

McCarvel: Yeah.

Seal: -- in a lot of ways. After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to City Council a file number H-2021-0026 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of September 16th, 2021, with no modifications.

Grove: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to approve H-2021-0026 -- or I'm sorry. Recommend approval of Hatch Industrial with no modifications. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

8. Public Hearing for Fields Sub-Area Plan (H-2021-0047) by City of Meridian, the Location Consisting of Approximately Four (4) Square Miles and Bounded by Chinden Blvd. on the North, McDermott Rd. on the East, McMillan Rd. on the South and Can-Ada Rd. on the West

- A. Request: Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment to incorporate the Fields Sub-Area Plan.

McCarvel: Last on our agenda is H-2021-0047, The Fields Sub -- Sub Area Plan and we will begin with the staff report. All right. Or just presentation. Sorry.

McClure: Good evening, Members of the Planning and Zoning Commission. I'm here tonight to discuss The Field Sub Area Plan with you. My name is Brian McClure and for those who don't know me I'm a long range planner. Caleb Hood is also here and Megan Moore with Logan Simpson, our lead project consultant, is on Zoom. Briefly this is the presentation outline. We will do an intro, cover the background, briefly describe the process, the plan and go over the request and, then, take questions. The Fields Sub Area Plan is a direct continuation of the 2019 Comprehensive Plan. This is a sub area plan with a high priority for Council, which continued funding the work. The application before you tonight is a Comprehensive Plan text amendment. The proposal would be to add this new sub area plan to the list of adopted plans and studies by reference. This is like the Parks and Recreation Master Plan, pathway master plan, Destination Downtown Ten Mile plan, various utility plans and many others. There are no future land use map revisions. As I said, this is a direct continuation of the work and the analysis from the Comprehensive Plan. There are also no proposed annexations or development. Any proposed development with annexations would have their own public hearing process and the city does not engage in forced annexation. This area is unique and so some background and additional context is probably useful. Planning work has been ongoing for more than a decade now. In 2008 that area was formally added to the city's area of impact for Ada county. Land uses assigned at this time were generally considered interim. As a result, there have been multiple studies and white papers, multiple local and regional working groups to look at potential economic activity and patterns of

development and there have been quite a few design charrettes and visioning exercises. None of this really coalesced and, frankly, caused a lot of confusion. The city began to solidify plans in 2017 with amendment around the Intermountain Gas facility and the Williams Pipeline connection. The Williams Pipeline is a 24 inch, 30 mile long, natural gas pipeline that traverses much of Meridian and is a connection to Intermountain liquefied natural gas tank south of McMillan and just west of the Phyllis Canal. The city's separation requirements codified in the Unified Development Code for the pipeline. The seven million gallon Intermountain tank filled with natural gas has been chilled into a liquid state. For those that are curious, natural gas, it becomes liquid at negative 260 degrees Fahrenheit and is 600 times smaller than the gaseous form. It's either really cool science or magic. The photo here is at dusk earlier this year. There is a red combine for reference scale highlighted. The tank needs 1,000 foot nonresidential safety buffer, which falls a little outside of their property and there are some other off-site impact considerations, such as light, noise, conductivity and quality of place. Another obvious influence in the area are development pressures. The construction of Owyhee High School has brought a new level of that. This is a challenge as we don't currently have adequate fire service and our police officers have long travel times. Utility infrastructure is inadequate. We still need some major improvements to sewer, including a new lift station. There is also uncertainty with road improvements and the State Highway 16 extension west of McDermott. Finally, there is no neighborhood services and many that are likely to be of interest earlier are not necessarily in the best location or had the best community or long term value. And, finally, as previously noted, 2019 Comprehensive Plan was a huge basis for a lot of the background and context for this plan. It identified the future plans for the area and the need for more integrated development patterns and service planning. I realize this map is a little late, but it serves as a -- as a good transition here. The left shows the region and The Fields area and the right shows the adopted future land uses without the other noise. The liquid -- the liquefied natural gas tank is called out. The candy striped line near McDermott is State Highway 16, which will have crossings only at Ustick, Chinden, McMillan and Five Mile Creek. The Phyllis Canal and Five Mile Creek wrap around the industrial area and the Intermountain facility in the southwest corner. The background information here is all context and history for the Comprehensive Plan. We have had some questions on it, though, and it's casual -- and casual why not type comments. So, it may be useful for newer P&Z members not involved in this work previously. During the Comprehensive Plan build out and analysis consider neighboring cities, citywide allocation, corridor analysis and sub area planning. The Fields area was one of the several dedicated focus areas. Most of the adjacent regional land uses are mixed use in today's market and away from the highway that's largely -- likely to largely be residential with linear commercial along the frontages. In Meridian and of late the next best use from commercial that has reached saturation is multi-family. This vacant commercial -- chances are someone has thought about putting multi-family there and regardless of conductivity, access transportation, employment or supportive uses. Star is actually looking to pair their commercial uses back due to viability. You can see this in Meridian. People think Chinden, for example, should all be commercial, but most of it is, in fact, residential. Limited access requires nonresidential to be focused and there has been no reversal of the effect, except generally for those destination uses and spaces that really shine. Employment opportunities in The Fields area focus in the southwest,

