

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:02 p.m., Tuesday, August 25, 2020, by Mayor Robert Simison.

Members Present: Robert Simison, Joe Borton, Luke Cavener, Treg Bernt, Jessica Perreault, Brad Hoaglund and Liz Strader.

Also present: Chris Johnson, Adrienne Weatherly, Bill Nary, Sonya Allen, Joe Dodson, Scott Colaianne, Joe Bongiorno and Dean Willis.

**ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE:**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Liz Strader	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Joe Borton
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brad Hoaglund	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Treg Bernt
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jessica Perreault	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Luke Cavener
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mayor Robert E. Simison	

Simison: Okay. Well, with that I will call this meeting to order. For the record it is August 25th at 6:02 p.m. We will begin tonight's meeting with roll call attendance.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Simison: Next item is the Pledge of Allegiance. Please stand and join us in the pledge.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

**COMMUNITY INVOCATION**

Simison: Next is our community invocation, which tonight WE will be led by Justin Jordan with Real Life Ministries. If you all would join us in the invocation or take this as a moment of reflection for yourself personally. Justin, thank you.

Jordan: Thank you, Mayor. Let's pray. Lord, we come before you and thank you that we are gathered here tonight to pray for Council, our government, for our community, Lord. I pray, Lord, as the Council meets and goes through the agenda, Lord, that they have to make decisions and decisions for what's best for our community, I pray you give them a heart of listening, a heart to learn, to understand, and to make a judgment, Lord, and that that judgment would be in alignment with what's the best for Meridian and that you would extend grace and love to our community and they would continue to build upon the great values that already drive the City of Meridian, Lord. We ask for your blessing on this community. We asked for continued -- just expansion of the amazing qualities of you and that it would be rooted in your goodness and your grace and be rooted in the image of your son, Lord. We love you and we praise you for your goodness in our community. We pray this in your son's name, amen.

Simison: Thank you, Justin. Appreciate you being here this evening.

Bernt: Pastor Justin, good to see you, buddy.

Jordan: Thank you. Have a great night you guys.

## **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

Simison: Council, our next item is the adoption of the agenda.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Looking at the -- I move that we approve the agenda as presented.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to adopt the agenda as published. Any discussion on the motion?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Do we need to move the Community Development or Miranda's presentation to this agenda?

Simison: We are going to do it next week.

Perreault: Great.

Simison: Is there any other discussion on the motion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it.

**MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.**

## **PUBLIC FORUM – Future Meeting Topics**

Simison: Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone signed up under the public forum?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, not for a topic we can discuss this evening.

## **ACTION ITEMS**

- 1. Public Hearing for City of Meridian Proposed Solid Waste Fees**

Simison: Okay. Then with that we will move on to our first action item, which is a public hearing for City of Meridian proposed solid waste fees. I will open this public hearing with comments from Tom. I think Tom is going to be presenting it or he will probably turn it over Rachele or from Rodney.

Otte: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. Tonight you are going to be hearing from Republic Services on their proposed rate agreement for fiscal year '21. Staff and SWAC have already reviewed the numbers. They have been approved by SWAC and recommended to Council with a do pass. SWAC Chairman Cory is here this evening for any additional questions and I will be happy to stand for questions as well. Rodney, I believe, we will be presenting some of the numbers from Republic, so if you would like I will turn it over to him.

Simison: Thank you, Tom. And, Rodney, if you could state your name and address for the record, please.

Remling: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Rodney Remling, Finance Manager for Republic Services, 11101 West Executive Drive, Boise, Idaho. 83713. Members of Council, Mr. Mayor, as you know, the solid waste rates are subject to an adjustment annually as lined out in the contract in Section 21. That increase is -- is a subject of a number of factors. The first one being the change in consumer price index as published by the Department of Labor. All nondisposal costs are allowed a price increase of 90 percent of the change in that index and the index and change today at 90 percent is 2.64 percent. Now, comparing that to our cost increase, the -- the largest line item in our expense is labor and year over year we have seen just over a seven percent increase in labor costs and this is due primarily to the growth and demand for skilled labor in the valley and so we have had to increase our wages significantly more than we typically do in a normal year to retain qualified labor to be on the streets driving the equipment and handling the waste. So, the CPI is significantly less than our largest labor -- or our largest expense item which is labor. With that I would like to walk through some of the cost components or the revenue components that we are asking for a change for. I would note that the household hazardous waste has been a component of the rate for a number of years. That's currently assessed at 18 cents per household and we are not requesting a change to that. This year that's running very close to the actual cost life to date. Republic has spent 4,827 more dollars to process that than we have collected from residents, but that does not warrant a change in the rate and we are just asking to leave it where it is and rolling forward in the future years it would be -- either go up or down based on the cost of that service. Second to that is the recycling service charge. We are asking for a ten cent increase per residential household on that and the reason for that is over the last 12 months Republic Services has sustained a loss of 178,499 dollars in that line of business. So, we need the additional dime to cover the bulk of that cost and I would note that it doesn't completely cover our loss this year, but it is closing the gap on that and we are trying to, you know, ease that into -- into the rate and given some of the additional increases, you know, we have agreed to -- with staff to leave that as a dime. Republic Service has had service contract for the last eight years starting in April of 2012 and disposal has not seen an increase in that time frame. This current year, starting October

1 Ada county is going from a volume based or a per yard based disposal rate to a per ton rate. You might hear that some rates are going down, others are going up. The transfer station rates are going up and the Meridian city waste is tied to the Meridian transfer station. Residential households dispose of about one ton of waste annually and that's on an average basis. So, a 95 gallon cart would dispose of a little bit more and the smaller cart sizes would dispose of a little bit less, so on average about a ton per resident per year. That equates to \$7.40 from 22 dollars to 29 dollars is the increase in the transfer station, which equates per household of about \$7.40. Now, that does include the franchise fee that Meridian city collects on every dime that's billed. So, we have taken that disposal increase and we have added the franchise fee with that. That is not the case with CPI. The Meridian franchise fee comes out of the CPI. So, when we get 2.64 percent, we actually get a little bit less than that, because Meridian gets a piece of it. In this case on disposal, it's -- it's \$7.40 and that's inclusive of the franchise fee. The other thing that Republic strives to do is to partner with our municipal supports and so the volumetric excise tax credit, which is as a result is a federal credit for utilizing alternative fuels. So, in the City of Meridian we utilize compressed natural gas trucks. We track that fuel usage by contract and -- and with the credit that we received from the federal government for the use of that fuel, Republic Services remitted a check during last year for 61,067 dollars and that was a retroactive decision that the president signed on December of last year that was retroactive to 2018 and 2019. So, it effectively represents two years. Staff wanted to reduce the increase on residents by giving that 61,000 back through the rates to the residents. So, that -- that is a reduction in the rate of 14 cents. So, that's another layer of this. So, it's in favor -- it's getting it back to the residents who are using it -- utilizing that fuel. So, in total the residential rate impact is \$1.08 and I would like to break that out. We have already talked about the components, but let's talk about it from -- from the aspect of where -- where the \$1.08 actually goes. So, as we stated, the franchise fee is going to change. So, the franchise fee -- or the amount that Meridian city will receive is seven cents of the \$1.08. Seventy-six cents goes to the landfill for disposal. The increase at the transfer station from 22 dollars to 29 cents, that's 76 cents per month going to -- going to the landfill. And, then, the last part of that is a net of 25 cents that Republic Services receives for -- for our services. So, in all, in an average year, it's a little bit less on our part, but when you take -- but it equals out when you factor in -- and backing of 61,000. So, it's a pretty normal rate increase from a CPI perspective. It's a little bit behind our increasing costs. And, then, as we stated, Republic Services is getting a mere quarter of the -- of the \$1.08. So, any questions?

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council, any questions?

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, this is Brad.

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Real quick I just wanted to ask Rodney about what the outlook is for recycling and return on recycled materials. It's -- it's a -- it's a low market, I understand that, but what's the outlook right now.

Remling: Right. So, the market has actually improved over the last -- over the last several months with the -- with COVID impacting, a lot of cardboard has hit the market and there seems to be an increase in demand for commodities. So, certain commodity prices are improving, but those are also being offset by cost of transportation and processing and all that. So, the reason we are asking for an increase this year is because we have never really caught up on our full cost. So, we are -- as I mentioned in the presentation, we are closing the gap on that. Last year we sustained a loss of 178,000 and change and this moves to close that. So, we won't be whole, but, you know, we are doing our best to be fair and equitable across the valley and as we ask for these increases and not be gouging in any way at all, just to cover our cost and -- and to move closer to that each year.

Hoaglund: Thank you.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Maybe just for some context for my fellow Council Members, as sort of sitting as an ex officio on the SWAC. So, a few years ago China started their Operation Green Sword, which affected global commodity prices for recyclable materials and it caused the cost for recycling to go way up compared to the amount that could be recovered in commodity prices and so what we have here is basically a catch up from that and, then, in addition to that the landfill fees went up, which impacted us quite a bit, because we use the transfer station in order to get the benefit from sort of compressing those materials. So, just some context as we are sort of looking at this.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Forgive my ignorance in this. As a new Council Member and a lot to learn, a few years back we were paying really significantly high fuel prices and they have come down and stabilized kind of in that low two dollar, two and a half dollar range. I don't know if that -- if you pay market fuel prices or if you have a contract for less than that, but I'm curious how -- how that's affected the cost to Republic Services and if it's -- if it's offset some of these additional costs that Councilman Strader just mentioned.

Remling: Yes, Council Woman. The -- the fuel cost has been fairly stable as you say and we have had some reduction in fuel cost at the pump and we do have large contracts, we do leverage the -- the scale of our business to purchase fuel. In total -- in this local market it's pretty close to what you see at the pump. Sometimes some variance up or down. Back when fuel was around four dollars a ton that was our -- excuse me -- four dollars a

gallon, that was -- if I recall correctly before 2012 when we acquired the contract. Some municipalities did a short gap of covering that high cost with a recovery fee. That went away when costs came back down. So, we have seen normal sort of changes in fuel, but as I said, the -- the real driving factor for us as far as comparison to the change in CPI is the labor. I would also add that, you know, our costs -- our costs of trucks is going up at about seven percent per year. We are paying about 350,000 dollars per year for a truck now and so those -- those costs are also buried in here as well. So, while we do have some -- some areas which may not be reaching the 2.64 percent, we certainly have some areas that are significantly over.

Perreault: Thank you.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for Rodney or staff at this time or -- okay. Thank you, Rodney.

Remling: Thank you.

Simison: This is a public hearing. Mr. Clerk, did we have anybody signed up to testify on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we had nobody sign up to testify.

Simison: Okay. So, maybe we will go to our other location. Is there anybody in the room who would like to testify on this item, if you would like to come forward to the podium now and state your name and address for the record. Or if there is anybody who is in the Zoom meeting who would like to provide testimony, you can do so by using the raise your hand feature at the bottom of the screen and we will bring you in and recognize you for three minutes. Seeing no one who wishes to testify on the item, Council, do you have any further questions, comments, or is there a motion to close the public hearing?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I move that we close the public hearing on the recycling process -- the amendment and proposed solid waste fees.

Simison: Do I have a second?

Borton: Second.

Bernt: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to close the public hearing. Is there any discussion on the motion?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I want to thank Rodney for being here tonight. I know we as a Council always take any proposal that increases the costs to our ratepayers to -- and, Rodney, the discussion or presentation tonight in conjunction to the previous information provided from a memo we received has been greater -- in being supportive of this.

Simison: Any further comments on closing the public hearing? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed no. The ayes have it.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Simison: Mr. Nary, I assume you are looking for direction to prepare a resolution to come back?

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, yes. And, then, also action on the recycle processing amendment after that.

Simison: I'm sorry, which --

Nary: So, yes, correct, Mr. Mayor. We do want direction to bring a resolution back to approve the fees that have been noticed and, then, secondarily, on the recycle processing fee amendment, so that is an agreement between the city and Republic Services to amend our agreement to include that. To give some context to the newer Council Members, a couple years ago we added -- added this -- this fee on. Prior to that all the recycled processing costs was -- was taken care of by Republic. Based on the change in the commodity prices worldwide, the city agreed two years ago to include an additional fee for the processing, but wanted -- the Council direction at the time was annually they would like to reevaluate that and see if the market had changed, see if the status has changed and that's why we have a separate amendment for that specific fee versus all the other fees. So, that's why that amendment is on there for your approval tonight as well.

Simison: Am I missing the agenda with the amendment on it or --

Nary: It is in the packet, so --

Simison: Okay. In the packet, but not on the -- not on the agenda itself.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I do think it is a little confusing. You have the -- the fee schedule as -- as one item attached to number one and that the recycling amendment is a second fee attached to that. So, I think from -- from an agenda perspective it is one item, but there is two separate individual pieces.

Simison: Thank you.

Cavener: No problem.

Strader: Mr. Mayor.

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: So, maybe I will try to make a motion and I don't know if it's going to cover those things or not. So, I move that we direct the city to prepare a resolution as discussed by Mr. Nary outlining the fee schedule that we received and, then, I also move that we approve the -- sorry, I lost it there. FY-2021 amendments to the franchise agreement recycling process fee.

Simison: Did he get what he needed?

Nary: Yes.

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: Is there a second to that motion?

Bernt: Second, Mr. Mayor.

Simison: Have a motion and a second. Is there discussion on the motion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it. Thank you.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

**2. Request for Pre-Approval to Apply for Beer and Wine License for a Business Within 300 Feet of a Church by Tango's Empanadas and Grill, Located at 46 E. Fairview Ave.**

Simison: Thank you, Rodney and Tom for being here this evening. And Mr. Cory, for your continued dedication to this topic in the city. With that we will move to Item No. 2 on the agenda, a request for pre-approval to apply for a beer and wine license and I will turn this over to Mr. Nary.

Nary: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. So, what you have before you is a request from Tangos Empanadas and Grill, which is located on -- in Cherry Plaza on Fairview. Here they are within 300 feet of a church or a school. There is a church located



in Cherry Plaza. So, the standard procedure that's required by the state of Idaho for the Alcohol and Beverage Control Unit to issue any type of liquor license or beer and wine license is that the business has to come to the City Council prior to application to see if there are any concerns that the Council has in considering this. So, you are not approving the license tonight, you are simply giving them the red light -- or the green light to apply for it. We did -- based on prior Council actions did notify the church that this was being sought. They expressed no concern about it particularly, but we haven't received that in writing. Again, the code doesn't really grant authority to the adjoining business or school or church to necessarily veto the request, they simply are -- we simply chose to inform them. The state code doesn't even require that. But the city has chosen to inform the adjoining neighbors that this is being requested. But all they are seeking tonight from Tango's is the Council's authorization to go ahead and move forward with the process. You will have it come back in front of you for final approval if it gets through the state and the county process.

Simison: Thank you, Mr. Nary. Council, any questions for Mr. Nary? Okay. And I assume you don't need a motion to allow them to do this or do you?

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, yes, the state does look for that, so they are going to look for that. We would, then, send them the minutes showing that we did get a direction with a motion. A voice vote is fine.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: As to Item 2, I move that we approve the request for pre-approval for a beer and wine license made by Tango's Empanadas and Grill.

Perreault: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

### **3. Request for Reconsideration for Cedarbrook Subdivision (H-2020-0012) by Givens Pursley, LLP**

Simison: Okay. Item No. 3 is a request for reconsideration for Cedarbrook Subdivision, H-2020-0012. I will turn this over to Mr. Nary for comments.

Nary: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. So, what you have before you tonight is a request for reconsideration for the Cedarbrook project, H-2020-0012. In your packet is the request itself from Ms. Nelson, their counsel. There is also a letter in there as well from -- or a memo from myself in regards to an issue regarding service of the --

of the request and, then, ultimately, you also have a second memo from Ms. Nelson outlining their position on the issue of service. So, in a -- in a request for reconsideration the Council cannot take any testimony, you have to base your decision based on the written material that's presented to you. You can ask questions if you have any clarifying questions you need answered in regards to either my memo, Ms. Nelson's two memos, any other questions you have maybe for the Clerk or the -- or the planners, but it is not -- it is not a public hearing and not public testimony. Your decision point tonight is either to approve the request for reconsideration and, therefore, grant a new hearing at a future date or to deny the request for reconsideration and -- and allow the rest of the legal process subsequently to continue and not grant another hearing. Or, third, you have authority under the statute to modify the decision if you think modification is necessary. So, it's either approve, deny, or modify is the decision point tonight. Do you have any questions for me?

Simison: Council, any questions for Mr. Nary? Is there any further guidance or direction needed, discussion, or a motion?

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: I guess as a -- as a preliminary matter, I think the issue that -- that was raised and addressed in the memo with regards to service is one that -- if that's a preliminary issue I think we should certainly accept the request for reconsider -- request for reconsideration having been accepted by the city and I think we might have some internal clarity we can do after the fact to make sure it's easy to comply with, but I don't -- I didn't see that -- the manner in which it was submitted is any reason of -- to not at least hear the matter today and we will address that at another time. I didn't find -- in review of the request and the record and findings, I didn't see that there was in my mind grounds that would -- that would warrant reconsidering it. I think there is just a genuine difference of opinion in -- in the decision that was made, which I understand, but I couldn't come to a place where I thought reconsideration was appropriate. I thought Council had laid out its -- its analysis I think relatively clear. But I understand that there is a difference of opinion in that decision. So, based on what's been presented I'm not supportive of a reconsideration of this application and the Council's prior decision.

Strader: Mr. Mayor, I concur with Councilman Borton's comments.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I would agree as well. In -- in the motion is there a -- is there a -- Mr. Nary, do we need to describe the reason of the denial or approval I guess for that matter in this reconsideration?

Nary: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Mr. Nary.

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, Council Member Bernt, again, the statute simply states that you have -- if you have reviewed the material as Council Member Borton just said, and don't find the reasons for the request compelling enough to reconsider the matter or reconsider your decision, then, you are -- you would be moving to deny it. You don't have to lay out individual reasons or identify each point.

Bernt: That was my question.

Nary: Yes. I'm sorry. Yeah. You don't have to do that.

Bernt: All right. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I move that we deny the request for reconsideration for Cedarbrook Subdivision, H-2020-0012, on the lines -- what Mr. Borton spoke earlier about, that the evidence to reconsider just wasn't compelling enough to -- to -- to approve.

Strader: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second. Is there any discussion on the motion? Hearing none, I will ask the clerk to call the roll.

Roll call: Bernt, yea; Borton, yea; Cavener, yea; Hoaglund, yea; Strader, yea; Perreault, yea.

Simison: All ayes. Motion to reconsider is not approved.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

**4. Public Hearing for Teakwood Place Subdivision (H-2020-0006) by Hesscomm Corp., Located at 1835 E. Victory Rd.**

- A. Request: Annexation and Zoning of 7.35 acres of land with an R-8 zoning district.**
- B. Request: A Preliminary Plat consisting of 26 single-family residential lots and 2 common lots.**

Simison: And we will move on to Item No. 4. Thank you, Mr. Nary, for your information on that.

Nary: You're welcome.

Simison: Item 4 is a public hearing for Teakwood Subdivision, which is H-2020-0006. I will go ahead and open this public hearing with staff comment and -- and turn it over to Joe for comments.

Dodson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I just want to make sure that Council can hear me.

Simison: Yes, we can.

Dodson: Okay. Good. So, yes, Teakwood Place. I'm not here to present that recommendation of denial from Planning and Zoning Commission. I -- the applicant, since that Commission meeting, has requested a remand back to the Planning and Zoning Commission, with the hopes of presenting some new plans and open space exhibits that -- I should say respond to most of the concerns presented by the Commission. So, that is the action before you tonight.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Do we need to close the public hearing or could we just remand it without having to go that far?

Nary: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Yes, Mr. Nary.

Nary: Once -- yeah, you would close the public hearing once you are ready to deliberate and make a motion. So, yes, you would do that.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Are we going to allow the applicant to say anything?

Simison: Is the applicant present and would the applicant like to say anything? Nothing in the room.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, I believe the applicant -- the applicant is on Zoom. One moment. And Mr. Lardie is joining us now.

Simison: Mr. Lardie, if you would state your name and address for the record. If you would like to make any comments regarding this recommend -- this direction.

Lardie: Mr. Mayor, Council Members, Dan Lardie, Leavitt and Associates Engineers, 1324 1st Street South, Nampa, Idaho. I'm joining you tonight and requesting for a remand back to Planning and Zoning. Since our last hearing it's been a long time -- or kind of a hard run getting here, but we did finally -- were able to sway the homeowner to see some things the way the Commission would like to see them and we have made some changes that are significant and that address the Commission's concerns and I believe that if you do remand us we should be able to garner there at least a recommendation of approval to City Council at that point in time. That's the reason why we are here and I will stand for any questions.

Simison: Council, any questions for the applicant?

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: No questions, but I would like to say we really appreciate it when an applicant is willing to go through that process again and allow our Commission to review and make recommendation to us. We know it -- it adds extra time, but we really appreciate the applicant's commitment to bringing forward a great -- a great application.

Lardie: Thank you.

Simison: Council, any further dialogue? Would you like me to ask if there is anyone from the public that would like to testify? Okay. Well, if -- this is a public hearing. Is there anyone from the public who would like to testify on this item, either in the room or remotely?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor? Sorry, Mr. Mayor. Sandy Blaser is here and did sign up on the public forum under Teakwood Subdivision, so if you would like to open it up, if he would still like to speak. Okay. He's coming to the podium.

Simison: If you would state your name and address the record, please.

Blaser: Sandy Blaser. 3370 South Como Avenue, Meridian. The major objection all the homeowners had to this project wasn't the development itself, but the major problem was the -- the fact that ACHD is recommending that all the traffic that this subdivision produces goes through our subdivision and our -- our position is we have about 41 homes now, we are going to end up having almost 70 homes of traffic going through a very small subdivision. ACHD stated that they did not want the subdivision to have an outlet on Victory Road, because it's a major arterial, but they did not give zoning and planning at that time any information on Locust Grove, which I don't know if the Council is aware of, but Locust Grove is being widened from Victory north to Overland and a -- I don't know what you call it -- a roundabout is being placed there by ACHD, which require us to -- they

are going to be acquiring property to do it. Our feeling is generally that Locust Grove, because it's a north-south road, we are pulling all the new traffic and new development from Kuna all the way through to Overland. So, we feel in that regards that ACHD's logic is overly flawed. We feel that Victory going east-west will be able to accommodate the -- the small amount of homes that Teakwood is -- is developing. We also found out recently that just west of our development on Locust Grove they -- a developer is going to come to -- come to planning with a development of duplexes and triplexes. So, that will be loading onto Locust Grove also and we are thinking about asking them to put a traffic light in there. So, the basic feeling of the homeowners is is that we feel if they could outlet to Victory we would have really no major objections to the subdivision and that's all the testimony I would like to give at this point.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Hoaglund: Yes, Mr. Mayor, just a quick question to comment that if we remand this back to Planning -- if we remand this back to Planning and Zoning, the process basically starts over and you are willing to engage in that --

Blaser: Yeah. We will get engaged again.

Hoaglund: Okay. Great.

Blaser: Sure.

Hoaglund: Thank you.

Blaser: Thank you. Thank you all.

Simison: Is there anybody that would like to provide testimony on this item? If you are on Zoom you can do so by hitting the raise your hand button at the bottom. Okay. Council, seeing no one else who is walking to the podium from my seat at my house or raising their hand, do I have a motion to close the public hearing?

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I move that we close the public hearing.

Hoaglund: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to close the public hearing. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I move that we remand Item No. 4, which is Teakwood Subdivision, H-2020-0006, back to the Planning and Zoning Commission for further consideration.

Strader: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to remand Item 4 to Planning and Zoning. Is there any discussion on the motion?

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: If not, clerk will call the roll.

Bernt: Hey, Mr. Mayor, I think Mr. Borton wanted to talk.

Simison: Oh. Okay. Got to get the math down quicker. Councilman Borton.

Borton: We are having trouble with the mics here now. I just think what Council Woman Perreault said is a really important point and I just want to emphasize that that direction from P&Z -- when P&Z makes a denial recommendation it really piques the interest of Council and we look at that extremely -- with a very sharp point and -- and we appreciate P&Z's hard work and when they do that an applicant who requests a remand and tries to address those concerns is -- is so well served. So, you know, P&Z would appreciate that and I know our Council does. So, I'm glad you brought that up. I think all applicants need to be aware of that.

Simison: Council, any further questions on the motion or comments on the motion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

Roll call: Bernt, yea; Borton, yea; Cavener, yea; Hoaglund, yea; Strader, yea; Perreault, yea.

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries. Thank you to the applicant for being able to provide that feedback.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

**5. Public Hearing for Paramount Point (H-2020-0082) by Brighton Development, Inc., Located at 6357 N. Fox Run Way**

- A. Request: To Short Plat 4 commercial building lots and 2 common lots on 3.88 acres of land in the C-C zoning district.**

Simison: Item No. 5 is a public hearing for Paramount Point, H-2020-0082. I'm going to open this public hearing with staff comments and turn this over to Joe.

Dodson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. The project before you as noted by Mr. Mayor -- hold on. I got to click in this. Now I have control. Is Paramount Point, H-2020-0082. It is a request for a short plat. The site consists of 3.88 acres of land, zoned C-C and is specifically located at 6357 North Fox Run Way, which is the southwest corner of Fox Run Way and Chinden. The proposed short plat is for the creation of four commercial building lots and two common lots for ownership purposes. The northern common lot is being created along Chinden Boulevard for the purpose of dedicating additional right of way to ITD. The other common lot, which is Lot 1, Block 2, at the very south edge of the subdivision, is being used as a buffer lot to the existing residential properties abutting the site to the south. There are existing sidewalks and landscaping along both Chinden and North Fox Run Way adjacent to the subject site. The submitted landscape plan show adequate parking lot landscaping in compliance with the UDC. However, the landscape plans do not show -- do not depict the landscape buffers to Chinden or North Fox Run Way or the future Plaza Shops Drive that bisects the property. This should be corrected prior to receiving city engineer signature. Submitted plans show that access to the site is proposed via driveway connections. One connection is proposed to North Fox Run Way to the east and the other driveway connection is shown near the south end of the site and connects to future West Plaza Shops Drive, which is an east-west road that bisects the property as part of the Linder Village project from the west. This future road is already approved and the right of way is in the process of being dedicated outside of this process in conjunction with the Linder Village project approvals. The road dedications are currently in escrow according to the applicant. Staff is recommending a condition of approval to ensure the road dedication is executed prior to receiving signature on this plat. ACHD has approved of the proposed driveway locations and the road dedication currently in process. The subject site has obtained CZC and design review approval for an urgent care facility in 2019 and that building is proposed on the northwest corner of the site as seen on the screen. It is on the proposed Lot 2, Block 1. In addition, an additional CZC and design review were approved this year for a new bank building located in the northeast corner of the site. The bank property is no longer a part of this property, because a property boundary adjustment was completed to move the existing property lines and place the bank on its own property. That dba was approved in 2019 in conjunction with the urgent care facility application and was recently filed with the county assessor. Compliance with the design standards, parking and landscaping were reviewed and approved with those applications. Future commercial building sites will also be reviewed through the CZC and design review application process for code compliance and this includes cross-access for those parcels that do not have street frontage. The short plat does depict future easements for this and said instrument numbers should be on the plat prior to obtaining city engineer signature. On deeper review of the existing entitlements and previous development agreements and the related modifications thereof, staff has determined that to be in compliance with the existing DAs a new DA modification application is required. Staff has recommended a condition of approval for this and the applicant has expressed understanding and agreement with this condition. There are no condition recommendations as noted. Short plats go directly to



you if they do not have associated applications and staff does recommend approval of the requested short plat applications.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, question for Joe.

Simison: Joe, are you complete with your comments?

Dodson: Yes. Sorry. I apologize. I will stand for questions.

Simison: Okay. Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Joe, I just want to make sure -- so, a new DA modification is required for this new subdivision and as part of that staff is recommending a condition of approval to ensure the road dedication is executed prior to receiving signature on this plat. And was there anything else? I thought I heard something else, but I wasn't sure.

Dodson: Mr. -- Councilman Hoaglund, Members of the Council, no, that is one of the conditions. I also noted another condition regarding revising the landscape plan to show the required buffers to Chinden to the north-south street, which is North Fox Run Way, and also the future West Plaza Shops Drive, which they are not showing buffers on. However, that southern lot will be an open space lot regardless on a common lot, so --

Hoaglund: Okay. That was the one I was missing. Thank you.

Dodson: You are welcome.

Simison: Council, any further questions for Joe? Okay. I see we have the applicant with us. I will turn this over to them for 15 minutes and if you would start off by telling your name and address for the record we would appreciate it.

Wardle: Mr. Mayor, just want to make sure you can hear me first. Perfect. For the record my name is Jon Wardle. 2929 West Navigator, Meridian, Idaho. 83642. With me is also Kody Daffer of our team. We will not take 15 minutes. We will be very quick. The application before you is -- is pretty simple tonight. Maybe even slightly monumental or anticlimactic. Maybe in the same sentence being that this will be the very last plat that we do for the Paramount Subdivision. This one has come forward at this time because of the Linder Village project next door, which is connecting the Fox Run through this project. We have been working with them, as well as ACHD and ITD for probably 18 months now on the dedication of right of way. As noted by Joe the right of way has been held -- it's being held in escrow. We have already signed deed for that. The -- the item that's still remaining is for Linder Village to complete the transaction, which includes the replacement of landscaping and other things along the Paramount frontage. We are told that that should happen here shortly, but as Joe mentioned, this is a four lot short plat before you this night. We -- we are maintaining a landscape buffer to the south along Plaza Shops Drive and we will update the landscape plans for staff prior to signature on

the final plat to show all the required landscape buffers on this project. With that I stand for any questions you might have regarding the short plat before you.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions for the applicant?

Strader: Mr. Mayor, I have a question.

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I'm a neighbor as you know, Jon, so just curious. What kind of landscape are we talking about? Is it something typical? I'm just not -- this is something I don't feel like is ironed out by this point, so --

Wardle: Yeah. So, Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, thank you for the question. What is a little different here -- because it is a commercial -- commercial subdivision, the landscape buffers can be done in an easement and not the typical common lot. We do have a hybrid in this case. We do have a common lot, which is along the southern edge. I believe we actually -- and, Joe, I don't have that in front of me, so maybe -- if you give me a second I can go to a different drawing here. But I think the minimum of the landscape buffer on the southern edge is 30 feet. We wanted to maintain all of the existing landscaping that we had there, as well as add the sidewalk within that area. It does get larger as we get out closer to Fox Run. As it relates to -- yeah, it doesn't really give us a good number there, but as it relates to Chinden, there is a 35 foot landscape buffer there, which will also have the ten foot regional pathway in that landscape buffer there and, then, on Fox Run we have a 20 foot landscape buffer that's required on that collector, which we will also depict. There -- there will be, Council Woman Strader, some significant changes to the way that Fox Run looks currently. As you know there is a structure over the roadway. There is also an island there. In order to make the -- the new road work for Linder Village it will become a five lane road. It's basically -- as you see up here on Chinden, you kind of see the island in the middle and the width. That width will carry all the way down. So, a five lane road at least with turn lanes and other things like that can be accommodated at the intersection of Chinden and Fox Run. We will be replacing a significant amount of landscaping along that area there at Chinden. So, the buffers are -- will be the required buffers and landscaping will be replaced once the road widening occurs.

Strader: Mr. Mayor, quick follow up.

Simison: Councilman Strader.

Strader: Is there a future plan or a look at some kind of a crosswalk here? Just given the road to Linder Village and Linder Village was approved before I joined Council, so I don't have all the back history on that, but is there kind of a pedestrian plan?

Wardle: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, so a couple of crosswalks -- or items here. So, Plaza Shops Drive is the one that will connect with Fox Run. The plans do delineate

curb cuts for pedestrian access that, you know, make it delineated where that will happen. I will go back and work with them on the striping of that, so it's very clear where that is. There, obviously, will be a stop bar, but I have seen them also add the crosswalk designation. So, we will go back and work with ACHD, with Linder Village, and ITD. They are the ones who had those plans, but we will -- we will see what we can do with that southern one. And, then, across Chinden -- or across Fox Run when we come to Chinden, yes, most definitely that will be a delineated crosswalk and will connect to the ten foot regional pathway east to west across Fox Run.

Strader: Thank you.

Simison: Council, any further questions for the applicant? This is a public hearing. Is there anybody of the public who would like to testify on this item? If you are in the room go ahead and come up to the podium and state your name and address for the record or if you are on the Zoom call and would like to do so, please, use the raise hand feature at the bottom of the Zoom platform. Seeing nobody who would like to provide testimony, would the applicant like to make any final comments?

Wardle; Mr. Mayor, no, I do not have any other comments. Stand for any questions. We just request your approval -- Council's consideration and approval of the Paramount Point short plat and we will comply with the noted conditions in the staff report.

Simison: Thank you very much. Council, any questions or do I have a motion?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: I think that's Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: It is. I move that we close the public hearing for Paramount Point, H-2020-0082.

Strader: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to close the public hearing. Is there any discussion on the motion? Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed no. The ayes have it.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Since nobody is jumping to discuss, I'm just going to go ahead and make a motion. I move that -- after considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony that we

approve file number H-2020-0082 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of August 25th, 2020, with no modifications.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: A quick discussion from my end. I do appreciate the applicant trying to work and make sure that we are getting adequate, you know, pedestrian crossings, especially off Fox Run. It has become a real busy area. Linder Village was done and put to bed a long time ago. I have seen some neighbors commenting about it and, you know, it's -- it's a done deal. It improved over time. We are going to make the best of it. And, hopefully, it will be convenient. But just wanted to state that I do appreciate the -- the folks looking out at Brighton to make sure we get that crosswalk and that that's going to be adequate for all the kids and teenagers and stuff going to the Linder Village.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Just a question for Council Woman Strader on her motion. Was that to include the conditions as presented by staff and agreed to by the applicant? I didn't understand the last part of your -- your motion there.

Simison: You mean Council Woman Perreault; correct?

Hoaglund: Yes.

Perreault: Yes. Mr. Hoaglund, no, I had just stated with no modifications to staff -- staff recommendation. Staff requirements. Brighton had indicated they agreed with everything that -- that staff required.

Hoaglund: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Mayor and Council Woman Perreault. That no through me for a minute -- that no conditions. So, I wanted to make sure. Thank you.

Strader: I will second the motion.

Simison: I think we -- we have the motion and the second. So, we are -- we are in the debate on the motion. Is there further debate on the motion? If not, I will ask the clerk to call the roll.

Roll call: Bernt, yea; Borton, yea; Cavener, yea; Hoaglund, yea; Strader, yea; Perreault, yea.

Simison: All ayes. Motion is agreed to and it passes.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

**6. Public Hearing for Brundage Estates (TECC-2020-0001) by LC Development, Generally Located East of S. Linder Rd. Between W. Victory Rd. and W. Amity Rd.**

**A. Request: A 2-year Time Extension on the preliminary plat in order to obtain the City Engineer's signature on a final plat.**

Simison: Next item on our agenda is Item 6, a public hearing for Brundage Estates, TECC-2020-0001. I will turn this hearing over to Sonya for staff comment.

Allen: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. The next application before you is a request for a preliminary plat time extension. This site consists of 136.63 acres of land. It's zoned R-4 and is located east of South Linder Road between West Victory and West Amity Roads. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designations -- there is two of them -- is low density residential, which is approximately 64 acres of the site, and medium density residential, which is 73 acres of the site. This property was annexed in 2014 with the Victory South application. A preliminary plat was later approved in 2016, which was valid for two years. The preliminary plat consisted of 366 buildable lots, 20 common lots, and one other lot on 136.63 acres of land. An administrative time extension was approved by the director in July of 2018, which granted an additional two year period of time until July 26, 2020, in which to obtain the city engineer's signature on a final plat. The reason for the time extension was due to incomplete sewer and water line extensions, as well as upcoming improvements to Harris Street. No new conditions were placed on the application with the previous time extension. The applicant is now requesting a second two year time extension on the preliminary plat in order to obtain the city engineer's signature on a final plat. The reason for this request is that the developer has been focusing on development of the adjacent Biltmore Estates, also known as Oakwood and Greycliff Estates Subdivisions. Approval of the subject time extension will allow the applicant to obtain the city engineer's signature on a final plat and proceed with development of the property. If City Council does not approve the requested time extension, the preliminary plat will expire and a new preliminary plat application will be required. Since the preliminary plat and previous time extension were approved there have not been any code changes that would necessitate new conditions being placed on the subject time extension. The applicant is still required to comply with the previous conditions of approval for this project. No written testimony was submitted on this application and staff is recommending approval of a two year time extension to expire on July 26th, 2022. Staff will stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you, Sonya. Council, any questions for staff?

Strader: Mr. Mayor, I have a question.

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I'm curious if you have to write these memos all the way from scratch on just these time extensions, definitely we could take a look at it. It seems really straightforward and I know you guys are super busy. If we could streamline this stuff and -- and have less --

Allen: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, Council, staff would definitely be in favor of that.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader? Or was that Perreault?

Perreault: Perreault.

Simison: Council Woman Perreault. Thank you.

Perreault: Sonya, a question about the information that you put in the staff report that says the reason for the time extension was due to incomplete sewer and water line extensions. So, is that -- is that the reason for the last extension or the reason for this extension?

Allen: The last extension, Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Okay. So, those have been resolved at this point?

Allen: I believe the applicant is on the Zoom call, if you would like to ask the applicant.

Perreault: Okay. Thank you.

Allen: Oh. Excuse me. In person. I didn't see Cody back there.

Simison: Council, any other questions for staff at this time? Okay. I will ask the applicant, who I understand now is in the room, if they would like to come forward and be recognized for 15 minutes.

Stoeger: Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, thank you for seeing us this evening. I'm here on behalf of the applicant LC Development. Should be pretty straightforward. Short little presentation for you. I just have a -- I'm here to kind of explain the backstory of why we haven't quite gotten to Brundage Estates yet. I'm going to go ahead and read -- with your permission I'm going to go ahead and read a -- oh, yes. So sorry. Cody Stoeger. 1157 La Reata. I'm going to go ahead and read a statement from the applicant as to explaining what's going on over there. When development was starting on my property in southwest Meridian I entered into agreement with the City of Meridian to vacate a sewer district and a community app site, as well as sewage lagoons. As part of that agreement I was asked to annex and provide preliminary plats for all 250 acres of my property. At that time the water and sewer was on the northeast side of the property, so my son and I started

working there with the plans of moving southwest as our neighborhoods were being completed. We are committed to providing quality, sustainable growth in this community. As you know, the process of designing and getting a subdivision approved and developed takes a lot of time, resources, and a significant investment. At this time the preliminary plats on my property consist of over six hundred homes and while that's a huge undertaking, we are committed to continuing our work towards Brundage Estates as part of the original master plan for my acreage. So, with that I stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you, Cody. Council, any questions for the applicant? Like the one we just had regarding the -- I don't know if you remember the question that Council Woman Perreault asked staff a few minutes ago regarding the location and reason.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: The question was whether the -- the water and sewer -- incomplete water and sewer line extensions and the upcoming improvements to Harris Street that were the reasons for the extension in 2018 have been resolved or if that is still something that's being worked on.

Stoeger: Council Woman Perrault and Mayor Simison, those issues have been resolved, so we do have water and sewer connections and Harris Street is in the process of being -- of being improved.

Perreault: Thank you.

Stoeger: Thank you.

Simison: Council, any further questions for the applicant? Okay. Thank you, Cody. Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone signed up to provide testimony on the signup?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, nobody has signed up.

Simison: Okay. Well, if there is anybody in the room that would like to come forward and provide testimony on this item or if you are on the zoom call and would like to testify, you can do so by using the raise your hand feature at the bottom. Seeing no who would like to provide testimony, I know Cody just sat down, but would the applicant like to make any final comments? I got a head shake from Council. Perfect. All right. Then, Council, do I have a motion to close the public hearing?

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Move we close the public hearing on Item H-2020-0001.

Strader: Second.

Borton: TECC.

Simison: Motion and a second to close the public hearing. Is there discussion on the motion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed no. The ayes have it.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Simison: Discussion or a motion?

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: I will make a motion -- a little clearer this time. I think the explanation from the applicant -- I appreciate you being here and from staff as well. It seems to justify this request for the extension -- two year time extension. So, I'm going to make a motion that we approve the TECC-2020-0001, Brundage Estates' request for a two year time extension on its preliminary plat.

Hoaglun: Second the motion.

Strader: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve the item. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

Roll call: Bernt, yea; Borton, yea; Cavener, yea; Hoaglun, yea; Strader, yea; Perreault, yea.

Simison: All ayes. Motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

**7. Public Hearing for Landing South (H-2020-0005) by Jim Jewett,  
Located at 660 S. Linder Rd.**

- A. Request: Rezone of 2.43 acres of land from the R-4 to the R-8 zoning district.**
- B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 11 building lots and 2 common lots on 2.27 acres of land in the proposed R-8 zoning district.**



Simison: Moving on we will move on to Item No. 7, public hearing for Landing South, H-2020-0005. I will open this public hearing with staff comments and turn it over Sonya.

Allen: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, the next applications before you are a request for a rezone and a preliminary plat. This site consists of 2.27 acres of land. It's zone R-4 and is located at 660 South Linder Road. This property was annexed in 1994 without the requirement of a development agreement. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation is medium density residential, which calls for three to eight dwelling units per acre. A rezone of 2.43 acres of land from the R-4 to the R-8 zoning district for the development of 14 single family residential dwelling units, consisting of a mix of single family detached and two family duplex dwellings at a gross density of 6.16 units per acre, consistent with the medium density residential future land use map designation is proposed. A preliminary plat consisting of ten buildable lots, three common lots on 2.27 acres of land in the proposed R-8 zoning district. The minimum lot size proposed is 4,004 square feet, with an average lot size of 6,305 square feet. Duplexes are proposed adjacent to Linder Road with single family detached homes on the eastern portion of the development. Access is proposed via the extension of an existing stub street, South Spoonbill Avenue, from Joshua Street at the northern boundary of this site, which ends in a cul-de-sac. Two common driveways are proposed off the cul-de-sac for access as shown on the plat. No access is proposed or approved via Linder Road. An emergency only access exists off site to the north via Linder Road. ACHD will allow a temporary construction entrance off of Linder during development of the subdivision, but not during home construction. Off-street parking is provided in accord with UDC standards. Two on-street parking spaces, as well as four spaces at the ends of common driveways, for a total of six spaces are available for guest parking, in addition to the parking pads provided on each lot. The red dots signify the off-street parking shown on the plat there. Staff is concerned there may not be adequate on-street parking for guests and area for trash receptacles on trash day. However, the UDC does not have standards for on-street parking. The Kennedy Lateral runs along the northern boundary of the site and has been piped. The pathways master plan depicts a ten foot wide multi-use pathway along the frontage of this site adjacent to Linder Road. However, because there is an existing sidewalk that is in good condition in this area, the Parks Department is not requiring it to be reconstructed and is only requiring an easement for a future pathway. A 25 foot wide landscape street buffer is required along Linder Road. Because this site is below five acres in size, the qualified open space and site amenity standards in the UDC do not apply. An open space exhibit was submitted that depicts .37 of an acre of common open space, consisting of the street buffer along Linder Road and the area along the northern boundary where the Kennedy Lateral lies. No amenities are proposed. Wrought iron fencing is proposed to be constructed at the back edge of the street buffer along Linder Road and along the Kennedy Lateral easement. Concept building elevations were submitted for the homes proposed in this development as shown. Single family detached homes are a single story in height, with stucco finish and stone veneer accents. Duplexes are two stories in height, with a mix of vertical and horizontal siding. The duplex structures are required to comply with the design standards in the architectural standards manual. At the first hearing before the Commission -- there were two hearings -- the Commission directed the applicant to modify the layout of the plat to improve parking and internal

circulation and revise the eastern lots to more of an R-4 size. The applicant came back with a revised plat with two fewer buildable lots and flag lots, instead of one of the common driveways. But the Commission, nor staff, nor the applicant was in favor of this design. Therefore, the applicant wishes to go forward with the original layout as shown. The Commission recommended denial of this application and I will go through a summary of the Commission public hearing. Josh Beach, Sawtooth Land Surveying, the applicant's representative, testified in favor, as did Jim Jewett, the applicant. No one testified in opposition. Janette Ackerman and Anthony Baggio commented on the application. Written testimony was received from Chris and Candice Johnson. Jeff Bolen. Kenneth Scott Grapatin. Josh Beach, the applicant's representative. Key issues of public testimony are as follows: Request for Joshua Street to extend to the west to Linder Road as a permanent access, instead of emergency only. Or at the very least that construction traffic is allowed to use this access for development of the subdivision. And that a no outlet sign be installed on South Tylee Way where it intersects Waltman Drive to notify drivers the street dead ends to prevent unnecessary traffic. Mr. Grapatin expressed concern pertaining to the continued provision of irrigation water to his property, which currently runs through the northern side of the proposed project and accessibility of the ditch for repairs and cleaning. The applicant requested conditions number 3-B and 3-C pertaining to specific tree mitigation be amended based on coordination with the city arborist to take place prior to the Council hearing and they have done so. The applicant testified that there would be one large trash -- trash dumpster enclosure for the development, instead of individual receptacles for each unit, to eliminate the issue of receptacles in the right of way or blocking sidewalks and driveways. And, finally, concerns pertaining to traffic and parking. Key issues of discussion by the Commission were as follows: The provision of a pathway from the sidewalk along Spoonbill Avenue to the sidewalk along Linder Road and to the north to the pathway along the Kennedy Lateral. The Commission directed the applicant to consider revisions to the plat to make the eastern -- eastern lots R-4 size, 8,000 square feet lots, and possibly reduce the density, improve parking and internal circulation. Work with ACHD to facilitate a construction entrance off of Linder Road until initial occupancy and include a pathway connection between Lots 58 and 59 from Spoonbill to Linder Road. Concern pertaining to parking and placement of trash carts on the pickup day. Reduce the number of units by replacing the duplex units with single family detached units and possibly reconfiguring the plat, so the lots are R-4 size and are a pinwheel design off of the cul-de-sac. The Commission recommended denial of the project for the following reasons: They felt it didn't fit the Comprehensive Plan. Challenges with turnarounds and access driveways and revised plat doesn't address the previous concerns of the Commission. And, again, the applicant is requesting Council approval of the original plat as shown submitted for this project, not the revised one submitted at the last Commission hearing. There are no other outstanding issues for Council tonight and there has been no written testimony received since the Commission hearing. Staff will stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you, Sonya. Council, any questions for staff?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Sonya, I apologize if you had stated this and I didn't hear it, but can you -- can you tell us what the -- the gray area -- the shaded area is on the preliminary plat on the left?

Allen: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Perreault, Council, that's the Fire Department turnaround.

Perreault: Okay. That's what I thought. I just wanted to check. Thank you.

Allen: Just demonstrating that it meets the dimensional requirements for that.

Simison: Council, any further questions for staff? Okay. If not, I will invite the applicant to come forward. I don't know if they are in the room or if they are online. In the room. If you would state your name and address for the record, please, and you will have 15 minutes.

Jewett: Yes, Mr. Mayor, Council. Jim Jewett. 776 East Riverside Drive, Eagle, Idaho. Thanks for having me tonight. I would like to comment right off the bat that based on earlier testimony on another application I'm not here in spite of Planning and Zoning's recommendation of denial. I think there just needs to be some clarification, because I did try to work with them and there was just a lot of confusion of what direction we should go on this in-fill. So, I would like to start, then, my testimony on the plat -- on some factual real estate data on where Meridian is today. I checked -- I'm a licensed real estate broker and associate broker here in Idaho, so I have access to all the MLS data -- MLS data and today I did a check. So, in all of Meridian for any type of housing, sub 300,000, there was one house for sale and I assume it will be pending before for the end of the day. I checked the 310 and 320 and not until I got the 340 or 350 did I find available units for sale. That's the condition of our market today. In our previous plat, the Landing No. 12, which is directly to our north, we did the same size lot, the same size development, and we had 29 lots in there and we sold homes in there from -- starting at 275 up to 365. In today's market those houses would be probably 320 to 385, 390, which, in my opinion, is still above the starter home. So, I have created a successful plat in the first phase. We wanted to carry it in this phase and at the same time create some diversity in the duplexes. Now, as Sonya showed you through the slides, there was a picture of a duplex that I had built in the previous phase and those duplexes we built, which is the same one that's the picture shown here, that's the actual picture of the duplex, it's the same plan we had planned on Linder Road. So, our concept was to have that front-on. So, this view you would see from Linder and the garages would access from our new proposed street, giving diversity in housing, giving a different look onto Linder Road, other than the back of a subdivision. That was our concept. Planning and Zoning initially liked that concept, but some of the confusion with the parking -- on-street parking and pathways drove them in our second hearing to maybe not like it as well. So, there is part of the clarification we need from the Council. What is the vision? And so that's one of the things I will be asking tonight is what is your vision, as well as mine, so -- and, then, by doing this -- our duplex

concept -- our spec level was just like our homes. Granted, nicer floors, nicer tile showers, two -- two car garages. This unit has 1,620 on one side and 1,580 on the other. So, it's just as big as the homes we are building and what we have in this particular unit here is an owner-occupied on one side, renting the other side. It's another concept that I have -- it's in other bigger markets and I think it's a market that will happen here to offset some of this increasing cost of housing. People can offset some of their living expenses with rentals. That was what our concept was. The struggle was the on-street parking, which, as Sonya pointed out, is not in the UDC. So, Sonya specifically asked me to come up with a parking plan and that's what she -- I submitted to her and that's what she showed you earlier. Another problem with -- at Planning and Zoning was the common drives. Again, UDC allows the common drive. UDC allows up to -- I believe it's six units per common drive. P&Z did not want to see more than two houses per common drive. So, if I do what P&Z wanted I'm basically doing an R-4 plat. If I do an R-4 plat everything I built and I just displayed to you I did in the other phase, I would not be able to do in this phase, so affordable housing at any level, whatever you want to call affordable housing, would not be available here. I would have to raise the cost of the lots, because they are bigger and I have less density and that's a -- it's a financial decision, as well as a social decision. And that's, again, what I will be looking for, some guidance from the Council tonight is what do they envision for in-fills? This particular site is challenged. We only have one access point and that is off of Spoonbill, which I built a couple of years back. We were denied any access, which I agreed to, we should not have access onto Linder Road, that would not be in our benefit. If you look at our plat -- if Sonya would go back -- the property directly to our -- to our south, they have a cul-de-sac there and if they would have extended and had a stub street it would, again, gave us different options. So, we are kind of shoehorned in what we have there. We are currently zoned R-4 and so I can do an R-4 plat, but I really think if we wanted to help the city and some of this real estate issue we have with more closer to entry level housing, I think we need to consider R-8. The pathway issues at the Planning and Zoning talked about -- I currently built a path out to Linder Road in my previous phase. It's just north of here along the Kennedy Lateral, which I piped. Adding another access point from our cul-de-sac strictly out to Linder, it just -- because of the guidelines within the city it would have taken too much of my property away. I said I would do a private easement with a pathway for the duplex residents, but not necessarily a public one, since they already had one directly north of it. At the conclusion of the second Planning and Zoning hearing, Planning and Zoning suggested that -- albeit that I was very creative in this layout, that maybe I should just simply be less creative, do the single cul-de-sac with the pinwheel. Now, I have drawn that up and I provided it to Sonya. I don't know if she can bring it up or not. To show you what that would look like and -- and that is simply a straight R-4 plat. It meets all the design criteria. Does not use common driveways and I have no objection to it, but I -- what I need is guidance. I need guidance from the Council on how you want in-fills to be treated. Is R-8 appropriate? If you do want on-street parking, how does one gauge that when it's not in the UDC? The trash receptacle issue. I offered the single trash receptacle as an offset to the issue that staff brought up to me that they are -- they are having problems with trash receptacles on common drives specifically. Again, there is no UDC guideline for it. So, I offered something to try to offset it. So, for me to come back and do an R-4, the duplexes go away, because they are -- they are only allowed as a

conditional use and they are twice as big a lot. So, it just -- it just kind of defeats the purpose. So, I guess the questions I would ask Council are is the duplex concept an appropriate direction that city would like to see? And are common driveways in the in-fill an appropriate way to go. And, again, if you want to see this on-street parking what threshold, what guidelines should I use in establishing that? I would also like to point out that in parking, the more parking that you provide the more parking you will get. That means they will just fill it up and in Boise they -- they don't make you put in extra parking, because they -- they have already learned that the only way you are going to take control of your parking is don't give it to them. Honestly, parking should be just for guests to come and to visit and to leave, not to park their cars permanently. The one example that Planning and Zoning gave is during a Superbowl weekend. I don't know. We told them we may not have a Superbowl weekend for a while. So -- so, what I'm asking of Council tonight is is interaction. Tell me what you envision for these in-fills. Tell me what you -- how you feel about the duplex concept, because if it's not, then, I would gladly accept a remand back to Planning and Zoning to go ahead and just do a straight R-4. So, with that I would stand here and take any questions.

Simison: Thank you, Jim. Council, any questions for the applicant?

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Question for Mr. Jewett. On your duplex from here -- from looking at this, the -- the driveways look fairly long, but how long are they on the duplexes?

Jewett: Just on the plat map you mean?

Hoaglund: Yes. Yes.

Jewett: There are -- there are -- a couple of them are long enough -- do you have my duplex layout? One garage will sit back a double depth, so -- do you have the floor plan for the duplex? One duplex is set back 20 feet from the other duplex. So, one is here and the other one is here. So, one driveway is twice as deep as the other. The one that's the shortest would accommodate two additional vehicles behind the garage doors.

Hoaglund: And, then, Mr. Mayor, just to follow up with a comment. You know, it's interesting your comment about -- if you provide the -- the parking you will be filled up and it's just interesting, just a commentary on our society, we are a car culture, especially in this west and this valley and it just amazes me, even in our subdivision, all, you know, single family homes and the family across from us, parents and two kids that drive and four cars, you know, just because it's that time of life for them and it builds up their driveway, plus on the street and -- and, then, of course, if you get renters like we have down the street and you have got five, six people in that house, yeah, you got six vehicles out there. So, it's just one of those things we grapple with and I don't know if there is an answer to it.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Maybe just a comment on one of the questions, just feedback from me, but the thing that really resonated with me from the Planning and Zoning Commission is this isn't like a boulevard where you have a true pedestrian life on the street where you would expect the homes to face the street. This isn't downtown Meridian and I have actually driven down the streets where it's like our typical subdivisions and, then, all of a sudden there is like a random set of three duplexes facing at a busy roadway and it just looks totally out of place, you know, so that -- that made sense to me. I -- I sympathize with you. I mean in-fill development is really hard. It's just -- it's just it hasn't -- it hasn't gotten to the creative point that it's something that feels like it fits and I -- I don't -- and we can try to give you as much guidance as possible, but I don't think our job is ultimately to -- and I'm just going to be very frank -- I don't think it's our job to help make something that's going to work. I think we could try to give you as much guidance as possible and, hopefully, the Planning staff will as well, but -- and that's a challenge to in-fill. It's an economic point. It's a -- it's very tough and I sympathize. But, you know, some of those points I -- I get -- I kind of get what they are saying, you know, the shared common driveway thing, that's -- that's been a big point for us lately and we are going to take a look at our UDC. You know, we know we have an issue there that we need to figure out. I love the idea of finding a lower price point for housing in Meridian. Don't get me wrong, but it -- it's got to be workable. You know, to me that has got to be workable in terms of navigating it. I will be quiet now, but that's just off the cuff. That's kind of what I'm thinking.

Simison: Council, any further questions for the applicant?

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton or Hoaglund?

Borton: Borton. Just to -- Jim, to answer your question, which is a fair question, I think it depends, quite frankly. I think each -- each project is different and there are instances in the community where the scale and location of a project is more amenable to shared attached units, common drives, integrate better and there is some areas that it just doesn't work necessarily and so I think we are supportive of creative solutions in in-fill, but it doesn't necessarily mean any one component will always work there. So, I -- I reviewed all of this with that same concern, the thought I would love to see an R-4 as it's zoned be what is presented and see what that looks like, understanding that might eliminate an opportunity to provide a smaller, more affordable house in this particular application. It still might be appropriate, considering the circumstances and conditions of this property. So, I guess it depends on the application, quite frankly.

Jewett: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Borton, truly appreciate your comments and when we look at a piece of property we look at what -- what's done prior and that's what I have looked at. In the prior subdivision R-8 wasn't acceptable. We have two common

driveways in there and 29 lots. So, I do appreciate it. Now, Sonya has pulled up the R-4 plat that is -- let's call it less creative, because it's just a cul-de-sac with -- with eight R-4 lots and as you mentioned, it doesn't provide some of that diversity, but it certainly meets -- this meets the comp plan. This is eight units for the 2.3 acres. So, we are still within the three to eight range. So, I realize that an R-8 zoning is not an entitlement, it is a privilege, and I'm at the privilege of this Council to either grant it or not grant it and I would respect whatever decision this Council made. The duplex would be a component of R-8 and would not be a component of R-4 and so I think that's probably the first decision that I will ask you folks to make is R-8 or not R-8, because that answers the rest of the questions. I think at that point we just -- I will ask for you just to remand back to Planning and Zoning to take this plat, which doesn't solve the on-street parking issue, because it still provides the same amount of on-street parking, because you can't park within a cul-de-sac. But it does change the lot. It does change the diversity. It changes -- it changes the housing count, which is going to change the car count, so I do appreciate your comments.

Borton: Mr. Nary? Or Mr. Mayor, I guess, a question for Mr. Nary.

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Thank you. In that scenario is the -- is the process then -- like the rezone request change, if it becomes an R-4 plat, that portion of the application is withdrawn and the plat itself gets remanded, because you no longer have a rezoning request? What would happen there?

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, Councilman Borton, I mean, obviously, completely new noticing is going to have to occur, right, and the new revised application is going to have to be submitted. So, I would simply -- if the direction of the Council was to remand it, just remand all of it the way it is and, then, again, a new application -- if the direction is the Council's preference -- I think what Mr. Jewett is asking is if the Council's preference is for it to remain a certain -- an R-4 that's currently zoned, then, to remand that and, then, he will work with the staff and submit a new application that will have to be renoticed. Unless I misunderstood him. That's what I thought he was asking.

Allen: Mr. Nary -- excuse me, Mr. Mayor? He would be reducing the number of buildable lots from ten to seven and, then, it would be a -- just the existing zoning. Would that still require renotice?

Nary: Yes.

Allen: Okay. Thank you.

Nary: Because it's a different project.

Simison: Council, any further questions for the applicant? Thank you, Mr. Jewett. Mr. Clerk, did we have anyone signed up to testify on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, nobody was signed up for this item.

Simison: Okay. Is there anybody else in the chambers? No? Okay. Well, we have eliminated that possibility. We do have some people who are still listening to this. Is there anyone in the Zoom call who would like to provide testimony on this item? This is a public hearing. If so, please, indicate by using the raise your hand button on Zoom and the clerk will bring you in. Okay. Council, I see no one who would like to provide testimony on this item. Would the applicant like to make any final comments at this time?

Jewett: Yes, Mr. Mayor and Council. So, if I understand Mr. Nary's comment, if we remanded the whole thing back, I could simply just withdraw my annexation -- I mean, excuse me, my rezone application through the renote process. Would that withdrawal have to come back to Council for acceptance?

Nary: No. If the direction of the Council is that that's the -- they are not willing to move forward with the rezone, when we remand it all back, basically, you are going to submit a revised application and with -- and include with that a withdraw of that request.

Jewett: Thanks for the clarification. With that I don't have any other comments.

Simison: So, Council, I will turn this over to you for any questions, comments, or close the public hearing.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Just a brief discussion. That's what I captured in this application. It's just so unique to this property that the challenges that -- that P&Z wrestled with and the applicant made a good faith attempt to try and solve, I don't think can be solved with the R-8. I think the R-8 sort of invited some of the challenges. Duplexes fit some places, but maybe not here as presented. So, I think the applicant's efforts to find a solution and the remand and have a new plat designed that's consistent with its existing R-4 zoning, that might, in turn, solve a lot of the problems that the P&Z rightfully wrestled with. So, that was just the thought process of where we may want to go on this one.

Hoaglund: And Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Yeah. Likewise, I appreciate the effort of the applicant to -- to find a way forward on that and working with the Commission to -- to figure things out and they looked at a couple of things and -- and had difficulty with it and in looking at the -- the R-8 request and how it came about, it just -- it didn't sit well with me, but I do appreciate the applicant trying to find solutions to it and -- and I think if we remand it back and, then, give it another



go we will see what happens on that end and see if we can get -- get an in-fill project completed.

Simison: Council, any further comments or do I have a motion?

Hoaglund: Well, Mr. Mayor? Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I move that we close the public hearing for Landing South, H-2020-0005.

Borton: Second.

Simison: Motion and second to close the public hearing. Any discussion on the motion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: After hearing staff and applicant testimony, I move that we remand File No. H-2020-0005 back to the Planning and Zoning Commission and let the applicant determine where he wants to go from there.

Borton: Second.

Simison: I don't know if the other people who are remote had the same troubles I had. I did not hear what was stated, although I know what the motion was, but --

Hoaglund: The motion to -- I move that -- after considering all staff and applicant testimony that I move we remand H-2020-0005 back to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Borton: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to remand the item back to Planning and Zoning. Is there any discussion on the motion?

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Just for clarity, if the motion includes what the applicant had made representations -- that the remand would be, then, to bring forward an R-4 project, that

the rezone request would be -- through that process withdrawn and it would be -- the R-4 -- R-4 plat as well would be presented to P&Z upon remand.

Nary: And notice for a new hearing, too.

Hoaglund: Yes. And, Mr. Mayor, I would include that in my motion to -- to make sure that is clear.

Borton: Okay. Second agrees.

Simison: Is there any further discussion on the motion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

Roll call: Bernt, yea; Borton, yea; Cavener, yea; Hoaglund, yea; Strader, yea; Perreault, yea.

Simison: All ayes. Motion is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

**8. Request to Withdraw Application for Villas at Twelve Oaks East (H-2020-0014) by Jim Jewett, Located at 115 S. Linder Rd.**

Simison: With that we will move on to Item 7 -- or Item 8, request to withdraw application for Villas at Twelve Oaks East, H-2020-0014. I will open this request with staff comments.

Allen: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, staff really doesn't have any comments. This request is directly from the applicant that you just heard from on the previous project. So, he's here if you would like -- if you would like him to comment on his request.

Simison: Thank you. Council, would you like to hear from the applicant on this request at this time?

Borton: Sure.

Simison: Mr. Jewett, do you have any comments you would like to make?

Jewett: Mr. Mayor, Council, Jim Jewett again. 776 East Riverside Drive, Eagle, Idaho. I will try to be short, but I want to make sure I'm clear with my explanation. We started this process about two years ago with this additional property adding into Twelve Oaks. Our original concept was only a portion of this property coming in to the Twelve Oaks and coming in as an annexation. The remainder being left is future commercial, recognizing that the comp plan had commercial designation. Through our meetings with -- with the staff, there was a desire to bring the entire parcel in and the comp plan was defined to support our application and just adding no apartments and as my previous testimony, we don't necessarily know if commercial is viable there, but I am acceptance of the fact that it's possible down the road and I'm willing to let that probability exist. So, what I would

like to do is withdraw this application and let me retune my original application and bring it back, which left a significant part of the property as future commercial. Through the process when we started -- again, it was a much smaller addition to the Twelve Oaks project, with that we asked for an extension of the sewer and water out of Twelve Oaks into this property to accommodate that growth and we were granted approval by Public Works and we actually already built that. So, we already have infrastructure in place to accommodate what our initial concept was. Not for the current concept that you saw recently, but the original. So, instead of having a one year moratorium placed on me to bring back that -- that subsequent application, I would rather just withdraw this, let me retool it and bring it back, leaving a significant amount of that ground as future and let's wait and see what happens with Linder Road, the overpass, how growth happens in Meridian. We are not in a hurry to make a bad judgment. So, I'm willing to see what we can do to appease the Council and -- and like our project with some level of expansion. So, with that I would -- I would stand for any questions. I guess it's not really a question.

Borton: Good explanation.

Simison: Council, do you have any questions at this time? Okay. Thank you. Then do I have a motion?

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I would move that we accept the request to withdraw the application for The Villas at Twelve Oaks East, H-2020-0014.

Borton: Second.

Bernt: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to accept the offer to withdraw the application request. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it. Thank you, Mr. Jewett, for your time this evening.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

## **ORDINANCES [Action Item]**

- 9. Ordinance No. 20-1890: An Ordinance (H-2020-0039 – Ascent Townhomes) for Annexation of a Portion of the Southeast  $\frac{1}{4}$  of the Southwest  $\frac{1}{4}$  of Section 10, Township 3 North, Range 1 West, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, as Described in Attachment “A” and Annexing Certain Lands and Territory, Situated in Ada County, Idaho, and Adjacent and Contiguous to the Corporate Limits of the City of**

**Meridian as Requested by the City of Meridian; Establishing and Determining the Land Use Zoning Classification of 5.25 Acres of Land From RUT to R-15 (Medium High Density Residential) Zoning District in the Meridian City Code; Providing that Copies of this Ordinance Shall be Filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as Required by Law; and Providing for a Summary of the Ordinance; and Providing for a Waiver of the Reading Rules; and Providing an Effective Date**

Simison: With that we will move on to Ordinance No. 20-18 --

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: -- 90. I will ask the clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, before we move on to that, Mr. Jewett had a question. Will you entertain it?

Simison: Yes.

Jewett: Thank you, Mayor and Council. I had a parks issue that I thought was going to be on the agenda tonight. Did that get handled in a previous session? On my bridge --

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, I think I can address that. Mr. Nary can correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe that was approved on the Consent Agenda. Was that a development agreement for T&M Holdings? No. Sorry. Wrong one. Number 11, Parks and Recreation Department pedestrian bridge construction agreement between Open Door Rentals and City of Meridian to connect pathway segments. That was approved on the 4:30 meeting.

Jewett: Oh. Thank you. I just wanted clarification, because I have been waiting for that to get that bridge going.

Hoaglund: You got a win.

Jewett: Thank you. Appreciate everybody's effort. Thank you. Good night.

Simison: And we will return to Item No. 9, ordinance number 20-1890. Ask the clerk to read this by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Ordinance 20-1890. It's an ordinance related to H-2020-0039, Ascent Townhomes, for annexation of a portion of the Southeast ¼ of the Southwest ¼ of Section 10, Township 3 North, Range 1 West, Boise meridian, Ada --

Simison: Mr. Clerk?

Johnson: Yes, sir.

Simison: You will need to up the volume for those who are on the outside looking.

Johnson: Okay. I took the mask down. Maybe that will help.

Simison: There you go.

Johnson: This is an ordinance related to H-2020-0039, Ascent Townhomes, for annexation of a portion of the Southeast  $\frac{1}{4}$  of the Southwest  $\frac{1}{4}$  of Section 10, Township 3 North, Range 1 West, Boise meridian, Ada county, Idaho, as described in Attachment "A" and annexing certain lands and territory, situated in Ada county, Idaho, and adjacent and contiguous to the corporate limits of the City of Meridian as requested by the City of Meridian; establishing and determining the land use zoning classification of 5.25 acres of land from RUT to R-15 (Medium High Density Residential) zoning district in the Meridian City Code; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; and providing for a summary of the ordinance; and providing for a waiver of the reading rules; and providing an effective date.

Simison: Council, you have heard this ordinance read by title. Is there anybody who would like it read in its entirety? If not, do I have a motion?

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: I move -- I move approval of Ordinance No. 20-18 -- Ordinance No. 20-1891 with suspension of the rules.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor. Mr. Hoaglun, that was 1890. The ordinance read.

Borton: Which --

Johnson: Number 9.

Simison: Dash 1891?

Johnson: It's 20-1890. 20-1891 is the next one.

Hoaglun: I'm -- I'm sorry, Mr. Mayor. I -- I jumped to the next one. I move approval -- we will start over. Ordinance -- I move approval of Ordinance No. 20-1890 with suspension of rules.

Bernt: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve Ordinance No. 20-1890. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

- 10. Ordinance No. 20-1891: An Ordinance (H-2019-0133 – Lupine Cove) for Annexation of a Parcel of Land Being a Portion of the Southwest Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of Section 33, Township 4 North, Range 1 West, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, as Described in Attachment “A” and Annexing Certain Lands and Territory, Situated in Ada County, Idaho, and Adjacent and Contiguous to the Corporate Limits of the City of Meridian as Requested by the City of Meridian; Establishing and Determining the Land Use Zoning Classification of 10.41 Acres of Land From RUT to R-8 (Medium Density Residential) Zoning District in the Meridian City Code; Providing that Copies of this Ordinance Shall be Filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as Required by Law; and Providing for a Summary of the Ordinance; and Providing for a Waiver of the Reading Rules; and Providing an Effective Date**

Simison: Next item is Ten, Ordinance No. 20-1891. Ask the clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. This is an ordinance related to H-2019-0133, Lupine Cove, for annexation of a parcel of land being a portion of the Southwest 1/4 of the Northwest 1/4 of Section 33, Township 4 North, Range 1 West, Boise meridian, Ada county, Idaho, as described in Attachment “A” and annexing certain lands and territory, situated in Ada county, Idaho, and adjacent and contiguous to the corporate limits of the City of Meridian as requested by the City of Meridian; establishing and determining the land use zoning classification of 10.41 acres of land from RUT to R-8 (Medium Density Residential) zoning district in the Meridian City Code; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State tax commission, as required by law; and providing for a summary of the ordinance; and providing for a waiver of the reading rules; and providing an effective date.

Simison: Council, you have heard this item read by title. Is there anyone that would like it read in its entirety? If not, do I have a motion?

Simison: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Mr. Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: I move approval of Ordinance No. 20-1891 with suspension of the reading rules.

Bernt: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve Ordinance No. 20-1891 under suspension of the rules. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it. The item is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

### **FUTURE MEETING TOPICS**

Simison: Anything under future meeting topics?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I would like to have a future discussion on whether we could find a way to allow for the Planning office to use their discretion to have a verbal summary of requests for extensions of final plat, instead of writing up these extensive memos.

Simison: So long as legal is okay with it. I have no issue with it and do we need a discussion about it? But -- noted. Duly noted. Duly noted. Perfect. Anything else under this future meeting item? Or do I have a motion to adjourn?

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor, I move we adjourn.

Strader: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to adjourn. All those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? We are adjourned.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:52 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON

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

ATTEST:

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