The Comprehensive Plan specifically states contiguous mixed-use identified areas that are bisected by an arterial or highway are considered separate and independent areas for use and design integration and will be evaluated independently of each other. Some of the reasons for such includes safety and efficiency of the transportation network, pedestrians and motorists alike. If the project is considered as one the overall residential density for the project is 14.77 units per acre and the percentage of residential uses is 49 percent, which is consistent with the related mixed-use policies in the Comprehensive Plan. Again, only if it's considered one project, rather than two as specified in the comp plan. An overall pedestrian plan was submitted for the annexation areas shown -- that shows ten foot wide pedestrian walkways in blue and five to seven foot wide sidewalks in pink providing connectivity along streets, through parking areas, quasi-public areas, commercial and residential areas. Conceptual building elevations and perspectives were submitted showing what future commercial retail buildings and plaza areas will look like. The primary transportation considerations for this development involve the timing and coordination of required off-site improvements, access management along Amity Road and State Highway 69 and completion of internal street and pathway connections needed to support a functional mixed-use neighborhood pattern. The project would add measurable traffic to a network that already experiences operational strain during peak hours, underscoring the need to align development phasing with programmed intersection and signal improvements. Because of its proximity to two major transportation corridors, the design must emphasize efficient site access, safe circulation and continuous pedestrian and bicycle connections consistent with the city's adopted street and pathway standards. ACHD's recommended conditions and findings addressing intersection mitigation, access spacing and collector completion reflect these shared objectives and are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the Unified Development Code standards for coordinated land use and transportation planning. A preliminary plat is proposed to subdivide the southwest corner of the annexation area, but not the northwest corner. The plat consists of ten building lots, six commercial, two office and two residential lots on 24.46 acres of land in the proposed R-40, L-O and C-C zoning districts. One access drive is proposed via West Amity Road and one is proposed via South Meridian Road and State Highway 69. A portion of a future collector street Hermitite via West Amity Road is depicted along the southern boundary of the site and stubs to the property to the south. The portion that connects to Amity Road is off site on the adjacent property to the west and is not proposed to be constructed with this development. However, the applicant has been working with that property owner and I believe has an agreement to construct the road on their property as part of the fire access requirements if this development is approved. A waiver from Council is requested to UDC 11-3H-4B-2A, which prohibits new approaches directly accessing a state highway. ITD has approved the access by Meridian Road. A backage road generally paralleling Amity Road and South Meridian Road and State Highway 69 is proposed for access to the properties fronting those roads in accord with the UDC. Landscape street buffers are required with the subdivision improvements in accord with UDC standards. There is a 40 foot wide gravity irrigation easement on the southwest corner in the commercial area as shown. That area in brown. Trees and large shrubs are not allowed in the easement area. The

easement is proposed to be landscaped with a dry stream bed, which also serves as a drivable access road with accent boulders and planter beds alongside. A conditional use permit is requested for a multi-family residential development on the southwest corner of the annexation area consisting of 302 apartment units on 16 acres of land in the R-40 zoning district at a gross density of 18.24 units per acre. Three and four-story multi-family buildings are proposed with parking on the ground floor of some buildings. The four-story buildings are proposed here on the north end and the southern end has the three-story buildings. Building materials consist of fiber cement siding, variegated board and batten in variety of colors and styles, stucco and brick. The final design, if approved, is required to comply with the design standards in the Architectural Standards Manual. The collector street access Hermatite is needed for emergency access and should be extended from West Amity Road to the site prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy within the multi-family development if approved. Based on 302 units a minimum of 1.82 acres of outdoor common open space is required. Excuse me. I didn't run through these. Let me just take a minute to run through the concept elevations for the multi-family buildings. Again, these are the four-story buildings that are proposed on the north end and, then, the three-story buildings. Based on the 302 units, a minimum of 1.82 acres of outdoor common open space is required. A total of 4.84 acres is proposed exceeding the minimum standard. Proposed amenities consist of a clubhouse and dog park from the quality of life category. A community garden and shade structure with seating area from the open space category. And a swimming pool, walking trails, children's play structure and three sports courts from the recreation category. Additional amenities from the multi-modal category are recommended by staff if approved, consisting of a bicycle repair station and charging stations for electric vehicles. The applicant is requesting the following waivers from City Council. The UDC 11-4-3-27-C8 states common open space areas in multi-family developments shall not be adjacent to collector or arterial street buffers unless separated from the street by a berm or a constructed barrier at least four feet in height with breaks on the berm or barrier to allow for pedestrian access. The applicant requests approval through the conditional use permit for common open space areas in the multi-family development to be located adjacent to a collector street buffer without a berm or barrier separating it from the street. The reason for such is an enhanced interaction is desired between the street and ten foot wide multi-use pathway along the collector street with a narrower street section and wider pathway adjacent to common areas. The second waiver from Council is to UDC 11-3H-4B-2A, which prohibits new approaches directly accessing a state highway. Council may consider and approve a modification of the standard upon specific recommendation of the Idaho Transportation Department or if strict adherence is not feasible as determined by City Council. The applicant is requesting Council approval of the proposed access south of Amity Road. A recommendation has been received from ITD on the access. They will allow a right-in, right-out access. No written testimony has been received on this application. Staff is recommending denial, because the proposed conceptual development plan is not consistent with the general mixed-use and mixed-use community principles in the Comprehensive Plan for the following reasons: The proposed development is not functionally integrated in design or uses per the design standards in the plan, i.e., the uses function as individual components not together as desired. The southwest corner of the development is 72 percent residential, with a gross density of 18.24 units per acre,

which is 22 percent more residential than the maximum allowed of 50 percent and 3.24 units per acre over the maximum allowed density of 15 units per acre. Commensurate levels of employment and other non-residential elements supporting residents and reducing local vehicle trips are not provided due to the excess of residential area and density provided. Community serving facilities, such as hospitals, clinics, churches, schools, civic buildings or public safety facilities are not provided in either development, which increases service and transportation network impacts and supportive and proportional outdoor public and/or quasi-public spaces and places, such as parks, plazas, outdoor gathering areas, linear open space and schools are proposed as desired. However, these areas are not located in spaces between residential and non-residential uses to provide integration and transition between uses in either development area as -- as desired in the comp plan. If the Commission decides to approve the subject applications the project should be continued to a later hearing date in order for staff to prepare conditions of approval for the Commission's consideration. Staff will stand for any questions.

Perreault: Madam Chair? Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: If we were to consider all of this as one project, would they have to apply for a comp plan amendment of some sort?

Allen: Madam Chair, Commissioners, Commissioner Perreault, no. A Comprehensive Plan text amendment would not necessarily be required. It would be the determination of the Commission and Council.

