

McCarvel: Okay. All right. Can I get a motion to continue?

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: I move to continue File No. H-2021-0027 Heron Village Expansion to the hearing date of September 16th, 2021.

Grove: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to continue H-2021-0027 to September 16th. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

5. Public Hearing for Wells Street Assisted Living/Andorra Subdivision (H-2021-0024) by Jamie Koenig of Babcock Design, Located at 675, 715 and 955 S. Wells St.

- A. Request: Annexation of 17.5 acres of land with a TN-R zoning district.
- B. Request: A Preliminary Plat consisting of 61 building lots and 8 common lots.
- C. Request: A Conditional Use Permit to allow an Assisted Living and Memory Care Facility on the southern portion of the property.

McCarvel: Next item is H-2021-0024, Wells Street Assisted Living and Andorra Subdivision and we will begin with the staff report.

Tiefenbach: Good evening, Madam Chair, Members of the Planning Commission. Alan Tiefenbach, associate planner with the City of Meridian. This is a proposal for an annexation, a zoning to traditional neighborhood R, a preliminary -- a preliminary plat and a conditional use permit. The property is 17 and a half acres of land. It's zoned RUT in the county. It's located at the southwest corner of East Magic View Drive and South West -- South Wells Street. Here are the maps you can see. So, to the north East Magic View Road. That's an R-8 zoning, mostly assisted living to the north there. To the east, South Wells Street, that is zoned RUT and L-O. To the south is East Wells Circle and that is zoned L-O and there is currently office buildings there. To the west is zoned R-1 in the county and that is existing single family residential, which I will talk about shortly. A little bit about the history of this. There was a similar proposal that was approved for these properties in April of 2020. It was called Andorra Senior Living. This proposal included 76 single family residences in a three story apartment building with 88 dwelling units. Following the Council meeting and the approval, the property owners have a parcel to the

left, which was part of this. It was 972 East Wells Circle. They decided they weren't interested in selling the property, which, basically, made the -- what was approved to fall apart. So, what you are seeing now is a new redesigned development and also no longer contains that parcel that was with the original one. The summary of this request is its annexation and zoning of 17 -- 17 and a half acres of land with the TN-R zone district. It's a preliminary plat. That would be the north -- I will just call it half, even though it's not really half -- the northern portion, 61 building lots and eight common lots -- that's about 11 and a half acres. There is a conditional use to allow a 91 unit three story nursing and residential care building with a footprint of 30 -- 30,000 square foot. So, three stories -- and I will show you the graphics. There is also a proposal for an additional roughly 9,000 square foot commercial building, although the end user has not been identified. There were a few administrative requests. One of them was to allow 61 private lots to be served by a gated community, whereas only 50 are allowed, and as I will talk about -- 32 of the required parking spaces will be provided in bulb outs, which, again, I will show you. So, I'm going to sort of run through this proposal with the graphics and try to explain this to you. Again, the applicant proposes to develop the northern part of this site with 61 single family lots, a 91 unit three story assisted living memory care building, and possibly a 9,000 square foot office. Within the nursing and residential care facility the applicant proposes some -- a restaurant, spa, salon, multi -- multi-purpose movie theater, lounge, library, and other spaces to serve the residents of this facility. The portion of the property to propose for a single family detached, which is what you are seeing here. So, I have kind of an overview on the right there to show the whole site and, then, I zoomed into the -- on the left there so you can sort of see which part I'm talking about. The portion of this property proposed for the detached single family residences is directly adjacent to the established Snorting Bowl Subdivision. That's what the actual subdivision is called, although it's also referenced as Woodbridge, and that's to the west. That subdivision would be roughly over here. This adjacent subdivision is comprised of lots of approximately 5,500 to 6,500 square feet in area. There are 16 existing houses in this subdivision and these houses are approximately 42 to 45 feet in width. The applicant proposes 21 houses of approximately 32 feet in width and lots sizes of 4,000 square foot. With 61 houses on 11.7 acres, this is approximately five dwelling units per acre. The Comprehensive Plan recommends three to eight dwelling units per acre for this area. So, this is somewhat in the middle of what the density would be designated. At staff's recommendation, the applicant -- so, one of the things we wanted to make sure is that -- is what they are proposing is compatible with the existing single family residences to the west. Staff had a few recommendations to the applicant and the applicant made a few other things. So, one of our recommendations is that we -- we wanted them to stagger the houses so that the neighbors wouldn't be looking at this wall of houses and that's what you can see here. They are -- they are staggering in the setbacks between 27 feet and 12 feet. That's what you can see here. Again, to try to eliminate that wall. The other thing they are doing is that they are varying the height of these buildings. If you can see this graphic, the -- the lighter shade is the one stories. The darker shade is the two story. So, the larger houses are one story closer to the western residences. The smaller houses, for instance, this one that you see here, are all two stories. So, again, this was done both to provide visual relief and to help to reduce the -- the visual impacts. One of the things that -- that is new, that the Planning Commission has not seen, is the original version of this and the staff

report that went out to the Planning Commission showed these houses having three foot setbacks from the property line. That's the requirement of the TN-R zoning district. For a few different reasons, including trying to be a little more compatible with the adjacent residences, the applicant has actually increased that. So, now they are proposing five foot side setbacks, which is -- would be ten foot wide between houses. If you measure the houses to the west, roughly -- they are around that same, between ten and 12 feet apart. So, this is trying to become more compatible with the existing single family residential. So, because -- because the increase in setbacks, the five foot setbacks for each house was not with the original staff report, staff is recommending an additional -- additional condition of approval and I will come back to this at the end and this condition of approval would be on the development agreement, requiring that the properties along the west, the ones adjacent to the subdivision, that they maintain a five foot side setback. Okay. So, here is the south half, which really isn't half. This includes 91 assisted living and memory care units with supporting retail, restaurant, and entertainment uses and a 30,000 square foot footprint. The proposed development -- what they are doing here does meet the goals of the Comprehensive Plan, which talks about mixed use neighborhood designation. But one -- one caution that staff would have is that the original version of this that came in when they -- when they did their notification and their neighborhood meeting was what you are being presented with tonight. Sixty-one residential units, assisted living and memory care on the bottom southwest corner -- southeast corner and office or a commercial building in the middle. Since that time the applicant contacted staff asking about whether or not the southwest part could contain a multi-family project instead. Staff told the applicant that that was not what this was noticed as. If they wanted to do multi-family, then, this would be required to do a new community meeting. They will have to re-notice this the -- the Planning Commission hearing would be rescheduled. Basically it was a whole new application. With that explanation the applicant said, never mind, we are -- we have figured it out. We are going to move forward with this proposal as it is. That's okay, but the -- the one concern that staff does have is that TN-R is one of the few zone districts that actually allows multi-family by right. Meaning that it would not have to go through a conditional use if it was zoned to TN-R. To make sure that what is being presented here tonight is what would be approved if the Planning Commission were more inclined to do that, staff has recommended and is adding -- has added a recommendation that the development agreement would say that the only use allowed here in the southeast corner would be nursing and residential care. If they wanted to do anything else, then, they would have to amend the DA and go back through a public hearing. They are required to provide ten percent open space, which is about 1.1 acres of property. They have provided an exhibit here. They are providing 22.6 and they have this -- the exhibit that you are showing here is open space that meets what the dimensional requirements are per our code. So, again, they are meeting -- they are -- they are providing twice as much open space as they would be required. They are required to have one amenity with this development. They are proposing at least nine, depending on how you count it. There would be a central open space, a 4,300 square foot clubhouse, swimming pool, hot tub, pickleball court, horseshoe pit and a dog park, as well as numerous pathways across the development and what you can see through the middle as sort of this central green space corridor. Although not required, because this is nursing and memory care and they don't have to provide an amenity, they are. So,

the -- the nursing residential care facility shows a sizable open space, an internal courtyard, a few different ball courts, a picnic -- picnic gazebo and a community garden. There is an informal ten foot wide pathway stub that the west sub -- west subdivision line. So, over here there is kind of an informal pathway that's there. Has not been developed. The Meridian Pathways Plan shows eventually that there would be a future multi-use pathway that would connect to this. The concept plan, as shown does actually show a direct connection. So, again, this is where that would be and they have provided basically a direct east-west connection to this. There is portions of this pathway that are close to ten feet wide here, but it narrows down to probably five or four feet here. Staff is recommending because this is eventually going to be a major pathway, that this has -- all of this would have to be built to a template of ten feet wide to be consistent with the pathway plan. Also, what's -- what's important to note is that the pathway plan actually chose the pathway running along Five Mile Creek, which is here. As I mentioned at the beginning of the presentation, this piece of property here with the original proposal that came that was approved, this was part of that proposal. This no longer is part of this proposal, no longer under the applicant's control. So, we are not sure if and when this would develop. If it did develop and come into the city, then, we would recommend that the alignment of this pathway would be matching the plan, meaning coming down this pathway -- or, sorry, coming down the Five Mile Creek. However, in the interim the applicant is also providing this stub here and -- and if and when this was ever developed, then, this pathway would no longer provide the major pathway, it would be running along Five Mile Creek to be consistent with what the original configuration is. So, again, staff is also recommending that that segment be built to a ten foot wide template as well and in the -- in the interim it would just sort of loop around the commercial lot here. In addition to that, the conceptual development plan shows detached sidewalks and pathways providing designated pedestrian access between all the single family residences. The central amenity and the office building -- when we were going through the designs -- again, this is somewhat conceptual in nature and the more specified dimension things would happen at the time of the final plat when you see the -- the final plat and landscape plan. The plans indicate that some of the -- they are required to have an eight foot wide parkway along all of the streets in this development, including the internal streets. It may not, based on these plans and what we are seeing, it may not meet those. But, again, the applicant is aware of this and when -- if and when this goes to public hearing for a final plat we will be reviewing the landscape plans to make sure that all the minimum requirements and the minimum landscaping requirements are met. Access to this development is proposed from the adjacent local streets, which is East Magic View Drive, South Wells Street, and East Wells Circle. For internal connectivity the applicant is providing a gated community. And so this whole area here, all 61 lots, will be gated and they would consist of alleys and private streets. There was an existing unnamed ACHD right of way, which you can see down here, as Easy Gentry Circle. ACHD originally were -- were requiring them to build the whole thing out, including the cul-de-sac. The latest version of this that I just received from ACHD today is just because the applicant has limited control over this whole area, they are only requiring them at this point now to just stub it to the western property line. The -- the code states that a gated development shouldn't have more than 50 dwelling units. And if -- as I mentioned, the northern part has 61 dwelling units. This is because the homes are clustered around a central open

space. We have got additional corridors in here and many different pathways. Although it is feasible to restrict the number of gated lots to 50, the development is intended to be a walkable neighborhood with home clusters, like I said, and it even has MEWS, which is one of the intents of the private street section of the code. Because of this, because of the clustering, because of the amount of open space, because fire and PD did not express any issues with this, staff did not have any concerns with the extra 11 lots. This is something that the planning director approved through alternative compliance. So, if this were to go forward that would have already been approved by the planning director. It's important to note that there has been some changes to this concept plan since the staff report went out. The one thing you saw in the staff report was an older version. There has been a few versions that are in the case file. If you have been on the -- if you have been on the online case file recently there is many many different versions, but what has changed is that the original plan had a -- if you can see my pointer. The version of this -- of the plan that went out with the staff report, there was a house that was here, this road down here was an alley, and there was an additional private road here. A couple of different things happened. Staff noted that we had some issues with this long block -- this long block length. They are limited to the length of blocks and we thought there should be some sort of connection. So, the applicant has since provided this little park and this trail connection here. The house that was here has now been moved to the south of the clubhouse and swimming pool. The other issue was that the applicant says there was some problems with addressing off of the alley that was here. This alley has now been converted to a private street, so that addressing can happen and the street that was originally here is now gone away. So, there was -- so, they have lost one street and they have increased some of their green space here and they have provided a trail connection here. If the Planning Commission were inclined to recommend approval or approve the conditional use tonight, staff would recommend by reference that the most recent version concept plan, which would be July 13th, would be part of that, as you are seeing right now. The last thing I want to talk about is parking. So, single family residential -- single family residential portion of this development proposes 61 houses with three or more bedrooms and this requires per our code 244 parking spaces. That's four parking spaces per house, basically. Two of them would have to be covered and, then, two of them could be in the driveway. All of the number of -- the number of parking spaces that are being provided -- although the applicant has proposed that 32 of these be provided in bulb outs. So, you can see a bulb out here. You can see one here. There is a -- there is a few down here. There is some here. They have provided a parking plan showing that they have all these parking spaces and this is something, again, that -- that could be approved administratively through alternative compliance and the director did approve this alternative compliance. The reason why, again, is because of the number of open space, the clustered units, the amount of pathways, it was either support this or have them redesign and make the driveways longer and possibly lose some of the open space. So, the parking is there, it's just not -- some of it is across the street or directly adjacent to the houses and not directly on the houses. One thing I do want to mention, though, is the 244 parking spaces that I mentioned, they don't account for this clubhouse down here. They are required to provide, based on the commercial requirements, nine parking spaces. That's one of our conditions of approval. When we look at this plan we think it's feasible. The applicant can carve out an additional nine parking spaces. That is one of

the conditions of approval that has been included with the staff report. For a nursing and residential care facility, the parking requirement is a half a parking space per bed. This concept plan indicates 102 beds, requiring 51 parking spaces. They have shown 101 parking spaces and with the office building 18 would be required and they are showing 40 on this concept plan. I'm giving you just sort of a brief view of the single family residences. This is the assisted living. This came out later. A couple of weeks ago they provided the most recent elevations of the office per a request by staff. We -- just generalizing now, if and when this is approved, they will have to do a certificate of zoning compliance for anything that's commercial and they will have to go through design review. Looking at the assisted living, just -- just from guesstimating and eyeing, it's probably getting pretty close to meeting the requirements of the -- of the architectural standards manual, not so much probably with the ones on the left, I think this is just more conceptual than the ones at the top. However, either way, just so you know, at the time of CZC we will make sure that the -- both of these buildings meet the minimum standards that are required for design review and for the certificate of zoning compliance. At the time of the staff report going out staff received two letters of testimony. The concerns that we received were increase in traffic, the potential height of houses and narrowness of the side setbacks of the houses, adjacent to the Woodbridge or Snorting Bull Subdivision. Since staff noted that the plans have been updated, numerous times since the written testimony has come out, there has been a bit of discussion between staff and at least one of the adjacent neighbors about some of the questions and some of the concerns. I have not heard anything directly and have not seen any written testimony since the letters that we received since that time. So, I'm not sure if those concerns are outstanding or not, but I'm sure we are hear tonight. With that staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the conditional use to allow the nursing and residential care facility and just to mention that a separate conditional use may be required for the additional commercial building based on what the end user finally has figured out to be. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the annexation and zoning to TN-R and plat for 61 lots, a 91 unit nursing and residential care and additional office building. In addition to the conditions in the staff report, staff recommends a condition to the development agreement that the side setbacks for all lots on the western perimeter adjacent to the subdivision be increased to five feet and staff recommends that the Planning Commission include with their motion the updated concept plan dated July 13th, 2021, in their motion, and at that I will stand for any questions or concerns.

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

Johnson: You should be able to control this now from there, Jamie.

McCarvel: And, please, state your name and address for the record.

Koenig: Oh, sorry. I have got the wrong one here. Okay. That's -- that's not what I have. Jamie Koenig with Babcock Design Group. Address is 800 West Main. Downtown. Thank you, Alan, for doing such a fantastic job of running through everything and summarizing this. I -- actually, you covered practically everything I wanted to touch on, so I will try not to repeat anything that you have already covered. One of the main things

I would like to say -- as an architect occasionally you run across a developer that cares about the same thing that most of us care about, including myself, and --

McCarvel: Pull it right close. Yeah.

Koenig: Sorry. Would like to do -- we would like to do things the right way. They have an interest in the same things that most of us have an interest in, such as open spaces, quality amenities, having a site plan that's well thought through. Elevated design for the architecture. Interesting materials and design. That kind of -- when you manage to successfully pull all of that off all at once it kind of falls into place and becomes a very nice experience for everybody and a sense of place, something that people that live there can be proud of. People that visit will be interested and people that pass by as well. That doesn't always -- that doesn't always happen. So, I think we are very lucky because of that. Brent, the developer, is -- is that type of person. He is very much in line with how we -- how we like to see things done. We feel that this project fits in with the neighborhood very well. The assisted living and memory care is very close to St. Luke's, as an example. The -- although the 55 plus is not restricted to 55 plus, it's actually targeted toward that age group by having landscaping that's cared for and the price point I think sort of lends that -- lends it to the age group. I think it would also be possible that someone with aging parents could live in the assisted living building, someone that would like to be close to them, could also buy a home, just north of there to be close to them. So, that would probably work out very nice also in some cases. Traffic is always an issue in this area. That area is kind of broken and I don't -- we don't have a solution for that, but I think that the use that we are proposing, out of everything that could be proposed, tends to contribute less traffic than a lot of other uses that could come along and so we -- we feel like that's a good fit also. To backup to the parking for the north residential area, we are required to have 244 and through the south revisions that Alan spoke about there, our changing the streets around, we were able to increase the bulb out areas and get 266 spaces, which is above the 244 required. And, again, we have -- we have tried to pay close attention to Woodbridge's concerns and modulate the setbacks and the heights of the buildings and, again, these buildings are -- are going to be very nice, high quality buildings. So, I think -- I think that that works out pretty well. We think that we have done a good job and try -- we have really tried to minimize that wall effect that some of the Woodbridge neighbors have expressed concern over. The previous plan that was approved, it made it all the way through City Council, was Andorra and that project was all single story, but they were townhomes and so that was a much longer building and so the spaces in between, again, were three and three setback side yards and so you ended up totaling that up to maybe 30 feet of open space and in this layout with the skinnier lots, the 40 wide lots, we actually ended up with 200 -- 200 feet of running distance. So, we think that that's a lot better. I think the design is quite a bit better than it was last time around. The office -- office parking. I don't know if anything was mentioned about that, but I believe Meridian requires two per thousand square feet and we are right at 4.5. So, we are overparked for that. I tend to get excited about the open space, which is a little bit strange. I, obviously, don't work outside and I'm glad for that, but the Five Mile Creek connection to the neighborhood I think that's actually beautiful. I think with some natural grasses and the landscaping that we have shown could be a very nice evening walk for

many people and, then, as well as some of the connectivity that we have going north-south through the center of the space would really, you know, provide for an interesting experience and kind of reaches out into the community with the pathways. We think the ALMC is -- is also a very nice looking building. It will have very nice views in many directions and Alan's already mentioned all of the amenities that we are proposing on the courtyard spaces and I think overall for the entire site the combined density is 9.7 units per acre, which is less than it was last time when it was approved. It was about 10.1. So, that's really everything that I had planned on saying. So, do you have any questions?

McCarvel: Yeah. I'm going to start off with one. Are you in agreement with everything, then, that was in the staff report? That's that -- all the staff recommendations, you are in agreement with all of it? Okay?

Koenig: We have been in contact through --

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

Seal: Yeah. Just real quick. I was kind of looking for a map that was going to line up the houses on the west there with what's existing.

Tiefenbach: I have that. There it is. I can't figure out how to do full screen on this thing. Sorry. I have been trying to make the browser go away and I'm not having any luck yet.

Seal: Still not seeing it.

Tiefenbach: Oh. Sorry.

Seal: Okay. Thank you.

Tiefenbach: Do you want me to leave that up, sir, or go back to the original plan?

Seal: Oh, if you could leave it for a minute that's -- thank you.

McCarvel: Yeah.

Cassinelli: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Cassinelli.

Cassinelli: Kind of to tie into that, Alan, what -- the five foot side setbacks, is that kind of in line with -- with R-8 or R-15?

Tiefenbach: R-8. Bill says R-8. I don't have that memorized off the top of my head. Sorry.

Cassinelli: And is Woodbridge R-8 or R-4.

Tiefenbach: They are R-1. They are not in the city. But if you look at the distance between the houses when I scroll them off it's roughly the same distance between the houses. The houses in this development are narrower, but the distance between the structures -- the house are a little narrower, the lots are a little smaller, but the distance between the structures is comparable to the distance to the -- between the adjacent structures.

Cassinelli: Thank you.

McCarvel: Any other questions -- sorry.

Tiefenbach: I have -- do you want to show that? I think the applicant wants to -- see if I have --

Cassinelli: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Yes.

Cassinelli: Quick question for -- Jamie, on those houses that are -- that will back up to Woodbridge there, what are some average square footages? Do you -- do you have that?

Koenig: I don't recall of the top of my head.

McCarvel: Please, you -- you have to say -- everything has to be said into that mic. Sorry.

Koenig: I don't recall off the top of my head, but they are listed on the exhibit that we submitted. I believe the --

Tiefenbach: Are you saying the lot sizes of the development or the adjacent subdivision?

Cassinelli: No. The -- in the development. The home -- the average square foot -- square footage of the -- of the houses there that back up to Woodbridge.

Tiefenbach: Houses.

Koenig: I believe including the garages around 1,800. I believe.

Cassinelli: Obviously, you have got some -- you have got some two stories and some one story in there, so it's going to be some smaller and some larger. Okay. Madam Chair, I had another question.

McCarvel: Okay.

Cassinelli: And I just -- either to -- Jamie, to you or to Alan. So, there is no multi-family into that -- you went through a lot in the -- in the presentation there and I just -- because

we talked on that, but I want to make sure that that is not in this application. Is that correct?

Tiefenbach: Agree that there was a lot. Staff does have a --

Cassinelli: You did a great job.

Tiefenbach: I do agree there was a lot. My wife calls me too much information Alan. Too much information in there. To the southeast, the -- the assisted living memory care, right now as that use is being proposed, under TN-R the zone district that is being proposed to, multi-family would be allowed by right, meaning you would not have to come in front of the Planning Commission, but staff is recommending a condition on the development agreement that says that the only use that can occur there is this -- is a nursing home and assisted living. So, if they wanted to do any kind of multi-family at all, they would have to amend the development agreement and would have to come back, do a public hearing.

Cassinelli: Okay. Thank you.

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

Grove: Madam Chair. Jamie, just a question with what Alan had mentioned with the clubhouse and the nine additional parking spots. Is that reflected in the concept plan that we saw tonight or is that something that still needs to be added in?

Koenig: That's something that's in -- that's something that's in there tonight. It's reflected in the 266 number.

McCarvel: Okay. Any other question?

Cassinelli: Why not?

McCarvel: Commissioner Cassinelli.

Cassinelli: Jamie -- if we can put -- put that last -- the -- the plat map up there.

Tiefenbach: The one with the lot lines?

Cassinelli: Yeah. Well, not the --

Tiefenbach: The section one or the one with the property lines?

Cassinelli: The one of the 61 homes. The home -- plat of the 61 homes.

Tiefenbach: Is that the proper one?

Cassinelli: That will work.

Tiefenbach: Okay.

Cassinelli: The -- the bump outs there for parking on the west side, I'm just wondering, because I was going to bring this up in -- in our comments, but since we are still in open session I can ask Jamie here. There is really no additional park -- that puts all the parking on the -- all the -- I would assume visitor parking and whatnot on the west side. There is not a -- there is really nothing up in that northeast corner. Could we shift that island of homes that's -- I guess it's on the south side of Gentle -- Gentle something lane -- to where the parking is on the east side. Do you see what I'm trying to envision there? Because there is no -- there is no -- there is -- there is no additional parking on that side. So, anybody that did have to go to the other side of that, just a -- it's a random thought. I have those. Just like Alan has too much information.

Koenig: We certainly could make that change.

Cassinelli: Okay.

McCarvel: Any other questions? Okay. Thank you. Madam Clerk, do we have anyone signed up for public testimony on this application?

Johnson: Madam Chair, we have several people signed in, only one indicating a wish to testify. That would be John Overton, indicating he is the representative for the Woodbridge HOA.

McCarvel: Okay.

Overton: Good evening, P&Z Commission and city staff. Thank you. My name is John Overton. 1922 East Bowstring in Woodbridge Subdivision in Meridian, Idaho. We have stood before you many times, but before I start I need to make two quick corrections. There were two little snafus that were just said, one by city staff and I don't think he meant to. Woodbridge is very much in the city. It's not an R-1 county. Woodbridge is R-4. Desert -- Locust View Heights to the south of us is the one that's R-1 in the county. I know the question was what was Woodbridge. We are an R-4 subdivision. Okay? Second thing was city staff made a comment that said, I believe twice, that there were 244 parking spots, but when Jamie just spoke he said 266. That needs to be clarified as well. We got multiple numbers. This is the problem we are having. This is the big problem we are having with this project is we keep hearing information that is changing. It's been so dynamic it's been hard for us. We didn't mark we were opposed. We didn't mark we were in favor. There is things we like about this project, but there has just been too many changes and there is even another big change as we get through this that has not been mentioned once tonight really. That was a major part of why we as a subdivision approved the previous project. But we need to go back. We have had three projects in this area east of Woodbridge. The thing to remember here is no matter what gets built there, every single vehicle has two options. They can go out to the east or they go to the

west. There is no way they can drive south. There is no way they can drive north. When they go west one of their two options is they are driving -- all of those vehicles are driving through our residential subdivision on our residential streets. So, we have been very involved in all of the different applications over the years on safety, traffic safety, ACHD traffic studies, which I understand was not requested in this plan and I'm -- I'm at a loss for why this time there was no traffic study requested, when in previous applications there were. So, I'm a little lost on why we have no traffic study. We live in a subdivision with 269 homes and not a single crosswalk within our subdivision to get children and families across the street from the south side to the north side where our pool and park is or from the phase two on the east side to our west side to get to Fuller Park. We don't have a single crosswalk and we have a tremendous amount of traffic coming through Woodbridge. So, I'm a little bit at a loss why ACHD isn't playing a larger role in determining what the impact is going to be on our subdivision. We have sat on committees -- I sat on committees with Mayor de Weerd specifically geared toward developments are going to affect our subdivision. For years she said this was going to be part of the medical corridor and we fought two multi-family developments successfully all the way through City Council voted down, because they just didn't fit with what this area was designed for. Now, we supported strongly the last development -- the first Andorra one. We have not just supported this one, because it's significantly different. The major effect -- or the major difference on this one is we got into the development agreement with the developers coming in agreement in the meeting at City Council last time that the individual houses would be in the development agreement as 55 and over. We needed assurances for our residents that we are not going to have all these houses turn into young families -- and maybe we are dealing with three or four cars or more per house really negatively impacting the amount of traffic already coming through Woodbridge. We totally support the idea of assisted living memory care or the independent living 55 and over plan. We were supporting it, we were behind it, everything was great. We are sad that that project failed, but this is not the same project. We now sit at a position where Magic View Drive -- and you don't really see it, but it's there, you come out on Magic View Drive, you turn left, boom, you are in Woodbridge. We have another development that's approved. It's on the north side of Magic View. They have a lot of parking and yet every day ten to 15 cars are parked on Magic View Drive on both sides, restricting our ability to get through, and now I see a development that we still don't know what the exact number is of internal parking spaces, but you get a large event, a party or a group, we are going to have cars parked up and down that Magic View Drive and if you get to our subdivision we have a beautiful island and restricted area. It's going to be an absolute bottleneck. It's not going to be safe and it's going to be a blind exit for us coming out of our subdivision. So, I really would like to see the applicant and the city discuss or commit to the over 55, the 55 and older, the independent living, what really fits with the other part of their project. The same way the initial one did. I understand and there was an initial letter we put on the file that profits were part of the issue and we get that, but we, as residents of Woodbridge, never put profits in front of safety of the residents of our subdivision. We need this to be a well thought out and safe project for everybody. Now, with that said, the applicant's done a lot. He has. He has made a lot of changes. He has made a lot of changes to the depth and the size and the height and the fact that they are not three foot side setbacks or five foot. Our understanding was

they were five foot, because they couldn't put windows on the sides of those houses at the three foot setback. They had to go to a five foot setback with ten feet between the homes before they could actually put glass on the side. I could be corrected if I'm wrong, but that information came out of Planning. So, the second problem we have -- and there was an article online today talking about it being 55 and over is the original plan was all one story, because that's what 55 and over is. When you start building two story houses with some of the master bedrooms being upstairs, there is no way people of Woodbridge are going to buy for one minute that you intend to build it as 55 over. Not a chance. That doesn't make sense. I have never seen that anywhere. The whole reason the first project did as well as it did and had the one story townhouses is because that makes sense. That's what other 55 and older communities did. You just don't normally ever see two story homes, especially not bedrooms in the second story. Although I don't have to park in there, we are really concerned that those bump outs are ever going to hold what number crunchers tell me are going to be in there, because they are not marked parking spots. I think you are still going to be short parking. We are still going to have parking out on the main roads outside of the gated community, which is going to cause issues for everybody else. The amenities. Besides hoping to see the applicant step up and say we will commit to 55 and over, we mean it, we want to be a good neighbor, we want to do what was done the first time where we stood up and we said, hey, this is great. The amenities listed fit with a 55 and over. Love to see the amenities, if it's possible, I don't know. Ted can tell us. Whether the amenities themselves can be required and listed in a development agreement, along with them agreeing to 55 and over and they may refuse and if the -- if the applicant refuses the 55 and over and listing out what the amenities are, at least they have told Woodbridge and all the residents what their true intention is. They have kind of told us their true intention simply by the fact that they tried to change to multi-family, because that's what we have been afraid of all along. It doesn't fit with the vision for this area. It doesn't fit with the traffic problems we have got. You can go out there to St. Luke's Lane every day and waiting in those long lines -- it's a nightmare. It's one of the reasons everybody uses our subdivision as a cut through. It's the reason that when a project like this comes to Council we get 150 people filling this place because they are so passionate about all these cars coming through our subdivision at all times of the day. What does that mean?

McCarvel: That's your ten minutes.

Overton: Is that my ten?

McCarvel: Yeah.

Overton: Okay.

McCarvel: So, if you want to wrap up your thoughts.

Overton: I will wrap. I used this term in front of the HOA board last night -- or Tuesday night. We are cautiously optimistic. We are not here to say deny. We are not here to definitely say approve. We are cautiously optimistic that the developer will stand up and

do the right thing, which the previous developer did, to get Woodbridge's buy in and approval.

McCarvel: Okay.

Overton: So, I stand for any questions.

McCarvel: Any questions? Okay.

Cassinelli: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Oh. Commissioner Cassinelli.

Cassinelli: John? Over here.

Overton: Oh. Sorry.

Cassinelli: Do you have any traffic counts through -- through Woodbridge?

Overton: Working with ACHD they have not done a traffic count since COVID started, because that threw everything off. The kids weren't going to school, they weren't driving, there is a history -- ACHD has our traffic counts and how they were increasing for the past almost ten years. We have continued to request them and had John Lawson from ACHD come in and run those counts. There was a request to have another traffic count done -- I think it was this spring and I never saw it happen and I don't know whether they are just busy or backlogged, but we need another one, because now we are seeing the world kind of come back to life and the traffic is really picking up and that's before this has been done. I hope that answers your question.

Cassinelli: I was -- well, I was hoping you had one maybe even from '19 or -- but you don't have -- you don't know the --

Overton: No. They are obtainable. I -- actually, we have made requests before from ACHD for all of them, so we can show the historical pattern of what we have seen, because we have actually looked at those in the meetings with ACHD and Meridian city staff.

Cassinelli: Okay.

Overton: So, it can absolutely be obtained.

Cassinelli: Thank you.

McCarvel: Thank you. And I understand Mr. Overton spoke for the subdivision, so if there is anybody else that has anything additional to add or -- I'm assuming you were all

in agreement of his presentation. Okay. So, that being said, is there anybody else that wanted to testify? Okay.

Weatherly: Madam Chair, we have no one else signed up.

McCarvel: Okay. Anybody else in the room have something urgent? Okay. Alan.

Tiefenbach: I just would like to add a couple of staff's comments on some of the things that Mr. Overton discussed, if that's okay.

McCarvel: Yes.

Tiefenbach: First of all, my apologies, that was a snafu about the -- about your subdivision not being in the city. My bad. About the 55 plus, the one thing I want to comment about that is that's certainly something that the applicant can do, but it's important to mention -- because we have talked about these before, these sorts of things have come in front of you and I have said the same thing from bad experiences in other municipalities. Not this one. It's very difficult for staff to enforce 55 plus. The only way that staff -- if I'm reviewing the project, the only way that you will convince me to review the project, under the assumption that it will be 55 plus, is a deed restriction. That's really the only way that it can be enforced. Otherwise, it could be something that the applicant could offer, whether it's the covenants or something like that, unless there is a deed restriction and I believe it's illegal, there is really not much we can enforce with it being 50, because it's targeted towards 55 plus. In regard to the amenities, that's something very easily -- generally our development agreements say that the concept plan would generally conform with -- that the -- what's being approved should generally conform with -- with what's being presented. You could certainly add the amenities as they are being required into the development agreement. So, if Mr. Overton thought that that would help calm the -- the concerns of the adjacent neighbors, certainly you can say that the amenities as listed in the Planning Commission hearing would be part of the development agreement. The last thing I -- in regard to the parking, he's absolutely right, it's been a very dynamic thing. At the time that the staff report went out the concept plan that we had had 244 parking spaces. They were missing parking spaces for the clubhouse. I have -- there is a recent version of the concept plan, which you are now seeing here. I have not counted those parking spaces, because I got this today. I would leave that to the applicant to mention whether that new number of 266 I think he said is correct. You could certainly add that to the development agreement. And last, just as an FYI, this is actually slightly less than number of units than the one with the multi-family. When ACHD commented they -- what they said is that because we reviewed it with the previous one and we did not require a traffic study, the way they put this is as a courtesy to the neighborhood you may consider doing a traffic study, but a traffic study is not required.

McCarvel: Thank you. Would the applicant like to come back.

Koenig: Just to clarify, the 266 number is correct in the north residential portion. The offices have 45 stalls and the assisted living to the south has 110 stalls and ACHD took

a look at the layout of this scheme and the average daily trips did not rise to the level to warrant the traffic impact study, so we didn't have one done.

McCarvel: Okay.

Koenig: And, then, I believe Brent may want to say a few words, too.

Thompson: Hello. My name is -- I really have to bend over. Sorry. This is Brent Thompson is my name. I live 2476 East Lacrosse Circle in St. George, Utah, but former resident of Meridian city. Used to live in the Saguaro Canyon neighborhood when it was first developed years ago. So, I am -- somewhat have some roots here and my in-laws live here as well. But we are really excited about this project. I have got a couple of comments just -- I hate the word rebuttal, by the way. It sounds a little aggressive. But I do have a couple comments based on some of the previous commentary. But we are super excited about this project. Many -- many of you probably don't know that we actually -- we are under contract for this project right before it was approved at City Council, so we have been involved in the original project. Due to COVID and so forth and circumstances, the previous developer chose to sell. That's when we got involved and did not own any of the parcels at that time. Since, then, we closed on all of these parcels. We own them. We have invested a great deal of money in trying to get the design, in our opinion, to a better design. Some of the challenges that we had -- and I just wanted to kind of -- it was thrown out there that we are making decisions for profits. We are making decisions based on marketability and -- and the livability of the community. Agreed that the 55 and older was a great concept. The challenge was is that they had for sale fee simple product, so when we had -- the original design only had one car garages and really small units. About a thousand square feet. For us we felt that just wasn't sufficient for most people that are looking to live in the area. I consider myself one of the prospects to live in this community. I'm 51 years old almost and I have parents that are aging that I would love to have them in this building and I view people such as myself to live in that -- that area. I recall the City Council, in approving the project last year, one of the Council Members commented about -- similar to Alan had commented about the challenges of restricting 55 and older. We are targeting 55 and older, so to speak, or my generation and older, simply so that we can be able to take care of our parents and people that may be housed in a building such as this. The building's a phenomenal building designed by Babcock Design. Jamie has done a phenomenal job with it and his team. We also have a great team with Van Elgin and Keith. Back here with JUB Engineering. We have integrated both the engineering firm and the architectural firm at the very start of this project, simply so that we can have the project well designed and be able to maximize its potential. Excuse me. Sorry. I always get a little nervous when I have to do this and we have so many commissioners. But I just wanted to -- to just make a couple of comments. I value very much the process that we have here in this great country of ours and for the opportunity to speak up and for citizens to be able to share their thoughts and so forth. The Woodbridge community is a very beautiful community. I respect that very much. And they are -- they are very interested in what's happening in here, obviously, and it sounds like it's been going on for years. We have really put forth the effort and the expense to make this the best project that we possibly can and to make it economically pencil and to

be able to provide a building such as this. You can imagine this three story assisted living memory care building, it's significant in cost. Close to around 20 million dollars or more. When we first got some of our bids back, because we have already gone down the road of designing this architecturally, some of the bids, just because of the cost and everything else that changes, we had a little bit of sticker shock. So, we did go back to Alan and said, hey, was there a potential -- I just want to make sure that it's known that when it said multi-family, we are simply going back to the old apartment design, which is really a 55 and older apartment complex. We weren't coming in with a traditional apartment building. We feel that we can make this -- this building work and make this project work and be a great success, although it is more expensive than it was, we are building it with steel and putting a significant amount of investment in it. Many of you may or may not know much about opportunity zones, but this is actually an opportunity zone area and this is an exciting -- I don't know how many projects have been done in opportunity zones for that purpose, but there is no intent to flip or sell. This project is simply going to be an asset that's going to be held for at least ten years or beyond and we are super excited about it. We think the architecture is exciting. The product that we have here is really modeled similar to other projects here in Meridian city already, which are similar to Brighton's Cadence product. They have two story product there, as well as single family. The other product they have is Pine 43. Also similar product. I don't -- I get a little uncomfortable when there is any kind of -- somewhat discrimination against young families that may move in. That's not our target. But at the same time we can't prohibit if somebody does have children that wants to move there or if somebody that's been divorced and has a young family and I don't think we can do that in any community, whether it be Meridian city, St. George, or anywhere we may live. We are targeting 55 and older, but at the same time we are definitely going to have people that are maybe 51 like myself that would like to live here as well. It's a gated community. I have a very similar community in St. George, Utah, called Bella Vista. It's also a gated community. We have 101 homes approved there. We have got right now 76 residents, most of which are from 50 to 75 years old. It's not age restricted, but just by nature it draws that client and so I think it's a lot cleaner and that's really our intent. We are not going to try to do every home a two story home. People may want to have the single level, but we want to have the flexibility to do so. My last example. My mother-in-law just moved from Eagle last year and moved into a Cadence -- Brighton home by Cadence there off of Chinden. She has a two story product. We just stayed there three weeks ago as a family in the upper floor. They have a main floor master and it's a beautiful product and very much in demand and I believe those setbacks are even smaller than what -- what are proposed here as a five foot setback, which I think is -- most of Meridian city is five foot setback, I believe. So, we think it's a very exciting product. We are putting in the money and the investment to make it right. We don't have any bank financing or anything on the project. We have come in and put forth our very best efforts on this project and we have a lot to gain to be able to make it best for the community and if you have any questions I'm happy to answer any if you had any.

McCarvel: Okay. Any other questions for the applicant? Okay?

Yearsley: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: So, just so I can clarify for the record that you are not planning to do any deed restrictions on these homes?

Thompson: No. Just simply because, again, we believe there is market individuals like myself that -- and the other thing -- just let me clarify that. Especially with so many people that have moved from out of state, we see this as an opportunity for people to -- if they have a loved one that needs to be in the memory care or the assisted living building, somebody may want to have a second home within this community where, you know, the yards are maintained and have great amenities when they come and visit. You know, we just don't know exactly who that buyer is. By limiting it to 55 and older it just creates challenges -- title challenges.

Yearsley: Thank you.

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: Just a quick question on the memory care unit and everything. That's -- I mean is that going to go in -- at what stage is that going to go in compared to the single family?

Thompson: We are actually going to go immediately, assuming if we can get through Planning and Zoning Commission, as well as City Council, we have actually gone through the expense -- and it's our risk and we do this on most of our projects -- certainly if you are in Treasure Valley. Developed three successful projects already. We have got seven that we are developing right now. This being one of them. We already have the -- the civil engineering drawings almost done for the entire site, knowing that there may be a few changes here and there upon approval. We also have the three story building is -- Jamie, can you just give me a number how much percentage done? Okay. So, we hope you had that --

McCarvel: Can you give the number in the microphone for the --

Thompson: He said about 25 percent done. As far as the -- and that's construction drawings. So, when I say at great expense, these aren't just conceptals that Jamie did in his office. The little office building that is down below, but that's kind of a simple 9,000 square foot building. The three story buildings are already in process in design. So, we hope to start immediately after approval, if we are so lucky to have so -- do so. We will actually be submitting construction drawings soon after. Thank you.

McCarvel: Okay. Thank you. If there is no more questions, could I get a motion to close the public hearing on H-2021-0024.

Seal: So moved.

Cassinelli: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to close the public hearing on H-2021-0024. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

McCarvel: I think we clarified in earlier discussions that I think everything that Alan went through is in the staff report as -- all the considerations, all the additional things that he wanted added, including the restriction of this being a memory care unit and not a multi-family, unless they come back with a different application.

Tiefenbach: Yes, except there would be an additional restriction regarding the five foot setbacks that just happened and the concept plan that you saw tonight is about one day old and so you would be also approving the concept plan dated July 13th with additional parking and the -- the trail connection put into the east. The southern most alley turning into a road and, then, what was the road south of the pool disappearing and becoming green space.

McCarvel: Okay.

Baird: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Yes.

Baird: If I could inquire -- okay. If I could inquire of Alan. There was an expressed desire to perhaps link the specifically listed amenities as part of the DA. Would that require an additional part of the motion to do that?

Tiefenbach: Bill's nodding his head, so if they wanted to -- if you wanted to reference the amenities as listed in the staff report, you certainly could do that.

McCarvel: Okay. Okay. We will open for discussion.

Cassinelli: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Cassinelli.

Cassinelli: All in all I think it's a -- I think it's a really nice product. A lot of it fits in there. Having sat through several projects that have affected Woodbridge directly, I do have concerns and I don't know if it would be in our purview to -- to condition for maybe some traffic calming measures if they have absolutely no -- not even a crosswalk in there and I think that the pool is right -- is -- is really right there on the -- on what is the collector on Woodbridge Avenue. I'm looking at -- and quite frankly -- and I have expressed disappointment in ACHD more than one time up here. I pulled up a traffic study on Woodbridge and it was from 2017 and there was a 24 hour account of -- of over 2,000

vehicles and that's acceptable on a collector, but not on local streets and everything winds up feeding those local streets to the backside of Woodbridge and I don't live in Woodbridge, but I have used it as a cut through more than -- more than once in the past. When you look at -- at a traffic, eastbound, westbound, a.m. peak, the numbers look like, just from what I'm seeing here is, is -- is actually people going in and out of Woodbridge or going through Woodbridge into that area. So, this is going to increase the traffic and, unfortunately, there is no -- there is no other way out, other than whatever the -- up at the light there across from St. Luke's. So, people are going to naturally go through Woodbridge and, again, so I come back to that. I don't know if there is any way that we can condition for -- again, if it's in our preview or not or just recommend maybe City Council condition for some traffic calming measures if we can through Woodbridge to -- to -- to help that. But other than that I -- I think it's going to -- you know, I tend to agree with the applicant, I think it's going to attract more of a -- an older, empty nest type of situation, but I think it's -- all in all I think it's a neat project for the area. Those are my thoughts.

McCarvel: I guess I would comment on that. I'm certainly not in the planning profession or legal, but I will -- I would imagine that it is not in our purview to condition this applicant to do something in another subdivision. I would encourage the people of Woodbridge to keep working with ACHD, because that is the controlling entity of that. And I will stand from correction by legal or staff if that was --

Tiefenbach: That was exactly what I was going to tell you. Unless they offered and ACHD was amenable, we can't make them do off-site improvements. We can only make them do -- ACHD can make you pay into a pot of money for road improvements to widen a road or something like that, but we can't make them do traffic calming for Woodbridge, but, you know, they could offer and work with ACHD, but we can't require it.

McCarvel: Okay.

Yearsley: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: I have to admit I'm a little torn. I did listen to the residents for the HOA of Woodbridge and, you know, they are -- they are really close I think. I understand the -- the desire not to make this deed restricted. You know, my biggest concern ultimately is you are seeing a new trend of huge developer -- or huge companies coming in and just buying the entire subdivision and, then, renting everything and so -- and at that point you don't know what you will ever get with rentals, so -- and I don't know how to fix that either. So, I mean it's -- it's not something that's -- that I expect to be fixed. I would like to see, you know, this -- the site plan has changed significantly since the initial submittal. I wouldn't mind seeing the applicant reaching out to Woodbridge one more time and at least presenting what they have, showing the parking, so they can be more comfortable with that and -- and at least try to reach out to them and help to try to figure out a solution

before City Council. Overall I think it's a fairly good layout. Still think it's a little dense, but -- yeah. That's where I'm at.

McCarvel: Okay.

Grove: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Grove.

Grove: I don't have an issue with the density. The layout is sufficient for me. I guess I have a couple of questions for staff, just in regards to the roads, Magic View and Wells. Are those streets -- are you allowed to park on those streets? And if -- and is that something that we can have any say over or is that out of our purview?

Tiefenbach: Alan Tiefenbach. Yes, I believe you can park on those. We could suggest ACHD work with the applicant, but they are right of ways, not private roads. So, we can't tell ACHD what to do with the roads. We could say pretty please. The applicant is required to do some road improvements, sidewalks, and some widening, but it comes back down to ACHD is in charge of the roads.

Grove: And, then, a second question -- and I think this was one of the first projects that I heard when I came onto the commission a year ago. Same question I guess is what is the possibility of having another connection east-west with future development? I know it had come up quite a bit during the Comprehensive Plan review a few years ago, but just knowing if there was any movement on -- on that front.

Parsons: Yeah. Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, I think that -- that's what Alan alluded to in his presentation to you this evening. You know, that was -- from my perspective when this project was back in front of you a year ago, we were getting that street stub through that county subdivision with the R-1 lots and the vision -- the plan does contemplate a connection out to Locust Grove to -- to provide to Woodbridge, but, again, as you -- as this body realizes, that -- that comes with development and redevelopment of other properties and so, you know, when we analyze this project before we even brought it to you, that's something that we discussed with staff is we were concerned that now that we are taking out this five acre piece that was originally part of it and now it isn't, we have created another roadblock for having that road get extended like we want and provide some of that relief to Woodbridge. So, certainly that's something within your purview tonight. Obviously, you can't make them extend the road, but that's certainly something you should take into consideration as you deliberate on the application tonight.

Grove: Thank you. All said, I -- I like the changes that we have seen tonight and I'm on board with moving this project forward.

McCarvel: I will jump in. I -- it is different than what we saw originally and I think what we saw a year ago we were all clapping for, but I think this is somewhat the same impact and

does fit in the opportunity zone with the nursing care, but I would be in strong support that this is tied to the DA that it would be a nursing care. That they would have to come back to do anything else with it -- any other high density option.

Yearsley: So, Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: Is it already in the staff report that they have to -- that in the DA that it is to be an assisted living unit? Okay.

McCarvel: I believe it is stated correctly.

Tiefenbach: Yeah. There is a direct reference that says that's the only thing that can happen.

McCarvel: All right. I'm just -- I guess I'm just making an over point of it, because it normally is allowed in the TN -- the zone we are bringing in here.

Yearsley: Okay.

McCarvel: So --

Tiefenbach: Which is why there is a direct note in the DA --

McCarvel: Yes.

Tiefenbach: -- for that reason.

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: Yeah. Just looking at it, I mean at first when I was reading through this and just some of the public comment and the history of it and things like that, I was -- especially some of the wording with the memory care unit in there, it was kind of lining up in my mind like a little bit of a bait and switch, where we will put the community in there and, then, eh, we will kind of change that out later if it doesn't work out. But where I think we are writing it in -- or staff has had the forethought to write in the fact that that has to be a medical facility and, then, the feedback from the applicant on the fact that they want to start this right away, the planning is already there, the architecting is already coming into place, I feel less like that at this point in time. So, I feel that the applicant's -- although not communicating it very well, seems like this kind of came in at the last minute -- they have done everything that they have really been asked by the neighbors as far as improving the setbacks, varying the -- you know, the house scape I guess you would call it, going through there and just to provide a little bit better breakup of the -- of the lots. Fairly good

alignment of the lots. I think that could be a little better. You know, if they dropped a -- dropped a unit or two in there and really worked on lining those things up, I think that that transition would be a little -- a little bit better for the neighbors, a little bit easier to swallow. So, I mean I kind of go back to one of our former commissioners, Ryan, where I also looked at this and where it's at -- I mean this thing is right off of Eagle Road. If this were in Ten Mile and somebody came in with single family over multi-family, we would probably be saying no way. This is where multi-family needs to go. So, the fact that it is single family and the density isn't that high and everybody can swallow that, then, but I'm okay with it, too. So, I'm definitely not somebody that likes to push multi-family and large developments. That said, land is disappearing fast in Meridian. So, there is only so many places you can put that, especially with this kind of access to the freeway. So, I think all of this is going to line up. There are other options that will become viable in the future for cut through -- or not cut through -- to avoid the cut through coming through Woodbridge. So, I think that the -- in all I think I'm on board with pushing it forward.

McCarvel: Any other comments or motions?

Yearsley: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to approve file number H-2021-0024 as presented in a staff report for the hearing date of July 15, 2021, with the following modifications: To add the amenities stated in the -- in the app -- the deal -- meeting today and to the design -- or development agreement. To add the five foot setbacks on the homes on the west side of the property and I would like to see the applicant to at least reach out to the Woodbridge Homeowners Association to discuss further actions for the -- before City Council.

Grove: And also the concept as shown tonight.

Yearsley: Yes. The five foot.

McCarvel: And the concept plan dated July 13th --

Yearsley: Oh. Yes. And add the concept plan dated today.

Parsons: Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, one other item that was discussed, the additional parking that Commissioner Cassinelli wanted added in the northeast corner to just kind of disperse some parking. The applicant agreed to adding some more into the development. I wasn't sure if any of the other Commissioners wanted that as well.

Cassinelli: If I could jump in, just clarify that, it was -- it was more just shifting it to the east. It wasn't what I had mentioned, but if the motion wants to add more parking, but my -- my thought on that was just to shift some of that from the west to the east.

Yearsley: I think for my motion my -- my thought was is they could try to adjust that as best as they see fit, not require.

McCarvel: Okay.

Grove: Second.

McCarvel: Okay. Are we clear on the motion, staff? Okay. It has been moved and seconded to recommend approval of H-2021-0024, Wells Street Assisted Living and Andorra Subdivision with modifications. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

6. Public Hearing for Brightstar Residential Care Facility (H-2021-0040) by Jeff Hatch of Hatch Design Architecture, Located at 3336 and 3340 N. Meridian Rd.

- A. Request: Conditional Use Permit to allow a 5,800 square-foot senior residential care facility.

McCarvel: Next on the agenda is H-2021-0040, Brightstar Residential Care Facility, and we will begin with the staff report.

Tiefenbach Sorry, I'm getting caught up with myself. Okay. This is a conditional use permit to allow a 5,800 square foot nursing and residential care facility in the L-O zoning district. This includes a request for a DA modification to reduce a 20 foot wide required landscape buffer and I will go through that shortly. The site consists of two lots totaling just a little less than half an acre, zoned L-O, located at 30 -- 333 -- well, basically, on Meridian Road across the street from Settlers Park northeast corner of North Meridian and Ustick. Adjacent properties. R-8 is to the north. Single family residential. East and south is L-O --

Yearsley: Before you go, can you put that up on the screen?

Tiefenbach: Oh, I'm sorry. My -- my apologies I thought we were there. Did it not come up? All right. I thought I had shared it. My bad.

Yearsley: Thank you.

Tiefenbach: Thank you for telling me. Okay. Adjacent land use. To the north R-8. Single family residential. East and south is L-O, office and commercial. To the west is Settlers Park. This property is part of the Settlers Business Park. About half of this development has built out. There is these two lots and I believe three more commercial lots left. The future land use map recommends this property for office uses. However, this proposal includes a nursing and residential care facility. It's important to note, though, that this is