

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:02 p.m., Tuesday, September 15, 2026, by Mayor Robert Simison.

Members Present: Robert Simison, Luke Cavener, Liz Strader, John Overton, Doug Taylor, Anne Little Roberts and Brian Whitlock.

Other Present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Bill Parsons.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

☒ Liz Strader	☒ Brian Whitlock
☒ Anne Little Roberts	☒ John Overton
☒ Doug Taylor	☒ Luke Cavener
☒ Mayor Robert E. Simison	

Simison: Council, we will call the meeting to order. For the record it is Tuesday, September 15th, 2026, at 6:02 p.m. We will begin tonight's regular city council meeting with roll call attendance.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Simison: Next item is the Pledge of Allegiance. So, if you would all, please, rise and join us in the pledge.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

COMMUNITY INVOCATION

Simison: Okay. We had no one sign up for our community invocation.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Simison: So, we will move on to adoption of the agenda.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: There is one change to tonight's agenda. We are going to vacate Item 4, the Executive Session, and with that I move that we approve the rest of the agenda as published.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to adopt the agenda by -- with removal of the Executive Session. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. . Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the agenda is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

PROCLAMATIONS

1. National Diaper Need Awareness Week

Simison: With that we will move on to our proclamations. The first one we are going to do this evening is the National Diaper Needs Awareness Week. I will ask Meg and anyone else to join me at the podium. Meg, you are becoming an old pro with these. Appreciate you coming back and making this happen each year. So, I will go ahead and read a proclamation and turn it over for any comments you all would like to make this evening. So, whereas diaper need, the condition of not being able to afford a sufficient supply of clean diapers to keep babies and toddlers clean, dry and healthy, can adversely affect the health and well-being of children and their families and whereas a supply of diapers is generally an eligibility requirement for babies and toddlers to participate in childcare programs and quality early education programs that enable children to thrive and parents to work and whereas through their work of addressing diaper needs diaper banks play a critical role in supporting Idaho's families and children in improving infant health and well-being and whereas diaper need is a public health issue and addressing diaper needs can lead to economic opportunity for the state's families and communities and improved help for children and whereas Meridian is proud to be home to trusted community-based organizations, including the Idaho Diaper Bank, that fill this crucial role for families, the state and our city. Therefore, I, Robert E. Simison, proclaim the week of September 14th through 20th, 2026, as National Diaper Need Awareness Week in the city of Meridian, encourage all Meridian citizens to recognize the role of diaper banks in addressing diaper need and to support organizations that collect and distribute diapers to families struggling with diaper needs and help all Meridian families thrive. Dated this 15th day of September 2026. On behalf of myself and city council I would like to present this proclamation to you and invite you up to say a few words

Larson: Thank you, Mayor. The Idaho Diaper Bank is very proud to be a part of the Meridian community. Our warehouse is located right here in Meridian and from there we are on track to distribute nearly a million diapers this year to families in need in Meridian and throughout the Treasure Valley and really help support those families and help them thrive physically, mentally, economically.

2. Hispanic Heritage Month

Simison: Okay. Now, for our next one invite up Mari and anybody else from her team who would like to join for National Hispanic American Heritage Month and I will start as you come up -- I don't know if there is a video of it, but Councilman Overton this week

attended the Mexican Independence Day Festival at Kleiner Park and him, along with his wife, did an amazing rendition of a proclamation in support of that event and that activity, including the Spanish version. So, appreciate John doing that. So, it's always good to see you and we will go ahead and do this and, then, turn it over to you, Mari. Whereas National Hispanic Heritage Month provides an opportunity to recognize the rich histories, cultures, traditions and achievements of people of Hispanic heritage, while celebrating the enduring contributions they continue to make to our communities and our nation and whereas national observation began in 1968 as Hispanic Heritage Week under President Lyndon Johnson and was expanded by President Ronald Reagan in 1988 to cover a 30 day period starting September 15th and ending October 15th of each year and it was enacted into law on August 17, 1988. And, whereas, this month's theme Unidos Somos Mas, Together We Are More, highlights unity, community resilience and shared principles, like family, perseverance, service and creativity across diverse backgrounds and whereas in Meridian and across the nation Hispanic residents, families, businesses, educators, artists, entrepreneurs and community leaders, like those found at the Idaho Hispanic Foundation, contribute to the city's continued growth, innovation, cultural diversity and civic life, helping build a welcoming, prosperous and vibrant community for all. Therefore, I, Mayor Robert E. Simison, do hereby proclaim September 15th through October 15th as Hispanic Heritage Month in the city of Meridian, encourage all citizens to celebrate the rich history, cultures and contributions of people of Hispanic heritage, recognize the important role they continue to play in the life of our community and participate in activities to promote understanding, appreciation and the unity throughout the month. Dated this 15th day of September 2026. On behalf of myself and city council I would like to present this proclamation to you and welcome you to say a few words.

Ramos: Well, thank you so much, Mayor. Thank you, city council, for this proclamation. You know, we -- we strive to work and make Meridian a place we can work and play and just live comfortably and we are now at about one in five people in Meridian who consider themselves Hispanic. So, that is quite a big population. So, we really really are very grateful that you have taken the time to recognize our community and all of the contributions that our community makes here in Meridian and in Idaho. So, thank you very much. Thank you so much.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND RECOGNITION

Simison: Okay. And with that move on to Announcements and Recognition. Council, anything this evening?

PUBLIC FORUM

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

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, yes. First is McKenna Marshall.

Simison: Good evening.

Marshall: Hi. I am an RHS IB anthropology student studying how Meridian's environment affect -- affects its city council's response to -- to water shortages to ensure sustainability. So, my question tonight is what is your process for approving water infrastructure or policies? What factors go through your mind to be sure of your answer. For example, do you rely on an expert to explain it or do you prefer to have a document to review before asking questions.

Simison: Thank you, McKenna. Unfortunately, we can't do a back and forth on the topic, but we can have someone either -- if you want to leave your information we will have someone reach out directly to you, either from our Public Works Department or if any city council member would like to do that. So, if you can just -- I think we have her contact information; is that right?

Johnson: I do not.

Simison: If you can give it to Mr. Johnson over here and we can have someone follow up directly. Thank you. Anybody else, Mr. Johnson?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, yes. Next is Linda Stevens.

Simison: Good evening.

Stevens: Hello. This is regarding the proposed building that's going to be on Meridian Road? Correct? The -- the -- what my comments are about.

Simison: If you are looking for the -- the application, this is not about the application yet. This would just be on a general topic.

Stevens: Okay.

Simison: So, if you are -- if you are wanting to speak specifically to an application you would need to wait.

Stevens: Okay. Thank you.

Simison: Okay.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, that's everyone.

PUBLIC HEARINGS [Action Item]

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

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

Simison: Okay. Then with that we will -- we will move on to our public hearing for this evening. First item up is public hearing for the Syringa Crossing Mixed Use Development, H-2025-0007. We will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Just really quick. I wanted to let people know I was out during the hearing on June 16th with my family on vacation and I have reviewed about 80 percent of the materials associated with that hearing and most of the materials from this hearing. I do pride myself on reviewing everything. If there is a vote this evening I will abstain. If it is continued for some reason I expect I would be able to vote at that time once I have finished everything. Thank you.

Simison: Okay. Thank you.

Parsons: Mayor and Council, thank you. Good evening. Next -- the application before you this evening is, as you mentioned, Syringa Crossing. It's a request for annexation, conditional use permit and preliminary plat. If you recall this application was before city council back in mid-July, as Council Woman Strader has mentioned, and at that time the applicant did modify the plans and discuss changes with you. I think you -- if Council recalls, the Planning and Zoning Commission and both staff had recommended denial of that application, so in order to get council's weigh in on some of the changes that were discussed prior -- at the Planning and Zoning Commission, they brought forward some changes to the plan and shared those with you. At that time you guys decided that it would be in the best interest to remand it back to the Planning and Zoning Commission for their deliberation and their recommendation on the revisions to the plans. So, the plans that are before you this evening are primarily the same ones you guys saw in July, but because of your actions they went back to P&Z to get their input from those changes, because, again, some of the changes the applicant made were based on some of the conversations that occurred during that hearing. So, this property -- just, again, I don't know if the council wants me to go through all the details again, because you have heard this, but I'm more than happy to do that if you would like me to. I'm seeing some nods, so I'm happy to go ahead and continue with all of the details of

the plan, so we can get everyone familiar with it. Perfect. No problem. Thanks. So, I just wanted to mention that the subject properties are located on -- near the northwest corner and southwest corner of Meridian Road and Amity, approximately 60 acres plus or minus, and the applicant -- currently zoned RUT and L-O in Ada county and it's -- again, it's by -- Meridian Road runs on the westbound -- or east boundary of the site, which is a major corridor for the city. As part of the application there is a small county enclave that was hooked up to city utilities in 2021. They are part of the annexation request, because when they hooked up to our utilities there was a consent to annex at that time and now with this application the property is now potential of being contiguous, which makes them eligible to request annexation. You can see here on the future land use map that the property is all designated mixed use community. The applicant, again, is requesting -- try to break the presentation into probably three pieces. So, we have got -- we have the northwest corner, we have the southwest corner and, then, as part of the southwest corner the applicant is subdividing that property and submitted a preliminary plat and a conditional use. So, the northwest corner itself is more conceptual in nature, where the applicant really wants to start development of the southwest corner and that's why you see the preliminary plat and the conditional use permit. So, a little bit more information or details regarding the southwest corner, but we will start with the northwest corner and, then, transition to those other applications as I get through the presentation. So, again, the applicant is here to request annexation of approximately 62.43 acres of land. R-15 of it will be -- 9.73 acres will be R-15, 16.558 acres will be R-40. There is 5.3 acres of L-O. And, then, C-N is 2.07 acres and that's that county enclave that I was speaking about and, then, there is 28.73 acres of C-C zoning. Again, this -- the exhibit on the right here shows how that breaks down. The graphic in the upper left -- right-hand corner shows the mix of the R-15, the L-O and the C-C for the northwest corner and, then, on the southwest corner you will see the C-C, the L-O and the R-40 zoning. Again, because this is an annexation the applicant has provided conceptual development plans for both areas. So, again, on the left-hand side of your screen is the northwest corner, which is more conceptual in nature. This plan does consist of 94 multi-family units, which is that R-15 piece that we talked about. Here is the C-N portion from the -- the county enclave that I was talking about. The L-O zone that transitions to the -- the C-N zoning. So, looking down at the breakdown we are looking at approximately 37,000 square feet of office uses on the northwest corner. The 63,000 square foot grocery here. And, then, these outbuildings are additional square footage. So, total -- looking at the total here you are approximately 117,600 square feet for the northwest corner. I think if you recall when the applicant was here -- and it will be part of their presentation tonight, but the -- the importance of both of these coming in this evening was the fact that the applicant is working with ITD on potentially a STARS agreement and in order for that to work and meet the requirements for ITD, the projects have to be looked at as a single project holistically and that's where the -- where the comp plan and the STARS agreement may not align, but, again, that's something that I will -- I will dive into a little bit more in my presentation. But I at least wanted to remind the council of that conversation during the last hearing. And, then, transitioning to the -- the concept plan for the -- the southern portion, you can see it has less commercial than the -- the northwest corner, approximately about 30,000 square feet and, then, there is about 7,800 square feet of office and, then, this is where the

southwest corner is more residential heavy than the northwest corner. So, this site plan here shows approximately 302 multi-family units on this site. Again, that was another topic of discussion in the staff report. If you recall the mixed-use principles for the mixed-use community designation, one of the requirements is that we can't look at this holistically, because there is an arterial roadway that bifurcates the project and so, essentially, what the applicant has done is wanting you to look at this, but by doing so they are basically spanning the density across both projects in order to account for the 302 units on this site and so if you look at it that way they technically could feasibly meet the density requirements of the MUC area, but if it's bifurcated like the policy in the comp plan says, then, this site is the dense -- it exceeds the acreage for the -- the residential component and it exceeds the density requirement of the comprehensive plan as well. So, there is kind of two things working against them on the southwest corner of the site. Again, it's part of the mixed use standards. The applicant is to provide quasi-public open space and you can see here the applicant is providing for the northwest corner. This exhibit shows that they are providing approximately 23 percent for the northwest corner and, then, on the southwest corner it's about 11.4 percent, for a total of 18 percent combined between both projects. Another important component between mixed-use developments is walkability. Typically when we have these larger mixed-use developments we do require the applicants to provide a pedestrian circulation plan. This is how they are demonstrating compliance with those comp plan policies. You can see here how they are showing how it's one integrated development. I remember at the planning -- or at the city council hearing Mayor brought up the issue of the off-site collector road in the southwest corner of the development and -- and it was discussed that this is one of the major components of kind of the mixed-use principles is that there is unity or integration between the transportation elements, not only for vehicles, but also for pedestrians and bicyclists. So, some of the concerns that were raised during the hearing were whether or not when was the timing of this road going to happen particularly since it was an off-site improvement. I know working with the applicant they reached out to the -- the property owner that controls the construction of that roadway, because they own the land and they are more than willing to work with Hawkins and allow them to build the road as part of their phase one. That was also a requirement of the fire department. In order to support that amount of density on this roadway that access has to be provided in order for them to do that. So, again, tonight is a recommendation for denial. So, there aren't any conditions of approval for you to take under consideration. But if council has deliberations on those topics that will be one consideration that I would encourage you to discuss as we move forward through the hearing process. The other components for mixed use are integration of uses and a mix of three land use types. So, you can see here on the northwest corner they do have the residential. They have the employment slash office and, then, they have some of the retail. As well, again, there aren't any end users identified. This is the applicant trying to meet the principles -- or the policies of the concept plan and -- and trying to set a concept plan in place that can work for them and their tenants as they come online. But they are actively seeking tenants to locate to this location. Here is some of the perspectives for you as well, as far as their plaza areas to kind of coordinate or integrate with the quasi-public uses. I think, again, a lot of this was shown to you back in July. A lot of the plaza areas are centrally located at the intersections and, then, at least on the