Lorcher: If they chose a different zoning instead of mixed-use community, has -- has that conversation come up at all as far as like whether it was more -- I'm just throwing out words here -- traditional neighborhood or some other kind of concept plan to be able to - - be able to meet some of these minimums of residential and commercial together?

Allen: Madam Chair, I'm not sure I'm following. Are you asking if we discussed them doing a different future land use map designation, rather than mixed use community rather than zoning? Is that what you're asking?

Lorcher: Yes.

Allen: Yes, we did. We encourage them to do commercial and a higher density residential. That would be more consistent with what they are proposing.

Lorcher: Okay. All right. Would the applicant like to come forward?

Mansfield: Madam Chair, Commissioners, thanks for hanging around with -- with us this evening. I'm Ethan Mansfield, representing Hawkins Companies. 855 West Broad Street, Boise, Idaho. 83702. Yeah. I would like to -- I have got a lot to pack in here. I would first like to say, look, if the Comprehensive Plan gets us past the finish line and we can

notice as such and keep this plan, we are more than willing to do that. That has not really been an option that we have really discussed, so -- or that I recall. So, something for your consideration. We do think this fits within the mixed-use community Comprehensive Plan area and I'm going to talk about why. You are familiar with the request, so I won't talk about that too much. A little bit of history. We were actually instructed in 2020 to consider this as a single project and the current Comprehensive Plan says mixed-use projects are to be developed with an overall master or conceptual plan for the larger mixed-use area. A development agreement will typically be required for a project with a mixed-use future land use designation. So, that's kind of what we are expecting, looking for and hoping for. One -- once we had our City Council hearing -- I just kind of want to be clear. So, City Council generally didn't oppose what we were proposing, but wanted the Commission, who had some comments about integration, uses, as you remember back in April, they wanted an opportunity for you to weigh in on this new proposal. So, after the City Council hearing in June we met with city staff on July 1st and we specifically asked -- give us some specific things we can latch onto to gain staff support, because functional integration is a little bit soft, a little bit subjective and we wanted to understand what can we -- what can we do with this plan that provides that and so we hammered out the list of conditions that you see in front of you. No back out parking on main access drives through the sites from adjacent public streets. Providing bulb outs for parallel parking as a means of traffic calming in -- in front of the drive aisles, pads A through D. Right. We are going to bring that four-story building on the north side down to three. These two are very important. An executed STARS agreement is required prior to any development of the site. We are going to talk about the STARS agreement momentarily, but I will say the STARS agreement requires both corners to come in together, because the STARS agreement is conditional upon having valuable sales tax generating commercial uses and those uses have to be configured in a certain way that will -- will actually generate the sales tax that are anticipated and, otherwise, we have to have a successful commercial development for STARS to work. We will talk about it in a second. The other thing that we are agreeable to is that we -- we will construct Hermatite on the south side of Amity with the first phase of development. If you go back and watch the City Council hearing the Mayor had a fantastic idea to kind of allow both the northwest and southwest corners to kind of be considered as one cohesive development, which was what was envisioned in 2020. He said, well, if you have a collector roadway, especially one as we are proposing with ten foot pedestrian pathways on either side, that might allow that development to be more cohesively tied together than separate -- totally separate developments and so we -- you know, we completely agree and so that's why we are willing to construct that Hermatite and bring that roadway to Amity right off the rip with this first phase of development. So, we thought we had gotten pretty close with staff and we apparently are still missing the mark a little bit. I'm not sure how and that's why I'm here before you saying that I think we have kind of nailed it. These are staff concerns. I'm going to go through and talk about why I think we have actually addressed these -- these pretty thoroughly. So, you know, what we have done is we have reduced -- I'm just going to go through these changes here really quickly. We have 33 fewer residential units than we had in the last plan. We added 24,000 square feet of office space. So, we added like a hundred more office. So, that's 45,000 square feet total. Basically doubling our office size. More than doubling. We added 10,000 square feet of retail. That's a shops building,

not additional drive-throughs or car washes or anything like that. So, we have got almost 150,000 square feet of food retail, personal services, other commercial services. Finally, we have ten acres of quasi-public open space. That's 18 percent. That's three and a half times the amount required by the Comprehensive Plan. So, when we talk about the amount of open space required to support the development, we have three and a half times what city feels is appropriate to support a mixed-use development and we will talk about that more later, too. We also have 4.8 acres of multi-family CUP open space and, again, we are willing to dedicate this to the public. Other than the clubhouse, obviously, that remains private. But we are -- we are looking at that -- that park. It's a quasi-public park; right? It's an -- it's over an acre of park. It's -- you know, I looked at the subdivision to the north. Their central gathering place is .6 acres. Another subdivision has a .5 acre. This is more than twice that size. We have 166 acres more than required of CUP open space and I will talk about that a little bit more, too. Well, here we are. So, this is where I get a little bit confused by staff's statement here, specifically on the southwest corner. These places do not comprise a minimum of five percent of the development area on the southwest corner. Well, even if you look at just the commercial stuff, the stuff in the commercial area; right? We have 2.8 acres, which is 128 percent more than what is required by the Comprehensive Plan on the southwest corner. In addition to that, we have got 166 percent more than what's required in our multi-family area alone. In total on the southwest corner, one in three square feet of the total land area is open space and that's open space per the UDO and Comprehensive Plan definitions of open space. We are not making up our own definition of open space here to fit that. That's one in three. Therefore -- and the Comprehensive Plan states high intensity residential requires commensurate levels of non-residential elements supporting residents and reducing local vehicle trips. We are asking for -- even if you took the southwest corner alone we are asking for three acres -- or three units per acre more in density, but we have 166 percent more open space than what the UDO requires and if the UDO is the right standard and that's adequate amount of open space, we are blowing that out of the water. So, we -- this development will not feel dense, packed, overcrowded, anything like that. I just want to make that really, really clear. As you note on the plan, if you look here in the southwest corner, these areas -- the staff report says these areas are not located in spaces between residential and non-residential uses. You know, if you look at the actual plan that's exactly where these use -- where these open spaces are located. You can see where the commercial is here wrapping the corner and you can see where the residential is interior to the site. We have a private roadway, which provides a buffer and we also have this connected -- area of connected plazas that basically take pedestrians from one use to the other. It's literally immediately between the commercial and the residential. I don't know how we could get more between. I'm just looking at the plan and thinking about it out loud. And if we can get more between I would love to hear your suggestions on how to get more in between and provide a better transition. So, here is what these spaces actually look like; right? We have got kind of little -- I mean we have got little areas for -- for rest and it's comfortable pedestrian experience moving from one place to the other across the development. You know, these show kind of connected themes from the area immediately adjacent, you know, kind of -- kind of integrated into the multi-family. You cross on a ten foot pathway kind of crossing across the main drive aisle, another kind of pedestrian plaza area crossing a drive aisle to the, you know, main commercial -- central

commercial hub. All the shops. Extremely convenient and comfortable pedestrian experience here. Furthermore, you know, here is just some views of what the park is anticipated to look like. Dog park. Pickleball. We have got, you know, open space, like I said, about an acre and, then, here, you know, we didn't talk as much about the north side. That wasn't really a concern of staff's, but, you know, it's linear open space, basically runs from North Alyer Street all the way down to the southern corner on Amity and Meridian. We actually had -- I think I told everybody this -- we had a couple at the neighborhood meeting -- one of our earlier neighborhood meetings actually get really excited about the prospect of having a walking path from where they live up in Stapleton to our development. This provides it. Here is a small office plaza. You know, again, we have these kind of small open spaces. Some are small, some are much larger, kind of tucked in throughout the development to create comfortable, pedestrian experiences, while still meeting parking requirements, meeting tenant requirements; right? We have to do both of those things. Here is our connectivity exhibit. Ten foot sidewalks throughout the site. Commissioner Smith last time asked a great question about how the heck does someone get from the southern end of the development to the northern end or across the street on a ten foot pathway without crossing through a bunch of parking lots? We have removed parking spaces around these pedestrian pathways to allow for trees, to allow for more comfortable spaces for pedestrians to kind of move through the site. Again, we have parking requirements. The City of Meridian requires north of two parking spaces per unit. So, we have got to provide that and we want to provide that, but we also intentionally are creating space for comfortable movement through the site. Finally, here is just a kind of A, B of the old and the new areas. We kind of went through exactly how those work. I can go back to them or dwell on them in the time after I present here. Importantly let's talk about STARS. STARS will provide the transportation improvements that are not only required by this development, but that are going far above and beyond. That includes the full build out of State Highway 69 from south of the development's southern boundary to north of the development's northern boundary. It constructs all of Hermatite backage on the north and south sides, builds out all of the legs of each of the intersections of State Highway 69 and Amity. This is only feasible because we have a commercial shopping center on the northwest corner. It's anchor -- it's a grocery anchored shopping center. Grocery anchors take up space. You can't just put a grocery store out there and have all of the out pads on the southern side of the arterial. It doesn't work like that. That doesn't generate enough pad interest. The grocer who is an anchor, that's what draws people in. You won't get the trip capture you want either if you do that, because people are going to get in a car and drive across the -- you know, it's like if you want -- if you want people to be captured in this area they are going to go shop at the grocery store, they are going to go out to eat on that corner, they are going to do all this stuff on the corner. We can't separate the commercial uses to the extent that would allow each development to be split 50-50. I hope that makes sense. I really hope it does, because it is an economic reality that we face. So, you know, some of the staff recommendations that are in this report simply just don't work with a STARS agreement. We can't remove the northwest corner from the annexation area. I don't know that that's -- I think that may have been a vestige of a previous staff report. It was in the most current, but it may be left over from another time. And, again, we can't modify -- we can't pull half the commercial from the north to the south side just so we can get 50-50 on each

side or, you know, 60-40 commercial-residential, because that's just not how grocery anchored shopping centers function. It's not how they work. We think this still provides an absolutely fantastic place to live, work and play. We have elements for each thing. We added office, so that they can, you know, achieve that. Speaking of community serving facilities, we are providing an acre plus park that we are willing to dedicate to the public. We are absolutely happy to provide daycares, churches, schools, medical offices, clinics, anything that wants to be here can be here with the mix of zoning that we provide. We are happy to consider civic uses, institutional uses. We have not heard; right -- these agencies all get transmitted. We have not heard any interest. Each of these groups has professional facility siting people that, you know, typically are like, hey, we have a master plan that shows us wanting to expand in this area. We want to go here. We haven't heard from anybody. I asked the school district many years ago when this process started if they would be interested. There is no interest in a school here. I think they have their siting years, years, years in advance; right? And so, you know, we don't have those -- we are happy to consider them if you guys have ideas. So, in sum, we think we comply. We would love for you to consider the development as a whole. That's the only way we get all those transportation improvements with the STARS agreement, which is a condition of the approval should you choose to recommend approval and this just indicates how we comply with the Comprehensive Plan and additional detail. Happy to leave it on that slide so you can read it. Thank you very much for your time. Happy to answer any questions.

Gelsomino: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Gelsomino.

Gelsomino: Staff, quick question. Who -- could you kindly remind me, because it's been a while. Who owns the -- who owns the other portion to the west of Hermitite, the property?

Allen: Commissioners, that's part of the Storyrock development that was recently approved by City Council.

Gelsomino: Perfect. Thank you. Now quick question, Ethan. So, the fire department has conditioned multi-family occupancy on prior completion of South Hermitite Avenue. Hermitite, of course, like we just confirmed, crosses property to the west that the client doesn't own. What legal instrument exists today to guarantee right of way dedication from that property? Is there a signed option agreement, a recorded easement or any executed instrument between your client and the adjacent property owner to the west?

Mansfield: Madam Chair, Commissioner Gelsomino, there is e-mail -- basically we have been in communication -- deep communication with the developer of that property Corey Barton and Trilogy Development. We typically don't execute easement agreements prior to approval from governing bodies. It would just be a -- kind of a silly thing to do, because we don't have permission to build anything there, so we wouldn't execute an easement to build anything there. So, if the plat for Storyrock, that particular phase, is not recorded

prior to when we are ready to start construction, we would -- we would record an easement -- an access and utility easement over that. That would, then, be replaced very quickly with Storyrock's primary entrance road, because they are in the same place -- they are -- they are the same road. So, we have coordinated extensively with Trilogy to assure that whoever goes first builds the road, constructs the road and if that -- if we are building the road I'm sure -- well, I know that Trilogy would absolutely give us permission, because we are building them a free entrance road. So, everyone wins. And Storyrock has been approved, so you know that if they want to proceed with their development that road goes in.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Yeah. Thanks. Question for the applicant. Can we go to slide 17? I guess it's a comment -- a couple comments followed by a question. I think from my perspective. I can't speak for staff. But I want to communicate some of the problems that I still have. I'm glad you mentioned kind of our discussion last time around pedestrian connectivity. I'm not going to put you through the same rigamarole as last time, but I still see -- again, I -- I like the pathways. I like the -- I like everything here. But if I'm in kind of one of these corners -- you know, one of these residential corners, either on the northwest or southwest sides, I still have to go through four, maybe six conflict points to get to the nearest commercial; right? And I know there is -- there are economic realities at play and you can't have everything fully integrated, but -- you know. And if you go to slides 15 and 16 I think some of these functional integration kind of -- kind of callouts, I don't -- I don't really look -- I'm not -- I can't speak for every consumer. I don't see a spot between two offices as functional integration. I don't know that I see a fenced-in pool or -- or dog park as -- as really functional integration and I -- again, I know that there are amenities and certain requirements and you are trying to balance all these. So, I understand it. But when I looked at this last time I think my perspective was that there are a lot of smaller issues that pile up here and not that you can resolve it through a bunch of small tweaks, but there are so many small issues that there might be a larger problem with the overall design. Even if you were to consider this as one project it still feels very residential -- commercial, residential. I know some of that's the fact of the hard corners, et cetera. But I wanted -- you know, monolog over is -- is -- is the client -- are they just dead set on this site plan? I mean what -- what is the -- you know, given the feedback from -- from Planning and Zoning or -- or was this kind of prep for City Council, hoping that City Council disagreed, which no offense. If that's the plan that's fine. I guess kind of walk me through some of the decision making of why we are kind of tinkering with something that from my perspective Planning and Zoning last time said this is kind of maybe a little too fatally flawed to -- to work.

Mansfield: Madam Chair, Commissioner Smith, I really appreciate the comments. I appreciate the directness. I will say that Hawkins has been doing retail developments since the mid 1970s. We have a pretty good idea about what makes a successful retail space and what makes a retail space that turns over frequently. Retail spaces that turn

over frequently typically don't have -- and -- and, again, I'm not saying -- I'm going to just preface this by saying I live in -- a few miles from downtown Boise. I love downtown Boise. I love Hyde Park. That's why I live close to downtown Boise; right? Like -- like I love having to park two blocks away and walk to Hyde Park to eat and, then, walk back to my car. However, that said -- I was just speaking with our leasing guy yesterday and he goes you are an absolute anomaly based on how people spend their money and how people actually use spaces and I'm like, yeah, I guess I am. That's -- that's kind of a bummer, but that -- that is the reality of the situation; right? Is like what drives successful retail is convenient places to park, easy visibility from adjacent roadways, easy access into centers and out of centers. That's what drives retail success and so as such -- and I guess I should -- as such this is why we have designed this the way we have. In addition to that, retail success is really critical here, because we have this STARS agreement condition that we have agreed to and we want to participate in that demands sales tax revenue to help pay for transportation improvements. So, it drives a public good. So, we need that retail to be successful. So, we won't be able to lease and we will accept much, much, much lower rents for buildings that are tucked inside -- let's say between Building One and Building D1 on the south side, for example. Like that's just an economic reality that we face. And, again, I'm the first person -- I'm like Exhibit A on like why I don't -- why I hate that reality, because I walk around downtown -- I love living downtown. But -- but that is an economic reality that we face and we cannot do what we need to do with accepting lower rents. The community doesn't get what the community needs with lower rents. Lower rents means lower tenant -- like lower means lower value. Lower value basically means like, look, a tenant is not succeeding. It's a bad thing. Like tenants don't succeed; right? And they -- they -- they circle out and they -- they don't renew, because they are struggling to make ends meet; right? Like successful community spaces is what we are after here and so what I'm experiencing and have experienced in the past several years working in Meridian is that there is this fundamental disconnect between what we want to envision our community as and economic reality and it bites that those are different and what this attempts to do is -- is merge those together to create comfortable spaces within the context of making a successful shopping center and that's as -- that's as good as I can get. I mean that's really as good as I can give you. Like I will say one more thing about multi-family parking ratios. We are way over what we would like to be as a -- as a multi-family developer. If I could remove another 20 parking spaces from this I probably would, but I can't because of the code; right? We -- we like to park 1.7, 1.8. You know, you have to park at 2.1, 2.2 in Meridian, so --

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: I guess a follow up to that -- and I appreciate the economic value, especially about around the retail. I guess part of it -- and I should have communicated this clearer -- is also the -- there is -- correct me if I'm wrong. Maybe I'm just flat out wrong. But I also think there is nothing, you know, prohibitive about pulling some of that retail -- or some of that residential closer to the retail. I mean you see even -- and I know it's -- again, it's a different location, different rules apply, but just outside these doors there -- there is

residential over retail. Again, different product. But is that just -- again, is that -- is that just -- it yields a lower rent product overall? I guess I'm trying to understand. I see plenty of places. I grew up in southern California, downtown Fullerton, Birch Street and Brea, you know, these places -- and they are similar to things that I have seen from -- from Hawkins.

Mansfield: Yep. Yep.

Smith: So, I'm just trying to kind of square that circle of -- and Hawkins is capable. I know vehicle oriented -- you know, vehicle friendly mixed use that still respects pedestrians is -- is doable. Why is it not doable here?

Mansfield: Great question, Commissioner Smith. Madam Chair, Commissioner Smith, this is a fantastic question. We should seriously get a beer sometime and talk about this, because I would love to just beat this up. I -- yeah. I mean the answer to that question is -- is kind of twofold. The main piece of that is the rents that this area is experiencing, the market rate rental product that we are experiencing, the market rates, market rents, are not high enough to support the construction of something like a four over two. We can't go any more than four over two. That might actually exceed the height of the R-40. I can't recall. Four over one. It simply doesn't work and it doesn't just work because we might make less money, it's much more complicated than that. It -- it doesn't work because when you don't have returns that hit a certain target; right? When construction costs are so high that your returns, because of market rents, don't -- don't generate high enough internal rate of return, you can't find people to -- to invest in your product. It's like asking someone, hey, would you rather spend -- would you rather put one dollar in and get five dollars out or one dollar in and get two dollars out? Everyone knows which one they would choose. They would rather put one dollar in and get five bucks out. Building something like a four over two in this location would be like, hey, why don't you put one dollar in and get two dollars out, instead of getting one dollar in and getting -- putting one dollar in and get five dollars out? That's like, you know, every dude, lady on the street is like making those decisions every day. They are just economic factors; right? They are like what would I rather do? How -- where would I spend my money? And that's what we experience when we try to build podium product and especially put things like retail in the bottom of the podium product when market rents aren't there and, you know, that's the best economic explanation I can provide. I'm just trying to be honest with you, guys. We just wouldn't be able to build it.

Smith: I appreciate it. Thank you.

Mansfield: Yeah.

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: This is so tough. We -- we always want to redesign projects for applicants. It's just -- but not -- not because we don't think you guys do a good job, it's just, you know,

we -- we are seeing the bigger picture of our city as a whole and what -- you know, what we would -- just think would be so beneficial here, but I have a couple maybe smaller questions. First, on the -- the -- the first waiver that's being requested regarding the common open space areas -- and I'm curious if you have like a visual of what it is that you're trying to help us understand regarding the -- the reasoning for it. It says in our -- in -- in the staff comments it says the reason for such -- for such an enhanced interaction is desired between the street and the foot multi-use pathway along the collector street with a narrower street section and wider pathway adjacent to common areas. So, that's in the southwest -- southeast corner of the southwest project; right?

Mansfield: Southwest corner of the southwest project.

Perreault: Is that where -- so, we are looking at UDC 11-4-3-27C.8. So this, is your first waiver request from Council?

