

**Meridian Planning and Zoning Meeting**

**June 3, 2021.**

Meeting of the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission of June 3, 2021, was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chairman Rhonda McCarvel.

Members Present: Chairman Rhonda McCarvel, Commissioner Bill Cassinelli, Commissioner Andrew Seal, Commissioner Steven Yearsley, Commissioner Maria Lorcher and Commissioner Nate Wheeler.

Members Absent: Nick Grove.

Others Present: Adrienne Weatherly, Ted Baird, Bill Parsons, Sonya Allen, Joe Dodson, Alan Tiefenbach and Dean Willis.

**ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nate Wheeler	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Maria Lorcher
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Andrew Seal	<input type="checkbox"/> Nick Grove
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Steven Yearsley	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bill Cassinelli
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rhonda McCarvel - Chairman	

McCarvel: Okay. Good evening. Welcome to the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting for June 3rd, 2021. Commissioners who are present for this evening's meeting are at City Hall and on Zoom. We also have staff and the city attorney and clerk's offices, as well as the City Planning Department. If you're joining us on Zoom this evening we can see that you are here. You may be able to 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 a process question during the meeting please e-mail [cityclerk@meridiacity.org](mailto:cityclerk@meridiacity.org) and they will reply as quickly as possible. If you simply want to watch the meeting this evening we encourage you to watch the streaming on the city's YouTube channel. You can access it at [meridiacity.org/live](http://meridiacity.org/live). And with that let's begin with roll call.

**ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

McCarvel: Thank you. First item on the agenda is the adoption of the agenda. We have several items this evening that will be opened only for the sole purpose of continuing and I will -- we will try to move those to the front of the agenda. Items H-2021-0033, Top Golf, requests continuance to June 17th. H-2021-0015, Woodcrest Townhomes, requests continuance to July 1st. And 2021-0030, Popeye's Drive-Through requests continuance to June 17th. We will move those to the top of the agenda. So, with that could I get a motion to adopt the agenda as amended.

Seal: So moved.

Cassinelli: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to adopt the agenda. All those in favor say aye. Opposed. Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

### **CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]**

- 1. Approve Minutes of the May 20, 2021 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting**
- 2. Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for Gem Prep South (H-2021-0020) by Paradigm Design, Located Approximately 1/8 of a Mile East of S. Locust Grove Rd., on the South Side of E. Lake Hazel Rd.**

McCarvel: Next item on the agenda is the Consent Agenda and we have two items on the Consent Agenda. We have approval of minutes for the May 20th, 2021, P&Z meeting and Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for Gem Prep South, H-2021-0020. Could I get a motion to adopt -- to accept the Consent Agenda?

Seal: So moved.

Cassinelli: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to adopt the Consent Agenda. All those in favor say aye. All those opposed. Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

### **ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]**

McCarvel: So, at this time I will briefly explain the public hearing process. We will open each item individually and begin with the staff report. The 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 to present their case and respond to staff comments. They will have 15 minutes to do so. After the applicant has finished we will open the floor to public testimony. Each person will be called on only once during public testimony. The Clerk will call the names individually of those who have signed in on our website in advance to testify. You will, then, be unmuted. Please 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 our Clerk will run the presentation. If you have established that you're speaking on behalf of a larger group, like an HOA where

others from that group will not be speaking, you will have up to ten minutes. After all of those who have signed up in advance have spoken we will invite others who may wish to testify. If you wish to speak on a topic you may press the raise hand button on the Zoom app or if you are listening on the phone, please, press star nine and wait for your name to be called. If you're listening on multiple devices, a computer and a phone, for example, please be sure to mute those extra devices, so we don't experience feedback and we can hear you clearly. When you're finished if the Commission does not have questions for you, you will be muted and no longer have the ability to speak. Please remember we will not call on you a second time. After all testimony has been heard the applicant will be given another ten minutes to come back and respond. When the applicant has finished responding to questions and concerns we will close the public hearing the Commissioners will have the opportunity to discuss and hopefully be able to make final decisions or recommendations to the City Council as needed. And we have -- I guess I do have a question for legal as a point of procedure. Can we move action items four, five, and seven to the top of the agenda as requested in front of Item No. 3 or do we want to do Item No. 3 first?

Baird: Madam Chair, with the adoption of the agenda and the mention of moving those up, I interpreted that to do them now before you take that action item, so that anybody who was here for those items couldn't find the next date for continuance.

## **ACTION ITEMS**

- 4. Public Hearing for Topgolf (H-2021-0033) by Arco/Murray, Located at 948 S. Silverstone Way**
  - A. Request: Conditional Use Permit for an outdoor recreation facility on 11.56 acres of land in a C-G zoning district to include extended hours of operation from 8:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m., seven days a week, abutting a residential zoning district.

McCarvel: Sure. Perfect. Thank you. So, with that we will open Item H-2021-0033, Top Golf. They are requesting continuance to June 17th. I believe that was a posting issue. Do we have any other comments from staff on that? Okay. Could I get a motion to continue H-2021-0033 to June 17th?

Yearsley: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: I move that we continue file number H-2021-0033, Top Golf, to June 17th, 2021.

Seal: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to continue Item H-2021-0033, Top Golf, to June 17th. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

**5. Public Hearing for Woodcrest Townhomes (H-2021-0015) by Blaine A. Womer Civil Engineering, Located at 1789 N. Hickory Way**

- A. Request: Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map to change the future land use designation on 2+/- acres of land from the Commercial to the Medium High-Density Residential designation.
- B. Request: Rezone of 2.10 acres of land from the L-O (Limited Office) to the R-15 (Medium High-Density Residential) zoning district.

McCarvel: Thank you for all who wanted to testify on that. We'll see you June 17th. Next item being opened is H-2021-0015, Woodcrest Townhomes. They are requesting a continuance to the meeting July 1st. Do we have any other comments from staff on this application?

Dodson: Madam Chair, not that I am aware, but that's not my project. I don't know if Bill has more comments on that.

