

Yearsley: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Yes.

Yearsley: I move -- I move we adjourn.

Seal: We are not quite done yet.

Yearsley: Oh, we -- we have one more? I thought this was the last one. My apologies.

Wheeler: We will let you do the last motion, since you haven't done any today.

Yearsley: All right. I was getting excited.

11. Public Hearing Continued from September 16, 2021 for Fields Sub-Area Plan (H2021-0047) 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.

Seal: All right. And we like to pick on Caleb, but I mean that -- that's just going too far. All right. We would like to -- at this time we will open up the public hearing for Item No. H-2021-0047, Fields Sub-Area Plan, which was continued from 9/16/2021 and we will start with staff report.

Hood: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission. If you don't mind I'm going to pull this down, so I can talk and a little bit easier to hear. So, I'm Caleb Hood. Brian McClure is here as well. We have 48 slides, but just because Commissioner Yearsley is in such a rush we will go ahead and, you know, make sure we run through each one of those, so don't worry, you don't have to listen to me the whole time, Brian's going to take about half of them, so -- no, we don't have 48 slides. So, as you -- as you mentioned, Mr. Chair, this has been continued from your September 16th agenda. You asked us to meet with the applicant, discuss some of the concerns they brought to your attention during that meeting and we have done so and I know there is a letter and we have members in the audience that will address you, so I won't go too much into the detail, but we have met with them and good -- good productive meeting and thanks to Brian and -- and the Mark Bottles team for -- for putting up with us as well. So, there is a -- there is a letter in your packet and Brian will touch on some of the details, but I do want to spend just a second setting the stage a little bit more. This project is something that the City Council did ask us to -- to take forward as a continuation of the Comprehensive Plan that was adopted in December of 2019. I need to stop calling it the new Comprehensive Plan, because it's almost two years old now, but it's still relatively new, but they did want us to put a finer point on some of the existing land uses that were adopted with that plan and

go through the specific area plan. So, we retained the services of Logan Simpson to help us craft the specific area plan that's before you this evening and the text of that plan was -- well, the plan itself will be adopted by reference in the text of the Comprehensive Plan. So, that really is the request we have for you tonight is to amend the text of the Comprehensive Plan. Brian's going to summarize a little bit more of what the plan is, but I want to just remind you what this isn't or doesn't do and they are on the slide there, but this is not a future land use map amendment. There was some conversation last month about that. We aren't proposing to change any of the map designations on the future land use map. Again, we are -- this -- the intent of this plan is to put a finer point on the existing map designations. And, then, we aren't proposing to annex any property with this. So, if you are eligible for annexation, this doesn't change that at all and, again, we are just trying to provide some of those details. So, again, without belaboring the point, we believe we have done what you have asked us to do. Brian's going to, again, summarize a little bit more, just because it has been a month, but we are asking for your support tonight and I will turn it over to Brian, unless you have any questions of me.

Seal: No, sir. Thank you very much.

McClure: Thank you, Caleb. Good evening. This slide here helps to provide some geographic context. I'm putting this up front this time. The image -- the image shows the region, the location of the Fields on the left and, then, the adopted 2019 future land uses on the right. As Caleb previously mentioned, the future land uses drive -- are driven by the Comprehensive Plan and these drive densities and more broadly the uses in the area and we are not touching those. As we discussed at the last hearing, the Intermountain Gas liquefied natural gas tank is a big deal. That's called out for reference and the Williams pipeline runs past it. Northwest and southeast through the city. The candy striped line on the -- on the east -- right side of the image there, is the future State Highway 16. You had a question for Bill earlier. The answer to that is next summer. So, they -- they are expecting to start construction on that soon. Now, there is three different -- three different phases of each -- of each project. They may start this -- the north part, the south part, or in combination, but they are going to move on it. That -- State Highway 16 will only have crossings Ustick, Chinden, McMillan, and Five Mile Creek within this area. As previously mentioned, they are moving forward. Star Road down the middle of the area has a river crossing and is planned for five lanes. ACHD is actually going to be making some bridge improvements to support that here in the upcoming years. They are working on the design right now. I probably neglected this area a little bit too much in the last meeting, so I will just try again here. The purpose of this plan is to ensure that the Fields area implements the vision of the Comprehensive Plan and is vibrant, self sufficient and distinctly Meridian. All the unique location, specific circumstances and challenges in this area are opportunities when consistently channeled and furthered within the context of the plan. Said another way, the sub area plan is about the relationship and integration of uses, with a key focus on central neighbor -- on a central neighborhood center, services and accessibility. Finally, a large part of this plan is just how we accomplish this and most of that comes down to money and partnerships. We have already had two discussions with the Council on that point. It was kind of a quick recap. Next up is a specific text amendment request and, then, some recommended changes to address the various

plans. A big request, as Caleb mentioned, for Commission tonight is to adopt the Fields Sub-Area Plan by reference into the Comprehensive Plan. This is what that looks like. It goes on page 3-3 of the -- of the beginning of that document. Along with a text amendment we have some recommended changes to the draft sub area plan. These are a result of discussions and comments with other agencies and stakeholders and specific to the sub plan -- the very plan itself. The first group of recommended changes were either included in the staff report or recommended at the September 16th hearing. Specifically we had a few changes to address some comments by COMPASS. We continue to recommend those. The second group of changes came as a result of Commission's requests to meet with the Mark Bottles team and after the last public hearing. Staff believes these changes address some of their biggest concerns by making it clear that the defined vision isn't tied to a specific solution. There is flexibility in how we reach the goal and, hopefully, these changes not only alleviate stakeholder concerns, but serve as a reminder for future entitlement and development decisions. All these changes, except those to address COMPASS comments, were included in the memo on 10/15 that we sent last week. We will step through these quickly in reverse order. This, again, is a new change. These were covered in the memo and, again, came as a result of working with the -- Mark -- Mark Bottles team. The block of text here shows and describes the wants and needs for the main street concept within the Star-McMillan center. The purpose of this section is to provide the vision and describe need, but not intended to be prescriptive. The only will statement included in the text was not brought up as a concern, but has been revised to help in consideration during future review by others. There are many ways to approach these concepts and ideas. There are many ways to respond to the needs and goals. Nevertheless, staff believes that the strength in the underlying text address stakeholder concern, clarify that they aren't explicit or prescriptive in all conditions and does so without undermining the need for a clear vision with appropriate context. We still want the main street. We still want to make use of the pathway integration and we still need an intensity of uses that provide for the geographic consolidation that many of the services that the existing and future stakeholders will need and want. This slide here was not an original stakeholder request. The recommendation by staff came about in discussions with the Mark Bottles team about the types and balances of uses. This small area of the yellow product identified as housing, it's highlighted in pink, now shown as purple, near the central commons. That could have just as easily been purple, which is why we are revising it. The mixed use allows for housing. Simply stated, the reason we changed it is because we want to continue to convey that there is flexibility. Showing specific buildings of similar sizes and specific color sort of lends itself to -- well, that we were being specific and we really weren't. The graphic shown here has been revised since the original was presented to Planning and Zoning Commission as part of the September 16 public testimony. After several iterations by the Bottles team, staff is recommending the concept shown as an additional exhibit in this draft Fields Sub-Area Plan. The balances of use -- the balance of uses, which is very important, is generally supported in more detailed concept by the project consultant, but also conveying to future decision makers that there is flexibility in the final design. A future development application would still need to be considered as a plan text. Elements such as integration with linear open space, authentic pedestrian experience, and so on. Basically a main street. The October 15 memo goes into this first bullet point quite a bit,

but, stated simply, this wording does not disallow any materials. That was the original primary concern in public testimony. The next step would be to better define this and related policies for the Fields area. Many of the materials listed on page 420 in those action items of the sub area plan can be really cool. Unfortunately, they are also frequently abused when you consider our administrative design review process. It provides a fast lane for review that meets minimum level of effort and, then, if you want to be innovated you go through more traditional design and discretionary review process. For the second revised action item, 411, the one on the bottom there, staff and the project consultant are fine with removing that one. The future land use map already does this. If you don't want to meet the density -- the plan density ranges you can apply for a map amendment. These changes are not addressed in the staff report. So, these are the older ones by COMPASS and I neglected include those in the memo last week. But we continue to recommend those, so if you make a motion to recommend the approval of this, please, consider the slide here. And these are all just clarifying comments to address the COMPASS comments. This screen and the next are both in the staff report and the memo sent last week 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 is more of the same. This, again, was all in a staff report and in the memo. So, that's the abbreviated presentation. Staff recommendation is to consider all the changes outlined as presented and included -- includes the original request in the staff report, the changes to this COMPASS comments and additional changes in the 10/15 memo. We are happy to revisit context and slides from the previous meeting or to respond to any questions.

Seal: Thanks very much. Do we have any immediate questions? Mr. Wheeler, go ahead.

Wheeler: Thank you, Chairman. I'm sorry, I missed your first name. I apologize. Brad? Is it Brad?

McClure: Brian.

Wheeler: Brian. I'm sorry. Brian. I'm still learning things here. So, thank you very much. So, Brian, on the -- on the map amendments -- or not the map amendments, but all the verbiage and things like that, you said that there was like a letter that was attached to it; correct? That's going to be added in on it; is that correct?

McClure: I'm not sure I understand that. I apologize.

Wheeler: Is there -- that was -- that was added to it; right?

Seal: Right. Essentially that's -- everything that he's come through tonight is addressed, essentially, in the letter that -- that was submitted, with the exception of what he has listed here as the post 19/16 -- or 9/16 memo.

McClure: So, Commissioner Wheeler, yes. So, there was a memo sent last week on the 15th that identified all the changes that we just showed you, except for the ones from

COMPASS, which I added to the slides here tonight.

Wheeler: Okay. So, that was the one that was saying that's going to be part -- okay.

McClure: But those ones were from the previous public hearing as well. So, they have been reviewed by -- before. Or considered anyways.

Wheeler: Okay. I guess I had a couple questions about some -- some of the changes on there. Like one of them had to do with -- yeah, you can -- if we can keep on going back a little bit to one of the further slides, because I kind of took a look at this, too. Yeah. Go -- we can start right there. And just kind of thought through it. One of them was -- I remember one of the comments that was made was right here, which you guys struck here was the two to three story mixed use buildings. That was something that they -- that -- that some of the stakeholders were like, hey, this is something that might hurt development or something along those lines. I'm trying to envision myself going through some of the other developments around, like even in Meridian, and thinking about going through -- like even The Village and thinking of walking in and seeing single story, you know, just brings kind of a different aura to it and so -- but seeing something that's larger that has kind of that facade stone on it just kind of gives it a different kind of a feel and so I'm kind of curious on what was the -- what was kind of the thought on why we -- why we don't want to have two to three story mixed use buildings in that pathway or that driving path there.

McClure: Commissioner, thank you for the question. So, the intention is to still have some of that. The original language -- the stakeholders felt that it implied that in all conditions that would be there and that was not our intent. It still needed to -- to -- some of it still needed to generate the intensity of uses and the opportunities for all the services we are looking to support, but it doesn't necessarily need to be there all the time either and so the way that's captured now is down below where it basically says -- I lost it. Authentic opportunities for retail or office on the ground floor and residential and/or office uses above. So, we are still encouraging that, we are just not requiring it at all conditions, which was never the point in the first place.

Wheeler: Okay. All right. That sounds good then. And, then, we can go ahead and bump forward just a little bit here. I'm just trying to make sure that I'm understanding some of it. Go ahead and go forward again, if you don't mind. I'm -- one of the graphics there. Yeah. I think this was something that some of the other testimony kind of spoke -- spoke about was some of the -- just really high density dwellings or zoning in this mile by mile block in this area specifically, that it didn't kind of phase down to single family dwellings, that it didn't phase into something different than just exclusively apartment style or very dense residential zonings and I understand that the stakeholders have interest on that, too, but what about the -- you know, some of the other testimony that was given on that about, hey, can we try to spread out some of the density that's in these areas and things?

McClure: Commissioner Wheeler, again, thank you for the question. So, as we said

before the land uses here are adopted as they are, they do have a range they are seeking. Part of that is very purposeful, because through -- part of the analysis that the consultant did was to understand what sort of rooftops we needed to support the center that we were looking for. It is envisioned that we have some medium high density residential out here, including multi-family. However, those plans did not depict those in all areas or -- and did not indicate that they weren't transitioning. You can have a variety of product types in the medium density residential, including things like patio homes or townhomes or row homes. There is an opportunity for a lot of diversity in housing out here. It doesn't have to be multi-family. I think you would expect to see more of that in the urban housing or close to the road, but we are not setting that right now. We have concepts and things could happen that way, but we still have the policies in the Comprehensive Plan that fall back on to -- which say things like transition.

Hood: If I can just build on that for one second. I want to go just back -- put that in context a little bit more, because this was also I think something -- the scale of that last graphic kind of gets lost a little bit when we are zooming into that area so much and I want to just put that, again, in context a little bit. It doesn't look like this mouse can do it. But, Brian, if you can kind of just highlight what was just on the screen, when you are talking here, it is just, basically, that brown area right there. So, we are talking four square miles. This is that much of one of them. So, there is density here, but when you look at it overall, the vast majority of it is still medium and low density residential. So, I just want to put that scale back into context for you that we are not talking, you know, a huge community or a square mile of higher density, we are talking about the neighborhood center and the scale of that here in that area.

Wheeler: Okay. Okay. That helps me out on that, too, then. Thank you very much. But is there going to -- so, they can, obviously, have some of the high density apartments there and, then, they can transition that out, like we have seen a couple times tonight, even with like the patio or row homes, is that -- as it goes down further into the mile block, so to speak?

McClure: Commissioner Wheeler, there is lots of ways to transition with roads and landscape buffers and creeks and pathways, than just having different size homes next to each other. The comp plan certainly speaks to having a transition of uses, though, and the land use plan requires a transition of uses just by having them stagger like that. So, it doesn't concern me at all, but --

Wheeler: Okay. And, then, yeah, go forward if you don't mind, please, again. Okay. So, I -- that makes sense, then, on that other one there with the limited single family development on that. That sounds good. Is there a reason -- but it also let me speak to the other thing that's crossed off there on the very top there -- or composition siding into commercial structures. Was there a reason why composition siding was something that didn't want to be used in this?

McClure: I'm not trying to blame the consultant, but I'm not really sure. It's -- it's -- it's a pretty common material and it's probably overused and I think the desire was to have

something elevated and more distinct and not just have a primary material be that. The only way to require that as is, though, would be to specifically put that into a development agreement, because you get to our administrative design review process, is not one of the disallowed materials. So, it's sort of a -- it doesn't do a lot, unless -- unless the Commission and Council want to get really specific.

Wheeler: Good. Good. Okay. And, then, just if you don't mind moving it forward again, please. That's fine there. And, then, just one more time, please. Yeah. I think those were my -- really just my biggest questions that I had in that use there. So, thank you.

Seal: Commissioner Grove, do you have something?

Grove: Yeah. I was just going to provide Commissioner Wheeler with a little more context for the -- some of the planning that went in three, four years ago or whenever it was. But looking at this four square mile area, the comprehensive planning committee spent a lot of time on this -- these -- this section in looking at how to make sure that there was high density areas close to the expressway and being able to also tie into the school system with the high school and the elementary and keeping it close to that area and making sure that it didn't end up, you know, just a sea of single family housing and so that was a big piece that came up multiple weeks during that two year process.

Wheeler: Thank you. Then -- yeah. And that was, I guess, some of my leaning in to try to understand this. We did get the paperwork to take it home, took a look at it, you know, to try and understand it and a lot of it for me was just to make sure that that intent that was originally done there isn't getting, you know, pushed out or getting moved to where all of a sudden, as something has a first splash in this area, that that's going to set a tone and, then, it's going to be the tone that we are all going to want to -- hey, kids, look over there instead when you are driving by it or it's just not going to give the feel that we wanted in this area and so that was some of my -- more my questions were at was just making sure we weren't getting off too much -- or at least from my perspective getting off too much of where the initial intent was and what the vision was that -- when everybody was going through that, so --

Seal: Commissioner Yearsley, do you have anything?

Yearsley: Nope. I'm good.

Seal: Do we have anybody signed up for public testimony?

Weatherly: Mr. Chair, we do not.

Seal: Anybody in the audience would like to come up? No? With that, Caleb, do you want to close or -- all good? All in all good? Excellent. At this time can I get a motion to close the public hearing.

Wheeler: So moved.

Grove: Is this a public hearing that we need to close? Okay. Second.

Seal: Okay. It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing for Item No. H-2021-0047, Fields Sub-Area Plan. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Okay. Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Seal: Anybody have any additional comments or motions? Mr. Yearsley, you can throw one out there.

Yearsley: Are we approving this or recommending --

Seal: Then you can get onto your next one. I know you are in a hurry for that, so --

Yearsley: Are we approving this or recommending approval to City Council?

Seal: I think we recommend approval to City Council on this and the graphic that's on the screen will be helpful in making a motion.

Yearsley: Hold on. I'm trying to juggle screens.

Seal: That's okay.

Yearsley: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend File No. H-2021-0047 as presented in the staff report to City Council -- recommend approval to City Council for the hearing date of today with the following modifications: To include the original staff report changes. Add COMPASS changes and the post 9/16 memo changes.

Wheeler: Aye.

Grove: Second.

Seal: Okay. It's been moved -- moved and seconded to approve Item No. H-2021-0047 Fields Sub-Area Plan with the aforementioned modifications. All in favor say aye. Any opposed? Okay. motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Seal: Commissioner Yearsley, I just want to say thank you very much for stepping back in tonight and helping us make quorum. We really appreciate you doing that.

Yearsley: My pleasure.

Wheeler: I second that.