northeast and neighborhood center. In the right context and conditions these each have an opportunity to specialize in different markets and uses. Parks and open space is also important for context. There is probably a little too -- too much information here. However, I want you to see a previous discussion point with City Council and one of the driving reasons for this work. Despite valiant best efforts by our Parks and Recreation Department, the city has not been gaining on its service goals. It's been going the other way, unfortunately. The Fields area in particular has no previously acquired land or dedicated land. The Borup on Cherry, Discovery on Lake Hazel, and to a lesser degree Aldape property along the river, all areas that the city has been proactive in planning for city park space prior to development coming. We don't have anything like that out here, though. The city didn't expect the high school and developments happening. State Highway 16 is coming and it just hasn't been a good opportunity previously. With some important background covered, we will step into a brief review of the process. This has focused on a recent engagement. As reiterated, this work has made use of further recent efforts. This has led to some challenges and opportunity. It's challenging because newer stakeholders and those that did not participate previously sometimes wanted to talk about previous steps. It's an opportunity, because it allowed us to focus on how much we really cared about. Usually, though, we just got asked about roadway questions. The consistent feedback through all this, however, was on pathways connectivity and a distinct community thematic. This was great as it's alignment with city's previous efforts and feedback received. For this project we began with small group interviews, in person and online. The focus of these meetings was concerns and opportunities and included partner agencies, city staff, development and financing professionals and key stakeholders, those near the community center. After initial direction and concept work the project team moved an online workshop. This used an interactive tool called Mural. The technology is still a little awkward, but worked well. All property owners in The Fields area were notified and invited to participate. The focus was still on the neighborhood center, but included broader visual preference, polling and discussion. Again, most of the questions were about the roads. Prior to submitting for public hearing, the city notified all previous participants and invited them to review and comment on a preview draft. This utilized a public comment tool equivalent to a market tool and PDF, Adobe Acrobat, but was available to all and made comments publicly visible. After submitting -- submitting for public hearing, we again notified all property owners of the public -- of the project and process and shared their project website with links to the final draft on the project folder on the record system. Staff has also continued to meet and engage with stakeholders throughout this process. Thankfully and despite the very large area and constant changing ownership, there are not a lot of unique property owners in the area. Unique being the number of property owners. This slide isn't going to do the platform justice, but here you can see a few screen captures from the Mural platform. This is a digital collaborative whiteboard that was used for the online workshop. The tool has been gaining in popularity and for good reason. You can engage with more people more easily, not just those who are close by and have more time. That was a long setup, so we will transition into the plan now. The Field Sub Area Plan includes four chapters, with an intro, overview of the public process, the plan or vision and implementation. The vision includes elements on transportation, parks and pathways, economic development, character and a focus on the neighborhood center. The graphics here will be discussed

and some late changes later, so, please, make a note of that. Implementation is focused on priorities, city participation, and action items. The heart and focus of the plan here is the Star-McMillan center. It is central to the area, accessible, but it's insulated from highways and yet distinctly Meridian. It's not Nampa or Star. It's intended to be iconic and to have a unique destination identity. It's designed and accessible for locals, but attracted to everyone else, too. Makes use of one of the city's pathways network and -- makes use of the city's pathway network and especially the Five Mile Creek pathway. This will have one of the few crossings on State Highway 16 with an underpass. It includes a main street style that provides more opportunities for destination uses and placemaking. This area is prime for partnerships and synergies, not just the pathway network and linear open space, but also to provide locational benefits from a future city park. A key characteristic here is the east-west alignment to make best use of access down McMillan. The access points nearest historic McMillan intersection may be limited or at least not as efficient. Market absorption may take some time here as contemplated, but to propose synergies and limited competing land uses in -- in the near vicinity provide a huge amount of opportunities long term. The mixed use nature allow some ebb and sway in trends with flexible and convertible space development. While a park or other destination uses may support a fully realized neighborhood center sooner, it has an opportunity to be self sufficient long term with the rooftops necessary to support the desired uses. The vision is that many of the services residents may normally drive to can be accessible without getting onto an arterial roadway or -- or crossing a congested state highway. A lot of thought went into how this can work. If you look at areas like Bown Crossing or this 36th Street Bistro and Hill, they have had problems. It's about combination shortcomings, including in lack of external access, local community access, visibility, essential use anchors, public amenities, programming, competing areas, and total rooftops were are all contributing factors. The project team looked at neighborhood center success stories and retail trends. Case study examples in the area and the region included Daybreak, Utah; Ferguson Farms in Bozeman, Montana; Montava in Fort Collins and others. There is going to be strong local demand in the future and with a river crossing at Star and overpass on McMillan, there will be visibility and traffic. The center itself will be a destination draw. This is an illustrated look and field sketch. This isn't prescriptive, but it does include many of the sense of place and focus elements that stakeholders have commented on. Here is a smattering of other images that have received positive feedback for look and feel elements. All these come from the plan. Next steps is crucial. The plan has limited usefulness of this self document. We didn't need to go to this level of effort for just development review. As mentioned, there is a lot of challenges and opportunities, including State Highway 16, and continued transportation impacts and existing infrastructure. A fully functioning high school, still largely in the middle of nowhere. A funded, but unconstructed fire station, changing land ownership and increasing development pressures. The coordination of partnerships can't be reinforced. In fact, it probably needs its own slide. Aligning city and partner agency services will be key. The high school shook things up and this plan is a good step to get service planning back in alignment. We can help that through public-public, public-private and private-private partnerships to reduce some of the risk with advanced timing and to address otherwise negative circumstances and barriers and, instead, create positive opportunities. I also want to be very straightforward. This plan has some of the usual

planning development guidelines, but it's also put a lot of responsibility for success on the city. It's not just evaluating consistency of broad planning elements with unique development proposals, but the city working with developers and owners and other stakeholders to ensure we have something special. The process to get here and the framework is important, but I would argue that next steps are even more important. That was a relatively quick summary. The project -- project team believes we have a balanced -- we have balanced a lot of perspective and interest with short and long term needs. The plan and staff report do touch on some other topics and there are, quite frankly, some other equally big ideas, such as funding, that fall on staff and City Council. I didn't go through the comp plan policies that support this work or the plan or the findings as illustrated in the staff report, but we feel this is not just consistent with the comp plan, but also finishing the work we already started. Quickly I will go through the request and some additional recommended changes. There is a lot of depth to discussion we could have on any number of topics, but it's difficult to do most of that outside of questions or several hours of debrief. The big request of Commission tonight, as previously noted, is to adopt The Field Sub Area Plan by reference. That amounts to one new row and table on page D of the Comprehensive Plan. We do have a few other proposed changes to the draft as well. The city has had some questions and feedback since the draft plan was submitted for public hearing. Most of these have been around understanding the purpose of text and some conservative prescriptive standards. A lot of this is very understandable and valid. The project team had proposed some adjustments to adjust -- to address some of these. More broadly, though, there are a few things to remember. The first is that this is a high level planning document. It's not all things to all projects. There is a narrative for data. There is narrative for data for records -- and reference. The plan is used for city priorities and projects and the plan is also used to review development in conjunction with the Comprehensive Plan, UDC, architecture standards and other approved documents. Another reminder is that not all development is the same. The location, size, and context is very important. This plan should not be blindly followed and -- with all -- with all elements required in all conditions. It's also difficult to strike up balance that makes everyone happy. The plan has to have language that is strong enough to be enforceable and provide confidence to both residents and development, but avoid blindly imposing an inappropriate condition or being so weak and broad as to lack any means to be implemented. This screen in the staff -- this screen and the next are both in the staff report as part of the staff recommendation. I won't linger here. This language is all intended to provide more context on why some of the information is there and why it's important. This page are just some simple clarification to other text and, again, these ones are included in the staff report as part of the staff recommendation. These changes are not in the staff report, so, please, consider these with any approval motion. COMPASS provided a few comments in their agency response. One set of comments -- comments were related to use as described on the illustrated framework map. That was the image referenced earlier. The quote uses described are not in the city's future land use designation portfolio. That was not fully evident apparently and so these changes are trying to make clear. Those were generalized uses, not future land uses. Those comments are to reference different regional planning documents. The wrong ones are cited in the document. That's the presentation. Lastly, doing the future amendment we would like to tweak a few sections of the Comprehensive Plan to better

accommodate all sub area planning types into one section. They are currently sort of all over. That is a little intensive and distracting from the actual work now, though, and so we are planning to do that with the next round of cleanup and update to the comp plan itself. I'm also hoping we can create a responsive website for this sub area plan, just like the Comprehensive Plan. We have the tools and ability, we just need some time. I just need some time. With that, myself, Megan and Caleb, are happy to answer any questions you may have.

McCarvel: Okay. Thank you. Any questions for staff?

Lorcher: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Lorcher.

Lorcher: I'm not sure if this is the right time to ask it, but the corner of Star and McMillan has some historic buildings on it. I assume that was the name of a town back in the wayback days. Does this Comprehensive Plan include saving what Meridian was?

McClure: Madam Chair, the -- the Comprehensive Plan has some historic elements in the -- in the main document. This specific -- or the sub area plan does not call out specific structures to save. It does, however, identify that church on the southwest corner of McMillan and Star as an historic structure. We did speak with the owners of that property. The church has acquired some other property on Star and they are interested in potentially relocating that -- moving that in the future. I can't say it will be a difficult balance in the future due to the proximity of the intersection with any future intersection widening. So, hopefully, they do relocate it, rather than tearing it down or having it removed for them.

Grove: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Grove.

Grove: Brian -- Brian, does the timeline on the highway extension change like how -- how important this is in terms of timing to get some of these things moving?

McClure: Commissioner, the timing for the State Highway 16 is ever evolving. It's changed from 20 years from now to sooner to an interim condition that could start really soon. I don't know how important it is to this plan's timing right now. I don't. But understanding how it will impact where development occurs is important. A lot of that is probably more for the broader Comprehensive Plan and not sort of focused on the neighborhood center, but certainly it's something that's very important and will have some huge impacts and we need to be aware of what they are.

Yearsley: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: You know, it's surprising to me how fast this has come about. I was on the Planning and Zoning Commission when we were looking at the subdivisions there off of McMillan -- off McDermott -- McDermott and how far out I thought that was and now we are planning all the way out to the city limits or impact area. It just amazes me how fast this is moving and -- and expanding. I applaud the city for getting ahead of this now and trying to plan for what this should look like and especially planning for services and parks out that way. So, I appreciate your efforts.

McCarvel: Okay. Any other questions for staff? Okay. And point of order to my legal counsel. We are taking public testimony on this this evening?

Starman: Yes.

McCarvel: Madam Clerk, do we have anybody signed up to testify on this application or this --

Weatherly: Madam Chair, we do. There are several people signed in. I will just call them as they signed up. First up is Jeff Hatch. I think he left. Mark Bottles.

Bottles: This mic or this mic? Both of them are live?

McCarvel: They are both -- both are live as long as you are close enough.

Bottles: Okay. Good evening, Chair and Commissioners. My name is Mark Bottles at 839 South Bridgeway Place, Eagle, Idaho. First I want to thank all the city staff, Brian and Caleb and the Mayor and everyone at the city that has contributed to get here tonight. We are extremely excited about the Field Sub Area, what we believe is really the last best area of Meridian and the planning that's gone into it. I'm here tonight with Jim Houk from Kimley-Horn; Deb Nelson and Emily Mueller, who is in my office, to discuss in greater detail some of our specific comments to the plan. Is there -- Brian, can you put up this -- do you have the slide for -- map just showing the parcels? Thank you. Together with several partners I -- or control approximately 630 acres in The Fields Sub Area. This represents almost a third of the developmental ground in the entire Fields district. We are invested in this area. Very excited about the plan and partnering with the city to make this a vibrant place to live, work and recreate. We are excited about the pathway system that's going to connect it all together in the park. After engaging with the city staff and Logan Simpson over the last year, we are left with only a few, but important comments to the plan prior to its adoption. These comments are primarily focused on the Star-McMillan center, which partner owns 62 acres of that. If we could go to that slide. If we have got the right one. Yeah. There we go. Thank you. The neighborhood center, which is adjacent to the current city limits, my partners are ready to bring this application in within the next six to 12 months. We are very excited about the center. We share the city's vision for the neighborhood, community center with walkable retail streets, with direct connection to adjacent neighborhoods and to the community pathway system, which it will be located on. While we -- while we cast vision for this area for the next five, you know, 20 and 50 years of the plan in the future, the plan should allow flexibility and

creativity in the mix uses and the design standards to respond to the market demand that will support and maintain the economic viability of the center. I'm very familiar with the successes and struggles of centers throughout the valley and -- and believe allowing the center's development to be driven both by the city and by the city's vision and the market demands, this will be key in allowing us to bring this center to life, so we are excited. I'm going to have -- introduced to you Jim Houk with Kimley-Horn, who I think should be on on Zoom. I guess that's what we call it.