McCarvel: Okay.

Yearsley: Madam Chair?

Parsons: Nothing from staff at this point.

McCarvel: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: I think they were talking about not having a -- I don't know if we have a quorum identified for July 1st.

McCarvel: Yes, we do.

Yearsley: Okay.

McCarvel: Yeah. Can I get a motion to continue Item H-2021-0015, Woodcrest Townhomes, to July 1st?

Wheeler: So moved.

Seal: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to continue Item H-2021-0015, Woodcrest Townhomes. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

**7. Public Hearing for Popeyes Drive-Through (H-2021-0030) by Erik Wylie of JRW Construction, LLC, Located at 6343 N. Linder Rd.**

- A. Request: Conditional Use Permit for a drive-through establishment within 300-feet of an existing drive-through on 1.0 acres of land in the C-G zoning district.

McCarvel: Next item, H-2021-0030, Popeye's Drive-Through is being opened and would like to continue to June 17th. Do we have any other comments from staff?

Dodson: Madam Chair, only that I put the reasoning at the top of the outline for all of you. Other than that no other comments.

McCarvel: Okay.

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Yes.

Seal: Move to continue file number H-2021-0030, Popeye's Drive-Through to June 17th, 2021.

Cassinelli: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to move Item H-2021-0030 to June 17th. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

**COMMUNITY ITEMS [ACTION ITEMS]**

**3. Resolution No. PZ-21-03: A Resolution of the Planning and Zoning Commission for the City of Meridian, Idaho, Validating Conformity of the Second Amendment to the Meridian Revitalization Plan with the City of Meridian's Comprehensive Plan**

McCarvel: All right. Back to the next Item No. 3. This is resolution number PZ-21-03, which does -- is not open for public testimony, but we have presentation from staff.

Cleary: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. This is Planning and Zoning Resolution 21-03, validating conformity of the second amendment to the

Meridian Revitalization Plan with the city's Comprehensive Plan. This is basically a procedural requirement pursuant to Idaho statute, but I will go ahead and provide some context for this item. The original Meridian Revitalization District is due to sunset in 2026. This is the first of several urban renewal actions that will come before you this year. These actions will enable the Meridian Development Corporation, the city's urban renewal agency, to continue its efforts in the downtown core and extend those efforts further north spurring additional private investment in our downtown. This second amendment provides for de-annexation of two specific areas within this existing district. The first is a 1.5 acre area identified in your packet as Attachment A and referred to as the Idaho Block. Ultimately this area will be annexed into the existing union district, which was established last year. The second area is a larger 77.1 acre area identified as Attachment B in your packet and referred to as the Northern Gateway. These properties, along with several other properties that are not currently in any urban renewal district, will ultimately be included in a proposed new district called the Northern Gateway District. The amendment to the Union District plan and the Urban Renewal Plan for the Northern Gateway District will come before you later this year. Those will include a more detailed analysis as to the conformity of those plans with the city's Comprehensive Plan. Because there is no proposed new Urban Renewal Plan, zoning change or proposed development associated with this particular amendment before you this evening, it is, therefore, still in compliance with the city's comp plan. Following your action this evening this plan amendment will move forward to the City Council for approval of an ordinance ultimately adopting this second amendment. As stated this is a required procedural action. Staff recommends approval of Resolution 21-03 and also MDC is represented virtually this evening, as is legal counsel, and if they want to add any remarks for clarification or answer any questions you might have.

McCarvel: Okay. Madam Clerk, do we have anyone on Zoom wishing to make comments at this time from --

Weatherly: Madam Chair, we do have Meghan Conrad on the line. Meghan, you have the ability to unmute yourself if you would like to add a few words.

Conrad: Thank you, Commissioners. Meghan Conrad. Elam & Burke. 251 East Front Street. Thank you so much for having me here today. I think city staff did an excellent job of setting the stage as to what is coming down the pike. Just procedurally I hope I can fill in a few blanks here. We are -- this timeline to get these parcels out of the existing -- what is referred to as the downtown district and in order to get the value back on the tax rolls really does need to be done by the fourth -- excuse me -- in the fourth Monday in July and there are a number of steps in this process. Following your consideration of the resolution here today, there are three readings of the ordinance, the 22nd, the 6th, and the 13th of July and, then, there is a number of post-adoption transmittals that occur after that time. So, working against that fourth Monday of July deadline really is critical path to getting those values back on the tax rolls. Second, as city staff indicated, there will be further actions taken with regard to discussion of amending the Union District plan to add in what's referred to as the Idaho Block, as well as the formation of a new project area, which includes the de-annexed parcels that are referred to as the Northern Gateway. So,

with that happy to answer any -- any questions or concerns from this body and, again, thank you so much for having me here today.

McCarvel: Thank you, Meghan. Any questions for the presenters this evening? Okay. Any other discussion, anyone, or could I get a motion to approve resolution number PZ-21-03.

Seal: Madam Chair, just quick -- are we recommending approval. We aren't approving; correct?

McCarvel: We are approving and, then, it goes further through the process to City Council.

Cassinelli: We are the deciding body on -- on the de-annexation?

McCarvel: Go ahead.

Baird: Madam Chair and Members of the Commission, in answer to your question, you are not deciding on the de-annexation. What you are doing is -- is making a finding that the de-annexation is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The -- the memo in your packet and the resolution itself outline that and, then, as both Meghan and Tori mentioned, there will be City Council ordinances that will -- the City Council will approve the de-annexation and within those ordinances it will note that this came before you and you passed this resolution and you are finding as required by the statute that it's consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. So, you're just a little piece of the big pie. Not to belittle you.

Cassinelli: But we can hold it up.

Baird: You could, but we would really like to see you take action on it this evening.

Cassinelli: So, we are a pretty big part of the pie.

Seal: Just the first part. I'll take a stab at this, Madam Chair.

McCarvel: Okay. Go ahead.

Seal: After hearing all staff, applicant, and public testimony I move to approve resolution number PZ-21-03 as presented in staff -- well, as presented by staff for the hearing date of June 3rd, 2021.

Yearsley: I will second that.

McCarvel: I have a motion to -- and a second to approve Resolution No. PZ-21-03. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Cleary: Thank you.

**6. Public Hearing for Meridian Middle School Cafeteria Addition (H-2021-0032) by Lombard Conrad Architects, Located at 1507 W. 8th St.**

- A. Request: Conditional Use Permit request for an approximate 7,525 square foot addition to the existing Meridian Middle School cafeteria.

McCarvel: Next in the middle of our agenda here we will actually open and hear the staff report for H-2021-0032, the Meridian Middle School Cafeteria Addition.

Tiefenbach: Good evening, Planning Commission. Alan Tiefenbach, associate planner with the City of Meridian. I think this will be relatively brief, unless you want me to go on at length. This is a proposal for a conditional use permit. The property is just a little shy of 37 acres, zoned R-4. It's located on Northwest 8th Street, which is in between Linder and Meridian. To the north is office zoned property. East, south, and west are all existing single family residents. There was a -- so -- so, what this is -- this is a conditional use permit to allow a 7,500 square foot addition to the Meridian Middle School. Real quick history of why we are here. So, Meridian Middle School campus consists of seven buildings totaling about 186,000 square feet. The first building started in 1969. In February of this year a representative came in to talk to staff about putting in a 7,500 square foot addition to the north side of the cafeteria building. You can see that here on the site plans that I have put up. This proposed addition -- basically it's going to be a vestibule. It's going to connect the cafeteria to the auditorium and the main classroom building. Some of the things that are going to be included are additional cafeteria space, a new kitchen and IT room, renovations to the choir room and some restrooms. When we were doing the pre-app we told the applicant that a public education institution is allowed in the R-4 zoning district by a conditional use. However, a conditional use has never been done for this school. So, this is really to address the as built conditions and to keep from getting snagged up in the future if the school wants to do any additional improvements. Again, the site plans have been included and shows what the external improvements are. I put a little bubble there, so you can see where it is. There was also a landscape plan. That was submitted. There is going to be two trees that are removed, but they are going to be putting in seven trees. Other than that, if you read our code it says that if you're doing additions of less than 25 percent there is no additional landscaping required. So, they are actually putting in a little more landscaping than they are required to. Here are the architectural elevations. What's existing is comprised of CMU, fiber cement, blue metal paneling and blue standing seam roofs. This -- oh, sorry. This is the new addition here is this little piece right here. That's looking from the north to the south and here is what you would see if you are inside the campus looking towards the north. This here is the addition. The applicant has submitted for a certificate of zoning compliance concurrently -- concurrently with this. So, if this conditional use is approved staff can release the CZC, so that the applicant can pull the building permit. The only two recommendations that staff had on this one is that Public Works commented that it looks



like there is an existing light pole on the school district within one of our sewer easements. The way this could be remedied is that the applicant could move the -- a manhole in the parking lot and we have showed the applicant which one it would be -- move it slightly to the east and, then, rededicate that easement. It would pull -- basically you would be re-shifting the easement and pulling the light pole out of that. That was the first condition. The second condition is that -- I can back up and show you. There is a very large parking lot here. Only some of it is striped. What the applicant has showed is 318 parking spaces, but actually what they are required per the code is 483. Quite a few more than -- than what they have shown here now. Staff believes a lot of this could be striped. Again, you have got pretty much a blank parking lot. So, staff's other recommendation would be that the school would stripe this parking lot to meet the code and with that staff will conclude our presentation, unless you have any questions or comments.

McCarvel: Okay. Any questions for staff? Okay.

Cassinelli: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Yes.

Cassinelli: You did say that with striping that lot that they would have plenty of parking?

Tiefenbach: I think the applicant can address that, but they -- I'm sure just random guesstimation on that. It looks like they have got plenty of parking that they would actually stripe that in. Again I will defer to the applicant, if they can actually -- if they have actually done the math on that to figure out if that works or not.

Cassinelli: Okay.

McCarvel: Would the applicant like to come forward?

Raman: Yes. This is Priya Raman. Good evening. This is Priya Raman, senior architect with Lombard Conrad Architects and with reference to the parking striping, we will comply with what is required in the staff report for striping the north parking lot, but given that this is a middle school, most of the students are being dropped off and there is a bus drop off zone as well to the north in that parking lot. Predominantly what that parking -- the lot that you see, the asphalt paved area to the north of the building, is actually a driver's ed is what I'm aware of. Motorcycle driving education is what it is used for when the school is not in session. But when we read through the report that the staff recommended, we have no problems with restriping that parking lot to the north. As for the actual numbers, I am not aware that we can meet the 483. I will have to just go through the striping to figure out if we can meet that or not. But I can assure the Commission that there is plenty of parking available on the site for the existing use and we are not adding any extra student population or trips into the site.

McCarvel: Okay. Thank you. Did you have any other presentation?

Raman: I don't have anything else to share, except for the fact that this is a much needed improvement for the school. This existing facility is severely undersized, both the kitchen footprint and also the seating footprint when compared to the other middle schools and considering that this -- this kitchen is operational throughout the year, it would be a big benefit to the school community to have this addition approved.

McCarvel: Any questions for the applicant or staff? Okay. Oh. Yes, sir.

Tiefenbach: Alan Tiefenbach. I guess my only comment or question is what's required by the -- per the code, good or bad, right, because I understand that most of the kids are being dropped off there. You're probably not going to have 483 cars there. That said the code requires what the code requires. My only pause is that if the condition of approval goes forward as it is, it says that they are going to restripe it per the code, meaning they have to come up with 483 parking spaces. If the Planning Commission wants to decide to tweak the language a little bit to say that the applicant will stripe as many parking spaces as they can and still meet the driver's ed or something, it might give a little more flexibility in the future. Otherwise, staff might have to enforce 483 parking spaces. Does that make sense?

McCarvel: Thank you. Madam Clerk, do we have anybody signed up to testify on this application?

Weatherly: Madam Chair, we do not.

McCarvel: Okay. Is there anybody in the room or on Zoom who has not signed up that would like to testify on this application? Okay. With that could I get a motion to close the public hearing for H-2021-0032.

Yearsley: Madam Chair, before we do that I just have a quick question of staff.

McCarvel: Okay.

Yearsley: It's in the condition to meet that many parking spaces. Can we actually -- because it's looks like it's been working fine the way it is. Can we remove that condition all at once and not require the additional parking spaces or is that something that we just -- by code we have to meet?

Tiefenbach: This is a conditional use. You can remove that. You can add a requirement that the number of parking spaces that exists now is acceptable.

Yearsley: Okay. Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Mr. Seal.

Seal: I will just make a quick comment on there after having my son go to school there that during -- when there was assemblies and things like that that we attended, I would

have very much appreciated that parking lot being striped. So, during school and everything, yeah, absolutely, there is not a lot of need for it. But when there are gatherings there it's -- it gets messy for sure.

Yearsley: Okay.

Parsons: Madam Chair, this is Bill.

McCarvel: Go ahead, Bill.

Parsons: Thank you. Yes, we can -- certainly if the applicant can't get up to that number we can certainly look at something through the alternative compliance process. So, if that's the purview of the Commission to get as many as possible, but maybe not get to that amount per code, then, we can -- I would just add a condition -- either, you know, work with staff on alternative compliance.

McCarvel: Right.

Parsons: Obtain alternative compliance for a parking reduction for the school site.

McCarvel: Yeah.

Parsons: Would be my recommendation.

McCarvel: Work with staff to have as many as reasonably possible.

Parsons: Yeah. We can do that. Again, we can do that staff level with their CZC and design review application that Alan's currently processing. We don't charge the school district any fees for application submittals. They would just have to amend their submittal with an alternative compliance. If they can't meet that, then, we can analyze the parking for the site and I think Alan brings up good points, we -- it's not like it's a high school where you need 1,500 parking stalls, because all the kids are driving, but --

McCarvel: Right.

Parsons: -- certainly it's -- I think more is probably necessary, but I don't know if we are going to get to 400 or not without working with the applicant and them striping it out and letting us know exactly what they can provide on site.

McCarvel: Okay.

Parsons: So, I think we can amend the condition to say provide 800 -- or 480 stalls or apply for alternative compliance, may be the easiest route to go for you tonight.

McCarvel: Okay. Thank you.

Lorcher: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Lorcher.

Lorcher: I was a parent there for six years as well and the way the parking lot is now, without the striping -- and I respect the fact that -- that when there are assemblies it can be a little challenging, but because it mostly is a bus terminal of moving hundreds of kids in -- in and out and the Star group doing their motorcycling, it may -- and -- and they may be just a pay client, you know, they may choose to go someplace else if it doesn't work out. I think striping would probably -- the reason it wasn't done is because the alternative uses for that parking lot throughout the year, the striping would -- would detract from what they are trying to do. So, whether you are a new bus driver and they want to create these lanes or whatever else the -- the number of assemblies that are done at Meridian Middle in a given year are probably ten at best, whereas they are in school for hundreds of days.

McCarvel: Okay. We can open that up in our discussion after we close the public hearing.

Yearsley: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: I move that we close the public hearing on H-2021-0032.

Cassinelli: Second.

Seal: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to close the public hearing H-2021-0032. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

McCarvel: Comments?

Cassinelli: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Cassinelli:

Cassinelli: Can -- can Star and the others that use that lot -- I mean would the striping of stalls interfere with what they are doing? Because -- I don't know. Alan, do you have a comment -- information on that? Or Bill maybe?

Tiefenbach: It might be a question for the applicant. I think that they certainly could stripe this to -- to get more parking spaces in. I'm not sure if they have actually done the logistics to figure out what they need for the bus turnaround. They just basically have a big, unstriped open area that would be available to the applicant, as Bill talked about with the

alternative compliance, because we are processing the CZC right now, so they would have to sort of show us what they need to get the buses in and out, what's the reasonable amount of parking spaces that they could get in there, maybe explain what the hours are, so that they have legitimate parking. They have tons of parking there, it's just not striped.

Cassinelli: Because I mean I have -- I have been to events there before where, you know, you show up to parking it's -- it's crazy, especially for somebody that isn't going there regularly and you are trying to race -- it's just kind of all over the place, upon on curbs and different things, and I don't know what that's like for the residents along 8th Street there on those days.

Dodson: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Yes. Go ahead.

Dodson: Sorry. I know it's not my application, but I run through that parking lot quite a lot, because I live in the area. The Star program uses the east side of this parking lot that we are talking about. Striping the west half -- you can literally see the cones when they have it on -- would not interfere with them from what I can see.

McCarvel: Okay. Yeah. I think if -- we can maybe move it forward by turning it over to the staff and the applicant to work together to stripe it in the best manner possible for bus traffic and additional parking stalls.

Wheeler: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Yes. Commissioner Wheeler.

Wheeler: How many additional spaces are needed, because there are several that are on that east side. So, how many -- if we can ask staff that.

Tiefenbach: On their site plan they identified 318 parking spaces. Per their code they are required to have 483.

McCarvel: Okay.

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: If I were to motion on this I would have the wording basically be that work with staff to get as many parking spaces as possible, without inhibiting its use as a bus drop-off, pickup, as well as ancillary uses, such as the Star class training.

Yearsley: Madam Chair? Madam Chair? I think he is also -- or we can -- or apply for alternative compliance --

Seal: Okay.

Yearsley: -- to reduce the overall number of parking spaces. I think that -- it's just amend that to -- to meet the parking requirements or apply for alternative compliance would be probably just as simple.

McCarvel: Okay. Great. Commissioner Seal?

Seal: Oh. Sorry.