Mansfield: Madam Chair, Commissioner Perreault, that would actually be along Hermitite Roadway.

Perreault: Okay.

Mansfield: That's not something that we actually need. You know, we are happy to not have that waiver. The reason we requested it is truly because the objective -- one of the elements of our functional integration is we want this community to not be fenced off like a little fenced-off enclave, we want this community to be part of the neighborhood. We are not adding like -- we are not adding a big fence there with little tiny gaps in it. We are generally trying to keep that open and accessible from our ten foot pathway that runs along Hermitite, so that people walking along that don't feel like there is like this closed-off development on one side of them. That's like in my mind a big element of functional integration; right? Is integrating with not only the surrounding uses within the development, but also the surrounding neighborhood fabric. So, because of that that's why we are asking for that waiver. We -- we could install stuff there to make it feel more walled off, but that's simply the only reason we are. So, I'm happy to, you know, go either way on that. We could figure it out either way. That's not even a cost. I mean it's not even a cost thing for us.

Perreault: Okay. Thank you. And, then, just one more. I think I mentioned this in the last hearing and -- but the plaza that's there in the -- the southeast corner of the northwest section --

Mansfield: Uh-huh.

Perreault: -- I don't understand it. If it's me I am not sitting anywhere that has two -- that has a state highway and a collector road that -- the noise itself is deafening. So, why would I sit there and have a coffee or sit with my friend in the plaza or even want to spend any time there and I certainly wouldn't want to take my children there. So, I want to understand that, because we are getting down into the minutia of -- well, I shouldn't say

minutia. That's not -- that's a bad word. But we are getting down into the specifics of these open spaces being so critical. That is one that your, you know, developments kind of trying to showcase. I want to understand the location of that and why that seems to be such an asset for you guys.

Mansfield: Yeah. Madam Chair, Commissioner Perreault, you know, that's a great point. That spot is likely not going to be a -- like focal point of large community gatherings or anything like that. It -- that piece right there is just one of many open space areas, especially on the northwest corner as you were talking about specifically the northwest corner, where, you know, we provide so many kind of other plaza spaces -- that's kind of just kind of a continuation of kind of the theme of like -- this is a plaza. This is a plaza. This is a plaza. Here is the termination of -- or kind of the end of this longer piece of like plaza network -- pathway plaza network. It's better to have that kind of -- it's -- it's almost more of like a visually appealing thing and kind of a -- a design esthetic to like notate that like here is your stretch of pathway plaza and open space areas. Here is the connection between one corner of Amity and Meridian, the other corner of Amity and Meridian and it's kind of a placemaking kind of like anchoring thing, rather than like a -- I want to spend time with my kids in this particular plaza. Does that make sense? And it is on a busy street, so I understand that.

Perreault: It does. The -- the rendering didn't give that, okay, yeah, in my opinion. So, that's why I was trying to understand that. If I can make a recommendation. Maybe do some really nice artwork. There is such a huge amount of traffic that goes through there. I think if you want to really do some placemaking, you know, do some -- do a dedication of some kind or some artwork there, just -- that's not a major issue, but just a recommendation. And can you -- I see the big picture of what's going on and your desire to have all of this -- you know, considered as one -- one project and I understand the -- the concerns as far as the STARS -- the STARS program goes and we had the same conversation with Costco on Chinden about, you know, should the transportation benefit of the STARS program be the driver for the approval of this project or is the project -- is that just a -- you know, a benefit that's received because we have this project that our community really wants and that's the same, you know, decision that we have to make here and there was a lot of criticism given to the city over you guys -- you know, the city just agreed to Costco, because, you know, Chinden Road got widened and this was a benefit to the City of Meridian; right? And so I just want to make sure that we are not doing that and the STARS is -- the STARS is significant. It's huge. It's -- it's really an amazing program; right? But I just -- I want you to understand as an applicant that that is a motivator for us, but that is not the motivator for us and so I don't know if my fellow Commissioners feel the same way, but I think that's something that -- when you're presenting before Council just kind of keep that in mind. That -- that's -- you know, it's a plus, it's a benefit, but we have been -- we have had these same conversations before and we have to be really careful with that one and I get how that's a massive thing for you all because of the cost of developing that Hermatite and -- and all of that. It's -- it's -- it's a big deal. But for me it's not enough of a motivation to say, okay, we are -- we are okay with just having this exist the way it is with all the ratios and completely discounting what it is that we have in our comp plan and our code. That being said, I -- I know you all have

probably gone through, you know, who knows how many different versions of this and designs and whatnot of this and I agree with Commissioner Smith that if there is any sense of getting just a little bit more creativity with it, that that would be a benefit. So, I just wanted to make those comments to you before we close the public hearing in case there is any questions that you have.

Lorcher: We haven't taken public testimony yet, so -- thank you. And, then, we will open it to public testimony and if we have anymore questions we will -- we will go from there. Okay? Thanks. Madam Clerk, do we have anybody signed up to testify?

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. We have Pauline Skeggs.

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

Skeggs: My name is Pauline Skeggs. I live at 259 West Norwich. I live in the Stapleton Subdivision.

Lorcher: Okay.

Skeggs: Okay. And I just had a couple of concerns. One with the noise and one with the traffic. I understand that the three -- the two and three story buildings will be -- when you walk -- fourth -- they just did fourth on our subdivision. It's fourth stage. Okay. They are all patio homes. They are all senior citizens. We look at our backyard. That's the empty lot. So, if they build those apartments right up on us -- three -- two and three story, that's going to be an issue for us. You know, we are concerned with the -- with the noise. I don't know if somebody's did a study on -- you know, a noise study on the impact of humans -- more specifically senior citizens and also if they are going to put a barrier that's going to protect our subdivision from their buildings and what they are going to build over in that lot, because a lot of the seniors have problems with sleep right now and if it's really noisy it's going to make it worse. They didn't tell me that when I bought my house a couple months ago. They just told me that it would probably be a grocery store that's going to be built there. Commercial. And I'm like okay. But that's why when I first saw the sign I'm like -- I better go see what they are going to do, because they told me a grocery store --

Lorcher: Right.

Skeggs: -- and now it's more than that. The second thing is the traffic situation. It is really bad. It is not only peak times, morning and evenings, Meridian Road is constantly full. It reminds me -- I moved here in '95. It reminds me how Eagle Road is now. Okay. They are building a Costco on Lake Hazel and Meridian Road. Okay. It's almost done. That's going to cause traffic to be even more than it is now. So, I don't know if they did a traffic study on the impact. Now if they build these 302 units and all these commercials and grocery stores and everything it's difficult to get out of our subdivision right now. That's going to impact us again. The other side of Stapleton is where the young families live, which is fine, they are probably fine with it, but, unfortunately, where they build the

fourth stage is all senior citizens. Those are our houses right across that lot and that's when I said, wait a minute, I got to go listen to what they are going to say, because I was under the impression it was just going to be like a commercial grocery store and I saw your little sign and said better go check it out, so -- so, that -- that's basically the noise and the traffic.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much.

Perreault: Madam Chair, I have a question.

Lorcher: Oh, Pauline.

Perreault: Did you get invitations to this neighborhood meetings?

Skeggs: No, I didn't. But one of the residents across the street, my neighbor did the last meeting, because we -- we kind of citizens -- ladies that are widows we kind of meet monthly and she said she had a little postcard and she said, oh, they had -- they had a meeting. We didn't -- I didn't go. And I'm like I didn't get anything. I didn't get anything this time as well. I just saw your big sign when you leave our subdivision there is a big sign saying that there is going to be a meeting on -- on -- tonight at 6:00 p.m. at City Hall.

Lorcher: And how long have you lived in your house?

Skeggs: I have lived there six months.

Lorcher: Six months. So, it may have -- it may have been before you moved in.

Perreault: Okay.

Lorcher: It was the neighborhood meeting in February? Yeah. So --

Skeggs: And most of the city -- this -- it was the -- like I said the fourth phase is all senior citizens. It's patio homes. And I have lived there six months and the majority of the people have moved in in that section.

Lorcher: Right.

Skeggs: After me.

Lorcher: Right. Okay. Thank you.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, we have Sandy Griffith.

Griffith: I'm Sandy Griffith and I live at 223 -- three -- Norich -- two houses down from Pauline. In the backyards -- my backyard faces that whole field and we have half fences in the back. On the sides we have a full fence. So, my safety level is going to go way down when people are out there and people are looking in my house and the noise level

-- like she said we are divorcees, widows, all, you know, retired people and the noise level will be in the traffic and to go out of our division there on Stapleton you can't go right -- you can't go left. You have to go right. I have to go up to that light and make a U-turn to go into town.

Lorcher: Yeah.

Griffith: Or go all the way through the division and go clear out to Victory to go out at a light. So, traffic -- and every ambulance that comes from Kuna comes down there and the big traffic jams at that light when the school bus was wrecked is right there in that intersection. Yeah.

Lorcher: Okay.

Griffith: It will be a hardship.

Lorcher: All right. Thank you very much.

Griffith: Thank you.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, we have Monty Palmer.

Lorcher: Hi. If you can state your name and address for the record, please.

Palmer: Hello. Monty Palmer. 3800 South Meridian.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Palmer: So, I have just been observing that development for a long time, even back in '19 -- just -- I know the plan for it. I think the widening of the road there to have access on Meridian, you know, and Amity is huge for that area, because if you try to pull into the -- like the Victory Greens right now there is a right-in, right-out where that old barn -- you know, where the building is and the business is, which is just crazy to try to turn out of there. It's okay turning in, but to try to turn out it's -- it's ridiculous. I don't -- is it crazy to think that -- that Hawkins Companies is trying to encourage people to like walk and stroll to go to the -- you know, to move within the development? Because it's -- like the gentleman was saying, the -- the lack of activity -- outdoor activity is -- I don't think it's unreasonable to walk and stroll and maybe find your way through -- you know, take a different path to get to whatever you are wanting to go to. That -- it's -- like I said, it's just the Costco obviously knows that there is a huge growth is going out there. Everything is moving that way, so -- so, to accommodate the -- the widening of Meridian and -- and -- and Amity and to even be, you know, a forerunner in that, is -- is I think very important to the community. I think like the -- the women were saying with their houses backing up to the -- you know, the multi-family, that's -- I'm not -- I'm not sure exactly the buffer zone or how much space is between there or, you know, what that needs to happen, but -- yeah. It's -- I just don't think it's unreasonable to -- to see a development that -- that spans Amity

Road that is able to, like I said, accommodate foot traffic and encourage activity offside of motorized vehicles, but --

Lorcher: Okay.

Palmer: Yeah, it's -- it's definitely needed. Something's definitely needed for there.

Lorcher: All right. Thank you very much.

Lomeli: There is a gentleman raising his hand. Go ahead.

Lorcher: Good evening. If you can state your name and address for the record.

Percy: My name is Jim Percy. I own the land that lays to the south of the southwest corner of this project.

Lorcher: Okay.

Percy: I have been farming it for over 45 years. If we can pull up -- I believe it's 19 on the --

Lorcher: The slide show?

Percy: It's the before and after. Yes. The current situation where you see the before, we have a lot of green areas and my farm lays to that southwest corner -- to the south of that. That is under a preliminary plat for Allure Subdivision. We have single-family homes that border that. There is 13 homes that will be against that right back-to-back. When you see the new project there seems to be a lot less green area and the apartments are longer taking up more space. This is the third plan we have seen on this project and the first one we downsized it to which you see the old. We were was able to agree with that simply because of the common green area that's in there. It's about as good as we can hope for for their project and it worked for us. I would like to see that remain the old project, rather than new project, simply because it's -- they are three stories, just like we have seen right here -- the other testimonies, three stories versus single family homes and not only the -- the stories, the elevation of the ground is higher than what my farm is. So, there is going to be an additional elevation. You know, I'm not sure just how the final grade will all work out, but that is my concern on that.

Lorcher: Do you know if the houses that are being built along the -- the -- the edge of this, are they single story or -- or double or two story homes or a mixture of both?

Percy: That's going to be up to the developer.

Lorcher: Developer. Okay.

Percy: Yes.

Lorcher: Okay. All right. Thank you for your comments. I appreciate it.

Percy: Thank you.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, we have Daisy Brooks, but I don't see anybody else in Chambers. I'm not sure who that is.

Lorcher: Okay. And there is nobody online, so --

Lomeli: Correct. No one else is signed up and no one else is online.

Lorcher: All right. Ethan, you want to come back and address some of the comments, please.

Mansfield: Madam Chair, I would love to. Thanks for having me. Just a quick note on the north side here adjacent to Stapleton. We actually spent a lot of time ensuring that the multi-family buildings were positioned in such a way that would only would -- would very -- as minimally as possible influence anyone in the Stapleton Subdivision. You can see that it's kind of oriented at an angle, so you don't really even have the windows on the end of the building or the windows on the side of the building really looking directly down at those yards. You know, Lyra Street is going to be, you know, like a -- I think it's a 50 -- what is it, like 60 foot wide collector strip is -- like that's the right of way dedication for the collector. It's only that narrow in one spot and other than that you have large amounts of green space. In addition to Lyra Street right of way buffering, we also put our clubhouse over there. Single story building. Finally, you know, if you actually look at traffic generation of commercial developments relative to multi-family, commercial drives a lot more traffic. So, we can expect on Lyra Street for -- for only minimal commercial traffic to be going through there. You know, you have to drive down Solaris Avenue just to get into the commercial development, so we think that's -- most of the commercial traffic is going to concentrate on Amity and Meridian. Finally, you know, the whole intent of this mixed-use area is to reduce trips by creating trip capture. This happens whether people like to admit it or not -- you know, I'm not going to go from building B1 -- I'm not going to drive my vehicle on any public roads to get to any of these pads on the southern end here. It would be -- it would take me longer to get out of my parking space, get onto a public road, drive down the public road, turn into the parking lot and park in the commercial parking lot than it would be for me to walk. You know, similarly, we can make the same case for -- for this; right? Like we are not going to get on Meridian Road, we are not going to get on Amity Road, because you would have to drive around a mile block; right? That -- that would just be silly. So, instead, I'm going to take my Lime scooter, I'm going to walk or jump on my bike and I'm going to cruise up, even if I'm going to the stuff on the north side from the far south, I might jump in my car, but that car will not enter an arterial road. It will cross one, maybe on Amity, but, you know, we are not generating arterial road trips. Like it's in -- literally anyone who is walking from -- or traveling from any residential area in this development to any commercial area in this development will not be traveling on an arterial road or state highway. It would just be minutes of delay,

half an hour of delay sometimes a day to -- to get through. So, you know, that -- that's not an option. I mean that doesn't -- it will not occur. So, because of that, if you think about minimizing trips, increasing trips captured, minimizing trips on arterial, the correct move here from a policy perspective is to max out the density. As many people as will fit comfortably here will reduce the amount of trips on the arterial roadway. The demand for housing in Meridian won't change based on the number of units we put on this development. What will change is the number of people who live within this development who can access services by walking, biking, scooting. I love Lime scooters, by the way. By scooting or -- or even traveling by vehicle on a collector road. So, just something to bear in mind as we are thinking about residential densities, as we are thinking about what's appropriate here as far as how much density; right? Eighteen units an acre is low by multi-family standards. Most of Hawkins residential developments, garden style residential developments are between 20 and 27 units per acre. Just for context. And that's because we have added so much additional green space, open space to this plan and that's what we want, because we want it to be livable. But we -- we can't -- I will say it right now. We have spent 1.3 million dollars on site plans and traffic studies on this site. We are getting a little bit of deal fatigue on this. You know, we have tried to really coordinate with staff and we have -- we have gotten here. So, just want to give you guys some context there. I think, you know, separate from the importance of STARS it's still important for this community to have a successful commercial development; right? If you put another layer of commercial buildings deep -- buried deep in this multi-family on the southwest corner, you are just going to have vacant commercial space -- or vacant office space, you know, and -- and that's not good for us. It's not good for the community, because it doesn't generate tax revenue. It's not a valuable thing. So, value is good for everybody. It's not just good for the developer. It's good for the community. And, then, finally, you know, just one more thing about ground floor commercial spaces. Again, goes back to population density. If you think about the success of ground floor commercial spaces in downtown Boise, for example, it's important to remember that there are -- you know, at last time I checked there were 50,000 jobs -- 55,000 jobs in downtown Boise and so that's why there is ground floor retail, 55,000 daytime, and, then, you add all the people who live down there, which is I think probably eight to ten thousand; right? So, you got 60,000 people milling around down there, moseying around, population density is critical to creating conditions for ground floor retail to be successful. And, historically, in post-zoning America, we don't see that level of population density, because communities don't support that level of density and so when you think about buildings in pre-zoning America -- not -- sorry. Again, we got to get a beer and talk about this, Commissioner Smith. But I think about this all the time. We -- when you -- we are allowed to build big tall buildings, that's when you get the ground floor retail, when there is 50,000 jobs surrounding your community, but that's the only time it works. That's the only way it works, you know. Here in Meridian it's starting to work a little bit. Like Voodoo is awesome. But it can't support a whole, you know, city of that. So, you know, as a very passionate city builder myself, I think about this stuff daily and I have seen -- as a former planner I have seen the planning side. As working for a development company I'm seeing the development side and I guess I can just say like I would love to walk you guys through this development when it gets built and show you around. I'm excited for it. I want it to happen. So, with that I will stand for any questions. Thanks.

Lorcher: For the development to the south where the buildings have -- have changed shape and having more exposure to the single family homes that are going to be on the other side, have you and your team discussed that at all based on your new presentation?

Mansfield: Madam Chair, we learned of that earlier this week. Just as a note, these are both three-story buildings, so the buildings are slightly longer. We don't -- you know, this isn't really to scale. This is for like illustrative purposes only. So, you know, we -- we could look at how long the buildings are. I mean we -- again, we don't know -- I mean we would have to go back and look if we -- see if we can absorb additional decreases in density. I don't know if that's -- you know, I mean we can look at it, but there is absolutely no guarantees that losing density would absolutely only make the project harder to accomplish.

Lorcher: Right.

Mansfield: Yeah.

Lorcher: And it looks like you might have some topography issues. I don't -- he said his property is lower elevation then -- yours is going to be higher. So, a three would be even higher than the other. But something to take into consideration for the -- the south neighbors, so -- any other questions or comments for Ethan?

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: So, the commercial that's on the south side, is there not -- or has there not been another -- I don't want to say anchor tenant, because you are not going to get another big tenant in there, but -- but another, you know, business that would draw more, so that you can add more commercial to that or is it -- is that just too much for the entire area in general?

Mansfield: Madam Chair, Commissioner Perreault, that's a great question. You know, when we design the breakout of, you know, how much commercial space do we want to develop here, we look at all sorts of stuff. We look at absorption, market trends, rent per square foot. We settled on this, because we thought that this is what would be -- what would work here given the amount of frontage, given the visibility and just generally the amount of space and you are absolutely right, you know, that was my first question is like, well, why don't we just put another little commercial center down here? There is just not demand for a second anchor down there; right? It's still -- this is still on the edge of -- it's not in the middle of town; right? You know. But what we need to do is be providing services for people who do live and will continue to live out here and so, yeah, we looked at it. This is the right amount of commercial we feel to serve the surrounding area and be able to synergize with the center on the north side. We can't have the double layer pads. It just -- it just doesn't -- doesn't rent well and, therefore, could remain empty.

Perreault: Even given the traffic that Costco will bring, Kuna, all of that, it's still -- it's still not working, huh?

Mansfield: Yeah. I mean we -- we continue to look -- Madam Chair, Commissioner Perreault, we -- we continue to kind of monitor that and we just -- we just don't think there is quite enough -- just not enough draw there at that point yet.

Lorcher: Any other comments before we close the public hearing? All right. Ethan, thank you very much.

Mansfield: Thank you so much.

Lorcher: May I get a motion to close the public hearing, please?

Smith: So moved.

Gelsomino: Seconded.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Ethan, the second -- that -- it's not a conflict of interest. You know, I would love -- love to grab a beer and chat about this. I think to a larger point what -- what really I struggle with about this project is separating my would be legislative hat from kind of the judicial role that we serve. There is a part of me that looks at this corridor and says, you know, honestly, like a lot of this product would be great here and, you know, maybe we can kind of just, you know, make it work and fudge it a little bit and -- and it's close enough and -- you know. And that may be where City Council ends up with, you know, kind of the -- the hat that they wear, the far more expensive hat. I just -- I just don't think the integration of uses is there for what this future land use and for what this zoning asks for and I think that if there was a world where this came to us as a rezone and they were able to justify that rezone and approach that, this is -- you know -- you know, high density residential and retail, I -- I might be able to get there. But, again, that's a different conversation with a different set of staff analysis and different implications there. I -- you know, I agree on the density issue. Density is not my problem here. I would, honestly, love to see more density here if it was able to make it work in an integrated fashion. This is a really important pair of corners and a really important pair of corridors for south Meridian and so I think this is -- this is really important that we -- that we get it as right as possible and I struggle a lot with kind of, you know, us -- the government telling what the

-- the developer who has done far more market research about what people want, et cetera, to do and what -- what is right. But in the interest of the city and in kind of what City Council set forward of -- of the vision, I just don't think that -- that this -- this complies with that. And, again, it's -- you know, I agree. I think a post-zoning world is interesting. Every once in a while look at what's going on in Houston I think is really cool, but -- but that's not the -- the place that we are at right now. So, you know, again, I think this is an argument that the applicant can make to City Council, because they wear a different hat than we do, but from a Planning and Zoning Commission perspective I don't think I can support this. I really appreciate what they are trying to do and I appreciate the overall value that this would provide for the city, but I think it -- it is not aligned with what the plan calls for regarding integration of uses specifically for pedestrians and for non -- non-vehicle users. So, again, separating what -- you know, I really want to be able to support this. I really want to be able to like this and put this Commission's kind of hat behind it, but I just don't think we can from the lens of the hat that we wear for those reasons.

Lorcher: I agree as well. There were two things that you had said. A quasi-public park, which was on the -- the south side, but as a person driving down Amity or Highway 69, I would -- I would never stop there, because it seems like it's just for that particular community and I can't tell if you have re -- you realigned where the -- the pool was on the -- the south side, but you have to go through two parking lots and past three buildings in order to get to the pool if I'm living in one of those apartment buildings and that seems -- like where you have your public park I -- I would rather see the pool there, because, then, it's kind of in the middle of all the buildings, not all the way at the top by the commercial. I a hundred percent agree that everything on Highway 69 and everything on Amity Road needs to be commercial. I a hundred percent agree that there should be a grocery store there. That's actually a great thing, because I think the long-term goal for the City of Meridian is have people who live on south of 84 to live, work and play there, because, then, you have less trips going back and forth. The Costco is going to be a great addition and I think the way they are working with it is that's going to have its own drive aisle to get in and out. Hopefully, getting people off of Highway 69, so that it doesn't create that bottleneck of people turning in and out, like we do see on Ten Mile and Chinden more often than not with the Costco up there. The convenient pedestrian experience is there if you are on your side. So, I can't get past Amity Road being a major arterial road dividing this project into two. I cannot see -- and, you know, through the lens of our code and -- and the city this being one project because of that. Although I understand a hundred percent that you want to be able to take advantage of the STARS program with, ITD so it needs to be and if it needs to be, then, it needs to either be rezoned not mixed use community or something else that still gives you the ability to be able to take advantage of that program, but in a way that works. And, then, finally, you know, where people will be taking the interior roads to this absolutely, but like Pauline and Sandy said, they are not going to walk to the grocery store. They are going to end up driving, because in the winter time it's going to be too dangerous and if you have a senior community at the north side of your project all of those seniors are going to have to find different ways of transportation and it's not going to be walking and I don't know what kind of community is going to be to the south of you, but if there is more patio homes and that -- and that's great that they don't have to get on Amity or Highway 69. They can take

interior roads to be able to do that. But there is going to be less walking than -- than you think, especially people who live on the ground floor. So, with that in mind I also cannot support this, although I think it is needed and what you have here is -- it's some version of this. It's just not this version. The grocery store is fantastic. The outer pads are fantastic along Amity to get that trip capture, to be able to make those sales, to be able to -- be able to do all those road improvements are key. Having those tall buildings next to patio homes and single family homes is a little problematic, but if you were just learning about those projects now, then, this design might change a little bit. Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Madam Chair, I agree with everything you said. I couldn't have said it better. There is absolutely need. I have no opposition to the -- the concept as a whole and -- and the businesses that you would like to go there. I really want to say yes to this, but as Commissioner Smith shared, that's not -- our goal is not to necessarily do the big picture, you know, approval of this. I -- I just -- I want to say to you as a -- as a main player in this area and in general that the idea that residents will stay within their mixed-use area to access their services is -- is not really a proven thing; right? Like we -- so, I was not a decision maker in the District at Ten Mile. Personally I think that if you have high-end employment in an area that folks probably aren't going to live in the apartments that are in that, they are going to live in a four-bedroom house in a subdivision, because they are making enough in a high employment area to not live in the apartments. So, I don't always assume that the residents of that are going to use the services that are going to come into that. You know, I doubt that folks that are living in an apartment are going to, you know -- they are going to -- patron a plastic surgeon's office that might be in the office building; right? I mean just -- just like we -- we kind of have to take -- we kind of have to take the idea that folks are going to be using these services that are here that they are actually going to want those services. So -- so, when it comes to conversations about pedestrian access and internal and external, I'm always kind of keeping in mind the fact that -- and we can get all into the numbers of who is staying in and -- you know, who is -- the trip capture and -- and all of that, but we don't even know if those residents are actually going to use whatever ends up going in there. So, I just want to keep that in mind as we are having that conversation, too, because it is a -- you know, we are talking about design in terms of pedestrian activity and -- and flow of this, but that's making a lot of assumptions about the residents actually using these services and these services, with the exception of -- of the grocer, may not even be at the financial level that residents who live in an apartment are going to be able to use. That's just the reality of it. So, that's just my two cents on that.

Gelsomino: Madam --

Lorcher: Commissioner Gelsomino.

Gelsomino: Madam Chair, there is nothing further that I can add that has not been said already.

Lorcher: Okay. Are you drafting something here?

Smith: Yeah. Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend denial to the City Council of File No. H-2025-0007 as presented the staff report due to a lack of adequate multi-modal interconnectivity and the lack -- lack of functional integration between the different uses, particularly regarding quasi-public spaces and I guess that multi-modal interconnectivity as well.

Gelsomino: Seconded.

Lorcher: It's been moved and second to deny Item No. H-2025-0007, Syringa Crossing. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.