Weatherly: Yes, sir. I'm transferring him over now.

Bottlers: Okay. Thank you.

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

Houk: Thank you, Mark and Chairman and Council -- Commissioners I should say. We appreciate the opportunity to -- again to -- to share in this adventure with the city and the planning efforts that the city has put forth. As Mark had mentioned, you know, the -- the town center is an important part of the puzzle and even as Brian, excuse me, has outlined, you know, it becomes kind of a cornerstone for a lot of what's being envisioned for the community and we are excited to be part of that. I think what I would really just stop and say is we think, you know, from our planning efforts and as a team and working with the city, there is -- there is alignment. There is a great alignment that's going to make this very possible and it's exciting to know that Mark and his partners are in the position to really bring this plan forward in the near future. So, we are excited to be a part of that. We are excited to also share with you some -- some initial thoughts tonight. This bubble diagram was -- was provided as an additional version or concept of what's possible out here today and we are excited that city staff has allowed us to bring our own ideas to the table and show how maybe what one other version might look like for the town center as a -- as a -- as a whole. We understand that -- that through this alignment we are going to provide, you know, great pedestrian and auto connections east, north, south, west from the center, really encouraging the multi-modal options, but also eliminating some of the traffic concerns that we, you know, are all experiencing on the major corridors today. But what we are really talking about, too, here is about the principles of creating -- creating place. One of those buzzwords out there in the planning world. Sense of place doesn't always happen overnight, it takes time, it takes people living there, it takes, you know, time for places to get ownership and a sense of authenticity and we think moving the plan forward we need to make sure that the language continues to support those options, supports new ideas that we haven't even thought about yet moving forward and we appreciate Brian's efforts to talk about the limitations or changing the language a bit on prescriptive tones within the original draft that we were reviewing with them. Moving forward we want to recognize that -- again, that the plan should recognize the time that it will take to mold the community as we -- as we talk about the market forces, but also giving time for the neighborhoods to begin to develop and for the housing mix to kind of evolve and we are encouraging that the plan continue to reinforce that language, opening up the opportunity -- opportunities for a series of potential opportunities around the town

center as it relates to the mixed use and how that begins to take shape. So, we would continue to just -- and ensure that the document clearly states how that vision and the town center will move forward, but also that -- that there are options on the table, as Brian had mentioned, that really will embrace some of the things out there from the market standpoint, but also from the residential development perspective. I want to move on to the next slide real quickly. This slide was really just introduced as a way to give some perspective on -- on the Bown property and the development that's happened there, you know, that we -- when we talk about envisioning a plan and moving it forward, it really comes based on, you know, what our history has been, what we have experienced, success and failures, and as planners, you know, we -- we talk a lot about lessons learned and I think in this case, you know, we can see the -- the success, but -- but also the evolution of how the -- the project has gotten to where it is today and just for reference also the -- the spread that you see before you on the aerial, it's about two and a half acres, and that same two and a half acres -- and, then, that's reflected over here on the bubble diagram as a -- just I guess for reference and perspective on what the town center here potentially could be and how it will maybe evolve with the main street, the connections to the greenway, as well as the civics pieces there in blue. We even envision kind of celebrating the agricultural history of the place and encouraging civic space for commerce markets and things of that nature, but also recognizing that as we move forward we want to -- my screen is frozen. Sorry. The bubble concept we think in this case, as well as the one that's shown in the plan, really begins to celebrate those connections that are important to the overall vision for the plan. We believe it's important that the sub area plan continues to be flexible and nimble, enough to develop over time and that's where we really have been talking more with Brian and staff and team about just making sure that some of the language is -- will benefit options in the future, really support the benefits of new business and new housing opportunities that will be coming to The Field at some point. So, with that I think we are grateful for the opportunity to share this bubble concept with -- with you all and the opportunity to share and can be part of the development of this plan and we think it will be a great -- a great next steps for the City of Meridian. With that I will be open to any questions, but, if not, I could -- I could pass the mic on.

McCarvel: Any questions for this testimony? Okay. Madam Clerk?

Weatherly: Madam Chair, I believe it's Deb Nelson.

Nelson: Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, Deborah Nelson. My address is 601 West Bannock Street. It's a pleasure to be with you this evening. We are here to support the plan. I'm here on behalf of the team that's representing the current landowner and developer and we do -- we are very grateful for the process and opportunity to weigh in on this. We do have some relatively minor, but very important adjustments that we are asking you to address and my focus this evening is to talk about some of this prescriptive language. You know, Brian addressed that this is supposed to be a high level planning document. That's its purpose and we completely agree. There is just a few places in the plan where we would suggest some of the language doesn't accomplish that goal of being a high level planning document. Instead, it gets prescriptive to the point that it operates more like a zoning ordinance and could limit market opportunities, could limit innovation.

So, I want to highlight a couple of those areas. First on -- on page 315, addressing the center components, a particular language that we asked for some change on, if you look under on the right you can see where the plan language says under main street style -- and here is just a very prescriptive sentence of two to three story mixed use buildings fronting a curved street running east-west. You know, we would just ask that rather than prescribing the layout and the building types with this level of specificity, instead you address -- you address design qualities that are desired here and how to accomplish those. So, we suggested language more like -- that incorporates innovative design and uses based on market demand with on-street parking and pedestrian oriented streetscape. You know, requiring the two and three story buildings can not only stifle that innovation, but really limit market interest and you are trying to develop a successful commercial center here. Commercial uses are particular about building height and often do prefer a single story frontage opportunity and you can still achieve with that single story appearance the same main street feel that's part of the architectural theme here and that's really illustrated well by these types of examples. Single story retail. They activate the streetscape without overpowering it. They encourage walkability. They still have that great interface with the pedestrian and the street frontage and they really capture the theme of this plan as set forth of contemporary rural thematic that's really sought here for the commercial. So, you can accomplish that, whether it's one, two or three story buildings, we just asked that that not be so prescriptive. The second area that we wanted to focus on is on page 420 of the plan. Design standards. Here there are some -- within the recommended action items, which is, really, a place where the -- the plan is calling for the development of future architectural standards. We recognize that that's calling for a future action, but the direction that's given here about what should be in those standards is very prescriptive and we would just ask for some minor changes on the first two bullets to incorporate flexibility, so that when the people come together, the city is working with stakeholders and developing these architectural standards, which, of course, our developer is excited to be a part of, that they haven't started out of the gate with too many rules in place before they even get there. You can still incorporate these great concepts, but we ask that it includes some language such as, you know, incorporate material such as, but not limited to. So, you give the guidance for how they are going to develop these standards. The third bullet was probably the most concerning I guess to us, because it seemed like the most prescriptive, where it says to discourage or allow only a very limited use of -- and, then, it lists quite a few materials. These materials are commonly used in high quality, innovative developments and still are used in ways that can meet these -- these character goals. You know, we would ask you, instead, to make sure the design standards in the plan and the resulting architectural standards are flexible enough to achieve the development that can meet those character goals, create a successful commercial area without limiting important materials for that creative process. For some examples, these are all on the restricted list. As I said, this type of material, composite siding, metal siding, cement board, they are appropriate, they are attractive and can be used in innovative and quality ways and are. The plan doesn't need to restrict these materials to accomplish its goals. In fact, a good architectural standard, you know, can and should work for a variety of materials and particularly in today's market conditions where supply of materials is so limited. You know, let the architectural design come through without arbitrarily cutting out these basic materials used day in day out in

commercial developments. And so with that we thank you for your consideration of those changes. We are very supportive of the plan and the process. Appreciative of all the work that Brian and everybody on the city staff has put into this and their welcoming of our input and they have been very receptive to that. So, very appreciative. Just focusing on a few details that we ask you to consider. Thank you.

Weatherly: Madam Chair, Emily Mueller.

Mueller: Good evening, Madam Chair and Commissioners. Emily Mueller. 839 South Bridgeway Place, Eagle, Idaho. And I will just be wrapping up the last couple minor comments that we have to the plan from this ownership group. The two main requests that we ask to be addressed in the plan include Table 4-A, which is an overview -- overall development program table. Staff did address some of our concerns that we have had in the interim over the last several days with comments that Brian shared earlier. However, with those comments it is still unclear to us what the purpose of this table really is. Is it a target four square footage or is it just an estimate or a record of what's been done? And, additionally, it's unclear how the figures were reached to us and we have had additional follow up with Logan Simpson, which we really appreciate, but we would like that to be included in here and -- and it's hard for us to replicate those -- those estimates or those -- those figures and so while the plan -- so, yeah, the intended use of this table I think is the primary concern here, it not being clear, and -- and while some of the added language that staff included says that this is -- is to estimate -- this is to estimate a table, it still is used to consider the overall development of the area and while we agree that it's important to balance uses and consider the area, while paired -- while that language is paired with these really specific numbers, it's -- it can be confusing and problematic. So, we would request that this table either be removed or that it's revised to explain how these figures were reached and add a statement that the table reflects estimates and doesn't present standards for consideration of future development applications. Our final request is regarding some of the recommended action items on page 4-11 of the plan and the first bullet point here suggests that a specific action would be to limit single family developments per planned use designations and our concern with this clause is that it's somewhat of a blanket statement about -- about product type. Single family product is consistently being refined with denser product types. I live in a neighborhood where my single family home is smaller than the townhomes in my neighborhood and so we feel that this was more of a blanket statement on a product type, instead of the goal, which is to include density where we need density. The second bullet point recommends codifying standards -- stronger standards for a maximum percentage of land use dedicated for residential within mixed use areas and we would recommend not including this. It would really be the first time that there is maximum standards prescribed for residents in mixed use and we don't think that precluding residential will bring commercial. Market brings commercial. And so we don't think that that is an appropriate action item moving forward. I have included here a summary of our recommendations just for convenience. I also have a handout for you. The most important of them being the invitation we got to submit a concept of our desired development that is consistent with the -- the aesthetic of the plan to include and so that is our first and our primary recommendation, the plan that Mr. Houk went over and the rest of our recommendations are summarized here. So, if I can

give these to you. With that I or any member of our team, if you have a specific question for a member of our team, can stand for questions. Thank you.

McCarvel: Any questions at this point for the current testimony? Madam Clerk, do we have anybody else signed up?

Weatherly: Madam Chair, we do not.

McCarvel: Okay. I'm thinking just as we go forward on this discussion -- I don't know that we really opened -- point of order, sir. We haven't really opened a discussion, so we don't need to close the public hearing, because this presentation was not really an application.

Starman: Test. Test. I think it was advertised as a public hearing.

McCarvel: Okay.

Starman: Or staff can correct -- planning staff correct me. I think it was advertised as a public hearing. So, I would consider the testimony you received this evening as part of that public hearing. You can ask if there are additional members in the audience or on Zoom that want to speak, but after that I would -- I would say just close the public --

McCarvel: Go ahead and --

Starman: Or continue to where ever the Commission's desire might be.

McCarvel: Okay. Would the Commissioners like to leave the public testimony open to ask more questions or close the public hearing and move on with deliberations?

Seal: Madam Chair, I have a few questions.

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: Just for staff and Brian specifically, I mean we have got -- we have got a big list of things that we could make a motion out of, but, personally, I would like these discussions to happen between the folks who gave the presentation and staff and for us to not be an intermediary in that, unless staff basically says, yes, we agree to everything they say.

McClure: Commissioner, this is the city's application. Our consultants have delivered to you what they feel is in the best interest of the city. Public testimony is important and I would encourage you to consider and listen to that, but at the end of the day it's not really a negotiation at this point, it's whatever you think is best. So, staff's happy to talk to the -- some of the stakeholders in the area further, but I'm not in a position to necessarily negotiate the details of those. It's sort of we have given to you what our consultant feels -- feels is best and if you think some of this is valid or would like to have some discussion about it we could, but I'm not going to be in a position -- I'm not in the best position to go through those further. They have given most of this to us previously. We understand and

feel that a lot of them are valid and understand and recognize them, but there is usually reasons for why some of them were not made. Maybe I will have to defer to Caleb as to -- yeah.

Lorcher: Madam Chair? Oh, are we --

McCarvel: Yeah. Go ahead, Caleb.

Hood: I don't have much to add, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. As Brian mentioned, we have -- we have met with the folks that have testified thus far on this project. It's not that we don't agree with some of their -- their comments, we thoughtfully have considered them. Some of them we could make. I think at this point, though, it's good to hear back from the Commission on what you think is in the best interest of the city and what you have before you now is what we are proposing to move forward. But no hard feelings if there is additional changes. You have questions and want to talk about some of those we are certainly happy to do that.

McCarvel: Commissioner Lorcher.

Lorcher: So, are you -- are you willing to make any changes to the recommendations that have been made or are your design -- your presentation for the city final? These bullet points that they have brought forward to you. You have listened to them. Are any of them open for consideration or you have already considered them and made your designs --

McClure: We have made some -- some recommendations based off some of these already. They are in the list of staff recommended changes in the staff report. For example, to the table -- they have reviewed that and they -- it's still not where they like it to be and that's fine, but we have made the changes that we thought were appropriate. If you guys think more changes are appropriate that's certainly within your purview, happy to have specific discussions about them. But this table is more for you than it is for me at this point.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Grove: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Grove.

Grove: Brian and Caleb, is this document that we have been presented, what is its long term use in terms of being amended or modified as we go? Is it, you know, in line with like a comp plan where you don't want to go back in and make significant changes as, you know, things on the ground change or is it a recommending document more than anything else where changes are okayed a little bit more? I'm kind of thinking like the Ten Mile Specific Area Plan or whatever that -- it's not as rigid as some of the other documents that are out there. So, what are -- what's the long term use of this document?

McClure: Commissioner, I don't think we ever want to change the plan more than necessary. It is -- this plan would be a text amendment, because it's adopted by reference. Well, actually, I'm not sure -- we would generally consider it a text amendment to modify the plan. Text amendments aren't as difficult now as the map amendments, which have a restriction. Staff can change the text whenever we want, so if there is an appropriate time the staff can do it. Development interest, stakeholders, anyone can make a request to change the text of the plan. Long term reason for the plan is just like the Comprehensive Plan, it just has some additional areas of focus that sort of deal with the unique conditions of this area. So, this is not a future land use map plan. There is -- there is no element of that here. It would just be text to modify the plan. Does that help at all?

Grove: It does. Thank you.

Hood: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Caleb.

Hood: I would just note -- and maybe you are getting there. I just want to make sure we -- we have other folks in the audience. I imagine they are here for -- to testify, but this is a public hearing, so if you are willing to take additional public testimony we would certainly like to hear that, too.

McCarvel: Oh, absolutely. I thought we had gone down the road. Sorry. We had no more that were signed up; right? Okay. Anybody else in the room that would like to offer comments?

Wessel: Madam Chairperson, Commissioners, my name is Tim Wessel. I live at 5080 North Baylor Lane, directly in line with where all this is going to happen. We have been here for two years. This is the first notification whatsoever that we have ever received of any of this. So, not good with communication, I guess. I come from the service side. I'm a retired fire chief out of southern California. Thirty years in the fire department and I would have been strung up had we not communicated with people in the area better than this. There is talk of high density housing directly across McMillan from our street and, then, with the high density housing comes a lot of things that are not nice. Higher crime, trash and all kinds of other great problems. I just would hope that in the future going forward with this project that those of us that are living in the middle of it are going to be contacted and be talked to and asked what our opinions are, because so far we haven't been. I just really hope that in the future as this moves forward -- because I know that things can change and things will change as this whole process goes forward. But I really hope that there will be an effort to talk to those of us that are going to be directly impacted by this, because this is going to directly impact us. I live on a street with seven houses. There is a cornfield in front of us and a farm behind us. So, we are going to be impacted by this. I just really hope in the future that -- that you guys will take the time to make sure that we are talked to. Thank you.

McCarvel: Okay. Madam Clerk. Oh, you said we had nobody else. Is there anybody else in the room? Sorry.

Ross: Madam Chair, Commissioners, my name is David Ross. I live with my wife at 5595 North McDermott. Couldn't have said it better. Our first notification was that postcard we got in the mail as well. Large impacts. We understand that development is coming and it has to come. Commissioner Grove, you brought up a very significant issue and it is Highway 16. To our knowledge no one has got Idaho Transportation Department involved in this process either. So, we are on the north side of this, but when we first saw that map on the postcard that has us in your impact zone in your Comprehensive Plan, we are here tonight just to go on record that we oppose any annexation.

McCarvel: Okay. Anybody else in the room that wishes to testify on this? Madam Clerk, did we have anybody online that is raising their hand?

Weatherly: Madam Chair, we have one person. Warren Ryrie. Warren, you should be able to unmute yourself and state your name and address for the record.

Ryrie: Yes. My name is Warren Ryrie. I live at 8478 West McMillan in Meridian. My wife and I own the property that's -- that's on the northwest corner of McMillan and Star Road. My concern is is that as this project began it appeared that the intent of the planning was to maintain more of an open, even an agricultural appearance for this land and preserving that -- that openness and that type of lifestyle that is so important and has been so important in the development of this area and as what I see happening here and even more today with some of the changes is an intense effort to move towards high density -- very high density housing associated with that and it appears to me that the comments that have been made by the folks that live in this area and that own property in this area, other than Mr. Bottles, has not been listened to and we do not agree with the -- with the shift towards such high density housing development in -- in this area. Thank you.

McCarvel: Madam Clerk, anybody else online?

Weatherly: Madam Chair, not that I see.

McCarvel: Then could I get a motion to close public hearing on H-2021-0047.

Seals: So moved.

Grove: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to close the public hearing on H-2021- 0047. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Lorcher: Madam Chair, I have a question for staff.

McCarvel: Commissioner Lorcher.

Lorcher: In regard to the designation and the gentleman who was on -- I think McDermott in regard to annexation, nothing's being annexed. Correct? It's all being discussed as far as just a designation. But in order for the parcel to be annexed it would have to be brought forth to the City Council or the Planning and Zoning; is that correct?

McClure: Commissioner, that's -- that's correct. There are no proposed land use changes. These were all adopted with the 2019 Comprehensive Plan and there are no proposed annexations. This is a text amendment only.

McCarvel: No. Sorry.

Grove: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: It's not you, it's the process. Mr. Grove.

Grove: Madam Chair. I would just like to make a point of reference here for the last three that presented. I know that it might feel sudden, because you hadn't read the documents or weren't in the area when some of the decisions were made. But this was part of the comprehensive plan that was an 18 to 24 month process that was formally voted on by the City Council on 2019. So, a lot of this was discussed prior to that. It was part of that larger Comprehensive Plan. So, just saying -- just want to make a point of order that a lot of this documentation and conversations have been had for many, many years and that's where some of these discussions came out of with the document that they are presenting tonight.

Wheeler: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Wheeler.

Wheeler: I -- I for one would kind of like to see -- like Commissioner Grove pointed out -- that this was something that was done in a process for, you know, 18 to 24 months. City Council take a look at it. Had I'm assuming focus groups go through the verbiage, things of that nature. I'm for one that would kind of like to see their plan that they have accepted kind of play out in this area, personally speaking. I'm looking at also just one of the points here under item one, about -- about being two to three story, mixed use buildings and a front. I go through Bown Crossing and those are all two story buildings as you drive down that street. Personally I kind of like the feel of that, rather than the single stories and the flats on that. For me, it's kind of -- and everything deals with ratios and some restrictions one way or another. We do that with open spaces. We do that with parking. We do that with densities all over and -- and that's what holds on to the community to make it viable for generations to come and to me that's part of what the Council underwent for two years in getting this input, going back and forth, putting it together and they came up with this verbiage in their mind of how this community in this four square mile block could look and really benefit. So, for me I'm -- I'm more of one that

says, hey, I would like to see this play out and if something comes up that needs something, then, it can be adjusted at a CUP or something at that time when something is submitted. But to go through and change the text is not really something I'm in support of.

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: I would like to thank staff and for the people that are feeling that this is all at once and that things are kind of being forced on you, like Commissioner Grove said, there has been a process in place to go through this. It took several years in order to get there. Unfortunately, we can't notice the entire city and the Comprehensive Plan literally dealt with the entire city area of impact. It is something that was very public that had a lot of involvement and in the end the properties that you have don't have to do anything. You don't have to annex, you don't have to sell, you don't have to do anything. You will be impacted, because, like you said, it's coming. I mean it's coming and, you know, I have got things -- I have got a nice farm field out in front of my house. It's not going to be there anymore. So, I'm in the same spot that you guys are. So, it's part of living in Meridian at this point in time, fortunately or unfortunately, depending on how you -- you know, how you view that. What the city and staff are trying to do at this point I personally commend, because there has been a lot of areas where people don't -- didn't get a notice in their mailbox until stuff was getting built. So, you all -- all of a sudden had multi-family sitting out in front of your doorstep, where they are trying to corral this in, set up a plan to where it looks good, instead of having pathways like the one that exists between Ten Mile and Linder Road that's like being on the Greenbelt that dead end and go absolutely nowhere. That's one of the ones that I ride all the time. They are trying to get in front of this and trying to make it something cohesive, something that's going to blend into the community and not just be an add on as more garage farms basically. So, I like the idea that they are going through this or trying to get in front of it and everything. I do have some reservations about the recommendations that are coming in. I mean I think some of these are good recommendations. But, again, I'm not a city planner. I mean I understand that there is reasons why they may not have taken these recommendations in, but I -- I don't have enough information to really know if that's the way that it should lean or not, to be perfectly honest. I mean as a Commissioner I would like more information on why some of these are or are not good recommendations, why they shouldn't be included. I know there is some things -- just the way overall amount of amendments to what's being submitted tonight has me thinking that this isn't ready. There is a lot of stuff that you guys submitted to change. There is a lot of things that are being recommended to change. I just don't think this is ready to go forward in its current iteration. I think it could use some more work, because I will use -- I will use the same thing on this as we do on developers as they come in. We get one chance to get this right. So, let's get it right.

Yearsley: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: I wholeheartedly agree. For me I need to take time to review what they are asking and kind of go back to the plan and have a chance to better review it to better understand what's being asked of us before I feel comfortable making a decision.

Lorcher: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Lorcher.

Lorcher: Looking at this map that they handed out today -- and if you break it down into little sections, over 67 percent that is being recommended as high density. Do we really need another -- and when we say high density, aren't we talking about things like multi-family housing, multiple stories, people kind of on top of each other with -- with shared spaces and there is definitely a need and a place for that in our city and we have seen a lot of that along the I-84 corridor and the Ten Mile interchange. But this quiet little farmland out in the middle of the edges of our town, do we really need another blast of high density housing? I just don't -- you know it -- it needs to be gradual where we have our density and, then, we kind of level out a little bit, so that the -- the history of Meridian and what we are about and the farmland has some existence. Otherwise, we lose what Meridian started as. So, I'm opposed to this plan in regard to -- I like The Field idea. I love having another city center out there. But surrounding it with high density housing and not having any medium or low density housing indicated at all would be a horrible addition to our city out in that area.

Grove: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Grove.

Grove: We are not litigating what's already been put into the Comprehensive Plan. We are -- we are litigate -- we are talking about the text that kind of clarifies some of the points that are already there. So, we are looking at this not from a five year standpoint, but more of a 50 year standpoint. What does this look like in 50 years? How is this built out to make the community sustainable? In this general -- like in this area we are looking at two major highway systems that are -- are at the northeast corner of this property -- or this general area. We are not talking about an annexation. We are not talking about a subdivision. We are talking about a general area that has much higher level pieces and I think if we start getting like sucked into the bubble plan that was out there or any of the images, then, we are kind of losing focus on what we are asked to be looking at tonight, which is a much larger, long-term piece of planning than what we are typically charged with looking at. It is much more complicated, much more nuanced in a lot of ways, but also a little bit easier, because we are not saying, okay, this is exactly where that road goes, this is exactly what this needs to look like, we are -- we get a chance to create an entire -- you know, they mentioned a sense of place and that is something that is not always available to us when we are doing smaller developments or looking at, you know, even a one square mile part. We are looking at four square miles here. We are looking at this from a long-term perspective. One of the things that Commissioner Wheeler said kind of resonated with me in thinking about, you know, the market might not do right now

the one -- you know, they want the one story. That makes sense. But does that have that long term viability for our community if we think about how does something redevelop, how does something have character, how does something have identity as we move forward and I think we need to take a few steps back and -- and look at what this document is, what it is being added to and why we are talking about it.

McCarvel: Any other comments or motions? I'm thinking on the general consensus we want a little more time to read through and digest what we have been presented with tonight. It is text amendment to the plan. It's not annexing or approving a plan at all tonight. Or with this presentation, so -- but there is significant text changes that they are asking us to look at and I think probably warrants some time to think and compare.

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: Yeah. I would like more time, but I mean, essentially -- I mean I would look at a continuance so that they can include all of those into their submission with anything that they also agree with from the group that presented tonight. That way we can have one comprehensive document in front of us that we are -- that we know what, you know, they are willing to yield on, what they are not willing to yield on and maybe some explanation as to why. That would be very helpful in this, because, again, just, in my mind, trying to make a motion of this with everything that we have been presented is -- it's not within my possibilities.

Starman: Madam Chair, I'm not sure how the Commission wants to proceed tonight and you will figure that out shortly, but I did want to -- maybe for the Chair and for the Commissioners, if you do decide to table us and come back, you may want to consider reopening the public hearing and continuing it, so you can take further testimony. You don't have to do that if you just want to deliberate amongst yourselves in two weeks, that's fine as well. But if you do want the opportunity for additional public input interaction, I would recommend that you open the -- reopen the public hearing and continue it.

McCarvel: And we need to do that to hear from staff as well; correct? To reopen the public hearing?

Starman: I missed the first part of --

McCarvel: We need to reopen the public hearing just to even hear from staff; correct?

Starman: I think if the Commission is just deliberating and has specific questions to staff, I don't think you need to reopen the public hearing for that, but I think if you want to take --

McCarvel: Additional --

Starman: -- feedback from the group that spoke tonight or from the public in general, then, you ought to do so.

McCarvel: Okay. Let's start there. Would the Commission like to keep the public hearing closed or reopen it?

Grove: Madam Chair, I have a question real quick. Are we approving or are we recommending approval?

McCarvel: Recommending.

Seal: We are the recommending body for this.

Starman: Commission is being asked to make a recommendation to the City Council.

McCarvel: Yeah. To the -- yeah.

Yearsley: Madam Chair, I think it would be --

McCarvel: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: -- advantageous to open the public hearing back up and -- and in doing so I would make a motion to open the public hearing.

McCarvel: Do I have a second?

Wheeler: Second.

Grove: Second.

McCarvel: It's been moved and seconded to open the public -- reopen the public hearing on H-2021-0047. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Yearsley: And I guess the next question I would have is when do we want to continue this to?

McCarvel: Yeah. The next available is October 7th. Madam Clerk, can you tell us what -- is that one already stacked or should we go onto the next one?

Weatherly: Madam Chair, currently on October 7th with the continuance of the Burger King CUP there are six hearing scheduled for October 7th.

McCarvel: Okay.

Weatherly: After that is October 21st. There are currently five hearings scheduled for October 21st and that date has not been noticed yet, so it's possible the Planning Department could add on another application.

McCarvel: Okay.

Weatherly: I could, Madam Chair, make a recommendation to the Planning Department that they don't add anymore applications that night if you want to continue this one. I'm happy to do that for you. I think Caleb could help me out with that.

McCarvel: Okay. I'm guessing the 7th is not just a whole bunch of small ones.

Weatherly: Madam Chair, so we have the Burger King conditional use permit. So -- let me get to my list. A small rezone of less than an acre and a short plat. There is an expansion of a wood products business on 3.1 acres. There is annexation and zoning of ten acres with a rezone of 6.84 acres and a preliminary plat on that one with 65 single family detached buildings, et cetera. There is an apartment's conditional use permit for multi-family consisting of 164 units on nine acres. On the 21st if you want to know what -- is that good enough?

McCarvel: Yeah.

Weatherly: Okay.

McCarvel: Okay. Next motion, please.

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: I move to continue file H-2021-0047 to the date of October 21st, 2021, in order to provide a more comprehensive summary and include any modifications in the plan before submitting back to Planning and Zoning.

Yearsley: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to continue H-2021-0047. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

McCarvel: One more, please.

Yearsley: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Yearsley.