Cassinelli: We are all waiting for you.

Seal: I was going to let you keep going. Okay. So, after considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to approve file number H-2021-0032 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of June 3rd, 2021, with the following modification: That they work with staff to stripe the parking lot with as many parking spaces as possible without inhibiting its use for bus, pickup, drop-off and Star class training, et cetera, or they can apply for alternative compliance to meet the requirement.

Cassinelli: There was also a condition on the easement.

McCarvel: I think that's covered in the staff report.

Cassinelli: Is it?

McCarvel: Yeah.

Cassinelli: Oh. Okay.

McCarvel: As written.

Cassinelli: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to approve H-2021-0032 with modifications. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

**8. Public Hearing for Gramercy Commons (H-2021-0023) by Intermountain Pacific, LLC, Located at 1873, 1925, and 2069 S. Wells Ave.**

- A. Request: Conditional Use Permit for a multi-family development consisting of 164 age-restricted units within a multi-story building with a multi-story parking garage on 5.24 acres of land in the C-G zoning district

McCarvel: Next on the agenda is H-2021-0023, Gramercy Commons, and we will begin with the staff report.

Dodson: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. Now, it's my project. Here we go. The application before you is for a conditional use permit. The site consists of 5.24 acres, zoned C-G, located at 1873 and 1925 and 2069 South Wells Avenue. As you can see on the zoning map and somewhat on the aerial, the north, east -- north and the east have C-G zoning adjacent. To the north of the northern most lot is an existing commercial building. To the east is three parcels, two of them are developed with commercial uses and one of them is undeveloped. To the south is a multi-use pathway and, then, further south of that is TN-R and R-15 zoning districts with -- I believe there is some attached single family, as well as some detached single family in there. To the west is R-4 zoning and Mountain View High School. It was originally annexed in 2006 as part of the Kenai Subdivision, now known as Gramercy Subdivision. And platted following that and the applicant has received, as of last Tuesday, development agreement modification approval from City Council for the proposed concept and conceptually for the use of -- that we are here to discuss tonight. Future land use out here is mixed use regional, as you can see on the map on the left. Rather large area, encompasses a lot of acreage on all four corners of the Eagle and Overland intersection. The applicant tonight is requesting a conditional use permit for a multi-family development consisting of 164 age-restricted units within a multi-story building, as wrapped around a multi-story parking garage on 5.24 acres of land within the C-G zoning district. The three parcels that are part of the application actually make up a total of 6.9 acres, but only a segment of parking lay across the shared property line between the northern most lot and the center lot. The applicant has received City Council approval of their concurrent DA mod as noted, which conceptually approved the site plan development and use. The purpose of this application is to ensure compliance with the specific use standards, UDC 11-4-3-27. The subject project is proposed to be constructed in one phase. Access to the site is proposed via three adjacent drive aisles, one to the north that currently does not exist until the very north of the property as noted. These two drive aisles to the east as well and they do exist currently. ACHD has noted that no improvements are required to any adjacent or nearby public roads and they did not require a TIS, a traffic impact study, because the development is not estimated to generate enough peak hour vehicle trips, despite proposing over one hundred units. ACHD has noted that all adjacent public roads, which would be East Goldstone Street and South 4th Avenue as the closest ones, are overbuilt for their current capacities and capable of handling additional vehicle trips without issue. Therefore, staff is supportive of the proposed development in regards to its transportation impact. All of the departments have also signed off on the proposed development with minimal or no comments, including Fire, Police and Public Works. The site plan depicts a singular multi-level age-restricted -- which would be three and four stories in height, multi-family apartment complex that is wrapped around a parking structure, something we do not have here in the City of Meridian. The parking structure is proposed to contain a majority of the required parking spaces. Around the proposed building the new development plan depicts a drive aisle that -- that circles the entire structure and includes two areas of surface level parking located on the east and north sides of the proposed building and they contain the remaining required parking. The drive

aisle that circles the building is intended to be for Fire and Emergency Services access. As noted, the project is proposed as a wrapped concept, where the vast majority of the parking is contained within the parking structure located in the center of the building or the site, with the apartment units wrapped around it. This design is affectionately known as a Texas donut and allows for a smaller building footprint and more efficient utilization of the -- of the development site overall. Based on the number of bedrooms per unit, which there are 108 one bedroom and 56 two bedroom units, a minimum of 274 parking spaces should be provided, with at least 164 of those spaces covered or within a garage. The applicant is proposing 291 parking spaces, with 220 coverage spaces within the parking garage. The remaining 71 spaces are located around the perimeter as noted. The applicant is, therefore, exceeding the minimum code requirements. I would like to note that they also included guest parking, which is not a current requirement, but a future requirement, so that is part of why they are exceeding their minimum. A minimum of 41,000 square feet of common open space is required per the specific use standards at the ratio of 250 square feet per unit, because each unit is between 500 and 1,200 square feet in size. The applicant has proposed 42,000 square feet of qualified common open space. The proposed open space consists of those areas outlined on the exhibit before you. A plaza along the east side of the building. A pool and pool deck with assorted amenities on the south side. A terrace with fire pits and barbecues and additional seating areas on the west and a pickleball court and community garden along the north side of the building. All of these areas have been verified by size and use to meet the -- meet and exceed the required quality and amount of common open space. Overall, the submitted open space meets the specific use standards and staff finds the proposed open space is adequate for the proposed development, especially when you combine the array of proposed amenities. Furthermore, the subject sites are within a quarter mile of a city park, which is to the south. They are in close proximity to a plaza park that is within the Gramercy Development and the shared park with everybody and directly adjacent to a regional pathway, which does go across the southern boundary -- or adjacent to the southern boundary. All of these factors present more than adequate open space and recreational opportunities for future residents. As noted, the proposed open space contains all of the amenities, which to be more specific on what I had before, swimming pool, a plaza with a public art, a sports court, which is a pickleball court, a community garden and multiple seating areas with barbecues and firepits. Staff finds the proposed amenities to be adequate in serving the proposed age-restricted multi-family development, in conjunction with the additional amenities nearby. The submitted elevations are for conceptual purposes only and will require future administrative design review approval. Staff notes that the submittal -- the submitted elevations do not meet all of the required design criteria for multi-family development, but at the time of the design review submittal staff will analyze the structure in more detail for the conformance with the -- with our architectural standards manual. An application for certificate of zoning compliance is also required to be submitted along with a design review, which will verify -- confirm these already discussed development points. There has been no written testimony as of 2:00 o'clock this afternoon when I wrote this. Staff does recommend approval of this subject application, because staff finds that proposing an apartment complex within this area of the city that is in close proximity to commercial development, childcare, charter school, which is directly to the east and established regional pedestrian



facilities, warrants the use, as well as is consistent with the mixed use regional Comprehensive Plan future land use designation. After that I will stand for any questions.

McCarvel: Okay. Thank you. Would the applicant like to come forward?

Clark: Hi, everybody. Hethe Clark. 251 East Front Street in Boise and working with the applicant and I think Joe is getting my PowerPoint teed up here. As he does I will just mention a couple introductory things about this. We are here to discuss the conditional use permit for this -- what I think is a really cool apartment project in the Gramercy development. It's part of a two phase process procedurally. As Joe mentioned, the first phase was a modification to the development agreement that was processed with the City Council last week. As we discussed that with them, you know, one of the details that I would mention is that this is on the back side of the Gramercy project, kind of nestled there against -- against the high school and next to other multi-family and so Council agreed that it made sense in this location to change that and allow for a mixed -- or a multi-family project. So, with that in place -- this is in the C-G zone, so we have to do a conditional use permit, so that's why we get to come here on the hottest night of the year and see everybody in person. Our presentation is going to move forward in two phases. In order to make sure you're familiar with the details a little bit more beyond what Joe has shown tonight, we are going to have Mark Sindall with GGLO Architects, who is online, kind of walk through what was presented last week, so you guys can see all of that and, then, I'm going to come back and I will go over a few procedural details and, then, it looks like we are still having trouble with the -- the PowerPoint, but -- oh, is it? Good. Oh, it's just not on this screen. Got it. So, after Mark's done I will come back and, then, in the meantime I just want to note that Mike Chidester and Aaron Elton are here, they are with the Meridian based ownership group, so this is a -- truly a local project and a very cool thing for the city. So, with that I will turn the time over to Mark. It's black. I can just look over my back shoulder here. And do we have -- is Mark coming forward, too?

Weatherly: Mark, you should have the ability to unmute yourself and turn on your camera if you would like.

Sindall: Okay. Thank you. All right. Madam Chair, Commissioners, thank you. Mark Sindall. Principal with GGLO, 1199 Shoreline Lane in Boise. Next slide, please. Keep going. So, this is directly from your comp plan. We will start with that and I will just read it. You know your plan well. Multi-family residential may be allowed in some cases, but should be careful to promote a high quality of life through thoughtful site design, connectivity, and amenities and that's really what the basis of our design was from the beginning. Next slide, please. We also looked at the Gramercy experience and the notion of homes, workplaces, and shopping blending seamlessly into an urban inspired community. Of course, that's the most successful with proximity and walkability, as staff mentioned, and we believe this proposal goes a long way in delivering the truly Gramercy experience. Next slide, please. So, the site is situated adjacent to ball fields and a school. Walking distance to shops, parks, commercial and health services. And, really, as a site it's ideal for age restricted multi-family housing if planned wisely and with the right approach that we will get into a moment, it can open up opportunities for adjacencies and

future development of sites, with some efficiencies with the parking. So -- yes. There you go. You can see all the proximity. Next slide, please. So, that brings us to parking. Livability means more space for people and open space and a recognition that absolutely we need to accommodate cars, but not at the expense of livability. So, to that end we studied the impact of a four level wrapped garage, as staff mentioned, and Joe -- over a surface parking lot and what that can mean for livability goals for the district. The punchline is that we are reducing by two-thirds how much of paradise is being paved by parking lot, for you '70s or '90s rock fans, and the added benefit, of course, that most residents park on the floor that they live in. This is the nice aspect of a wrapped project. So, here is what we are proposing. If you go to the next slide. A parking garage. Keep going. A parking garage tucked behind a high quality building with large amenity spaces immersed in a beautiful regional landscape. The project traverses the district with outward facing plazas and frontages. You can keep clicking. With residential scale frontages and amenities facing the more pastoral ball fields and the high school. Click again. All right. If you go to the next slide you can start to see the location and the plan of the amenities that were mentioned previously, with terraces, gardens, and amenities and, then, a different approach to the architecture, depending on whether it's facing -- call it the more pastoral ball fields versus the more commercial district on its frontage. Next slide. So, you start to see how this lays out with the garage in the middle, the wrap, and, then, concentric rings with the gardens and amenity spaces and, then, the perimeter parking for access and fire access. Next slide. As was mentioned, we really tried to focus on usable diverse, larger, common amenities, so that this would really provide year around interest and open space for residents. So, community gardens, pollinator gardens, pickleball courts, private patios, common areas for lounge -- with lounges and fire pits and, then, the pool area and a more of a public facing plaza. On the commercial side all again immersed with trees for shade in a regionally inspired Treasure Valley landscape. Next. Just a little bit about the architecture. We don't want to get too much into this, but we are being attuned to the district and picking up with the Gramercy brick and materials and providing a mix of a more commercial and residential feel, providing a little bit of stature and simplicity to the building, given the bridge location that it's in between the high school in the larger fields and the rest of the district. Also just trying to keep it a little bit more simple, so we can focus on quality materials and good detailing. Next slide. So, elegance is key. Also looking at solar shading and how that all works with climate for human comfort and for a more sustainable, less intensive mechanical approach to the project. Keep going. And there is just a few shots. This is that public facing frontage with entries and with the plaza. Next slide. This is the amenity deck that you see there. Next slide. And, then, the more residential side with more modulation. Next slide. Elevations, just to give you an idea of the materials and the rhythm of the building. Keep going. More. And, again, this will just kind of show you what the intent is and we will get into that with design review. Thank you very much. Back to Hethe.

Clark: All right. Thanks, Mark. So, again, on the -- on the process, this did go in front of the Council. We are here for a conditional use. Again, it's required in the C-G zone. So, as we look at the proposal, it's well developed, it's a detailed application, as Joe mentioned, and meets or exceeds all of the applicable standards. A couple more details on that. We are proposing that it remain within the Gramercy development agreements

and all of the existing structure there. That will mean that the exterior parking will be part of the cross-parking, cross-access regime that exists at Gramercy, so it will be integrated into that project and it's part of the -- it will be part of the association as well. It's an age targeted facility, as Mark mentioned. It's very near services. You got right there within walking distance restaurants, physician's offices, banks. So, it's really ideal for an age targeted facility. As far as agency review as -- as Joe mentioned, no negative comments to date and ACHD has approved it without any improvements to the roadway system. So, the -- the question, then, for us is whether the conditional use permit factors have -- have been satisfied. So, we will just run through those quickly. The site is large enough to meet the proposed use. Again, this is a first for Meridian, but it's a very efficient use of the site that allows for less parking field and makes a lot of sense. The project is harmonious with the Meridian Comprehensive Plan. It's in the mixed use regional designation, which foresees a mixture of residential and commercial uses and, you know, I would just note that within the mixed use regional nodes there is a minimum of ten percent of residential and a maximum of 50 percent of commercial and we are a little heavy on commercial on this -- in this Eagle-Overland area. So, this will actually help get it closer to the -- to the intent of the Comprehensive Plan. The product -- or excuse me. The project is compatible with other uses. Again, you got multi-family right there on the east. You have got the commercial that this is going to take care of -- advantage of on the north. It won't adversely affect other properties. As Joe mentioned, we are overparked and we have got a system where folks are going to be able to come in and go right directly to their -- to their units and, then, additional parking on the exterior. It is adequately served by public facilities and those public facilities will not come at excessive cost. Again, all the agencies have commented and they have indicated no issues. There is no excessive production of traffic, et cetera. None of those apply here. ACHD's approved it. And I'm going fast because I think I might be kicking a dead horse here, but -- and, then, finally, there are no natural scenic or historic features affected. One last item that I just wanted to point out. Joe's been great to work with on this one. We had a condition of approval that's in the -- in this staff report that is also in the MDA and so we -- as a result of that we made a modification to the site plan that you can see on the screen and that was to create a connection or a physical connection between this project and the regional pathway to the south. So, we sent an updated site plan to Joe for the -- for the hearing last week and that's what you are seeing on the screen right now and we're going to use pavers to help connect and draw people into the regional pathway. So, with that I think I will wrap up and answer any questions that you might have.

McCarvel: Okay. Any questions for staff or the applicant?

Cassinelli: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Cassinelli.

Cassinelli: Only because we are taking bets whether we would get out of here in under an hour tonight, so I got lots of questions. Actually --

Clark: So, you have the over is what you're saying?

Cassinelli: Exactly. Either for -- for Hethe or for -- for staff. Do you know is -- because I didn't fully read all the ACHD comments. Are they planning on -- on lighting Wells or Bonita at anytime in the future?

Dodson: Mr. Cassinelli, I believe that it is supposed to signalize at Wells and Overland, but not Wells and Bonita. I do not know.

Cassinelli: Bonita is the next one over coming out of El Dorado.

Dodson: To the east. Yeah.

Cassinelli: It's to the east. Yeah. But Wells -- there is planned to -- to signal that at some point?

Dodson: At Wells and Overland. Yes. Especially with some more apartments potentially going in on the north side of Overland.

Cassinelli: Where Winco is going to go?

Dodson: Correct.

Cassinelli: Okay. Thank you.

McCarvel: Okay.

Yearsley: Madam Chair? Are these going to be leased or are they looking to be like townhomes or be sold?

Clark: Madam Chair, Commissioner Yearsley, they are -- it's intended to stay in common ownership, so they can be leased.

Yearsley: Okay.

Wheeler: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Wheeler.

Wheeler: I have a couple questions here. On this access that's to the north -- let me see. That -- one of the slides there showed an access that was a drive aisle that was going to the north. I just wanted to know if that was actually connecting to the parking lot that was to -- what would it be? To the north of there. I think that's like a behavioral health building or behavior parking area.

Clark: We will try to get the map out --

Wheeler: It's right there. Yes. That drive aisle there to the north, the access drive, is that actually tying into the property?

Clark: Madam Chair, Commissioner Wheeler, so it goes by the -- it's built. It goes by the building, but not into the parking lot. So, it's an access drive, not a -- it doesn't connect directly in there.

Wheeler: Okay. So, then, where is that tying into for an access drive for traffic?

Clark: I think it goes up to the last road south and parallel -- south of and parallel to Overland.

Dodson: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Yes.

Dodson: From what I have -- this site plan kind of cuts it off, but when it's put out on the -- on the actual overlay it connects to the existing drive aisle that's there. It just isn't part of the -- the parking lot. It's like an actual drive aisle, not -- not just the parking. So, it will connect and have the future connect -- and allow for connectivity in the area.

Wheeler: Okay. All right. I see that here now on the -- on Google Maps there, seeing how that -- that does tie into that. And, then, another question that I have -- so, thank you on that. I had another question. And that was on that amenity building -- so, on that same -- I think it's on that same slide you guys have there. Yeah. That amenity building to the south, is that going to be for privacy there, too? Is it going to be solid? Or is it just going to be a little transparent with a screen.

Clark: Madam Chair, Commissioner Wheeler, I'm going to -- that one is going to, obviously, be subject to the design review, but I think we have got a good idea of that. But let me ask Mark to weigh in on that, because I think he's got the best idea.

Sindall: Yeah. Commissioners, Madam Chair, thank you. So, yes, the idea is that that has quality materials. There is a rendering, I think, that shows it and we have got vines on the building, planting, openings. So it's a combination of actually frontage to hold the edge a little bit and for privacy and, then, there is going to be bike storage and other things in there. So, it should be quite nice.

Wheeler: Thank you.

McCarvel: Thank you.

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: I like the concept of it and the parking will be -- that will be -- not be open to the elements, it will actually be covered; correct? I think I saw that.

Clark: Commissioner Seal, that's correct. Yeah.

Seal: Okay. And, then, the only concern I have is the baseball fields. Being the guy that can crank one over the fence every once in a while, that and I could -- I could hit that building.

McCarvel: Are you here to brag or is that a question?

Seal: Yeah. Well, I just -- that's like -- that -- that seems really close to me for, you know, the amount of people that are going to be in there, so that -- that's just a concern.

Clark: Madam Chair, Commissioner Seal that -- duly noted and we will do some measurements and make sure that that's designed properly for that issue.

Seal: Okay.

Wheeler: Please bring him out to hit some balls, though, so you can see what the range, is just to clarify that.

Seal: Right. My sister can hit them farther than me, but I can -- I can knock them out there, so --

Lorcher: It's funny that you mention that, because the first thing I thought about -- if this was an age specific building, so I'm assuming it's more seniors; is that correct?

Dodson: Fifty-five and older, yes, ma'am.

Lorcher: And seniors and marching bands and kids and the high school and all their noise, I was thinking, oh, is this the best spot for it, because Mountain View is a pretty lively school throughout the year. I live right by the new Owyhee High School and we are looking forward to hearing the marching band in our backyard, but not everybody appreciates that, so --

Clark: Madam Chair, Commissioner Lorcher, you know, that's actually something that we have talked quite a bit about. You know, this is going to be a site where the -- the people who are going to be attracted to this are going to be attracted to the liveliness of the area, the -- you know, the -- the restaurants nearby, the sound, the excitement and we think that the folks who are going to be coming here are actually going to really appreciate that element of it and, you know, this is a conditional use permit, so we are really -- we are kind of focused on the outward effects of this project on neighboring properties, not necessarily their effect on us, but we have definitely thought about that and, in fact, the ownership has been to Mountain View to talk to the -- the leadership there about

possibilities of our residents coming and volunteering and being engaged. So, we think that's actually a selling point for the -- for the project.

Lorcher: It will have to be in their lease that, you know, all marching band music is required.

McCarvel: Any other questions for staff or the applicant? Okay. Madam Clerk, do we have anybody signed up to testify on this application?

Weatherly: Madam Chair, we do not.

McCarvel: That being said, is there anyone who did not sign up that would like to testify? Nobody on Zoom? Okay. With that could I get a motion to close the public hearing on H-2021-0023?

Seal: So moved.

Wheeler: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to close public hearing on H-2021-0023. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: I like this idea. I hope it pans out and works as well as what they are -- they are hoping for. I like the idea that it's -- not only is it a parking garage style, but it's also covered -- you know, it's just not something that's -- you can see from everywhere. So, sometimes parking garages aren't the prettiest thing to look at, so -- plus it adds a small element of security for people that are driving in and out of there. It's a little harder to -- you know, for somebody to get in and out of there I would imagine. But lots of amenities. I think the placement of it is pretty good. I hate to see some of the C-G stuff go to multi-family, but I think they are right, where that's tucked in back there I think it would be a pretty hard sell to get businesses to open back there that are -- you know, want more kind of open frontage appeal to them. The only concern, like I said, is the baseball fields. But outside of that, you know, people might enjoy sitting out on their balcony and watching a baseball game or practice as well. So, I think it's going to be a pretty good project. I do like the way it ties into some of the other amenities that are there available to it already as well.

McCarvel: I agree.

Wheeler: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Wheeler.

Wheeler: Did I cut somebody off there or -- okay. We are good. This is on my jogging path when I jog. I jog right by the spot, go touch Overland and, then, jog back home and I was always curious about what was going to be back in this area and I like the plan, I like it is actually hiding the parking, instead of just having a bunch of surface parking on it. That's a good spot. I do think it could -- if it had like some rooftop patios on there you could actually get like a fan club base up there and cheer them on during some of their softball and baseball games that are going on right there and, then, it's also squeezed in between two -- two different schools. There is the charter school that's on the hard corner and the school over here, Mountain View, on the other side. But always was curious when I would run by this, what was going to go in here and this could be a big -- a good benefit for this area. It's surrounded also by other multi-use properties to townhomes type stuff and, yeah, the drive aisles seem to be good and if ACHD doesn't seem to have an issue with that, then, that's good.

McCarvel: Okay. Any other comments or --

Yearsley: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: I guess there is only one concern that I have, just the bulk and scale of this -- this building versus what's around it is a little bit big. That being said, I don't think it's enough to -- to cause any concern about it. I think it's set back far enough from the main roads and I think it will -- with other buildings around it can be obscured a little bit better. Just as a side note, I thought it was interesting the landscaping plans showed all younger families in an age restricted facility, so I just thought that was kind of funny, so -- no, I think it's a good project, I think it is a good area, especially where it's a mixed use area, I think that serves a good niche for that area.

McCarvel: Any other comments? Motion?

Yearsley: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to approve file number H-2021-0023, as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of June 3rd, 2021, with no comment -- no modifications.

Seal: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to approve H-2021-0023. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.



MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Cassinelli: Madam Chair, I move we adjourn.

Yearsley: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded that we adjourn eight minutes past --

Cassinelli: Got the over.

McCarvel: -- on the official bets. All those -- all those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:07 P. M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS. )

APPROVED

\_\_\_\_\_  
RHONDA MCCARVEL - CHAIRMAN

\_\_\_\_\_|\_\_\_\_\_|\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK