

Seal: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council file number H-2020-0047, as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of October 22nd, 2020, with the following modifications: That the applicant provide noise abatement measures along the western boundary closest to Highway 16. We recommend that the three story medical building be moved or swapped with the parking area to its east. That the applicant work with staff to provide an electric gate that is approved by the fire chief for access to Serenity Lane from the south and that they reduce the number of lots to the south to provide better transition to the properties to the south.

Cassinelli: I will second that.

Fitzgerald: Just for clarification, you are giving the staff the ability to work with them to line that southern property up; right?

Seal: That's correct.

Fitzgerald: Just so I'm clear. Okay. Commissioner Cassinelli, does that make up with your second?

Cassinelli: Yes. Exactly.

Fitzgerald: So, I have a motion and a second to recommend approval with modifications for H-2020-0047, Prescott Ridge. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Fitzgerald: Patrick and Ms. Hunsiker, thank you for being with us tonight. I wish you best of luck working with staff to get everything finalized. And, team, if it's okay we will take a five minute break, so everybody can take a -- get a water or use the restroom and we will be back in a second to continue on and, Sonya, sorry, but we will just pause for five minutes.

(Recess: 9:27 p.m. to 9:34 p.m.)

**4. Public Hearing Continued from September 17, 2020 for Pura Vida Ridge Ranch (H-2020-0064) by Jay Gibbons, South Beck & Baird, Located 3727 E. Lake Hazel Rd.**

- A. Request: Annexation of 26.34 acres of land with R-8 (6.64 acres) and R-15 (19.69 acres) zoning districts.
- B. Request: A Preliminary Plat consisting of 157 buildable lots and 35 common lots on 26.34 acres of land in the R-8 and R-15 zoning districts.

- C. Request: A Planned Unit Development with a request for a deviation from the dimensional standards listed in UDC Table 11-2A-7 to allow reduced building setbacks in the R-15 zoning district.

Fitzgerald: Okay. So, I think we have all the team back. Moving to the last item on our agenda is the continued application for H-2020-0064, Pura Vida Ridge Ranch and we will turn it over to Sonya for the staff report.

Parsons: Yeah. Mr. Chair, you are actually going to get me for the rest of the evening.

Fitzgerald: Oh, sweet. Okay.

Parsons: So, as this Commission is aware, this project was continued from the September 17th hearing for the purpose of making some changes and bringing that back to this body. So, the applicant did work with staff to -- to come up with some landscape solutions for the hillside, some changes to the open space resulting in enlarged usable area and, as you recall, there are some significant slopes on this site and so they were asked to bring back a fire prevention plan as well and that had been presented to the fire chief for review and approval. So, the applicant did submit revised plans and I will go to those quickly. I think the color graphic probably depicts it the best. You can see it more accurately as to the proposed changes that they -- they have here. But you can see here that they have a larger central common open space area where a couple of building lots in a parking area were previously shown and that's in this area central to the development. So, you are looking at the graphic on the left, you can see where there is two buildings and that parking lot and go to the right here, you can see that that's been removed, the unit and the parking for more -- better interconnected open space. So, that resulted in an increase of .36 acres of qualified -- qualified open space overall and, then, additional site amenities consisting of a tot lot, children's play -- with children's play equipment and four fitness workout stations located in different spots along the perimeter. So, along here there is some fitness stations that were included along the pathway, if I recall. The applicant also provided some revised elevations for you to take into consideration. If you recall at the last hearing we did discuss the requirement of them bringing back an architectural design guidelines manual for the proposed development, we wanted to make sure there was a consistent design theme throughout the development. The applicant also provided that. And, then, the applicant also provided an updated parking plan, which, essentially, they lost -- they went from 71 off-street parking spaces to 20 for overflow parking, but they still maintained 88 on-street parking spaces. I think that was probably some of the reason for the continuance is to see if the applicant could get more open space and still maintain -- satisfy the concern of parking and provide better amenities for the development, because of the density that we were proposing. So, as I mentioned to you here, I will go through here and see if I can get to those elevations for you. So, this is kind of what they had at the last hearing. The single story detached. And these are some of the additional town -- townhome elevations that they want you to take under consideration tonight. Again, two story. And, then, this is the three story product that they -- they are thinking that they may want to incorporate into the development and want to get your -- your recommendation on allowing this to occur within the development. I

think the applicant will probably be best to go over those changes with you this evening. But, really, those were the -- kind of the themes that we heard from that previous hearing. As the previous hearing, staff is recommending approval and I will stand for any questions for you and, then, we will let the applicant present their changes to you.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, Bill. Appreciate it. Can you restate the percentage of open space again, just so I -- because I didn't hear you quite right.

Parsons: Well, yeah, let me see. I think -- I believe the applicant gave us some of those changes here.

Fitzgerald: Okay.

Parsons: So, you can see here open space is at 19.92 percent now. So, again, it was a 0.36 percent increase in the qualified open space for the development, which is what you guys wanted to see, at least --

Fitzgerald: Yeah.

Parsons: -- more central consolidated open space. So, you have gotten that now.

Fitzgerald: Okay.

Parsons: Which I think, again, from -- from our standpoint it is -- it looks like the applicant has done what the Commission has asked. Any other additional questions for me?

Fitzgerald: Any additional questions for -- for Bill?

Cassinelli: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Cassinelli.

Cassinelli: Bill, there was -- there was no three story previously; is that correct?

Parsons: That is correct, Commissioner.

Cassinelli: Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Any additional questions for Bill at this time?

Grove: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Grove.

Grove: Bill, so with the loss of -- you said -- I think it shows, what, 71 parking spots. Does -- what impact does that have for the overall parking of this development? Are we still --

are we getting down to like the minimum of what is required for the number of units that are going in or how are we looking?

Parsons: Yeah. Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission, again, I think -- if I recall, you know, this -- as -- as we work with applicants through moving them through the hearing process, we talked with him about providing a parking plan and at least sharing that with you. It's not really a code requirement, but each one of these units have to provide a certain amount of parking based on the bedroom counts and, then, as you recall, at the last hearing we determined that they had plenty of on-street parking. So, in your hearing outline tonight they still have 20 guest parking stalls, but they still have 88 on-street parking spaces. So, again, I think you are allowed to park on both sides of the street, if I remember correctly, along some of these -- this ring road and the one that stubs to the south here. So, again, from -- from our perspective I think you guys -- at least from my recollection, you felt there may have been too much surface parking and you wanted to see more open space. So, the applicant did keep some of the guest parking in the appropriate locations, but, then, incorporated more open space. So, I think from our perspective we think there is adequate parking and it meets code, so --

Fitzgerald: I think -- yeah. I recall we -- we thought there was too many parking spots and not enough consolidated open space. At least that was our -- my recollection as well.

Grove: Thank you. I just wanted to make sure we didn't lose --

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Cassinelli, did you have other comments or questions, sir?

Cassinelli: How do you read my mind?

Fitzgerald: I just do. I can see. Or maybe. I don't know.

Cassinelli: Bill, you had a -- you kind of flew by a plat map there that sort of had these two -- not that one. It was -- it was the -- the map with the blue line. There. No. It was -- it kind of divided -- it -- it kind of divided the two -- these -- these -- you know, the single family versus the -- the townhomes. Kind of on the -- it kind of split the hill. That's not the one. I don't know where it was and you flew through it. I just wanted to get -- I'm trying to get an idea for the -- there you go. But that -- that does the same thing. But that was the -- that was the better one on the other map, but -- so -- and just to clear this up, this is -- we are looking at this -- this is one large plat that we are looking at. So, when we are looking at the density, we are looking at the total overall density and whatnot and not that of parcel one and parcel two; is that correct?

Parsons: Yes. That's correct. We look at the density. This project just has two zoning district boundaries, but it's still one project.

Cassinelli: Okay. Oh, is that what -- is that why we have got -- there is two zoning districts in there?

Parsons: Yep. That's why you see it.

Cassinelli: What -- and what are the -- what are the -- what are they on the -- on the two?

Parsons: Are you referring to acreage?

Cassinelli: No. As far as what are the two -- what do we have in there? I think that -- that was on the next slide or the previous slide.

Parsons: Well, we have a hundred and -- we had -- the -- the housing mix is 30 detached homes or single family homes and, then, six attached and 121 townhomes, which, again, some of that's going to change slightly, because we did lose some units. Some attached units is what we are looking at, with an overall gross density --

Cassinelli: Is that on the land use map? Is that --

Parsons: Well, the land use map -- yeah. The land use map has this medium high density residential, which is eight to 12 dwelling units to the acre. So, this one's falling into -- if you look here on --

Cassinelli: Okay. Does that parcel one -- if that were to be looked at by itself does that fit with the future land use map with the zoning?

Parsons: I would say, yes, it does.

Cassinelli: It definitely does?

Parsons: Yes.

Fitzgerald: I think we walked through that last time.

Cassinelli: It was -- I'm still confused on that.

Fitzgerald: Bill, did you have a follow up?

Cassinelli: No. No. That's it.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Any additional questions for Bill at this point? Okay. Would the applicant like to come forward or join us on Zoom. Sir, whenever you are ready and to get your slides up. Make sure you speak directly into that mic and we will -- state your name and your address for the record and the floor is yours when you are ready.

Gibbons: I will stand closer. Can you hear me now?

Fitzgerald: Can you get that a little bit closer or maybe try the other one?

Gibbons: Okay. No worries. Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, this is -- I'm Jay Gibbons. I am with South Beck & Baird Landscape Architecture and Land Planning, 2002 South Vista, Boise, Idaho. I represent the owner and the project. So, I can answer the last question that Commissioner Cassinelli provided as well. This -- this first slide -- this -- I want to reacquaint you with where we are. The Pura Vida Ridge Ranch Sub -- Ridge Ranch Subdivision is -- the property is the four sided triangle there in the middle. We are just off one property away from Boise Ranch. Lake Hazel runs on our north property boundary and you have the South Meridian YMCA to the north. A couple of city parks as well. Recently you approved Poiema -- or the city approved Poiema Subdivision and the proposed development to the south of us, Sky Break, was -- was on a recent -- well, last week's -- two weeks ago Commission hearing. Got tabled until November 19th. So, you will hear more about that as we go forward. Let me address first the density question that Commissioner Cassinelli had. On the -- the lower portion, the R-15, portion the medium high density residential district a -- the city would like to see eight to 12 dwelling units per acre. We have -- because of the way we are doing are -- the reason we are doing the planned unit development is because we have basically -- you have got two and a half acres of the Ten Mile Creek drain that is unbuildable. It's -- it's fully within their property in the east. And, then, our ridge line that bisects the north of the bluff to -- to the lower end, that's about four and a half acres. So, there is seven acres total. That leaves us the bottom area in zone one with about nine -- a little over 19 acres. You take away seven you got 12. We have 127 units -- dwelling units on those 12 acres. That's just a little over ten dwelling units per acre. That's smack dab in the middle of what the city was -- was -- was looking for from a comp plan perspective. So, hopefully, you understand that a little bit better. Lake Hazel itself is a mobility corridor and that's part of the reason the city wanted to see the -- the medium high density residential in this area to support that designation. So, at our last hearing on 17th what I heard from the Commission was, basically, nine issues that -- that you would like -- that you asked us to go back and take a look at our development plan and see what we can do to really -- to address these. One of them was a more unique design layout. Reduce the parking for more open space. Create a common area for an open play and a tot lot. A more cohesive open space plan. Fencing along Ten Mile -- Ten Mile Timber Creek drain and the multi-use pathway that's -- that we are proposing along that. More hillside treatment. Provide a -- you wanted to see the firewise -- fire prevention plan before making a recommendation and go to the City Council. Similarly, you wanted to see draft architectural design guidelines for review before making a decision and, then, you asked us to explain the lack of vehicular connection between the R-15 homes and the R-8 homes. And so what I have geared my presentation tonight is around these nine questions and I will cover those in the following slides. Oops. So --

Cassinelli: If we could have Jay speak into the microphone.

Gibbons: I will stand still. That helps. So, my first slide -- Bill showed you the -- the overall color landscape plan from last time and -- and so, then, the follow up was we took that one and we -- we took away the two lots. The salmon colored lots that were formerly now the -- the open space, the -- the larger open space that we have created, we took out one ring road was road number four on the plat map. It was troublesome to ACHD,

because it was really short and only served basically a parking lot -- off-street parking lot and -- and two lots. We were able to recoup those lots. Took out some of the -- a parking lot that was over by the future bridge over Ten Mile. The Ten Mile drain. So, we didn't lose any lots. Part of the reason we are providing a new housing type or two new housing types -- one or the other is that originally they -- they all were on -- they didn't have a parking pad behind them. They had to be two bedroom. You didn't have a driveway. So, basically, you had a two car garage in each of those. We are proposing a housing type that is cohesive with the rest of our -- or will be -- more in line with what we originally proposed for the R-8 and the R-15 -- the townhome style. This is a shorter -- a shorter house, wider lots. They are 24 foot wide lots. They are still 65 feet long, but because the houses themselves are 40, 42 feet wide -- or 42 feet deep we can get a 20 by 20 pad behind each of them. That overcomes a loss of -- of any -- we still have 127 lots in the -- in the R-15, but we are able to supply parking on those lots for each individual home, as opposed to having those separated off-street parking lots that we have -- we have taken off and what we did with that -- by losing those 71 spaces is, then, at the ends of those -- the new lots are all the -- the tan color homes. The end caps of each of those are now greenspace, which ties into the MEWs running between the entries -- the front entries to the homes and this other -- other note about the -- one of the new product types is there is a -- there is a man door next to -- there is an entry into the house off the garage -- not in the garage, next to the garage doors. So, you know, a guest comes and parks in your driveway, you can let them in the back door, as opposed to having to go and find -- find your house in -- in the MEW. Another benefit of that is that each of these housing blocks have their own little extra green space -- usable gathering space, in addition to their MEW. And I will say that this -- so, it doesn't sound like -- .36 acres is -- is what the net or the -- the net gain to open space by creating this -- this larger open space with the tot lot and a fitness is -- it also will house -- it's a full size youth -- up to U-10 soccer field or half of a soccer field for -- or U-14 to U-19. It's basically 165 feet by 105 feet open. That's why there aren't trees in the middle of it. So, you got -- you got a lot of -- a lot of space there without -- without really that -- it's a benefit to us. What we have also done is connect the -- the pathway all the way across each of the 24 foot wide loop roads to -- that feed these houses to provide access to these houses. You remember last time there was -- there was a sidewalk between them, but there wasn't one outside -- near the toe of the slope. That allows us to really provide -- as you will see in a few minutes how it really all ties together. And so, like I said, we -- we propose a new two -- two story, two car garage, 24 by 40 foot home. We don't need the extra parking lots and they can be three, four bedroom homes and have a 20 by 20 parking pad. We also want to propose to you a three story product for -- and -- and I'm going to -- I'm going to tell you these -- these products that I'm proposing they only go for those 32 lots that we reconfigured. Those are the ones in the middle. They are not on the perimeter on the east next to the multi-use pathway, they are right at the toe of the hill, which, you know, it's basically per code they can't be more than 40 foot. That's -- that's the height limitation at 40 feet. Well, you got the two story product with the peaked roof, that's about 35 feet anyway. So, they are really -- they really -- but it allows -- you know, you can see -- you can have patios on -- on two different levels or what have you and -- and these are -- these are rear loaded as well and I'm looking for some input from the Commission on these, especially from -- from, you know, a look perspective. Because of our design guidelines all the homes in

this development will -- will -- as we finalize our design guidelines, you know, similar elements will tie all of our homes together, be it color treatment, it could be stone or masonry, it will be, you know, roof colors, there will be paint schemes, windows, decks, what have you. The whole nine yards. That will be in the design guidelines. These will have to comply with that as well. These are, you know, conceptual ideas for -- for three story product. So, one of the things that -- that -- of course, as the Commission pointed out was, you know, what's unique or we need a little more uniqueness to your -- to your layout and what -- we think we are pretty unique the way it is in the beginning, because of our housing type and, you know, how we can manage to get the city's wishes met with the zoning district, but having an opportunity to -- to create more of an active lifestyle in this development, we can create a recreation, a fitness plan that ties the multi-use pathway that runs over a thousand feet along the Ten Mile Creek drain, ties into the sidewalk there along Locust -- or Lake Hazel and, then, comes back into the development along our entry and follows the toe of the slope all the way around. All of those are -- are concrete sidewalks within our plan and it ties all of the open spaces together and that's a point -- .7 mile loop. In addition to that, we have got four fitness stations, two of them directly along the Ten Mile pathway and, then, one in our -- in our new tot lot and open play area and, then, one on the south end and where it turns and goes back towards the creek.

Cassinelli: Jay, if you could get into the microphone a little better. I'm having a real hard time hearing.

Gibbons: I apologize. I'm going to have to put it on my lapel in a minute, I suppose, but -- so, we have added some amenities. We are way above what the city would otherwise require and we have used the hillside -- we are going to -- we are going to have a -- you know, a cyclist -- a bicycle circuit, rest areas, benches with a -- you know, a post to park on. There is -- there is a trash receptacle, a rest area along the way. Viewpoints or what have you. And that's about -- that's about a .6 mile circuit. So, by interconnecting all these greenways it really helps. And there is another reason for those greenways that I will get to in a minute. You were concerned about fencing along Ten Mile drain and there is always an issue with fences along -- on the drain side, the water side, of multi-use pathways. In the first place the city doesn't typically put them in on the creek drains, because they aren't -- they are not -- they are not -- they are not live water per se. They are not like an irrigation lateral that it's running water during the season. This is a drain creek, natural waterway. Five Mile Creek doesn't have -- they will have -- they will have fences on the house side of the pathway, but not on a water side. It's what we are going to do, because our houses are there along the pathway, we are actually going to connect a wrought iron five foot wrought iron fence house to house and, then, at the ends of the MEW where the MEW -- the walkway through the MEW connects with the multi-use pathway, we will have a gate there, that way -- that separates the public versus the private space. We got public -- it's a public multi-use pathway. It's going to be a city pathway. The interior in the MEWs, that's -- that's a private space for -- our owners and so we think this is a creative solution and it's a good way to go and this is -- this is the -- the product that -- what we are going to use. So, we -- you asked to see the architectural design guidelines. I submitted a draft of those. Like I say they will be finalized as we go forward.



The condition -- the city has conditioned that it be finalized and approved and incorporated into the CC&Rs prior to the first final plat. Similarly, with the -- the draft Wildland Urban Interface Fire Safety Plan, long title, means the same. There are five firewise principles. You got fire resistant homes and that has everything to do with building materials. You have perhaps fiber cement siding, masonry accents of asphalt, composite shingles, all the things that aren't readily flammable from embers or even direct flame in some regard. The second point is fire resistant landscapes. You know, you have three zones -- can I wrap up? I have -- I can do this in a minute. Anyways. So, you have three zones out to 30 feet from the structures. You got the clean -- clean and green, which means that's -- that's basically yard space or manicured lawn and, then, from 30 to 70 is pruned and groomed and that's prune trees up eight feet. You have groomed the -- the deadwood out of the shrubbery. You have -- you may have lower grasses. It's still -- it's still irrigated and, then, you have the native vegetation that you are going to address from 70 feet plus that -- it creates that safe zone from the structures along the natural hillside that the Fire Department is concerned with and we are, too. Third is an evacuation plan. Be prepared and plan ahead. Fire prevention. That's all about awareness and education. And, then, fire ecology and management. It's how the fire -- firefighters do their jobs. And it all goes hand in hand and our -- our plan addresses these and it, too, will be incorporated into the CC&Rs prior to the first final plat. So, I have some overall concepts -- one from above looking into the development from across the north side of -- of Lake Hazel along Ten Mile Creek. To the right of that is the entry into our development, undeveloped land to the west. The bottom left corner is the alley loaded product with the driveways and, then, to the lower right corner is one of the -- one of the MEWs along the creek. It's between some of the -- the three townhomes along Ten Mile Creek itself. You can see it actually looks bigger than -- than just in the plan view. It's not exaggerated. It's a nice -- it's a nice picture. And with that I will stand for questions.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, sir. Are there questions for the applicant? Not at this time? Going once, going twice. Jay, thank you very much, sir. I'm sure we will have comments or -- I will I let you close after public testimony.

Gibbons: Perfect. Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Thank you. Madam Clerk, do we have individuals who would like to testify in person or online?

Weatherly: Mr. Chair, we have two people signed in as if necessary. John Roters, do you want to talk? Okay. John Roters is not speaking tonight. Justin Griffin? Okay. We don't have anybody in house left that is raising their hand on that.

Fitzgerald: I see Annette.

Weatherly: Yep. Annette, one moment, please.

Fitzgerald: Annette, how are you, ma'am?

Alonso: I'm good. Can you hear me?

Fitzgerald: Yes, ma'am.

Alonso: Okay. Let me state my name.

Fitzgerald: Yes, ma'am. Go right ahead.

Alonso: Okay.

Fitzgerald: You know the drill.

Alonso: I know the drill. This is Annette Alonso. 2204 East Hyperdrive, Meridian. And I am representing the Southern Rim Coalition and I just want to start, I just want to say I like the redesign of the open space. I think it's nice. I think it's nice that they put it along the toe of the hill there. I just wanted to kind of discuss a few other things. One is we still haven't talked about any connectivity to that upper part and -- and being that we are in the situation we are with Sky Break, not sure where that's going to go, we still don't have any way for that to access. So, I don't know how this works. Maybe they could have -- maybe they could have a DA later to talk about that part of the development, but I think that's their last phase anyway. I just don't know exactly how to handle that part of it. The other situation I wanted to say is -- they are still talking about having the R-15 -- we are going to have some deviation in the setbacks of those R-15s and we haven't really talked about that. Essentially, that is equivalent to a step up and we are not doing any step ups as I know. So, I don't think that has been addressed. I'm having a little struggle with the three story thing and, then, going much higher than the 35 feet. I don't know how that works out. But I don't think that's supposed to be allowed either. Thirty-five feet is that UDC requirement on the single family, but, like I said, I do like the open space. Little -- still a little worried about the hill and how you are going to address that part that's on the upper side of that R-8 that's on the top. Are we doing any fill? Because I know the Sky Break is talking about a huge bunch of fill up there. We have essentially only one chance to take care of our southern rim, that existing portion, and so I just want to make sure we are not talking about a huge amount of fill. I want to make sure we are protecting that natural geologic hill there and not doing anything crazy. So, those are kind of my questions. What are we doing with that no connectivity. Can we ask for a DA later for that last phase? What are we doing about that setback on the R-15s and the height of those homes that I'm not really excited about. So, just want to make sure we are protecting our geological features that we have naturally. I think those are my last few things that I have. Otherwise, I talked about it all before.

Fitzgerald: We appreciate it.

Alonso: And that's all I have.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, Annette. We appreciate it very much. Appreciate you being here tonight.

Alonso: Thank you, guys.

Fitzgerald: Visiting with us.

Alonso: No problem.

Fitzgerald: I don't see any additional attendees. Is there anyone in the audience that we didn't hear from? There is no one else on line. Okay. Hearing none, currently -- and, Commissioner Seal, no one else has raised their hand and wants to testify?

Seal: That is correct.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Jay, would you like to come back up and answer a couple of questions and close, sir?

Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners. I'm back. I'm going to stand close. Try to speak for -- or speak appropriately. So, we -- we recognize that access -- that the vehicular access to the top of the bluff where R-8 zone is has to come from the south. Throughout this whole application process and working with the city, we have had to work with the property owner of Calvary Church with Poiema Subdivision. They needed access, we are building a bridge, so both of us need access. We are sharing that access. The property to the south we have worked with both property owners at one point or another. The one that was -- when that application went -- was withdrawn and, then, they got a new owner and now they are back with Sky Break. So, we have worked with them all along, so that our -- our access to that R-8 -- and the reason that it's R-8 and the reason we asked for R-8 zone on the top is because that matches what's going to happen south of us. So, that way there isn't a transition area with -- because, technically, our whole 26 acres is -- is medium high density residential, but we feel that if we are taking access from the south that translation should be better anyways. I brought my own peanut gallery. So, anyway -- so, yes, we -- it's our last phase. We recognize that even -- and you will -- you will have a crack at -- at Sky Break in a few weeks. According to their -- their plan, that piece that abuts our property doesn't happen until phase five and we are fine with that. We are not in a hurry to develop it or anything at this point on top of the hill. It is -- it is what it is. So, we will have to -- of course, we will deal with the -- with the -- the water lines, utilities that the city is going to require to be -- you know, from top to bottom or heavy, that's going to happen regardless. But development on the bluff is -- is down the road. The setbacks in the R-15 -- yes, we asked for some reductions in order that the -- the reductions are for the attached products that don't have parking pads. Basically, we are asking for a reduction because it's -- it's a unique product type and a higher density residential district that we are trying to come up with a -- with a quality product that fits and it's a high, you know, from -- from an aesthetic standpoint the type of homes and materials used in the homes is -- are high quality. We -- it's not really asking for special dispensation, it's -- you know, there are a lot of things that we are -- we are also doing as part of the development plan to justify those -- those asks. So, I don't think there is -- there is really any -- there hasn't -- that's the first time I have heard anybody have -- take issue with the -- the reduced setbacks on -- on some of the lots in an R-15.

It's not every lot, it's only -- it's only -- it's a two story, two bedrooms product that doesn't have parking pads. So, anyways -- and, granted, that's -- that's 64 lots, so -- out of 127. Then the three story product, it's -- you know, in vision what we would like to see is -- the R-15 height limit is 40 feet. So, I'm comfortable saying that. One of the product types has a flat roof. We would like -- actually, whatever we build we would like to have a flat roof. That provides that homeowner -- they have got the roof -- they have got a roof deck for -- for family functions, a personal open space right on top of the roof and that -- that stays under the height limit for the city. It's a creative solution. It's a creative product. And we would like the commission to give us their thoughts. And other than that, I do have my engineer here if you have any questions as far as roadways or -- or traffic or what have you, so --

Fitzgerald: Jay, can you address the fill -- fill issue. I know that that's a pretty significant slope coming off from the -- from the two phases. Can you address the comment about fill and what you -- what you -- how much fill you are bringing in, if you are bringing in any.

Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, so we are not building a road up to the bluff. We are -- and that's the reason we are not building a road is because they have already -- the one home that exists up there has a road cut up from Lake Hazel up the hill and it does have a significant cut gap in order to meet the -- you know, the -- ACHD and the city's guidelines for slope. But all of that fill was pushed to the -- to the valley floor in order to provide a ramp. We -- we can't -- that can't remain. So, that home can't remain. So, we have to -- we have to deal -- we have to fill it back in. So, you know, we are not cutting more out of that hillside. We have a pathway. So, it's only a five foot pathway. But it's -- it's a balanced cut and fill at that point. Does that answer your question?

Fitzgerald: Yes. I just wanted to make sure we are on the record explaining that. I know there is already a -- kind of a road up that side and you guys were cleaning that up and maintaining the hillside.

Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, that's correct. We are going to reclaim that road.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Thank you very much. Additional questions for Jay?

Cassinelli: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Cassinelli.

Cassinelli: I know we talked about parking, Jay, but how many lots did you lose in this redesign?

Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Cassinelli, we lost no -- we didn't lose any lots. We -- we took two lots out and put them in a different location. We lost a parking lot in order to put those two lots over there. We reduced the parking, we are -- we are -- still have way more than -- than what's required for -- for the housing types that we have shown, so --

Cassinelli: Okay. And, then, my other question was was this designed as a rental product or --

Gibbons: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Cassinelli, no, these are single family homes. They are single family attached homes in the R-15 and they are single family detached on -- on the R-30. They are not a rental product.

Cassinelli: Thank you.

Fitzgerald: Thank you, Commissioner. Additional questions for Mr. Gibbons? Anyone? Well, Jay, thank you for being here tonight. We appreciate you and your team being here and we will go from here.

Gibbons: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners.

Fitzgerald: With that can I get a motion to close public hearing?

Grove: So moved.

Seal: Mr. Chair?

Cassinelli: Second.

Fitzgerald: I have a motion and a second to close the public hearing for H-2020-0064, Pura Vida Ridge Ranch. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Fitzgerald: I do appreciate, Jay and your team, that you guys took our comments to heart and made some significant improvements to -- especially that open space and that was -- Commissioner Grove and I were kind of on the same page in regards to having something that was centralized. So, we appreciate that. Anyone want to lead off?

Grove: Mr. Chair, I will.

Fitzgerald: Go right ahead. Commissioner Grove.

Grove: So, I think with the -- like you said, the centralized open space is a lot better. I was a little concerned with the -- the amount of parking that was lost, but I'm looking at, you know, this view here, you see all of the parallel parking along the street, I'm not as concerned. I would like to say I am a fan of the three story product and the placement of where that three story project is going to be. I think that it works well with where they are going to put it. It's kind of tucked away from, you know, the main road. It's against the hillside. I think that it works where it is. They also, you know, have incorporated more green space in the -- in those areas. I like that. The biggest thing that I kind of didn't notice the first time reading through it, but really paid attention tonight was with the loop

that they made for recreation. I think that is a very big value add and does a lot better job of tying at least the bottom portion of this project together. I still have concerns similar to the testimony from Ms. Alonso in terms of how the bottom and the top portions connect. I know that can't be necessarily addressed with this single development, because it's relying on neighboring projects -- or neighboring projects to tie them together from a vehicular standpoint and so that -- that portion is a little muddled in my head and, then, just to reiterate my concern in this area, just in terms of the school and looking at the West Ada numbers that came over, I know that doesn't necessarily weigh in as much as I would want it to, but it is something I would at least like to say is mildly concerning.

Fitzgerald: Thanks, Commissioner Grove. Additional thoughts?

Seal: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: I will start with the good. I like the changes that were made. I really do like that -- the athletic loop, the way that that's put in. I have been hanging out at the HP campus for a long time before they sold it and they have the -- a similar loop that's over there with similar equipment. So, it's actually pretty functional and provides for, you know, good -- a good -- good fitness community. I like the changes that have been made as far as where the parking was taken away, where the open space has been added, how it's been added, the continuity to it. Also like the way that the -- I mean, essentially, have a small trail system that's going on between the upper and the lower for connectivity as far as, you know, the ability to bike there, so I can see this. I have a -- you know, I have a young son, who is -- I shouldn't say a young son. I have a young man son that would probably be interested in a product type like this as far as, you know, first -- first time homeownership. You know, it's probably going to be a place where there is not going to be a lot of school aged children that are going to be there. I'm looking at this as more as kind of, you know, first time homebuyers, maybe starting a family, not necessarily raising them here or -- either that are empty nesters that are, you know, trying to find something similar, you know, a little bit less maintenance, a little smaller footprint, but, you know, nice amenities and things like that. The -- the rest of the layout -- I mean I'm -- you know, again, I'm -- I don't dislike the higher densities, but sometimes when you get more out into what has typically been the country it's a little bit harder to swallow sometimes, but I do like the product, I do like the way that it integrates. I -- I also like the idea of the three story houses with a rooftop. I think that's something that's -- to me that's innovative and especially for the people that are going to be looking into something like this, you know, to be able to have, you know, rooftop summertime, springtime celebrations, get togethers and things like that, that's -- you know, it's an innovative -- innovative way to do it without them needing a -- you know, huge backyard in order to do so. The school situation on it. Generally speaking that just the overcrowding of the schools in this area would be enough to basically stop me in my tracks, but for the product type that's here and the fact that the -- you know, where families with children are going to be living is the R-8 part, that's going to, you know, start developing at a far later date, hopefully, by the time schools open in

this area, kind of negates that for me. So, I think that overall, it's something that I can -- I can support.

Fitzgerald: Thank you, Commissioner Seal. Additional comments? Commissioner Yearsley, go right ahead.

Yearsley: Personally I don't like it, but -- I don't think it fits that area, but it's already been through the process and I'm coming in late to the game, so I will leave it at that.

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Cassinelli, thoughts?

Cassinelli: They -- you know, I -- I will compliment the applicant and that they did take our feedback and they did make adjustments. You know, they -- they did it without losing lots. I thought that they were going to give up some lots for a little bit more open space. I'm really torn, I mean I know -- we were just dealing with -- with in-fill earlier tonight -- or maybe that was -- how many hours ago that was. It feels like yesterday. And it's tough. But to me this is just one of those -- it is a -- it is a round peg in a square hole. Because of this -- of the attached portion. I like the product. I like the MEWs. I'm not even opposed to three story product like this. But I think that fits in a different area. If this were in -- if this were a neighborhood center or something like that, you know, I would want to see that product all day long. I think it would fit there. I just don't -- when you look at the -- you know, you look at R-8 right up the hill and you look at -- I'm assuming -- I don't recall what the -- you know, what we are looking at where the church is to the property to the east there, but I think the -- the homes are R-8. They might be R-15. But it -- it just doesn't -- it doesn't fit and I'm not saying that I don't like it, just not there. So, I just can't -- I know it's tough. You know, it's -- what works I don't know. But I'm not -- because of the fact that it's just this round peg in a square hole to me, it's just -- it just doesn't work and I don't -- and I -- and, again, the other thing -- and Commissioner Seal addressed it -- that's been bugging me is that this has been such a rural area and, you know, now we are putting -- you know, we are going from -- from nothing to everything in this area and it's -- that's a tough one to swallow. So, that's -- those are my -- I just can't get behind it, though, because of that.

Fitzgerald: I'm going to probably come at it from a different angle than you guys it sounds like -- or maybe I'm kind of on both sides. You know, we just finished a comp plan process and this is what the comp plan requires or requested and so they are trying to fill in in a really rough and geographic location, too, and you have a drain on one side and you have a giant 35 foot hill on the other side and so I -- I -- and you are trying to put medium high density residential in here and we are asking him to put R-4 it sounds like and I don't think that's what we are -- the city comp plan process took us through. So, I -- I like the product, it looks like something that the river district in Eagle built. I think it's got, you know, funky undulation. It's something we don't see every day. It's tucked underneath that hill, so I think you could do some rooftop decks. We don't have -- we need some different products in my opinion. I'm tired of looking at the same product that gets built in every one of these major subdivisions. We got to do something different and I'm sorry to say it, but the south is -- this is where it's coming, guys. They have a couple of parks that are going out there.

I know that we are looking at a major -- some of the major city centers moving out this direction and Kuna is coming right behind us, not very far away, and so there is -- there is employment both directions and so I don't think we can call this a rural area anymore and so I think we got to understand that this is why we went to the comp plan and this is what the city wanted is, you know, a differentiation in housing types and that's why they put this kind of zone over the top of this area and so I think you have a golf course right next door, you may have some mixed -- a mixture of -- like I said, I don't think it's just going to be young families with young kids, I think it's going to be a different kind of product type -- or different kind of group of people that are going to be living here and I do appreciate kind of the different look than the same old thing we see every day. I do like the MEW living. I think they are -- those are cool. It's a different kind of person than I think maybe everybody else is -- is used to looking at purchasing and so I think we need to look at differentiation a little bit. I think it definitely fits into the stuff to the northeast or where the church is. You have a pretty big significant building that's going on right to that northeast corner not very far away from this thing and they are doing a bridge to interconnect that community into Lake Hazel Road. It's funky with that -- that neighborhood on top of the hill -- or that piece of the neighborhood on top of the hill, but I think that comes in very much later. But I do like the way they have connected with the -- the nature trails with the one hard path -- that connection into that big community center type greenspace. So, I guess I'm kind of thinking about it a little bit differently. I think you are -- you are putting a niche product in a niche kind of component of the land and that's kind of where I come from a little bit different angle. I understand that the school age piece -- or the school kids, like Mr. Grove mentioned, I think this wouldn't fit that group very well. It will be a different purchaser. That might be playing golf at the ranch and maybe looking to retire soon. Or maybe empty nesters or somebody that. Maybe that's not the sound, but I think that's something that's a little bit different than your normal growing family. So, just my thoughts.

Cassinelli: Mr. Chair, if I could?

Fitzgerald: Yeah, go right ahead.

Cassinelli: One -- another thought on that is even if this were 500 feet or whatever it is to the west at the intersection, I think this would fit -- to me it's just in between those things. Again, it's a tough one. But if this were -- if this product were right now at -- at the intersection of Eagle and Lake Hazel, it would fit more as a transit, you know, to transition. It's a -- it's a weird transition with this piece. It's this -- it's this attached piece that -- that I can't get my -- get my mind around. And the other thing I want to say is that, you know if this -- what I -- what I do oppose in this, because of where it's at, is the three story. I like the three story. Not -- if this is -- to me if this is going to pass in here, that's -- that would be a -- you know, I might be swayed to approve this, but not with the three story, because to me that just -- that throws it -- that really throws it out of whack. Where it's located. Only because of where it's located. Not that I don't like it.

Grove: Mr. Chair? Okay. I think -- I understand what Commissioner Cassinelli is saying. I would take a contrary view of it just to a certain extent and say that the golf course and



Lake Hazel and the hill kind of isolate this property and, then, the subdivision to the -- to the east to a very large extent and I don't see this as being as much of a clash of the -- the surrounding area just due to the geography of how this is laid out. I think if it was a flat map and we were looking at it it would look a little bit different, but the geography of this area kind of makes it so much different than if we were just looking at it as a flat surface and so I -- I struggle with that just from that perspective and, then, to Commissioner Seal, I agree a little bit with, you know, the -- the farmland and how it feels somewhat out of place, but I think if we use the future land use map and the -- and kind of think about it from ten, 15 years from now, does this feel as out of place at that point based on how the area has grown around it and I don't -- I don't have that -- as much concern with it looking at it from a longer viewpoint than -- than today.

Seal: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: And to kind of touch on -- I mean, you -- you -- you touched on it a little bit, but, essentially, I mean I have been out in this area quite a bit this last summer and I mean, personally, it was shocking to me to drive out there after not having been out there for a decade, because to where you are used to seeing hillsides and farmland, you see rooftops, you know, and, essentially, a sea of them out there and it is -- I mean it's -- it's right in this area where -- I mean there is -- there is not many acres out there that aren't going to be covered with rooftops out there, so -- and that -- to me that's hard. I mean it's -- you know, when I see that it makes me a little bit sad. That said, it's where our city's at and it's where our city is growing. I think a diverse product like this, it is something different, which is good. I think it's going to attract younger people and give them, you know, hopefully an affordable housing choice that isn't, you know, something that's just stripped down and bare, you know, to make it fit on, you know -- you know, essentially, make it fit into a -- fit -- fit the square peg into the square hole, I guess. So, I think something like this where it is a little bit more diversified it's going to be something that might be good for that community out there. Again, you have a golf course that's next to it. You have parks that are coming in. You have something that's, you know, kind of built to be more of fitness minded folks living there, you know, with the bike trails, with the -- the fitness loop that's in there and things like that. So, you know, again, personally, I'm not a huge fan of the higher density stuff, but I see this as -- you know, I mean, you have an irregularly shaped hole here, so not much is going to fit in there. My hat's off to them to make -- you know, for making something that's this different fit in there this well at this point. And, again, they -- you know, they took everything that we asked them to do. They did it. I think they have addressed the questions that we originally had. So, you know, again, I'm -- I'm more in favor of this at this point.

Fitzgerald: Additional comments, thoughts? Commissioner Grove? Oh, you went back on mute. I caught you having to talk. Anybody -- additional comments or thoughts or motions? I -- you know, Commissioner Seal, I think you and I are on the same page. I think -- and I do think there is a need right now and I think there is -- with some of the folks moving in from out of town there is a -- there is a lot of people that would like attached

products. They sell really fast. I get to live with a realtor and so I -- they try to find more product like this in town and there isn't any and so I think there is a need out there for that kind of product and I know it may not fit everybody's style, but I think there is a desire for -- like I said, an affordable option that is a sense of community, too. And so there are folks that are moving here that aren't necessarily traditionally going to like that big open space, they like having tighter area and more community and, like you said, fitness focused and so I think I'm in agreement with where you are.

Grove: Mr. Chair?

Fitzgerald: Commissioner Grove.

Grove: Unless anybody does -- was there any modifications that we were -- that we are mulling about on this one? I don't have any really written down, but if there are none, then, I would move forward with a motion.

Fitzgerald: I think the only thing was the -- is fencing -- the way they fenced the -- the drain is everybody okay with that? I think it's a request to vet it or do whatever they need to do with the Council anyways, but I don't have any problem with what they are proposing.

Seal: I agree with that.

Grove: So, anything with that?

Fitzgerald: Yeah. I think -- I don't have any -- any modifications that I'm aware of.

Grove: Okay. I'm going to try it, if that's okay, Mr. Chair.

Fitzgerald: Go right ahead, sir.

Grove: All right. After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council of file number H-2020-0064 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of October 22nd, 2020.

Fitzgerald: And, Commissioner, I guess I'm going to throw a monkey wrench in your comment. We do need to talk about the three story product. Are we going to -- I know Bill had an opinion about that. Commissioner Seal, you had an opinion about that. So, I stopped you in the middle of your motion. I apologize. But that's something I think we do need to address. Does anybody -- I know Commissioner Cassinelli had an opinion. Commissioner Seal, you had an opinion. I tend to think it works there, but I understand that there is a compromise to be made. I understand that there -- this could be the compromise. So, Commissioner Cassinelli, go right ahead, sir.

Cassinelli: I -- yeah, I'm definitely opposed to the -- to the three story product in this place.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Commissioner Seal, do you have follow up thoughts?

Seal: I stand by my remarks.

Fitzgerald: Okay. Commissioner Grove, what do you -- do you want to incorporate that into a motion, whichever way you want to lean? I -- I'm okay with the three story. I don't know where you are going to come down, but --

Grove: I actually prefer it. I think that it adds some additional qualities to this project, so I'm in favor of it personally.

Fitzgerald: I think if we put it in there they need to have elevations finalized and ready to go before City Council, so they understand what they are getting into, because what they presented tonight don't match up with what the original elevations are. That would be my only thought there.

Grove: It would be -- I do like the flat top, just as a personal --

Fitzgerald: I do, too. I agree.

Grove: All right. So, I will try this again.

Fitzgerald: Sorry about that, sir.

Grove: Okay. After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council of file number H-2020-0064 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of October 22nd, 2020, with the following modification: To add in completed elevations for -- before City Council for review, with recommendations to make the three story product a flat top product. Badly worded.

Seal: Second.

Fitzgerald: I have a motion and a second to recommend approval with modifications of File No. H-2020-0064 and, Madam Clerk, I will have you call the roll.

Roll call: Grove, yea; Yearsley, nay; Seal, yea; Cassinelli, nay; Fitzgerald, yea; Holland, absent; McCarvel, absent.

Fitzgerald: The motion passes on a three-two vote.

**MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO NAYS. TWO ABSENT.**

Fitzgerald: Mr. Gibbons, we appreciate you guys being here tonight and we hope you get all your ducks in a row and elevations ready for City Council and we wish you luck. Team, thank you. It's been fun, literally an evening of three continued projects. Okay. I need one more motion.