northwest corner a lot of the quasi-public open space is oriented through -- more through the multi-family because of the Williams Pipeline that runs through the site and the -- the multi-use pathway that's required for the master's pathways plan, but -- and, then, on this -- again on the southwest corner the applicant is trying to go -- tie in that plaza areas to more of the quasi-public uses that are located here at this intersection. Again, here. As I mentioned, this southwest corner, the applicant is proposing to subdivide the property. The plat itself consists of ten lots, if I'm not mistaken. You can see the access and the -- the requirements and, then, the conditional use permit is for that 302 multi-family units that we talked about here. So, again, there is a private road. One of the waivers before you this evening is for that right-in, right-out access to Meridian Road. As you recall that does require approval from ITD for you guys and, then, you guys can either recommend -- grant that waiver and allow that access and looking at the record I know working with ITD they have allowed that right-in, right-out access. So, again, that's one of the waiver requirements for you this evening that we need to take -- have you take under consideration. With multi-family developments we are -- we do require open space and common open space and amenities as well. So, outside of the open space for the quasi -- public quasi uses or open space, the applicant is also providing their own amenities and open space for the multi-family portion of the site. So, again, based on the unit count the applicant is required to provide 1.82 acres of land and this plan before you the applicant is providing approximately 4.84 acres. So, quite a bit more than what is required by the UDC. So, staff has evaluated the multi-family standards and, again, the applicant does meet a lot of those site amenities open space requirements. One of the waivers that -- that is also as part of the multi-family development is typically, which if there is open space adjacent to a collector roadway, which is -- this is the -- along the west boundary it's Hermitite, which will be a collector roadway, we require a waiver to allow that to occur. There has to be a physical barrier to separate that, so we can separate that from the road -- the landscape buffer. The applicant's asking for the council to waive that. They think it's better integrated not to have it fenced off or bermed and physically separated from the open space that they are trying to achieve. They think it hurts the esthetic of the development and they want to integrate that open space for the multi-family portion of the development with that collector roadway system. So, as I mentioned to you this was in front of the Planning and Zoning Commission last -- in the beginning of August. They did recommend denial of the applications again. There was quite a bit of testimony. There was some neighbors that testified during the hearing. Some of the concerns around noise and traffic generation. Some of the neighbors that live in the Stapleton Subdivision to the north were concerned about transition between the multi-family and their single-story homes. They thought there was too much -- there wasn't adequate transition between the -- the heights of the buildings. They are concerned about the noise caused by the development as well and, then, there was also a gentleman that owns the Allure Subdivision to the south and he had concerns with the previous development plan had smaller buildings and more open space along the southern boundary of the site along the Allure Subdivision and he testified that he would like the applicant to provide better transition. Again these are three-story structures right up against single-family homes. He liked the previous scale of the buildings and the -- the open space that was provided on the previous plan. Key items of discussion by the commission. Again they were still

of the opinion that the project did not align with a lot of the policies of the mixed use principle -- the mixed use community guidelines or comp plan designation. They weren't supportive of the quasi-public park. They didn't like how the -- the two sites integrated for the quasi-public -- quasi-public park in this location here. They didn't think it met the intent of the -- the comp plan. They weren't supportive of this being viewed as one development for development purposes. They felt like the -- the policy in the comp plan was pretty specific to -- as to the requirement between bifurcating the properties between the two with an arterial street. It's pretty clear in the comp plan that they should be independent of one another and I think we discussed this a little bit. If I recall we did discuss this at the previous city council hearing. It's -- keep in mind it's -- you have to go across the street to get to services and that's why the intent of the comp plan is to make sure that each one of these nodes are kind of self-contained providing that mix of uses, so that residents don't have to cross major arterials or walk or bike across major arterials and that was one of the comments that the Mayor brought up is why it was so critical to have that collector roadway, because that's where you could see a light, that's where you could see a pedestrian cross -- a crosswalk to get residents or bicyclists across that -- that major arterial roadway and that's why the applicant went back to that property owner and was able to work with them and negotiate with them on building that offsite improvement as suggested. And, then, also the -- they weren't supportive of the transition between three stories and the one stories next to the Stapleton Subdivision as I mentioned. So, again, I -- I have kind of mentioned those two recommendation -- or those two waivers that are on your plate this evening. Again there are no conditions of approval for you to take under consideration. If -- again I mentioned if the commission -- or the council entertains the potential of that staff would request that the project be continued to allow staff to work with the applicant and bring forward appropriate conditions of approval for you to -- to act on. Again Planning and Zoning Commission and staff both recommended denial. I will conclude my presentation and stand for any questions you may have.

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

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Bill, if this road wasn't an arterial would this -- would staff recommend approval?

Parsons: Mayor, Members of the Council, not necessarily. I think -- if you look at the staff report there were still some concerns with other integration and some of the pedestrian connections through the development, particularly the northwest corner of the site. You can see there is quite a bit of parking lot, but in that -- that section where the grocery is and so we are still trying to -- we feel like that was some of the discussion that the Planning and Zoning Commission had is how do we get pedestrians traversing through a commercial parking lot and that's -- some of that rub. But I think if -- if the arterial -- if the arterial wasn't running through it I think there is a stronger argument for

the integration of uses and the density that the applicant is proposing for sure. I could definitely say that that does help with that -- that component of the policies.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Bill, I know in the past we looked at what the definition of like an adequate transition is for residential uses. How do you think about that in the context of mixed-use development like this one?

Parsons: Well, Mayor, Members of the Council, I think we all agree. We -- we -- I think this is a topic we always discuss every time we come before you. I can think of that -- that Rolling Hill project is one of the more recent ones where they try to do it through building design or you do it through landscape buffers or you do it through setbacks and, again, that's where -- maybe I will go over to the overall plan. That's where I think the -- the applicant's justification is is we actually have a road that comes off of Meridian Road that -- and, then, additional open space to try to soften that and provide that transition. So, to me the comp plan speaks that you can do it that way. You can do it with -- with other elements. It doesn't mean you have to -- there is a high disparity, but in this particular case if you were to ask for my opinion I think the homes are far enough away that it probably doesn't present -- I think what the applicant's shown here is probably an adequate transition, at least from my perspective. But sometimes transition is also -- does it work for internal to the development, too? It's not necessarily externally. So, again, if those office buildings are going to be one story and you have 40 foot tall buildings next to it is that the appropriate scale? Does that still transition or integrate internally with the development? I think staff did raise some of those concerns at least in the southern portion of the development with those being four stories and the bulk and the scale of those buildings and how they transition to the single-story commercial building. So, again, there is a lot of different components here, but as far as adequate transition to some of the residential -- maybe the south side not so much, but definitely I think on the northwest corner, typically road and landscape buffers are a pretty good transition.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Bill, I know that you said that the north section is mostly conceptual, but the Williams Pipeline runs right through that. Is the concept that we are looking at compliant with the requirements that Williams Pipeline has for what can be built on and around it?

Parsons: Mayor, Members of the Council, I -- I know the Williams Pipeline has a handbook and they allow minimal improvements within their 75 foot easement. So, anytime development occurs around it the pipe has to be upgraded, so that it's right --

it's because of its urban settings they have got to upgrade the pipe so there is not a catastrophe there. So, I believe that's occurred, but the applicant I think that's been updated. So, that's one component of it and, two, is they want to limit the number of crossings over their easement, like the irrigation districts, and the third part of it is landscaping. So, historical -- at least my experience with it they don't like trees, but they are good with pathways and lawn. So, the applicant will have to do one or two things. Either submit for alternative compliance not to include the trees or provide widen -- provide landscape -- the trees outside of the 75 foot easement to still get that effect. But that's -- that's a very good point. Those are the -- those are the details that you kind of get into once you get deeper into the -- the project is you have to look for those to see what kind of constraints are there and with a conceptual plan you -- you will get the nice color renderings and all the landscaping, but sometimes that doesn't always come to fruition, because of other outside agencies' requirements.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Bill, you made an interesting comment or observation really about how the comp plan and the STARS agreement kind of collide here in an interesting way. Has that happened in Meridian where the two -- you know, our code and our comp plan and the STARS agreements have kind of collided? If so have -- have we worked through that or has it always sort of kind of actually work together fairly well?

Parsons: Yeah. Mayor, Members of the Council, they are only -- they are -- they are only at odds here because the comp plan's changed. So, I have been with -- I have been with the city for a while as you know and there has been two STARS agreements that we have dealt with. One was The Village, which worked very well. It's all one integrated unified property. No -- there is no bifurcation of uses there. In this particular case when we started with the applicant -- and I think you have heard their -- the comp plan policies hadn't changed yet. We did not update the mixed use standards. So, at the time that we met with the applicant we were encouraging them to submit as one development, one proposal, because the comp plan didn't have that requirement, but as they continue to finesse their plan and continue to meet with staff we have -- we shared with them that the comp plan is going to change. So, you either -- you either need to submit before that or -- or be consistent with the new policies and so they got -- they really got trapped between the -- the time of the old and the new and so here they are working with ITD on that STARS agreement and ITD -- they need to be one project in order for that to even work and they are close -- if I'm not mistaken they actually have a draft agreement to ITD for review. So, it's -- it's getting closer to that potentially happening. But, again, in order for that to happen it has to be one project -- looked at as one project and that's why to me that's kind of the -- the -- the biggest glaring topic of tonight is -- all of those other things are right things. It doesn't integrate? Does it work? Does it meet all those things? Yes. But ultimately as -- as city council and me as a -- personally as a planner, we want to make sure that we have a good transportation system and we can update those things if the developer is willing to do that ahead of the

process and this is one tool that they -- they can use to do that. So, long story short, no, it's never happened before. It's only happened in this case because of the -- the change to the -- to mixed use standards a few years ago.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor, just one more question for Bill.

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Can I ask you to maybe go back in history or -- or think a little bit about when we updated the comp plan. What's the reasoning behind the -- the -- I will use the word prohibition of having an arterial go through the middle of a project and sort of separating a project, so that you have to look at them as two separate ones instead of one. What's -- is there more concrete direct reasons why we did that or is it just sort of a general overarching philosophy that makes sense or is there some -- something that's really driving why we made that change?

Parsons: Mayor, Council, like -- again, I wasn't -- I didn't lead that effort. I know our long range team did and they were probably here sharing all of that feedback with you and they were presenting those changes to you, but that's -- I guess from -- from a current planner -- current planning side of the house it -- it just -- when you look across the interstate or along the arterial it's -- you -- if I don't have those uses on one side of the street I have got to force -- it's safety. You have got to send people across a major roadway to get to services. You hear us talk about a lot of time when we don't require stub streets to be extended or we don't get across access and all of a sudden we wall off a development and we have to give them access to an arterial, because we didn't provide a stub -- a cross-access or local street to that development. We are forcing people out of direction to go to services and that's where we -- when we rebuilt and redid the mixed-use standards we really wanted to put in policies to help -- one, I try to strengthen them so that it was better understood by the development community, but we are -- oftentimes we are here kind of debating about how we interpret these things and they are up for interpretation, but the intent was to make sure that those uses can sustain that side of the road and vice-versa. It's -- it's -- not that it won't work or can't work, but that was the intent behind it is to make sure that we are getting services scattered -- or leased in different parts of the town so we don't have to drive three miles to the grocery store, we can have things right and -- and -- and have easy access to those things, not only for vehicles, but for bicyclists and pedestrians and in this particular case you have Meridian Road, so I don't know how many people are going to be walking down Meridian Road, but I could see people walking down Amity, because there's a lot of residential subdivisions approved out there and so getting that interconnection and having people get to this rather than impacting -- having to go on Meridian Road to go out and put more trips on the busy roadways is kind of the intent behind it. It's safety and just good planning.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Just a little follow up on what Councilman Taylor said. Bill, did planning staff ever try to work with the applicant so that we could be in compliance with the STARS agreement and the comprehensive plan or more balanced approach on both sides of the road, so that it would work with both?

Parsons: Mayor, Members of the Council, we -- we always try to work with the applicant and I know Ethan and I have had -- and staff, we have had multiple e-mails back and forth how to massage the plan and make it work and have it align a little bit closer and ultimately there was -- there were changes as -- as noted, but, again, in -- in coordination with long range and current planning we didn't feel like the changes went far enough and the biggest hurdle, like I said, it -- the difficulty is really the policy for the arterial street. But, again, that's where at City Council you have the ability to kind of look at this and say what -- what is the -- the better direction? Is it to get the transportation improvements or is it to look at these two different projects and not get that and deny it and, then, we don't get Meridian Road and Amity improved. So, that's -- that's -- we are with you, we are on the same page as like -- we don't -- we are not so rigid that it's -- this is how you got to do it and we are always willing to work with applicants, but it is very difficult when you see -- at least from our -- from current planning side of things when you look at nine -- nine units to the acre on one side and 18 on the other and how do you strike that balance and say, well, you are putting all the density on one side, but all the commercial and services are on the other side of the road. So, now if you don't have some of that here I have got to send everyone on a collector road, go across Amity to get to a grocery store. I'm not saying every corner has to have a grocery store, but that's why we don't want that road separating the two things, because, again, that's exactly what you are doing. I'm taking and picking and choosing where I -- I kind of put these uses, rather than saying it's all got to be combined and function and integrate well and together and that just makes it very very difficult and understanding that Meridian Road is a busy -- very busy road and the retailers are going to want the visibility on Meridian Road and not necessarily turn their back to the road and -- and have all the commercial on a collector roadway like we envision with some of these mixed use designations.

Simison: Council --

Parsons: Mayor and Council, if I could just maybe elaborate a little more. The -- the other thing that I have talked with the applicant about quite a bit on this is -- you have the comp plan, but they are also trying to meet the requirements of the UDC and UDC wants buildings along the roads, you know, parking lots screened and those types of things. So, it's really hand in hand where you have a mixed use wanting open space, you have multi-family wanting open space, you have a minimum parking standard you have to meet and all that has to come together to try -- try to meet a vision and meet the law and sometimes they don't always align and I know internally we are trying to do that. I have had conversations with the Mayor that said, yeah, we have -- we have got to align our -- our code with mixed use principles a little bit better and we are having those internal discussions, just to let the council know

Simison: Seeing no further questions or comments, invite the applicant to come forward.

Mansfield: Good evening, Mayor Simison and Council Members. While Bill is pulling up my presentation I just wanted to address a couple of things that were asked specifically by Council Member Taylor about, you know, connectivity, functional integration. One of the things Bill mentioned was, you know, there is a large commercial parking lot. I guess my question to you -- as we are thinking through this entire development is how do you have a grocery store without a commercial parking lot? The UDC doesn't allow it. The -- the -- the -- like this corner people will drive to it and I will talk about that in a second. But, you know, it's just -- I think it -- and it has to be located where it is; right? Because there has to be buildings along Amity Road per the UDC, 65 percent of Amity and 65 percent of Meridian Road need to be building facing. So, we could put the parking on the outside of the development, but that conflicts with the UDC as Bill mentioned. So, you know, that's just a -- one example before I get started here of some of the conflict points between the UDC, which is law and the comp plan which is a guiding principle. I also just wanted to mention that one of my very first calls was to the Williams Pipeline to obtain the developers' handbook. So, we are very much aware of their standards, what they are anticipating there. I just wanted to assure you of that, Council Member Overton. In addition, you know, we are talking about no one walking along Meridian Road. We -- and every development along Meridian Road -- is installing a ten foot multi-use pathway in the hopes that that investment will encourage people to walk and bike along Meridian Road. If we didn't think it would why are we installing it; right? I mean I think that's this -- this line of thinking about -- about bike ped infrastructure. Anyway, those are just some thoughts I had as you guys were speaking earlier. I will get started. I will just start with kind of a brief overview. As Bill mentioned, about 56 acres northwest and southwest corner of Amity and Meridian Roads. Two phases. Southwest is going first. Northwest is going second. A CUP and preliminary plat on the southwest corner. This is the history. Excuse me. We have been through it before, but in 2020 we had a pre-app for the northwest corner only and we were instructed to pursue a master plan for both the northwest and southwest corners considered under a single development agreement that is supported by the comprehensive plan. Again, the comp plan is a guide. It has a lot of aspirational things. It's very important to understand that as a former city planner that was a real challenge; right? You have this guiding document and you have the UDC. Every development has things in the comp plan that support it and things in the comp plan that the comp plan doesn't agree with the development about. It's just the way development happens. Today -- and we saw this in the staff report that came out I believe in April. If city council determines that annexation is in the best interest they should remove the northwest corner development from the annexation area until such a time as development is proposed to create a more firm plan. Well, that's, obviously, in direct conflict with what we heard in 2020 and so by the time we heard this -- this was, again, last April. We had already been working with ITD since last October or November. By the way, I have Kendra here from ITD to answer any questions about ITD. We have been coordinating and we can talk more about that. So, it's just -- it's very I guess challenging, because it takes a long time to put these together. You know,

we had to do a traffic study and, then, a revision to that traffic study before the city of Meridian and that has to be accepted by ACHD before the city of Meridian can accept the project application. So, you know, that's a two to three year process right there at this point with ITD -- or with, sorry, excuse me, city of Meridian. And, then, of course, the concern about density on the southwest corner, which we will touch on in a second. But, again, the reason we laid it out as we did is because we have a grocery store and the grocery store just inherently takes up more land. You also want to have your shops, buildings and your pads in front of your grocery store. That's where people expect it to be. That also encourages more trip capture, because when someone goes to the grocery store, they go shopping, they go get lunch, they go do their -- their -- get their -- hair done, get their nails done, all in the same trip. That's the way it should be. That's the way the tenants want it. The residents want it. Everybody wants it that way. And, again, I just wanted to pull this out of the staff report. If the project is considered as one the overall residential density for the project is less than 15 units per acre and is less than 50 percent and that's consistent with the mixed use policies in the comprehensive plan. Just to make sure we are all on the same page. So, again, just a quick review of what we changed since we first heard from Planning and Zoning Commission. We reduced the number of units by 33. We increased the amount of office space by over one hundred percent. That's up 24,000 square feet from last plan. We increased the amount of retail personal services, shop space by 10,000 square feet and, again, we increased it by 10,000 square feet for community serving shop -- I mean I shouldn't say community serving, because drive-throughs also serve the community, but non-drive-through space. So, these are shop space, salons, you know, non-drive-through retail, not standalone drive-through pads. We also have 18 percent quasi-public open space. Again, the reason you don't see any of that down in the multi-family area is because we tried that and we are instructed that that's double counting. You can't double count the multi-family amenity area and the quasi-public area, even though -- I just want to be very clear about this -- there is nothing prohibiting -- and, in fact, we are trying to encourage by reducing the -- the fencing and berming along the collector road on the west side, there is nothing prohibiting the neighborhood -- surrounding neighborhood, which hasn't been built yet, but Corey is working on it, to our west from using the amenities in our project. We are not locking the doors. We are -- you know, the pool and the gym will likely be for residents only. Outside of that this is -- this is quasi-public. I just want to make it really clear, you know, just -- that use is available, even if it is included in our multi-family CUP open space. So, 4.8 acres is 166 percent more than is required. So, when we think about density is it too dense? Well, we have 166 percent more open space than is required. Open space -- and I mean density is literally a function of how large your buildings are, how much space they take up, how big the units are. Like it's all about space planning and here I think we can demonstrate that we more than exceed the required amenities and if the required amenities are the right amount or the minimum right amount, we are clearly far exceeding the right amount, even if we have 18 units per acre and they are calling it 15, you know, on only the southwest corner. So, this isn't going to feel too dense; right? This isn't going to feel crowded. On the southwest corner to demonstrate this, across the commercial and multi-family, one in every three square feet of the site is open space. That's not just -- that's not parking lots, that's not buildings, that's amenity space and open space. Just

to kind of put that in context. So, another thing to note is that some of our kind of -- most kind of central amenities are located between the commercial and the residential. Again, the parking is situated where it is because that's where the parking has to go. We are -- we are not overparked by market standards. We have been doing commercial for a long time and we hear retailers talk about the parking challenges that they face. We hear residents talk about the challenges of not finding parking. We have developed retail centers without enough parking and they don't do well. That's why we are proposing what we are proposing. And as we will talk about soon, we need this retail to do well, because we are doing a STARS agreement, which relies on sales tax reimbursement and so not only do you want the retail to do well, not only do our residents want the retail to do well, we want the retail to do well, ITD wants the retail to do well, so we can have -- everybody wins basically. Here is kind of what our -- we anticipate the clubhouse and kind of pool area looking like and park area. Again, this park is not walled off. There is a dog park -- I'm not sure we can absolutely look at, you know, opening that up to public use as well. I mean I'm -- it's just a gate. You know, here is kind of the north side -- the functional integration on the north side. You know, yes, we have the ten foot pathway. We actually had someone come to a neighborhood meeting and talk about how excited they were to be able to walk from Stapleton to our development on this pathway. So, like people are excited about it. People want this pathway here. They want to use it to access commercial services and I, frankly, think that this is laid out in a really integrated, but yet transitional way where you have the commercial uses on the corner, you have the office uses and, then, you have the residential uses to the north and, then, less dense residential uses -- there are some townhomes up there to -- you know, slightly farther north of this. So, you are going from multi-family to townhomes, single-family homes. It -- to me it makes a lot of logical sense. The blue are ten foot sidewalks. The pink are seven foot sidewalks. As you note, we are at -- as -- as I guess I should note, is that we are dedicated to constructing that future roadway with phase one of the multi-family project on the south. We talked with staff about some conditions of approval. That was one of them. We agreed to all the conditions of approval that staff and -- and us talked about. And, again, we are building these ten foot pathways so people can use them. We are actually using a -- a different collector roadway setup where there is a 26 foot wide pavement area, so that's two lanes either direction for vehicles and ten foot pathways on either side for pedestrians to -- to encourage more use of that collector as kind of slower traffic, more bikes and peds, a more inviting pedestrian experience, because we understand that we -- our goal is to integrate as much as possible the northwest corner and the southwest corner. As much as possible; right? But because we have a grocery store we have to put the commercial on one side. We have to put the residential on the other side and yet there is components of all and both on each side. So, why not vertically integrated mixed use? Let's talk about two different trade areas. 9th and Broad. That's our Hawkins corporate headquarters. Fifty thousand people or jobs within one mile. Fourteen households an acre. Seven thousand people. Thirty-two, thirty-three thousands jobs. One mile of Amity and Meridian. Seven thousand people and jobs. That's 14 percent of downtown Boise, 3.6 households per acre. For -- for vertically integrated mixed use to work you really need people to be able to walk and bike to it and a lot of people, not just a couple people, a lot of people and that's just the -- the

reality of the situation. That's just the reality of what tenants want and what really I think the -- the community really wants. We don't want users to fail. That's why we laid out the site the way we did. I just want to point out 30,000 vehicles per day travel through the State Highway 69 and Amity intersection. It's a lot of vehicles. That's why we are proposing the layout we are proposing. Here are the conditions of approval. When we went to staff and said, hey, how can we gain your support? We talked. These first two talk about kind of the layout of the -- you know, parking areas. We are totally agreeable to those conditions. Third one talks about a four-story building on the north side. Totally agreeable. Fourth one talks about STARS. I will let Kendra handle that one. We are agreeable to a STARS agreement. We are working on it. We are working on it with ITD right now and we are also agreeable -- agreeing to construct Hermatite on the south side with the first phase of the development. Here is what the STARS agreement looks like. That right-in, right-out is approved by ITD. You are getting three lanes in either direction, plus turn lanes. It's a full build out of Amity on our side and, then, a full build out of the intersection as a whole on the -- that would be planned south, but east side of the road. Again, we can't do it with the commercial that's on the southwest corner. We can only do it on the northwest on -- with the whole thing as one. And, then, finally, I just wanted to talk really quickly about some of the mixed signals we received from the Planning and Zoning Commission. This is a little bit long. We got confused. I'm happy to go into it, but we have people who say -- we had a commissioner say we need way more density. We would love to see more density. That's the whole issue that staff is having with it. We have people with -- I one hundred percent agree that everything on Highway 69 and everything on Amity Road needs to be commercial. We agree, too. That's why we put it there. And, then, you know, you can read on, but I just pulled some quotes that I thought were -- they kind of resonated with me. As we didn't really get from the Planning and Zoning Commission when we went back. We didn't get any concrete ways to make the site better to improve it. We got the site's good, but we can't recommend approval. So, that's the history. That's -- we are kindly asking for your approval tonight. Happy to answer any questions.

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

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor. Ethan, thank you very much. Probably my -- there is lots of concerns, but my biggest concern is the safety of the residents in south getting across Amity to all the great shops and things, grocery store that you are going to have. So, Hematite will be built and cross with a light. Amity, is that the correct name of the -- the road going in?

Mansfield: Mayor Simison, Council Member Little Roberts, it's -- it's Hermatite and it will -- it will be constructed with phase one of the development. Our half on our side and, then, also it will, then, go onto the adjacent property, that will all be constructed with a

ten foot pathway to -- to -- to answer your question about pedestrian access and, then, there will be a ten foot multi-use pathway crossing at the light at Hermatite.

Little Roberts: Follow up?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor. So, there is or will be eventually a light? Is this going to take a while? Is this going to wait for another development to go in? At what point will the light -- because that's not going to be a safe crossing no matter how many great pathways we have until the light's put in.

Mansfield: Mayor Simison, Council Member Little Roberts, you are absolutely correct. I mean I don't think you would want to cross that road with -- without a light. You also won't have anything on the north side until the light's installed. I think the light -- it's a -- it's in the ACHD staff report. I believe for some reason 400 p.m. trips sticks in my mind as something that warrants the traffic signal and it's basically a signal agreement with ACHD with Corey and I think most importantly, however, the STARS agreement contemplates that light. So, that STARS agreement includes the infrastructure of Amity, the light and all of Hermatite.

Little Roberts: Thank you.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Ethan, do you have a sense of how much the improvements for ITD and along Meridian Road, the highway, that you will be putting into this and, then, what the reimbursement amount would be potentially?

Mansfield: Mr. Mayor. Yeah, Commissioner Taylor, we priced out all of the improvements shown here. Bear with me. And it -- you know, I would -- I think we came out with the low end at 13 or 14 million. The high end's probably way much higher than that. I mean, you know, we are talking seven -- I would say 15 to 17 is reasonable.

Simison: Quick question. You may not be able to answer this one, but as -- I'm not going to pronounce the road, but the bulb out section, do we have any idea what was going to go into that area from the developer to the west's property?

Mansfield: Mayor Simison, currently -- and I believe Bill can back me up on this, but I believe it's an L-O zone; is that right, Bill? Or C-N, maybe?

Parsons: Yeah. Mayor, Members of Council, yes, that was part of the Storyrock development recently approved and there will be office there and, then, they are required to grant cross-access to this property and, then, tie into the Hermatite there.

Simison: Okay. Thank you.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Where -- what -- where are we talking about on the map? Is that where -- south of -- right -- okay.

Simison: Just to paint the whole picture. Council, any additional questions for the applicant at this time? Okay. Thank you, Ethan.

Mansfield: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Simison: Mr. Clerk, anyone signed up to provide testimony on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, yes. Linda Stevens.

Simison: If your name is called if you would come forward. And if you would state your name and address you will be recognized for three minutes.

Stevens: Linda Stevens. 3900 South Lone Pine Avenue in the Oakview Estates, which is just north of the Stapleton development. I walk the dirt road that is to the west of the proposed development almost every single day and notice that -- I found the meeting tonight, because it says the meeting is tonight on one of the big billboards. My concern most importantly after having lived here eight years is the lack of infrastructure of the roads that support this kind of influx of people that are coming in. He said on one side of the development are going to be 490 family units. That's 490 people. That's not including the wife and the husband, which is equating to like 960 people driving in and out and, then, the other side there is going to be about 360, 390 apartment buildings, which is more toward the north side. The only ingress and egress of these places to live is Meridian Road and Amity Road and as you know they just finished widening Meridian Road to four lanes and in the morning for -- for at least two hours it is just bumper to bumper and unless the infrastructure of the roads is built before all this development, it's -- it's just going to be a nightmare for people trying to get to work, as you are all familiar with the horrifying road conditions that are now taking place all over Idaho because of the tremendous growth. So, that's my concern about this development is the road infrastructure. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions? Thank you.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, next is Dale Morgan.

Simison: Good evening.

Morgan: Council, my name is Dale Morgan. I live at 247 West Norwich Street, which is a street that backs up to the -- what will be the north development. We have several concerns. She very eloquently discussed one of those, but we believe that there should be a barrier wall. Our houses that are built right along there right now have a three and a half foot fence before they, then, have open area up to a five and a half foot fence and that is the road that is -- Lyra is supposed to go clear back across the back of our houses up to the -- the subdivision behind us and we feel that there should be at least a barrier fence on our side, a six foot barrier fence and one that is a noise reduction barrier fence for it to be livable. If they leave it the way it is right now they will be able to see directly into our yards and actually directly into our houses if we happen to have our window shades up at that point in time. So, that is a concern. Again, we believe that the quotas -- it's interesting -- it looks like they are trying to do the -- put it together just so they can get a number of people in those houses that they want to and that's a concern. I feel if there is a law we should be following the law. That's my concern. And, then, on a lighter note my wife feels if they are going to put a grocery store in there she votes for a Trader Joe's. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, next we have Sandy Griffith.

Simison: What was the name, Chris?

Johnson: Sandy Griffith.

Simison: Hard to hear up here, too.

Griffith: Sandra Griffith at 223 Norwich. I agree with all the people. I personally walk down your access road the gas line to see what was happening and I talked -- stopped and talked to two guys that were workers and went on down and when I got to there and seen Amity, two lane road with two cars that can turn left at the end and the street there, you couldn't walk down there. There is a maybe two to three foot ditch on each side of the road with the ditch and they say five to ten years for any road repairs. So, I walked down to that house, which is a veteran that's paralyzed from the waist down that lives in the house with all the trees around it and talked to him and his wife's a teacher and she said, yeah, because the school busses go down there from 6:00 o'clock in the morning until after 8:00 o'clock. There are cars all the way down as far as I can see past that farm development, the big white house, and they go stop and go with the light every morning and that's going with whichever way they go. So, that's no way in or out. There is a big -- when the end of your sewer line there, your gas lines, there's a big water ditches and pumps, cement culverts and, then, I walked down to the other farmhouse and talked to them for a little bit to see their opinion and, then, I was approached by a man that asked me what I was doing and I told him I was just wanting to see for myself the conditions and he says, oh, and I said, well, you could help me and

he says, no, I can't do that and, then, he scared me, because he says, well, somebody -- they should buy you a new car. So, I left. He said I seen you coming. He had been watching me, whoever he was. Just walking. But we can't get out there. Ours -- from Stapleton you can't turn left and that's where they are going to come out. All the traffic and all the people you are putting there in those houses are going to come out through Stapleton, so they can't turn left. So, they are going to go all the way through our development to get to Harris or go to Victory before you get the light. That's the way I go out. We have had one car accident in our narrow roads already. When a police car and an ambulance comes and a tow truck, it stops all the traffic that could come in that half of the section or go out. I couldn't get out of my house. And you will hear more about that later. So, it's not safe. We are going to get their garbage trucks. We are going to get all their traffic and, like he said, I bought a patio home --

Simison: Just can you wrap up.

Griffith: I can't -- I won't be able to have any view or privacy and the noise and we wrote you a letter. Three of us wrote you letters. I put out flyers. Nobody was informed -- nobody in Stapleton is for what he is saying. Only two people got written notices. Only Friday -- last Friday they wrote in pencil when this date would be. Pauline made flyers. I put them on everybody's mailbox. I went door to door and talked to people. I didn't find anybody that was for this.

Simison: Thank you, ma'am. Council, any questions?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, I have --

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, next is Barbara Chambers. Barbara Chambers.

Simison: Oh, Councilman Cavener, did you have a question?

Cavener: Yeah. Sorry, Mr. Mayor. To the last person who gave testimony, she's made a mention about a notice being written in pencil. Can I get a little bit more clarity about what she was referring to, if you wouldn't mind?

Simison: Ma'am, would you mind coming back up and --

Griffith: Excuse me. I didn't hear you.

Simison: He was asking a question about the information that you said was written in pencil, what that was from.

Griffith: That's --

Simison: If you can speak into -- can you speak into the mic.

Griffith: Oh. That's the sign on our road leaving Stapleton that tells us when you have these meetings. All of the people that I went door to door and talked to only two people got notice of this meeting and they only wrote that on Friday with a sharpie marker changing the date for this meeting.

Cavener: Ma'am, do you --

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Ma'am, do you have any photos of that? And I apologize I'm not there in person. You are probably just hearing my voice. But do you have any photos of -- of that?

Griffith: You could walk out there, because there is nobody -- I went door to door -- I went to the dog park, I went to the park, I talked to all these people. Pauline paid 17 dollars. I put flyers on the mailboxes. And I talked to these people personally. They didn't know anything about it and nobody was for it.

Cavener: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Griffith: Nobody wants all that traffic. The noise -- I was on my patio today --

Simison: Thank you, ma'am.

Griffith: The traffic noise.

Simison: Okay.

Chambers: Hello. My name is Barbara Chambers. I live at 216 West Norwich and I'm concerned about the density issue. As we all know Costco is going in. We already have poor traffic in the area and there is ITD counts or whatever how many cars that were stated earlier that go on the road -- roads and such. But that's not accounting for this huge change that we are all going to go through with Costco being and all the cars that are going to be drawn in going down Meridian Road and all the feeder roads as well. So, you know, I think that those numbers aren't very legitimate because of that and because of Costco, let alone all the other projects that have already been approved that are going to add that additional traffic to our area and I know people have a right to sell their -- their land and developers buy it, put housing in, but I, honestly, would encourage you as a council to take this into consideration to look at the housing density and all the cars that by approving this high density housing what it's going to do to our area, how it's going to change -- change the way everybody lives and I have lived in areas where I have seen this change. I have been in Idaho for 27 years and I have seen all the change. I remember Eagle Road, two -- two lanes and some of you probably do, too. I mean this affects your lives, too, the way this area is changing. So, I'm just asking you to seriously think about this high-density housing and the traffic nightmare that it's going to be. Thank you so much.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions? Okay.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, next is Cooper Sharp.

Sharp: And Council -- Mayor and Council Members, Cooper Sharp. 3578 South Falconers Place. I'm here to support this project. While supporting it I agree with every comment that's been made by every one of the neighbors. Traffic is a number one concern and in Idaho with our growth traffic is horrible. But we all know that. But the only thing that helps that is development, because without development there is not the opportunity to get developers, such as Hawkins that's willing to front the money to build the roadways or to partner with ITD to build the infrastructure, to build, so that we don't have ladies walking down gravel pathways that should not be on gravel pathways. We don't have people walking across canals that -- because there is nowhere else to walk. Development such as this is the reason why we help our community and how we help our community and how we partner with the agencies, such as the city of Meridian, to improve the lives of individuals that we saw before us. I just wanted to share -- shared it last council. I live on Eagle Road and Victory, just down the street, and develop -- and experienced over the last six years very similar to what this area is going through. We had several developments south of us that were coming in and no one knew why they were getting approved. No one understood why we were allowing density, why we were allowing subdivisions, why we are allowing shopping centers, things of that nature and in the six years I have been at Meridian I haven't had a better quality of life than I have right now, because of those developments that went in and because now I have a ten foot walking path on both sides of the road from my house three miles down to Discovery Park that we can ride our bikes with my boys to enjoy that amenity. But all that's possible because of the development that has been allowed at -- between Victory and Lake Hazel. Without that we would not have that lifestyle and we would be traveling to Kleiner Park or to other parks across the freeway that are not accessible by -- by walking or by bike. So, I'm very supportive of this project and I feel like as been discussed it is the solution for a lot of the problems that have been expressed tonight. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you, Cooper. Council, any questions? Thank you.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, Kendra Conder from ITD is here if needed it says. If you have questions for her.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Would you like her to make a presentation first or do you just want to go right to questions? I'm joking. I'm joking, Kendra. Sorry. Councilman Overton.

Overton: I'm glad you are here tonight. I have had concerns for quite a while about Meridian Road with ITD. My question is always the same. As Meridian grows it's not just Meridian, but it's the boomtown of Kuna --

Conder: Yes.

Overton: -- that is causing such a huge amount of traffic that's continually backing up farther and farther every single day trying to get to I-84. Every time I have asked for what's your vision, what's your plan, how are we going to fix Meridian Road when it approaches I-84 and deal with the backup on traffic, I have never gotten an answer. I don't think there has been a visionary plan for what we are going to see and now we are going to have Costco out there and we are going to have all that growth around it and now we are looking at this application. Is there anything new you can enlighten us with on Meridian Road on Highway 69 on what ITD has plans for?

Conder:, Councilman Overton, I just want to clarify. Is there a specific question about Meridian Road in general or as we get closer to I-84 is it the Overland intersection and that bottleneck area or maybe both.

Overton: Well, you -- Mr. Mayor, follow up. I don't think you can say the Overland bottleneck when there is days it's past Victory.

Conder: Okay.

Overton: So, I'm talking about the fact that that bottleneck is going back sometimes over a mile back up and getting worse as we develop to the south.

Conder: Sure. So, we do have an adopted corridor plan, which at the ultimate buildout calls for three through lanes in each direction, dedicated right turn lanes and, then, dual northbound and southbound turn lanes. So, as we have identified it so far that's the ultimate plan that we are working towards. Hawkins, if their project moves forward at the Amity intersection will build that out for us. Additionally, they would build out the through lanes, 1,500 feet south of the intersection and, then, about 2,000 feet north of that intersection as well. So, we do have a plan in place and I'm happy to get you a copy if that would be helpful.

Overton: Mr. Mayor, follow up.

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: So, I would love to see that plan.

Conder: Okay.

Overton: Now, when you are talking about dual right-hand lane --

Conder: Dual turn lanes, yes.

Overton: -- you are talking about Overland or are you talking about --

Conder: So, that would be from the Kuna curve just south of Overland.

Overton: Okay. What about I-84? Because I'm most concerned about most of that traffic that's coming in is waiting to get on I-84 and they can't get there. What's our -- it's broken as it sits right now and I don't hear anyone giving us a solution for how to fix that traffic issue as it gets worse.

Conder: I completely understand. I think as a department we recognize that that interchange is a beast of its own, which is partially why it was left out of our corridor plan that needs to be tackled almost as a separate project from the rest of Meridian Road. I apologize I don't have a better answer for you, but it's the truth for what I have today.

Overton: Thank you.

Conder: Uh-huh. Thank you.

Simison: Kendra, how do these road improvements transition into the road improvements going further with the -- with the other STARS agreement? Does this give us a good two mile stretch of three lane roads through this section?

Conder: Yeah. Mayor, that's a great question. So, in all honesty Hawkins improvements are great. We will have a scenario where we have the ultimate build out. It will taper back down and, then, we will have the ultimate build out again as we get closer to Costco's development. So, there is an hourglass effect, but until we have development come through and make those improvements ITD just doesn't have the funding to supplement that right now. So, you will see that for a little bit. The goal is to fix that, but you will have an hourglass effect.

Simison: Any idea -- is it a thousand feet? Two thousand feet?

Conder: So, south of Amity it's 1,500 feet. It's actually right before you get to Mr. Percy's property is where that stops and, then it would be the existing configuration down to Lake Hazel just north of the canal and, then, we have the Costco project pick back up. So, there is -- there is a pretty good -- probably half, three quarter mile difference.

Simison: Three-quarter mile?

Conder: Yeah.

Simison: Okay.

Conder: Thank you.

Simison: Counsel, any additional questions for ITD? Thank you.

Conder: Okay. Thank you.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, that was everyone that signed up.

Simison: Okay. Well, Mr. Percy, you were the first one that stood up earlier, so if you would like to come on up and if there is anybody else that would like to provide testimony if you just want to come up to the front row and if you are online you can use the raise your hand feature. Mr. Percy, come on up.

Percy: Mayor, Council, my name is James Percy. I live at 1250 Stegerman Court, Meridian, Idaho. 83642. And as was expressed by Bill, my concern is the transition area between the south portion of this project and the Allure Subdivision. The old plan we agreed to it worked out well. There was two units in this that were there and both of them were 13 -- 13 people -- 13 units per building and with this increase there is now 25 and 20. They replaced those two buildings with larger buildings and with the extra parking required the transition area is a lot tighter. It just -- it did flow. We have got 13 homes -- single-family homes that will be on the south side of this project that will back right up to that and another aspect of this is that the ground level -- the elevation is higher where Hawkins is at, we are down lower, so that's going to give another height factor and we were pleased with the old plan. If we can go back to that. It will work. It's the best we can ask for. And we are very excited about the roadway that will go to Amity that is a part of this first project, because the Allure Subdivision needs that also for a second access. That's my only concerns.

Simison: Okay. Thank you. Council, any questions? Thank you.

Percy: Thank you.

Simison: Good evening.

Skaggs: Mayor and council members, I'm Pauline Skaggs. I live at 259 West Norwich Street and I'm concerned about the traffic flow. It is really bad. Over the past year the traffic flow on Meridian Road has gotten really bad, because I used to live off of Overland and Victory and it wasn't too bad and over the last year, then, I moved down between Victory and Amity and the traffic is really bad. You can't get out of our subdivision. I'm concerned with this new development if the road's going to go in the back of our homes that the noise and, then, we do need a barrier there, you know, and because apartments going in it's going to devalue our homes and most of our homes are -- that are the fourth phase of the homes were senior citizens and so I'm concerned with that. But, more importantly, the traffic. I looked at the planning and zoning. I read that 97 page document that they had and it showed that the -- the traffic was done -- to look at the traffic was in 2024 and so it hasn't been reviewed and I don't know what ITD -- I didn't see anything about Meridian Road. I saw Amity would be built up and additional lanes in 2030 and so I think before anything goes in there they need to fix the roads, because it goes all the way -- backs up to Lake Hazel. My daughter lives on Lake Hazel and Eagle and I was going there during the summer every day to watch my

grandkids and it was backed up, not only going but coming and all through the whole day -- it's not just during peak hours, it's for the whole time. So, adding Costco is going to even make it worse and, then, now adding all this new development. I think the roads need to be fixed and widened before anything is even thought of putting any development in those areas.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Skaggs: Oh. And also the sign coming in the subdivision, that's the Planning and Zoning sign. It had said before August 6th and, then, over this last year, a couple days ago it was just marked out August 6th and with a marker it said September 15th was today's meeting. It goes into our subdivision. There is a sign right there and that's what she was referring to and, then, people got little postcards that were mailed to their home address, but only two residents in our whole Stapleton Subdivision received those cards. Nobody else did. We had to just look at the signs.

Simison: Okay. Thank you. Is there anybody else that would like to provide testimony on this item? Okay. Would the applicant come forward to close.

Mansfield: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Member of Councils -- Members of Council. I first just want to address the transportation concerns. We completely understand those concerns. You know, there is challenges walking, biking, driving in and around the area currently. That's what this is intended to in part solve. This is -- this challenge is larger than a single development, but there is a couple things I think we should consider as we contemplate this particular development. First of all, something like the Allure Subdivision is not eligible for a STARS program. It will not make improvements widening of State Highway 69 in a comprehensive way, because it doesn't have that commercial component. This provides the commercial component necessary to do that, as well as residences for people that want to live in your community. Another thing to think about is if I live in Stapleton, if I live north on Harritt -- all the way up north to Harris and as a future resident of Allure Subdivision, I can travel to any of this commercial development without either walking or driving adjacent to an arterial roadway. I can do it all on a collector or local network. So, when you thought -- when you talk about impacts -- negative impacts to the road, people backing up on Amity, people backing up on State Highway 69 for a mile section -- from the half mile south and even south of that to the half mile north and even potentially in the future north of that, all of those trips coming to this development don't have to use Amity. That's the beautiful thing about transportation planning and that's why Lyra is a master street map required roadway from ACHD. They were looking ahead and that's why we are building that and that's -- you know, we are making connections to the surrounding neighborhoods, not for folks who want to, you know, have to drive into Boise to go downtown to work, but we are making those connections so that people can make local trips to the grocery store without driving north to Walmart, without driving south to Costco on State Highway 69. Look, I can't control what every single person in that community does, all we can do is provide another option and do we want our option to be the one chosen? Absolutely. That's how we make money. So, we -- we -- we want that to be used by the community

and that's why we have all these connections and that's kind of the point of transportation planning and the point of the STARS agreement is to create all of these improvements concurrent with development, not when ITD has the funding five to ten years from now; right? Not when they get funded by the legislature to construct Meridian Road now. That's the beauty of this STARS agreement. So, I guess I just wanted to, you know, mention that. Maybe I will touch on Eagle Road briefly. You know, access management is a huge issue on Eagle Road, specifically like the really congested piece just north of -- of I-84 access management is huge. That's why we have got one right-in and right-out on the south side, one on the north side. Completely different ball game. We -- basically what I'm seeing in this is the transportation agencies and cities kind of learned their lesson; right? And they are like we need to manage access here. That's what we are doing and we are totally agreeable to this access management. We are working to get access that's adequate for the development, that also serves the community, the citizens and the people who are trying to use State Highway 69 to get to and from their job. I would like to just quickly address the signposting issue. We could not get our sign guys out there by the statutory time to post. I went out there with duct tape and a -- the biggest Sharpie I could find -- and we have pictures of it, so I think it's adequate and I marked up the signs. So, it was done in time. I believe it was done the 3rd or the 4th of September. I think it was the 3rd and it's -- you know, I have pictures so I think it's very legible. Clearly this is the biggest turnout we have had for the public hearings, so people were notified more than the other public hearings at least. So, if that's a -- if that's a metric. But we are statutorily compliant there I believe. So, if there is any other questions happy to answer them. Got a lot of material here.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Just got one quick one, Ethan. I understand the STARS agreement. I understand the improvements that will happen on Highway 69. But I guess I'm not clear what improvements, if any, will happen on Amity Road between Hermitage and the intersection?

Mansfield: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Overton, great question. There will be kind of the -- the base configuration will be two in either -- two lanes in either direction with a center turn lane and, then, like a -- like they call it a suicide lane or a two-way left turn lane. There will be access controlled. So, the -- on the south side there will be a single access you can see noted. It's kind of difficult to see. I guess I can use my little deal right here. Let's see. That is the single access. It will be right-in, right-out, left-in I believe until this is constructed, which, actually, will be constructed in -- imminently, right, with the first phase. So, this will basically just be right-in, right-out and I believe we may have left-in there. It will be the same for the one across the street. Because of the commercial nature of the north side we are still working with ACHD on this proposed right-in, right-out here. But, essentially, you are getting, yeah, two lanes and -- two

lanes in either direction with the center turn lane, plus additional turn lanes as you approach ITD -- or, yeah, ITD's State Highway 69.

Overton: Thank you.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: A lot of discussion about a STARS agreement. Do you have a draft agreement or conceptually -- like you have a high level of confidence it would be approved? Because what I don't want is to do this with -- if we are to approve it under the assumption we have it and, then, find out that's not the case.

Mansfield: Mayor Simison -- or Council Member Taylor. Excuse me. We have been working -- we do have a draft agreement and we have been working with ITD since, you know, we first told them we were interested in October, November maybe. We met for the first time in February and most recently I think we met in May I want to say and discussed kind of more detailed terms of the agreement, but I think ITD and us both share the feeling that we are going to get to an agreement and, you know, Kendra can speak to that if she disagrees.

Simison: Since we are on the STARS agreement, I'm not here to talk you out of one, but your primary funder of this is a grocery store. Are there any concerns that the state legislature exempts taxes on groceries? It's a risk. What is that? I mean you -- you hold all the risk in that case. Is that correct in this case as well?

Mansfield: Mayor Simison, that's correct. I mean I think when we sign it we are -- we are kind of on the hook to -- to complete the improvements is my understanding and, you know, we have -- you know, it's tricky, but we -- we have done a sales tax analysis for all of the uses and we do feel comfortable that those assumptions -- you know, we -- we trust the consultant that provided it to us. We feel comfortable with their assumptions. You know, I think -- I think we have looked at what happens when you pull the grocer out and, yeah, it definitely expands the timeline with which we get -- in which we get reimbursed. You know, I can't say for certain whether that kills it or not, but we are still on the hook.

Simison: Yeah. Just want to make sure that we were all in the same understanding and -- do you have another STARS one? Okay. Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Mr. Mayor, I was curious like what entity specifically would be on the hook under the STARS agreement?

Mansfield: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Strader, where is Deb Nelson when you need her? It would be -- I mean it would be a Hawkins entity.

Strader: Uh-huh. Like a special purpose vehicle for this project specifically or --

Mansfield: Yes. We typically create an LLC on a project-by-project basis.

Strader: Right. So, to the extent that if the project became -- God forbid not viable because of a change, I was just kind of curious how that would play out legally. It certainly would be a condition of approval for us and we don't have -- that was one thing I was taking a little bit of an issue with. We don't really have conditions of approval, right, at this point. You have conversations you have had, but we don't have conditions of approval, so it's a little bit tough to say, well, staff has suggested -- you have had a conversation about hypothetical conditions of approval, but there are no conditions of approval in front of the city council right now. So, I just wanted to clear that up. But I just wanted to understand, yeah, like what entity would that be? And, then, certainly, I -- I guess the anticipation is that you would start by doing that; right? And so help me understand when under -- like when contractually you are obligated under the STARS agreement to make the improvements.

Mansfield: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, Council Member Strader, great question. So, this is proposed like our project in two phases and while the details of individual kind of metrics aren't totally hashed out because the agreement, obviously, hasn't been executed or -- you know, we -- we honestly wanted to make sure we could be entitled before we spend a bunch of money like ironing out the details of the agreement, but what it contemplates is that prior to occupancy of the first phase, the first phase improvements would be done. That includes a part of the intersection on State Highway 69 and Amity, the southern -- basically the -- the half of the roadway that is along the first phase, it would include all of Hermatite and it would include all of Amity. So, that would be first phase, second phase and you can actually -- well, let's see. I don't know if I have it. But second phase would be the remainder and that would come along with the majority of the commercial. So, you know, ITD and us are in agreement with that general phasing plan. But, again, it is basically completion of the improvements happen before the CFOs for the uses. Certificate of occupancies. So, you don't have a use until you have the improvements. But we are constructing them concurrently.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Maybe a little bit of an ignorant question. I just -- we don't look at STARS agreements that often. It's rare when we have an opportunity like that and I guess I'm curious is there typically like some type of recourse? Is there like bonding? Like what -- what kind of is the teeth behind your obligations in the agreement typically?

Mansfield: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Strader, that's a fantastic question. Again I don't know all of the answer. I probably know just enough to be dangerous. So, I do not want to provide you with incorrect information. What I do want to say is that this doesn't get executed by the developer, which in this case is us, until we know we are building the

project. So, we don't -- for example, if we entitle this and something happens and we don't go to construct, we are not going to have the STARS agreement inked until we are confident that we can actually perform.

Strader: Got it. So -- Mr. Mayor. So, you are going to have a signed lease from your anchor tenant that's going to give you the confidence to sign the agreement is basically your rationale?

Mansfield: Yeah. Or -- or at least the understanding that we can perform. So, yeah, I think that's a signed lease with the anchor tenant. Maybe it's the LOI. You know, whatever that trigger is it gives us the confidence that we are going to construct, perform and -- and, then, it becomes just like any other development where there is, you know, obviously, a risk during construction that we -- something happens. There is always that risk. That is the language in the agreement that I'm not sure about. But, hopefully, that kind of helps get at your question. I wish I knew more.

Strader: Okay. Thanks.

Simison: Ethan, can you also talk to the -- the neighbors who mentioned their low fence and the impacts and your thoughts on rectifying that situation when you are creating a mini collector behind their properties?

Mansfield: Yeah, Mayor Simison, absolutely. We are more than happy to construct a fence in that location. You know, we would have to understand exactly where it is, but that's not a problem for us. That's just details to work out.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Just back to the sign and not -- not to like cause stir with it or whatever, but just help me confirm from your perspective -- you met the statutory requirement on time. It was legible. Like help me understand from your perspective with the sign.

Mansfield: Yeah. Mayor Simison, Council Member Strader, yes, we met both the timeline -- statutory timing requirements and we believe -- I mean I believe -- I read through the ordinance before I went out and did it, because I was like, look, if I don't go out and do this, then, we, you know, push and I would prefer not to push. We -- we met the -- obviously, it's legible. I feel it's legible and so that is, you know, kind of the two -- kind of the two I think criteria; right? As you can see it and -- and I think one thing that's indicative of being legible is the people who are here tonight were never here at another City Council or Planning and Zoning Commission hearing, so I mean it must have been legible enough for more people to show up to this hearing than any other hearing in the past, which have all been printed hearings, so --

Simison: Yeah. And -- and understand -- we understand -- we -- we -- we understand. We -- we have a picture of the -- we have a -- we -- we -- we do have pictures of the sign though. That's -- that's what we have to go on on what's not -- council can see whether or not this was legible or not from their -- from their perspective. Does anyone disagree that this is the sign that was posted? This was not the sign that -- yeah. And what we can't do -- I'm sorry, I can't have a back and forth out there. I will have to defer to council, but the developer is here to respond to the information that was presented by the public and that's what he is doing and we can verify with our staff on whether or not the time and this information, whether it's legible or not. Bill, can you verify the date? Do you have a way to verify the date of the posting or the picture?

Parsons: Yeah. So, Mayor, Members of the Council, I had a chance to look at this and the affidavit that's required to be submitted or in the certificate stated it was posted September 3rd. So, that's what -- that's what we go off of.

Simison: Okay.

Parsons: They provided proof of that with their -- their signage.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Parsons: With their -- they have seven days per city code to get that to us and, then, we verify that it was actually posted ten days prior to the hearing, which the 3rd is definitely within the ten day window.

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I just want to make sure, because the details matter. Was it posted with the Sharpie by September 3rd or was it pencil on September 3rd and, then, Sharpie later? Because I just want to make sure that --

Mansfield: Yeah. Mayor Simison, Council Member Strader, it was Sharpie from the beginning.

Strader: Okay. Thank you. That's helpful.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for the applicant? Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Ethan, the Mayor brought up one of my questions on the fencing, but you also heard some testimony about the transition to the south and the prior project seemed to have that approval. Now, it's 20 and 25 units in those buildings I believe. Any consideration on density there in those two buildings, that -- any accommodations you could make there?

Mansfield: Mayor Simison, Council Member Whitlock, we actually I believe increased -- kind of in exchange for adding a couple more units; right? Because they basically went

from kind of buildings that were oriented north-south, but more buildings. I think there were six or so oriented north-south. I would have to look back at the site plan. We increased the distance and increased the landscaping between the buildings and the proposed lots to the south to kind of make up for -- so, there were fewer units, you know, facing the back, but those units were much closer and had less screening, more like code minimum. These units are actually pushed farther north and have more landscaping around them and what I would propose is that during a CZC -- you know, this become a condition of approval during the CZC. We are doing more than code minimum there and -- as far as landscaping goes to -- to provide that buffer. You know, obviously, we will have the fence absent -- you know, we have that ten foot pathway that connects the two projects, but we will have a fence there as well.

Simison: Council, any additional questions? Okay. Thank you.

Mansfield: Thank you.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Have a quick question for Bill. Ethan actually brought up a little bit the comp plan versus UDC. Does this proposal as -- as it is presented comply with UDC or is there anything amiss with that?

Parsons: Mayor, Members of the Council, keep in mind the north side is conceptual, so there is nothing really analyzed other than provide 35 foot landscape buffers, comply with the CUP for multi-family, those types of things. But on the south side I think for the most part I -- I would have to agree with the applicant. They have worked pretty closely with staff to make sure that they meet UDC requirements. So, I would be -- I am confident that, yes, that southern portion would definitely be meeting the parking standards, the open space, the amenities as required per -- per the -- the code and the buffers and everything. The -- the one thing that I do just want -- I want to at least bring to -- well, never mind. I will -- I will stand there. I will stand for questions. I thought maybe I -- looking at the revised concept plan and I thought maybe -- I know we asked for the one waiver on Meridian Road, but, again, the applicant shared that they are maybe seeking some additional access points to Amity and Meridian. So, again, if that's -- I know the north side isn't part of the discussion, but it would be nice to capture your -- your conversation on access if you want staff to analyze that further. But you can see in the STARS agreement it's contemplated to have another access to Amity as the applicant mentioned. They are working with ACHD and that's this location. It's hard to see on this scale with his road improvements, but this is the one access -- that right-in, right-out access and, then, you can see there is a -- a right-in, right-out here to Meridian Road. I think the -- the council knows kind of our policies on access to arterial and Meridian Road, so those, again, will require waivers. You can either address now or punt later. It's -- it's your prerogative this evening.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: It's not too late, I would sure like to hear from ACHD if Mindy's still online.

Wallace: Good evening, Mayor and Council. Did you have any specific questions?

Overton: Yes. Mindy, could you kind of just give us a rundown on ACHD's plans for the development and timelines on Amity Road, both to the east and to the west of where this development would take place?

Wallace: Yeah. So, on a page of our staff report we have a list of all of our programmed improvements -- so, I'm not entirely sure what just happened. But we have -- Amity Road is scheduled in the five-year plan to be widened to five lanes between Meridian Road and Locust Grove. The date is not yet to be determined and I don't remember exactly if you guys requested that as a priority for the next five-year work plan. But other than that we would have intersection improvements at Amity and Margaret for a pedestrian crossing and -- what else do we have? The intersection of Amity and Meridian Road, State Highway 69, we have program to be widened with seven lanes on the east and west -- west legs. So, that would be the Amity Road legs between 2031 and 2035. Specific to the development application we have asked them to widen and improve the Amity-Meridian Road intersection with five lanes and associated signal modifications and, then, the road would taper back to a three-lane cross-section at Hermitite and, then, they would install a signal at Hermitite when their site generates -- I think it was 425 trips in the p.m. peak hour. So, we would be watching those certificate of zoning applications to make sure that we have an accurate count to ensure the signal goes in.

Overton: Thank you.

Simison: Council, any other questions for Mindy? Thanks, Mindy.

Wallace: Yep.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Just a little discussion here. I guess a question I have -- not sure where we will end up here tonight. I know that I wouldn't be prepared to vote on approving this project without having the staff with the applicant actually write down the conditions of approval. There is a lot here, so I don't know if we will get to that point, but if we do I wouldn't be voting on approval tonight anyway, because I would like to see the conditions of approval written out and, then, have an opportunity to further refine it as a council if we need to. So, that said, I -- would we need to leave the public hearing open or would we

close it and, then, make a motion on one way or the other? I guess I'm looking for some clarity on some process a little bit, if that's where we end up tonight.

Simison: Mr. Nary.

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, if -- if you are going to want to discuss some findings, you probably should leave the hearing open. You might want to give planning some direction on what findings you would be wanting and, then, they could both take the standard findings and whatever specific ones that the council might have, so that you have an opportunity, because, then, you are going to want that feedback and probably the developer's feedback on that and whether or not, depending on how significant the findings are, I don't know if you are going to want any other -- any other testimony limited to just those specific findings. But I would leave the hearing open.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor, I guess I will make a -- if I may.

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: So, there is a lot here. Obviously we have had a couple chances to look at this, review multiple Planning and Zoning meetings and the projects, obviously, been in the works for some time. I have kind of distilled it down to just a couple things that are important to me as I'm trying to think through this a little bit. I have been pretty clear over my time on council about what I think about the comprehensive plan. I think it's a great document. I think it's helpful for the city for our long-range planning. I also, having participated in the development of it, seen all the different voices come in and -- and offer their opinions and expertise to some degree as to what that should look like and so for me it's very real in that it's a guiding document. I like to think of it a little bit as a blueprint for a home or a building. You follow the blueprint, but surely as conditions would maybe change we could -- we could adjust that blueprint a little bit to meet the -- the circumstances on the ground or whatever, things that we may find need to be changed. So, I view this in some similar way where I think our best effort six, seven years ago when we updated the comprehensive plan to say what we wanted mixed use to look like, this is a little bit unique with the arterial kind of cutting through it. So, I -- I opt to look at the -- the entirety of the -- what's before us, as opposed to viewing this in separate plans as the comprehensive plan would ask us to. I also look at this and see if -- I asked a question about the amount of money of investments we are looking at in our transportation infrastructure here with ITD, 13 to 17 million or so dollars that are not currently budgeted or planned for that will be brought to the area very near. So, it's not five years out or six years out or whatever the case might be, so -- and we know that the number one concern brought up year after year is -- is traffic and moving traffic and I know approving a project like this brings more trips, brings more traffic, but we have to acknowledge the fact that Kuna is not slowing down. There is -- really the problem is here. I really hope ITD can help us figure out what we are going to do at I-84, because that's -- that's really the pinch point here of all this. So, for me it's -- I distill it down. It's fairly simple. I'm supportive of this. I do think it's okay for us as -- as a council to say we -- the comprehensive plan is a great guide, but in many respects all the different

facets of this project do to the best that can be done align with where that is. It complies with UDC as much as we have the details for that and it does bring us a lot of infrastructure investment that we -- we desperately need to move traffic that we don't currently have. So, I'm going to -- I'm in support of the project. I do want to see the findings put -- put down on paper. I do want to have a chance to review those, refine those. But that's -- that's kind of where I'm standing. So, just for purposes of sort of kicking off the conversation, letting the rest of my colleagues kind of see what my -- my mind is at right now.

Simison: And I'm going to give you a preview of next week when you get the city survey results. Nothing's changed. Transportation is still the number one issue according to our residents. Councilman Overton.

Overton: So, I'm going to -- I want to be the point, counterpoint here tonight as we do this, but I'm concerned about this project and I will tell you why I'm initially concerned. I feel like the STARS program and the money is driving this development not us. We have a comprehensive plan. It's there for a reason. You can call it a guideline, but we update that because parts of our city change and we need to update that agreement and as -- as much as I would like to see all those millions of dollars in improvements done to Meridian Road, in the end of the day Meridian Road is still broken when you get to the interstate. None of these improvements help that. It's still broken. I can go out there every day and watch how bad that backs up. I think I'm -- I'm struggling because the north side is only conceptual and that concerns me greatly because of the Williams Pipeline cutting straight through it. I don't know what that's going to look like. I'm not used to just saying, hey, we got a parcel, we are going to split it in two and we really don't know what one half of it's going to eventually look like, but we think it's going to look like this. The pipeline has caused us challenges throughout the city as it cuts through and I'm not happy, nor would I support a development that's only conceptual that has that. I think I need a more solid plan when it comes to a parcel that has that pipeline cutting through it. I think I want to have more of a understanding of what half this project is going to be specifically because the traffic counts to get that signal at Hermatite are dependent upon traffic numbers and if that gets delayed for an extensive amount of time -- I mean I know it will satisfy the STARS program, but I don't think that satisfies the rest of the questions we are going to have about how that -- rest of that transportation network is going to be improved. We heard from ACHD on how long we are going to be before we see some of the improvements on Amity Road. If you get where Hermatite's going to be and you go just a little bit to the west Amity Road looks just like it did when I was in high school. Still a two lane country road. It hasn't changed and that concerns me greatly. We have -- we have had projects we have dealt with as a council where we have had to say, you know, this area I don't think is built to handle east to west what this project's going to bring in. The only thing we are hearing about is north to south with Highway 69 and that doesn't do it for me. I think I need to see all four sides of this able to handle traffic appropriately. On the smaller side, the three-story density up against the south, that's too tall. I'm sorry, I would be yelling and screaming if that was me on the south side. You are putting a three-story apartment up against where I live. I would be struggling with that. I think there is ways to do less density and

an easier ease into where that residential is on the south without having them look at a three story complex right next to them. So, I will not be supportive of this this evening. I think there is a way to do it right where we meet the comprehensive plan and get the STARS agreement aligned. I just don't think we are there.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Since I sit in between my two colleagues here I will straddle the fence. There is an old adage of a man who tells a young boy to -- to bring him a rock and the young boy goes and brings him a rock and he says not that kind of rock, bring me another rock and I -- I look at this entire project and they brought a rock to staff and they said not that kind of rock and they recommended denial and P&Z looked at the rock and they said not that kind of rock and they denied it and, then, they brought it to City Council and we said, well, that's a different kind of rock than you had with P&Z, but we want P&Z to review this new rock before we approve it. Sent it back and P&Z said we still don't like that rock and now they have brought the rock back to us and the rock has some changes to it. It's got Hermatite, which wasn't there originally, and I think that's a big improvement on this project. It -- we have had discussions about the STARS agreement, which I think really are the only way that we are going to get improvements there along this stretch of road. It helps on the Amity side as well. So, just -- I'm -- I'm still kind of on the fence in the middle of my -- my two friends here, because we have kept saying bring us a different rock each time. I don't know that we are completely satisfied with the rock that we have in front of us. Maybe if it had a Trader Joe's in it we would be okay. But I -- I guess I'm leaning more toward not being fully comfortable with the rock that's been brought to us tonight. Sorry to ramble.

Simison: Well, Council, I guess there is two paths forward. There is a motion to close the public hearing and take a vote and there is not a motion to close the public hearing and bring back other considerations. So, one of those will need to be made by someone at some point in time along this conversation.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: So, if there is a vote tonight, which I don't think there would be, because we don't have findings and I suspect -- suspected the majority of council would be uncomfortable with that. I think it's not the rock for me to -- to use the -- the analogy. I -- I'm still weighing it, to be honest. I'm really on the fence about it. I -- I think the road improvements would be a tremendous help. It's certainly of great value. I'm also definitely not convinced that you guys have met the mark in terms of what our comp plan expects. I view the comp plan as a little more than -- than a guideline. I appreciate there are different perspectives on it. One thing for me that I have been very consistent about is transition to single family homes and over the years I have always said I really

don't think a discrepancy of more than one story makes sense. I think we need to feather density. I know that's hard. You have been I think trying very hard to navigate a lot of different competing requirements and so I'm very sympathetic. So, I haven't totally made up my mind, but anything -- I guess my -- my one guidance to you would be I -- I do think spelling out what we would expect on the northern part of your property is important, because something of this magnitude and scale I get concerned where we might just end up with residential and we might not get, you know, all the different uses flushed out that we are expecting. We have seen that happen before. I'm not saying that will happen here, but I guess that's one piece of guidance I would have is that I do think that's important and my other piece of guidance would be to really work on your transition to the single family. I think that's really important here and I would not vote for this if that was not done. So, hopefully, that's helpful. I'm not there yet on it. I share the same concerns about the I-84-Overland area. It is a huge disaster and it's hard, because it's like, you know, one developer can't -- can't solve that and, you know, I don't -- I don't think anyone's recommending a moratorium on all development south of I-84. So, I don't know how we -- we fix that one. So, anyway, that's feedback for me. Again if there was a vote tonight I'm going to abstain, but -- but that's my feedback so far.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor. Well, to continue with the rock metaphor, I think our -- the rock that I have is closer, but still maybe needs some polishing. Like my colleagues I'm really struggling with the three-story, then, residential in the south. I do greatly appreciate the fencing in the north. So, I think we are making progress with the neighbors, but I'm just really not sure that we are completely there yet. But I think if we can see everything documented and continue the hearing and continue the discussion I think at least we will get more clarity regarding where we could and how we could potentially get there. I normally wouldn't have -- I would be more stuck on the comp plan, but the fact that it changed in the middle of working all this I have got a little more sympathy and a little more wiggle room there. But I think we have got some other things that we need to get resolved if we are going to look at this as a whole and definitely more clarity on the north part would be helpful, so --

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener?

Cavener: I will be -- I will try and be brief. If -- if there was a vote this evening for denial I would be in support of that. I think that this council provided some pretty good feedback back in July about what type of rock we were looking for and I think that's been largely in line with the feedback this applicant has heard from Planning and Zoning, not once but twice, and the many many conversations that they have had with our planning department. I would certainly urge the -- the council to -- to be cautious about approving this, because I think that when you start granting kind of a multi-use

across an arterial, the question, then, becomes to what end and I think that we should set not a dangerous, but certainly a worrying precedent. We are not -- we are not breaking the rock, we are sure bending it and -- and I -- it's not something I'm very much in support of -- Support of. In addition -- and -- and, then, I live in this area as you all know and there are transportation improvements that are incredibly needed in this area largely to serve the -- the citizens of Kuna. Our -- our Meridian residents in south Meridian are caught between a rock and a hard place in that these transportation improvements would in the long run -- long run perhaps improve their quality of life, but I think that the amount of density in this area would also count against their quality of life. So, if -- if this project is continued for findings it would have to be a pretty high road for me to be in support of if it comes back. If there is a vote for denial I would be in favor of that this evening.

Simison: Thank you. And I will just say a few comments from -- you know, I could do math earlier. There was five people that were going to vote. I wasn't going to be weighing in on this tonight one way or the other, but I -- I do think that, you know, I have viewed this and I have had this conversation with planning. I do view these issues differently. I don't view this as a comp plan issue, I view this as does this fit issue. What does it bring to the table? What -- what is the value? And as someone who lives closer than Councilman Cavener to this area and -- and I drive this road very frequently as I take my son -- or I used to. He now drives himself -- to his friends down -- down this road and someone who has a grocery store built into their subdivision at this point in time, these amenities change patterns. These -- these amenities greatly impact how things happen and I have no issue with the bifurcation of the road, because, quite frankly, how many people walk to the Albertsons in my subdivision compared to drive? It's not even close, because people are going to the grocery store with their cars to buy vast amounts of food. On the very rare occasion when I go down to get a bagel on a Saturday morning, a leisurely walk, do I walk to the Albertson's in my subdivision. So, these -- this bifurcation, this connection issue to me is not -- is not as important as necessary and I think if I looked at the north I think it could stand on its own as a value add to our community. If I look at the south I think it could stand on its own as a value add to our community. Does it meet our comp plan? You know. But -- but what is the overall value of the project to the long term value of the city or this area and it doesn't come without short-term challenges, like every single development that happens in Meridian at any given point in time. Just like Locust Grove has had development on it for, you know, 30 years and it's still the same two lane road that Councilman Overton patrolled back when he was with the city. No different than Amity is today. You know, you don't -- you don't get the improvements just because you do have development. You -- you may get a sidewalk here and there, but they don't connect to anything. Make it a pathway, but it doesn't happen until that next project develops appropriately either. So, to the point, nothing is going to solve all the issues and if half of this project came back and -- came back without the transportation improvements to the -- as part of a STARS project on Meridian Road, is that a better project? Council will have to cross that bridge if and when that ever does happen. I don't know -- I don't know the answer if it would be a better project or a better outcome for the community. But I think that the -- there may be individual elements which could be worked on to have lesser impact, but

overall I think it would have added nice value to this part of our community and brought services that are going to mean less people to drive up Meridian Road to go to Walmart. We talk about the problems on -- on Meridian Road, that's what they are doing, they are leaving from here halfway -- either -- they are going to drive to Kuna to go to the grocery store or they are going to drive north or they are going to head down Amity the other direction to go to a different grocery store. But that changes the patterns. Doesn't change rush hour. I get it. You know, the -- the -- but if we built our roads for rush hour we would probably never do another project in Meridian anywhere, because our roads come after the development happens. So, that was a little bit of a -- more than a short statement, but I felt like it was important to state, because I think it would add value long term. So, with that I will turn to council for a direction on -- to close the public hearing for a motion or to make a statement and ask staff to bring back findings or if you want to continue we will take that as well. Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I guess I -- the public hearing is open. I would be curious if the applicant would like a continuance or what they would like.

Mansfield: Mayor Simison, Council Member Strader, we would, of course, prefer an approval with direction to go provide conditions and I can say that, you know, we can certainly look at that southern two-story -- three-story building, look at how that impacts to go to two. That's not a -- that very likely will not kill the deal. That's very likely achievable. Regarding the northern parcel I would just say that the development agreement locks us into this general -- these uses, these building locations, these parking field layouts, these pathway locations generally and anything that differs from that would require me to come back up in front of you and ask for a development agreement modification, to which you could say no or you could consider it. But just remember that this is not like that -- this -- you are approving this layout generally. You are not approving some unknown project on the north side. I just want to remind you that that will be how we are treated at the staff level and that's -- and that -- that's just the way it works; right? It's not a bad thing or a good thing, it just is. It gives you an opportunity to tell us what you need from that north side if it's anything other than basically this. So, with that I -- I think I would be very -- you know, we would consider a continuance, as long as that continuance said, staff, write up some conditions of approval for us to consider. If it's a continuance without some sort of guidance I think -- I'm not going to lie, we have a lot of deal fatigue here. We have been at it for four or five years now. So, you know, you ask why the traffic numbers are from 2024, that's when we got our TIS approved and we have been swirling in the vortex ever since. So, we would love to move forward with this project. So, I hope that answers your question,

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Ethan, hold on. So, earlier -- I think Bill said this -- that you had discussed some conditions of approval, what they might be. Is that a list that -- and I know council can add to this list, but is that something that -- Bill and Ethan that you have discussed

these conditions of approval would be -- you both would be in agreement with what's there? And I just want to make sure you are both talking about the same list. There is an understanding that these things would be conditions of approval, understanding that we may have -- and that we would very well likely have additional things we would want to be part of that. But help me understand that.

Mansfield: Yeah. Mayor Simison, Council Member Taylor -- Bill, would you mind going to those conditions in my slide presentation? Frankly, Council Member Taylor, we had a meeting with staff and for most of that meeting we were under the impression that those conditions of approval would be conditions of a recommendation of approval. At the end of the meeting we were informed that that was not how it was going to work out and so we were a little frankly taken aback by that change throughout the meeting. So, in short those were the conditions that we had discussed in the meeting. I confirmed that afterward that these would be conditions of approval, but that they were not recommending approval. So, we are absolutely in agreement with these conditions and we would welcome other conditions that council needs to approve the project. We just -- frankly, we have really struggled, because, as Council Member Whitlock said, you know, bring us a rock. Okay. Here is the rock. Okay. What do you need with -- what -- what color would you like the rock to be? How do you want me to polish it and where? And that's a thing that we can do in these conditions, because we are still, frankly, confused as to what color the rock needs to be, where it needs to be polished, how it needs to be sat down on the desk. So, if we can get clarity through these conditions we can, then, say, no, that's not going to work or we can say, yeah, that will work. But without that we have deal fatigue and it's -- it's getting tough to hang with this one honestly, so -- thank you.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Bill, is there anything missing from this list from your conversation that you would think is important if we were to have these --

Parsons: So, Mayor, Members of the Council, I think it's important that this -- these five bullet points are based on a conversation that we had with all of you. They were based on changes to the northwest corner concept plan, so -- except for the STARS agreement and the -- the off-site collector street. So, when we met with the applicant we were like, hey, there is some -- here is some things where we can get a little more consistency with the comp plan. Are you willing to do this? And they were like -- and we sent the list to the applicant and they were very adamant that we -- we don't want to change the plans, but we are happy to take these as conditions. So, to me this -- these were some concepts that we talked about with the applicant to get consistency for that northwest concept plan and they are -- agree with that. So, no, this doesn't include all the conditions that we would bring back to you. There is probably 20 or more plus these, but if I had to guess, but, yes, to me the most important thing -- I'm going back to some of the Mayor's points -- is in order -- it's weighing the public benefit versus kind of

the vision and as you all know the comp plan is a vision document that the community endorsed. So, that's why it's hard for staff to say, well, just because you have a road we can't ignore that policy and that's why we don't want to give the applicants fatigue on their projects. That's never our intent. We do want to work. The other option we offered was do a comp plan amendment. I know that's another hill they have to climb and come in with commercial and residential and you don't have to meet all those things and that was another option discussed. But understanding some of the desires of the applicant -- meaning they worked on their traffic study, they have done all this work, met with staff numerous times, they felt like, you know, over time they could finesse their plan and come back with something that -- that met the intent and ultimately we told them we have to agree to disagree, but these are some of the policies that we need council to weigh in on, because they are the ones that can kind of do that -- interpret that and take in that public benefit that the Mayor mentioned that goes into kind of -- all of you are -- you are deliberating when you look at these projects. You have a little different hat than what staff wears and we understand that and so that's why we are kind of where we are at today saying, yes, we -- we like -- we like the south side. I think we have told the applicant we -- we like how that integrates better than the north side. We just find it hard to support the density. If you had less density, less residential and a little bit more commercial, it integrates very well the way they have that working. It's the north side where you see a lot more parking lot. It's a little more disjointed. The quasi-public use is up by the residential and not directly going through the development. So, there is a lot of things -- and, then, the multi-family here and, then, there is another building across the drive aisle. So, those are things like the applicant says -- are -- is the council willing to say go back, staff work with them and tweak the concept plan and require these as conditions that they do no more than two stories along the north -- the south boundary or lose that building or no building can be higher than X amount of feet or whatever it may be. But that's something where I would ask you as staff member to give us some direction if that's where you want to head with this project. But right now, again, yes, these were things that we think can be -- conditions that could enhance the north side, but we are also open to feedback from -- from all of you as policymakers as to how you see it kind of transitioning a little bit more. I -- I don't want to think -- want the applicant to think that we are not -- definitely not willing to work with them, but we are. But there are -- again, if -- if -- if council finds that it doesn't meet the comp plan, then, apply for a comp plan amendment. There is always an avenue or a path to take to get to where applicants want to go. So, just at least want to put that on the record as well.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: You know, I think -- I think there is an opportunity to not take all the options off the table yet tonight. I think that applicant's heard some of the concerns and the sentiment from council. Obviously, there has been some discussion about what would be needed, but there is a lot more detail that staff -- would knowing if council wants to -- to see that. I -- I personally want to see that. I would really like the two of you to sit

down and -- and for staff to say here is what council is going to need to -- to work with and is that okay with you. You may very well say we can't do that. That's just not going to work. I don't know until you go down that road. And I understand you kind of thought you were going down that road, but, you know, this is not a very long list of conditions of approval for a project like this. I think -- clearly I think council wants to see a better transition on the south side. I think that would be something we would want to see in there. There might be some other things and we may very well look at this project in, you know, a month or whenever we come back -- or two weeks and say this still is not the right rock, even though we have tried to. But my sense is that we could still try to polish this rock up a bit with some finer details from staff and you working through that, if that's -- if you are open to it, to get to a point where staff or the council has a more clear picture of what we are looking at and what we are approving. I agree with -- is it a good fit? I think it's a good fit. The reason we have an awkward -- the reason we have an awkward, you know, the -- the northern side of this project and there is a big parking lot, because we are trying to qualify for a STARS agreement to get the -- the funding for it. So, that's what it is. So, if not this, then, what are we going to have? I think this is what we want to have. I do. I think this is what we want to have. And so I would put that out -- not to take any offer -- option off the table, but have council -- or, excuse me, staff and the applicant try to narrow in on the -- the conditions of approval. If not, if -- if you don't want to go there I don't think the council -- my sense -- and I'm trying to count here -- is I don't think they are going to -- it's going to be rejected and you are going to go home with a -- with a bagless -- full of no -- no rocks in your bag so to speak. So, I I'm trying to think if there is a way to keep it going to see if we can get to where the majority of council likes what we have and we may not. We may still end up where I think it is right now. But I would be open to your comments, Ethan, if you want to try to get very specific with some of the conditions of approval. If -- if council is there and I don't know if the rest of the council is -- is going to agree to that tonight, but that's -- that's what I'm offering as a pathway possibly.

Mansfield: Mayor Simison, Council Member Taylor, here is our challenge. We sat down with staff after our Planning and Zoning Commission hearing and we said please let us know a list of conditions that you can recommend that will give us a recommendation of approval. These were the conditions that were sent to me in the e-mail. So, the challenge is if I come back time after time after time and it changes every time with some new thoughts and some new ideas, how long is too long? I want to share with you our project at I-84 in Meridian where, you know, we went through iteration after iteration after iteration and our tenant driving the entire site plan left, went somewhere else. So, you know, I know that the Hawkins board -- the Hawkins investment committee is -- is experiencing severe deal fatigue. If we can look at this project tonight -- or, you know, have some conversation tonight about what needs to happen for it to get to an approvable place, we can write those down and Hawkins can look at it -- and it's not me, it's -- it's the Hawkins team; right? Can look at it and say, yes, we can absorb this, we can do this or, no, we can't, I think that's where I see this going. If it's going to be more conversate -- more and more conversation about whether we want something here or there or like the pathway over here or the pathway over there, I feel very strongly that I have tried to have these conversations time after time after time with

staff and it's impossible to give concrete recommendations, because the MUC doesn't give you concrete; right? The MUC provides a blueprint, a guide as you mentioned, Council Member Taylor, because it's not designed to give you concrete. But at some point there has to be this decision made that says does this comply? Does it not? If not what can be done? Is it -- and if -- there is just an -- there is an answer there somewhere and the answer should be here are the six things or 25 things that you need to do to make this an approvable project and if -- if I don't -- if I can't hear those things we can't just keep going round and round with it, because we will pass on the project; right? That's just the way it will be and we have spent, you know -- I think we have spent 1.8 million after land costs on, you know, site plans and, you know, traffic studies, renewing the traffic study, because the old one expired, so that's just -- you know, this is just the reality of the -- of the capital -- where we are deciding to allocate capital, where we are putting our stuff and it -- it can't be here if we can't get to an entitled project and that's -- I mean no disrespect with that. Absolutely none. I just want to be very honest and transparent with you. So, that's kind of what we are looking at here tonight. If there is a list of conditions we would love to hear them. If there is a list of conditions that you can provide staff or give staff some guidance to provide a list of conditions that we can, then, look at and, then, come back and say this is the -- and, then, say staff agreed to this list. Approved. Staff didn't agree. I think that's fine.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I hear your frustration and I -- and I'm very sympathetic, but at the same time our staff recommended denial twice and so did our Planning and Zoning Commission and I would hate for you to have to walk away from this kind of opportunity, but at the same time that -- that's the business that you are in. So, all due respect, but that that's the risk that you take when you do these kinds of projects. I would recommend that you -- you know, do a continuance for a couple weeks, see if everybody can get on the same page and -- I don't think it should take more than a month, but I'm not going to pre-agree to hamstringing our planning and -- our planning staff's conditions of approval, because they include everything under the sun, from whether your infrastructure is adequate, to things from Public Works, to things from the Fire Department, et cetera. So, that's not a realistic ask and I'm sorry that that's the case from my perspective. I don't think that's realistic. I think -- you have heard a lot of feedback. Your four-story multi-family building can't be four stories and your multi-family in the south needs to be a story shorter and these conditions certainly you should contemplate and I think do what you can to assuage everybody's concerns and give it your best shot would be my suggestion. I just -- yeah, I -- I -- I get that you are losing patience, but I think that this is the business that you are in and this is how -- unfortunately how it works when you are trying to work through the planning process. This is an area that's very challenged. It has a lot of infrastructure issues and I -- I -- I could tell you that I don't want to feel pushed into a corner tonight and I would not -- I would vote no, actually, at this point if I was. So, that's just me, but --

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Strader: -- my feedback.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Yeah. I think it sounds like you have something to -- to share. To be fair, we have never been at a point where conditions of approval could be presented to you officially and I understand some of the process. But, you know, we have -- four denials here. But we have never -- even as council when we considered it a little while ago we were -- yes, we tried to remand it back to Planning and Zoning as a lifeline. Otherwise, the project was dead in June or July, whenever we saw it. I also think we are offering you an opportunity to keep the project alive, because the project is going to die tonight unless you agree to do this process. So, if you don't want to do it, that's -- that's your right, that's perfectly fine. This is -- this is your lifeline. I don't think there is going to be -- when you come back we are going to say, you know, let's do this -- we don't do that and this is actually I think a somewhat unusual process for even to agree to it to say we are going to give you a chance to go back and try to work it out. So, as I see it you have an option where this is probably not going to pass tonight and, then, you have got how many years of wasted time or we can keep a lifeline open for you for a couple more weeks while you try to work it out, get some feedback from council and, then, we will take a look at it. So, that's how I envision this right now.

Mansfield: Can we just have a -- Mayor Simison, Council Member Taylor, can we just have maybe 15 seconds to just think about that question?

Simison: Do you want a five-minute recess?

Mansfield: A five minute recess would be fantastic. Thank you.

Simison: Okay. We will take a five minute recess.

(Recess: 9:35 p.m. to 9:46 p.m.)

Simison: Are we ready to come back? Do we have a disposition? So, Ethan, what -- what would be your preference, your request of council for them to consider?

Mansfield: Mayor Simison, Council, I truly do appreciate the opportunity to even have this discussion. So, first of all, thanks. It can be kind of contentious and I just want to say -- just appreciate the discussion. I would like the opportunity to work with staff to understand some conditions. Work kind of with staff to bring some conditions forward for -- for next time, if that works for everybody.

Parsons: Yeah. Mayor, Members of the Council, the -- the -- we -- we talked about some hearing dates, so October 13th seems to work -- work well for all of our schedules. That will give us time to work with the applicant on crafting some of those conditions of approval. I just want to remind that -- you know, I'm hoping council will give us some guidance. I don't want to go back and forth trying to interpret -- interpret what you want. So, again, if that's your desire for staff to -- to prepare some conditions and some findings, happy to do that prior to that hearing and get those in front of you. There are -- again, keep in mind there are a couple waivers that were discussed this evening and, then, I saw brought up those access waivers. So, the -- the additional right-in, right-out onto Amity that was shown on that -- the improvements with the STARS agreement and, then, there is also a right-in, right-out onto Meridian Road for the northwest corner as well and keep in mind the applicant does have ITD's approval -- or at least of the -- the two access point, the right-in, right-outs to -- to Meridian Road. So, I just wanted to remind you of that. So, if that's something you want to weigh in, as well as giving us direction on access and how you want to see the transitioning and all of those other things, I would appreciate that feedback and make sure that those are captured, in addition to what the applicant showed on the screen, because those are things that we are going to be -- they agreed to. I have -- I'm like Ethan, I came prepared, I printed off the e-mail, so I remember the discussion very well. So, those were things we did, in fact, discuss and the off-site improvements and the STARS agreement were something that we were going to recommend as part of the development agreement for sure.

Simison: So, Bill, do you need stuff repeated that was already stated about -- by Council Woman Strader about the fence issue on the north? Are you just looking for other things? If council has any other items that they want you to -- that they would like you to look at.

Parsons: Mayor and Council, yes, please, repeat and we will make sure we will capture all of it. I want it very clear that the applicant knows what the expectations are as we head into the October 13th hearing.

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Parsons: And any other comments you might have.

Strader: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. So, I guess the -- the feedback I had so far was the applicant had agreed to put the fence in, which I think you noted. You had already provided a condition -- kind of a condition that four stories was too high in the north part of the development and, then, in the south part of the development I think that needs to come down by a story, too. And maybe go back to the original plan, because the neighbors seemed okay with it. Some version of that. I don't -- and that's the problem with this request and -- and we are going to do our best, but until we see the conditions of approval it's very hard to anticipate everything. But those were the things that stood out to me as being important so far in terms of the transition. I think staff needs to take a very hard look at the north part of the project, because it is a concept plan and

because it is such a large development and so critical, I think putting the conditions that are needed around it to make sure it's functioning well, understanding, yeah, it would be anchored by a grocery store and that involves a parking lot and everyone knows that, but how -- you know, how do we make it work the best that we can? So, I know that's very general, but that -- that's what I had so far.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilor Taylor.

Taylor: On the waiver issue, Bill, I know that ITD has given approval on a couple of those right-in, right-out, but was there one that Ada County Highway District also needed to approve on the right-in, right-out on Amity? Have they -- could you remind me if they have indicated -- are they okay with that right-in, right-out or do we need to -- just trying to understand that.

Parsons: Mayor, Members of the Council, I -- I -- I don't think they supported the one access to Amity. They were open to one, but not the right-in, right-out. So, that's why the applicant said that they were willing -- they were working with them on that, but that's -- again, it -- it's ACHD's policies, but it's also our policy about limiting access. But, again, it -- it takes a waiver if that's something you are supportive.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor, just on that. I personally am supportive, because as I am looking at the -- the plan it seems like we would need those right-in, right-outs to make it function a little bit better. So, I mean -- unless the rest of council can weigh in on it. I -- I think those -- I would be okay with that. I think we should have those.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Also just want to say I know, like Councilman Cavener and others had some strong feedback, and even if they would be against it, conditions that would help make them feel better about it are always appreciated, too. Even though, you know, it may not get you there, but just a thought.

Simison: I'm seeing Councilman Cavener shake his head, so must have no additional comments.

Cavener: No additional comments, Mr. Mayor.

Simison: Council, anything else that you would like staff to specifically look at or consider? Okay.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: I'm -- again just assuming since, it's here in the -- in the presentation that Hermatite is part of the project moving forward. We don't need to do a condition on that -- on that improvement?

Mansfield: Mayor -- Mayor Simison, Council Member Whitlock, that will be a condition of approval, but that's already -- I mean I can pre-approve that we have -- we have pre-approved the condition of approval. I agree. Mr. Mayor

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: If no other comments, I would make a motion that we continue Item No. 3 to October 13th, which is item H-2025-0007.

Strader: Second.

Simison: Have a -- have a motion and a second to continue this item to October 13th. Is there discussion on the motion?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Real quick. I will be voting no on this. My perspective is the council has already granted this applicant an opportunity, both with meeting with staff and Planning and Zoning to address much of the feedback, similar in nature to what we provided last -- last July. So, I don't think that a continuance is needed. I would -- I'm actually more in favor now of voting for denial. So, I won't be supporting the motion for continuance.

Simison: Okay. Thank you. Is there further discussion? Okay. If not, all in --

Nary: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Oh.

Nary: Mr. Mayor, just before the vote, I just wanted to make sure for the public, both here and online, that with the continuance from here there won't be a new sign posted, there won't be new notices or new mailers, so this will -- this is the notice for the next date. So, there isn't going to be another change to that. So, just so you know since that came up tonight.

Simison: But the public hearing is open for any additional comments --

Nary: Yes.

Simison: -- and testimony --

Nary: Absolutely.

Simison: -- at that time.

Nary: There just won't be any new signage or notices at all.

Simison: Okay. Okay. Any further discussion? If not, all favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay?

Cavener: Nay.

Simison: The ayes have it and the item is continued. Okay. We will see you back here in October for this item.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE NAY.

FUTURE MEETING TOPICS

Simison: Okay. The Executive Session was vacated, so, council, anything under future meeting topics or a motion to adjourn?

Overton: Mr. Mayor, I move that we adjourn.

Little Roberts: Second.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:54 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON

_____/_____/_____
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK