

Meeting of the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission of February 5, 2026, was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Vice-Chairman Jared Smith.

Members Present: Commissioner Jared Smith, Commissioner Matthew Sandoval, Commissioner Jessica Perreault, and Commissioner Matthew Stoll.

Members Absent: Commissioner Maria Lorcher and Commissioner Brian Garrett.

Others Present: Tina Lomeli, Kurt Starman, Bill Parsons, Linda Ritter and Nick Napoli.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

<u> </u> Brian Garrett	<u> X </u> Jessica Perrault
<u> X </u> Matthew Sandoval	<u> X </u> Matthew Stoll
<u> X </u> (Vacant)	<u> X </u> Jared Smith
<u> </u> Maria Lorcher - Chairman	

Smith: Good evening. Welcome to the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting for February 5th, 2026. At this time I would like to call the meeting to order. The Commissioners who are present for this evening's meeting are at City Hall and on Zoom. We will also have staff from the City Attorney and City Clerk's Office, as well as the city's Planning -- we also have staff from the City Attorney and City Clerk's Office, as well as the City Planning Department. If you are joining us on Zoom this evening we can see that you are here. You may observe the meeting, however, your ability to be seen on screen and talk will be muted. During the public testimony portion of the meeting you will be unmuted and, then, be able to comment. Please note that we will not -- we cannot take questions until the public testimony portion. If you have a process question during the meeting, please, e-mail cityclerk@meridiantcity.org and they will reply as quickly as possible. If you simply want to watch the meeting we encourage you to watch this streaming on the City's YouTube channel. You can access it at meridiantcity.org/live. With that let's begin with the roll call. Madam Clerk.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Smith: The first item on the agenda is the adoption of the agenda. There are no changes to tonight's agenda. Could I get a motion to adopt tonight's agenda?

Stoll: Move to adopt today -- tonight's agenda as presented.

Perreault: Second.

Smith: It's been moved and seconded to adopt the agenda. All in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

1. Approve Minutes of the January 15, 2026 Planning and Zoning Commissioner Meeting

Smith: Consent Agenda. Next item -- the next item is the Consent Agenda, which includes to approve the minutes of the Planning and Zoning Commission on January 15th. Could I get a motion to adopt the Consent Agenda as presented?

Perreault: Mr. Vice-Chair, so moved.

Stoll: Second.

Smith: It has been moved and seconded to adopt the Consent Agenda. All in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

ACTION ITEMS

2. Public Hearing continued from December 18, 2025 for Syringa Crossing Mixed Use Development (H-2025-0007) by Hawkins Companies, generally located at the northwest and southwest corners of S. Meridian Rd./US69

- A. Request: Annexation of 62.43 acres of land with R-15 (9.76 acres), R-40 (18.01 acres) C-N (2.07 acres), C-C (9.12 acres) and C-G (23.47 acres) zoning districts.
- B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 8 building lots on 24.46 acres of land in the proposed R-40 and C-C zoning districts.
- C. Request: Conditional Use Permit for a multi-family development consisting of 322 residential apartment units on 16.35 acres of land in the R-40 zoning district.

Smith: Item No. 2, H-2025-0007, Syringa Crossing mixed use development has requested a continuance. So, they are requesting to continue this to February 19th due to the site not being posted correctly. So, may I get a motion to continue the application to February 19th?

Stoll: Mr. Vice-Chair, I move to continue the hearing for H-2025-0007, Syringa Crossing Mixed-use Development, until February 19th.

Perreault: Second.

Smith: It's been moved and seconded. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

3. Public Hearing continued from December 18, 2025 for St. George (H-2025-0004) by Shaun Wardle and Jason St. George, located at 3870 E. Overland Rd. and 1545 S. Topaz Ave.

- A. Request: Annexation of 2.0 acres with the R-15 zoning district to construct nineteen (19) multi-family units, 7,987 Sq. ft. of commercial space and four (4) vertically integrated residential units.
- B. Request: Two Conditional Use Permits, one for the multi-family residential and one for the vertically integrated residential project in the R-15 zoning district.

Smith: All right. Item 3 on the agenda is H-2025-0004, which is a continuance of St. George on Overland and Topaz for annexation and two conditional use permits. Before we get started with the staff report I just wanted to defer to Kurt for a quick moment.

Starman: Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chair. Just for the record when this item was first heard by the Commission some time ago Commissioner Stoll was not in attendance at that particular meeting and, similarly, Commissioner Perreault was at that meeting, but had to leave early and so both didn't fully participate in that initial discussion. However, both have told me and I will just ask them to state this on the record here in a moment, but both have told me that they have had the opportunity to review the record, either the recording and/or the minutes and are prepared to act tonight. So, I think we are -- they are prepared to proceed and deliberate and vote if that comes -- if that's the Commission's desire tonight and may I just ask both Commissioners just to briefly confirm that they are prepared to proceed.

Stoll: I am prepared to proceed. I have reviewed the recording of the meeting.

Perreault: Same for me. I have reviewed all of the materials in the project folder and watched the video from the original hearing.

Smith: Great. Thank you. With that we will continue with the staff report.

Napoli: Good evening, Chair, Members of the Commission. Next item on the agenda is the annexation and conditional use permits for St. George. So, on November 6th, 2025,

St. George project was presented before the Planning and Zoning Commission. The Planning and Zoning Commission continued the project to have the applicant work with city staff to fix the outstanding issues. The applicant has submitted revised drawings and documents based on this direction and just a reminder to the Commission, the applicant's request tonight is an annexation of two acres with the R-15 zoning district, to construct 19 multi-family units and one vertically integrated residential building consisting of 7,987 square feet of commercial space and four residential units. Both uses require conditional use permit in the R-15 zoning district. So, just going to go over the changes since the previous hearing. Since the previous hearing the applicant has resolved the following issues. They resolved issues with Public Works regarding water-sewer easements and separation requirements and provided updated floor plans meeting the requirement for private usable open space and revised the landscape plan to incorporate additional details. However, there is still some existing -- or new issues that have not been resolved. So, the applicant did revise a landscape plan. However, it still does not meet all the design standards. I did talk with the design -- or their landscape architect. They are aware of what they need to do to bring that into compliance. But currently at this time I have not received those revisions. And, then, concerns still persist regarding functional integration with surrounding properties. In addition, staff is asking the Planning and Zoning Commission to carefully consider whether traffic generated by the development is appropriate given the existing conditions and access points. However, the largest new concern continues to be focused on the open space around Five Mile Creek. Since the previous hearing the applicant has been in discussions with the irrigation district about piping the creek and the feasibility of a bridge. The irrigation district did indicate that piping the creek was possible and a bridge may be pending the correct approvals. However, the UDC does prohibit piping natural waterways and as a result staff is not in favor of piping the creek., So, if -- if the Planning and Zoning Commission is going to be recommended approval tonight we ask that you do not pipe the creek, because the UDC prohibits it. So -- and so if the Planning and Zoning Commission is in favor of the updated -- the new plans staff has recommended that Five Mile Creek remain open without a bridge and the northernmost unit on Building A be removed to incorporate additional open space and three amenities, one from each category, be located in the open space north of Building A and this would be Building A. Right -- this would be what we would be asking to be removed for more additional open space. And we have not received any written testimony since the previous hearing and I will stand for any questions you guys have.

Smith: Is there any questions for staff? All right. Would the applicant like to come forward?

Wardle: Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chair, Members of the Commission. Shaun Wardle. 2239 East Griner Street on behalf of the applicant for the St. George project. We appreciate the opportunity to work with staff on a continuation. We believe that we have solved all of -- the majority of the technical issues. Our landscape designer did speak with Nick and is -- is aware of our deficiency there and will be submitting a new plan. So -- so, that's submitted. We have got 19 multi-family units. We have got 8,000 square feet of commercial space and, then, four vertically integrated units here. We feel

that -- that that meets the Comprehensive Plan's focus and goals for not just density, but for a mix of uses and -- and we think it will be a nice addition, especially along that Overland frontage. As part of our application -- our last discussion was over the bridge and a proposed bridge, which would access our amenities across that bridge and so we went to the Nampa-Meridian Irrigation District, we worked with them. One of their solutions was to what they call pipe and cover that particular waterway, which would, frankly, be their -- their preference from a maintenance standpoint and -- and we talked about this particular waterway in an urban area. We also went to the Parks Department to discuss the -- effectively what would be mandated as a pathway. There are a couple issues with that. The Parks Department has told us that they don't want the pathway constructed as part of this -- as part of this project and they are not sure which side of the -- of the ditch it would go, if they want it at all, and --- and one of the considerations there is if you look at -- if you look at Five Mile Creek from Topaz, as it meanders through the business park, there really isn't a solution and -- and when it gets to Eagle Road, of course, it dead ends and -- and how would you get over Eagle Road; right? So, the Parks Department is -- has effectively said let us figure that out. We have an easement with the irrigation district if we choose to do a pathway and so we -- we feel like we have attempted to -- to meet those requirements. We -- we have submitted two e-mail communications from the -- from the -- the -- excuse me -- from the irrigation district, both with which allow us to, one, pipe and cover, but we have got some federal permits to do. I will point out that ACHD did pipe and cover the ditch on Topaz and received a 404 permit there and so we are working with those entities to -- to -- to make that happen. We do have permission from the neighbor to the south to pipe and cover that portion as well, which would be a requirement of the irrigation district. So, the -- the new comment in terms of not being allowed to -- to put a bridge, which wouldn't allow us to access our property, was -- was new and -- and wasn't something that we had considered within our plan. So, we are here to -- to have that discussion and I would stand for any questions.

Smith: Thanks. I will start. Any -- any Commissioners have any questions for the applicant? So -- so, I guess I -- I have one question around this. It seems so -- trying to get to the bottom of this, because it seems like this is -- if I had to guess might be -- kind of one of the main points of contention. NMID seems to be okay with piping. It's not in the UDC. It seems like there is federal permits is what you are -- you are saying. I guess where -- where is the rub and where is the -- what I'm trying to understand is -- for what reasons does the UDC prohibit it and are they accounted for in any way kind of --

Wardle: Mr. Vice-Chair, if I might -- just before Nick answers. If I might make -- so, one of -- one of the -- one of the things about this particular application is -- is if you -- if you have been out there and seen the waterway a lot of people individually in Five Mile Creek -- how it runs through to my neighborhood. I live in Woodbridge and -- and the developer did a nice job of developing a pathway. I walk my wife's dogs every day down that particular pathway. This portion of Five Mile Creek, which runs through the business park, runs through Topaz, Rolling Hills and, then, effectively across the freeway is -- is not that aesthetic that I believe that the UDC and the -- and the

Comprehensive Plan would -- would anticipate and so that's one of the reasons that -- that the irrigation district would prefer from a -- from a maintenance and construction standpoint to -- frankly, to pipe and cover it.

Smith: So, I guess to append to that, Nick, from -- from my recollection -- and you guys maybe correct me if I'm wrong -- it seems like we have done this for canals. We have been okay with piping and covering. Is it just -- is it that it's natural currently is is the main reason?

Napoli: Commissioner Smith, that's correct. Natural waterways in the UDC -- I think it's 11-3C-6 or 3-A-6 I should say, requires natural waterways to be improved as a natural amenity in the city. If they were -- obviously, Council does have a -- a purview to approve something that's not code through, you know, a variance process. There is a process to do that. But from staff's perspective, correct, we are consistent on leaving natural waterways -- improving natural waterways I should say, but leaving them open as a natural amenity. If they are going to pipe it I would like to know -- I did talk with our floodplain administrator. I don't know if that's his exact title. Jason Korn. He broke it down for me on kind of everything they would need to go through as far as federal permitting and he kind of broke down a rough timeline for me and, you know, you are looking at some -- sometimes up to 18 to 24 months, because you have to do CLOMR and LOMR and when FEMA mapped this area they actually didn't map it I would say accurately, so we would want an accurate map for this actual portion of the -- the canal -- or the -- the creek I should say. So, it's not as easy as just piping it. There is quite a bit of permitting that goes behind it that's on a federal level that even includes the Army Corps of Engineers. So, I -- I will -- I guess I will stand for any questions if you have on that additional --

Smith: That's very helpful. Thank you. And, Commissioners, any other questions?

Perreault: Mr. Vice-Chair?

Smith: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: So, our notes say that the staff still have concern regarding the open space. We received some new schematics in the memorandum that staff wrote and I was hoping the applicant could kind of walk through that with us a little bit, especially the revised open space exhibit.

Wardle: So, a couple of the big revisions were along -- were along Overland and we will have one additional revision which will -- which will have an -- an amenity there and, then, we have got open space down -- down the middle of -- of the multi-family units. The pathway there -- I guess I'm -- here we go. Pathway through here. We have also got a bike station, which will be here at the end of the units, as well as some green space here and, then, again, we are -- we are planning on having a BBQ picnic area across the other side of that -- the other side of Five Mile Creek, which is one of the reasons that we are looking at that crossing with -- with the bridge.

Smith: Commissioner Stoll.

Stoll: Shaun, are you okay with staff's other recommendations regarding the project? Their memo?

Wardle: All the recommendations with -- with the exception of -- of the removal of -- of the bridge. We -- and we understand -- I -- I guess the question for this -- for this body is if we were to -- to want to pipe and cover that would -- is -- is that a consideration at the Council level or is that a -- okay. So -- so, we would ask that -- that -- that we be allowed to -- to move forward with that issue. We can do some additional research on -- on what that looks like and make a -- make a better presentation on -- on that and so the only -- the only recommendation within the staff report that we wouldn't agree with would be the removal of the bridge and we have -- we have submitted evidence that the Nampa-Meridian Irrigation District will allow it within their parameters. They have some pretty strict parameters.

Stoll: But just to clarify, the bridge would only be necessary if the Five Mile Creek wasn't covered?

Wardle: Correct. Correct. Yes.

Parsons: Mr. Chair?

Smith: Yeah.

Parsons: Just -- just clarification if, Nick, you can go back to that -- that exhibit. So, the reason why we bring this to your attention is we -- we believe that this is an amenity for the project. I don't want the applicant to think that we don't -- the concern we have is that it's in the floodway and nothing can be built in the floodway. So, theoretically, as it stands today I don't think anyone could approve a bridge to cross the creek in the floodplain. I don't know how you permit that. Unless we go through that mapping exercise and -- and determine that it was mapped incorrectly or whatever work ACHD did corrected that situation and now it's no longer in the floodway. We don't know that. We don't have that information. So, that's the difficult part for us. That's why as staff we are like, well, if we can't -- you could still count this as open space if you leave it natural. The code says you can. That's -- it's just whether or not the Commission wants to incorporate more usable open space into the development. If you recall with multi-family standards the applicant has to provide X amount of open space based on the square footage of the unit. So, again, if the Commission finds that that natural area still meets the intent of the code you can approve it that way or if not you can stick with staff's recommendation and say lose that unit and put the -- the amenities or add more open space per the intent of the code. We are trying to get it to integrate a little bit better. I like that the applicant testified that the Parks Department doesn't want the pathway either. It's such a small segment it makes no sense to build such a little piece of that pathway. It's better to get the easement and deal with it when we have more land and incorporate that with the rest of the property. So, I think that's a wise decision.

That's why Nick, staff, we have said leave it natural, leave it alone. We know there is challenges with the floodway. We don't know what those are. Nick and I aren't experts, but the best thing we can do at this point from our perspective is leave it alone. Leave it a creek. Don't disturb it and we will get the right permitting and figure it out later. But, again, that process takes time and, then, as part of your -- a part of the Commission's purview tonight is whether or not this is the right time to annex the property. Do you feel like is that something you feel comfortable with just leaving it natural and dealing with it later as parks suggested or having the applicant lose units in favor of more open space and relocating those amenities, because it may even be difficult to put those amenities in that floodway. I mean typically we want to leave those as undisturbed.

Smith: I guess if -- if -- a question for you is -- see if there is a few options and -- and one of them on the table is potentially counting this against the open space without that kind of pipe and covering pathway. Would that -- I guess how is the bridge and pathway important for open space considerations or part of the -- the -- the broader project plan and vision -- you know, will that still work?

Wardle: I -- I believe it still works. And -- and, again, understanding that we meet -- you know, we would meet the open space requirement. That's -- that's important. We understand that. We understand it's a tight site, multi-family, and -- and -- and we knew that we had the minimums to meet there. I guess the question -- and I haven't really talked to my client about it -- is if -- if we are not allowed a bridge there, then, it effectively doesn't have access to a portion of his property, because of this ordinance -- or because -- not this ordinance -- because of that decision and so that -- that would be a consideration that I can discuss with them as we take additional testimony.

Smith: That sounds good. I think Kurt -- I might have questions for you during deliberation or something like that, but I will save on that for now. Great. Any other questions for the applicant? All right. Commissioner Sandoval, you have any questions?

Sandoval: None at this time.

Smith: All right. Okay. So, we can move on to public testimony. Madam Clerk, is there anyone signed up to testify?

Lomeli: Yes. I have Shirley Sterner. And, Vice-Chair Smith, she's indicated she is representing -- is it five --

Sterner: I am representing -- I have five listings in the neighborhood and I'm a realtor and I also -- there are three other agents that have on -- several other listings in the neighborhood and so I'm speaking on behalf of those parties.

Smith: Okay. Thank you. And before we -- we get to the substance, could you also just say your name and address.

Sterner: Shirley Sterner. I don't live in the neighborhood.

Smith: Just say an address.

Sterner: 8860 West River Beach Lane.

Smith: Okay.

Sterner: And so I am -- the people that have their properties listed -- at least the ones that I -- you know, they basically want to sell. They want the best use of their land and I think they have a right to that and so we are trying to see this project go forward and have it continued on through the neighborhood and I have heard a lot of -- you know -- and I understand people don't want to see more traffic, but three of the parties in the neighborhood have -- already have short-term rentals in their homes, which creates more traffic and there is basically a business within the community anyway, so -- and they are not ones that are wanting this project to go through. So, I think that that needs to be taken into consideration as well. So, I just want everybody to know that our votes -- many of the people in the neighborhood's votes are, yes, please approve this. Okay? Thank you.

Smith: Thank you very much. Madam Clerk, is there anyone else?

Lomeli: Commissioner Smith, no one else has signed up and nobody online is raising their hand.

Smith: Is there anyone else who would like to testify? All right. I guess would the applicant like to come back forward?

Wardle: Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chair, Members of the Commission. And -- and just to -- to clarify, if -- if we were to move the items that are effectively across Five Mile Creek and relocate them at -- at some appropriate area and -- and be able to -- to continue that as the open space calculation, my team would agree with that and -- and would be able to -- to move that around, so --

Smith: All right. Any questions -- any other questions, Commissioners, for the applicant?

Stoll: Mr. Chair?

Smith: Commissioner Stoll.

Stoll: Just to clarify. So, you would be willing to -- you would be open to moving the amenities -- I guess be north of Five Mile Creek and as long as you don't lose that building or are you open for still losing that building?

Wardle: Correct. Right. My team believes that they can move -- they can move that without losing the building -- without losing the building.

Smith: Okay. Commissioner Perreault?

Perreault: Mr. Vice-Chair. Give us a ballpark location of where those would go. And the staff made the suggestion of a specific location, but --

Wardle: Sure. I'm going to bring up our architect Jim Escobar.

Escobar: Hello, Commissioners. Jim Escobar. P.O. Box 1277, Eagle, Idaho. And, yeah, I think the thought process is if we took that area that we are trying to make as an amenity on the other side of the ditch and we move it to the north of Building A, which is the eastern most building, instead of losing a unit we still have a chunk of ground there and it's still open space. We can use it and beautify it. We can do some landscaping around that area so that the occupants of those buildings can use that space, I -- I think it's suffices and I guess my question really is for Planning and Zoning if there was a concern there with going that route versus losing that northernmost maintenance garage unit that we have currently in the design. That's -- that's the intent of what -- what I'm -- what I was sharing with Shaun and what he was trying to share with you guys.

Smith: Thank you. Nick, if you want to --

Napoli: Yeah. Commissioner Smith, Jim, so, you know, really, the thought process behind it -- for one and I -- in my original staff report really highlighted -- there is no regional park in the area, like, you know, none and as this area redevelops I don't know if there is any going to be a -- you know, a public amenity that people can use out here as far as, you know, plazas and those type of things between commercial and residential and as this area redevelops it's going to be -- you know, it's going to be projects like this where there is certain -- I wouldn't say piecemeal, but it -- it is. It's -- you know, you are getting a few properties here and there, a few properties here and they are trying to consolidate it, but it's going to be -- you know, it's -- it's in-fill. So, it is challenging. The thought process behind losing that -- that unit is provide more usable open space. You know, ultimately if you guys think what they have is adequate that's your guys' purview. Staff thinks, you know, having more usable open space is always better, especially when, you know, you have -- 23 units is really -- I mean that is what is out here. You know, four vertically integrated and 19 multi-family. So, you are going to have a significant amount of people living out here with practically no park, nowhere to walk their dogs. That's the challenge. So, I guess for you guys I would ask you to consider what you guys think is adequate for that.

Escobar: May I follow up to that quick?

Smith: Sure.

Escobar: So, my thought process is making sure, first of all, we can comply with what the code says -- whatever the zoning code says. So, I think it still complies from what I can remember from our process. The second part is make sure it's functional and usable and it's not just something on a piece of paper that nobody ever -- I mean that's -- we all want that for the benefit of the community and, then, the third point to that is it's a pretty significant impact the fact that there is not a regional park in a very heavy commercial and used area. We understand that's a challenge, but we don't feel like that burden is necessarily our challenge to face, yet we still want our community to be -- to rent, to be usable, to be a positive atmosphere. The owner's got his heart in this. He's planning actually on living on site in one of those vertically integrated residential units. So, we are not trying to skip by, we are not trying to develop the project and disappear, we want a good project. We have been working really hard with staff to be able to get there and I think the point is we can meet the -- the goals and have a usable area and we have a chunk of ground there on a road that's not heavily traveled. So, that's -- that's what I'm trying to propose, because the idea of eliminating that space is -- well, new to me as of a half an hour ago. So, I'm just shooting from the hip a little bit, too.

Smith: Did you have something? Commissioner Sandoval, any questions?

Sandoval: Nothing for me.

Smith: Okay. I guess with that is there a motion to close the public hearing?

Stoll: Move to close the public hearing.

Perreault: Second.

Smith: It's been moved and seconded. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed?
Motion passes.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Smith: I will head off with -- with some thoughts. I think as a whole the project is -- is -- I -- I think this is actually a solid project. I think being right on a -- on a -- you know, a transit corridor is -- is helpful and -- and makes a case for -- for me for density. I'm balancing a couple things. One regarding the -- the floodway specifically. I don't subscribe to the idea that something is inherently good just because it's natural. You know, arsenic is natural; right? That being said, that doesn't mean we want, you know, more developed areas to have zero natural kind of integration in them and so trying to balance that and especially with the -- the floodway considerations, I -- I -- I don't know that we have the right expertise to be able to -- to -- to judge on that and to rule on that, so one of the things that I'm considering is -- it -- it -- does that justify continuing or something like that? I don't know that it does. I think that is a conversation that regardless is going to require a council waiver if something happens up there. So, I think that's a conversation to research and -- and -- and thoroughly kind of investigate and present to Council kind of with all the -- the pros and cons, cost and benefits and

also legal rights. I have some thoughts and, Kurt, I -- I guess -- I don't understand how if you have part of your property that you can't access due to statute how that isn't a taking. Never -- never got my JD, but that seems a little bit odd.

Starman: Yeah. Mr. Vice-Chair. So, I'm not familiar enough with the -- with the site or the details to probably comment one hundred percent of that, but I would say to the extent that's the circumstance today, it's already divided by Five Mile Creek and access is limited. The city is not doing any more to -- to compound that, other than saying we are not going to allow you to make enhancements to better use it, but my take on it is that the property's already divided and has access issues. That's an existing condition.

Smith: Okay. That's helpful. And the -- the last thing I will say that I'm -- I'm kind of holding an intention is I agree it's not your responsibility to account for the fact that there is a regional park, but -- there is no regional park, but whose responsibility is it and -- and that's a question that I'm -- I'm chewing on. I think in previous contexts around mixed-use developments I have -- I have said, you know, there are a lot of projects that on their own in a vacuum are great, but you kind of can salami slice away certain things that we are looking for at a community level. So, I -- I think where I'm at is I -- I am okay with supporting this and against counting the -- the space on the other side of the creek against the usable -- against the open space, kind of what we were talking about, but -- but I think there is a larger discussion to be had about how this -- this area I think we need to kind of -- and I don't know -- I don't know what the -- what the process is, but I think some -- someone needs to account for the fact that there is a regional park. I don't feel comfortable making it any individual applicant and so I -- I'm concerned that there might need to be something at a city level, at a planning level to account for that.

Perreault: Mr. Vice-Chair?

Smith: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: I agree with you in regards to more research being done and -- and the Commission potentially not making a recommendation to leave that natural or not, just kind of allow Council to -- to go down that road, since it will be something that they will need to address with the UDC limitations. I would absolutely prefer the applicant move those amenities to another location, meet the -- the required open space, obviously, by code and I'm not as concerned about the open space, because there are some parks in the city of Boise -- there is Peppermint Park down on Cloverdale. It's kind of around the corner. There is Kleiner Park, which is really not all that far and -- and so I'm not as concerned about that. It would be nice for somebody to -- you know, place to take their dog and whatnot, but there is many, many multi-family developments in this area that -- that are surrounded by park -- parking lots and concrete and -- and just don't -- don't have that. Do I want another one that doesn't have it? No. But I don't feel like this project is like an island unto itself and -- and we are, you know, five miles from -- from a regional park. I mean Kleiner is essentially two miles, two and a half miles from there. So -- so, I'm not as much concerned about that. I appreciate that the applicant has

worked with staff to resolve some of these other variety of other kind of more technical issues, so I think I have addressed everything. If I haven't let me know.

Smith: Commissioner Perreault, I think -- I think you -- you got everything. Commission Stoll.

Stoll: So, my recollection from the public comments that we received was this -- previously this is part of a larger project that was proposed that the landowners had decided not to go forward with it and I really wish that this had been part of a larger proposal, but the application that we are dealing with today is limited to the size of this property and so those are the issues that we are challenged with trying to make a decision on. I can see staff's viewpoint on what the UDC says about natural waterways being left open and not tiling them and enclosing them, but I also can see the point of providing access to the property owner to that parcel to meet the open space. Either way from the open space calculation I think that meets that criteria that we have and I don't see a need to remove the -- I guess it's a southern building from what the applicant is proposing. As long as they move the amenities to a different location I am comfortable letting -- punting to City Council and letting them decide whether they want to enclose the waterway or leave it open. I would also like to leave the option for folks to pursue the bridge if the waterway is left open and that's -- those are my thoughts.

Smith: Commissioner Perreault?

Perreault: I would like to clarify my thoughts on what Commissioner Stoll just shared. I would like to see the -- the waterway -- if -- if this is the decision of Council, I would like to see it closed. See it tiled. I would prefer there not be a bridge over an open waterway and that's just my preference. But, again, you know, that's -- that's the decision of City Council, so --

Smith: Commissioner Sandoval, do you have anything -- any thoughts you wanted to add?

Sandoval: Mr. Chair, no, I think it's already been laid out here from everyone really well. It's interesting that portion that is pretty much cut off from the rest, but as presented I think it looks good and we should move it on and let City Council make a decision.

Smith: All right. I guess does -- would anyone like to make a motion? I can make one if -- okay. Want to leave that option on the table. Okay. So, after considering all staff, applicant and public testimony I move to recommend approval to City Council of file number H-2025-0004 as presented in the staff report with a modification to require that amenities be move -- moved to a different location south of the creek and to not make a recommendation about piping and covering and pathing the creek toward the northernmost battery. Any questions?

Stoll: I will second, just so that we can have --

Smith: Sure.

Stoll: -- discussion on the motion.

Smith: I can -- I can -- I'm happy to amend. Yeah.

Stoll: So, I think the staff report states that they would remove the one building. I can't remember what --

Smith: Yeah. So, I think that was the two options that are --

Stoll: Are you -- are you saying that you want -- you want to allow to remove the building?

Smith: No. So -- so, Nick was essentially -- and correct me if I'm wrong, but, essentially, the -- the question was if we move the amenities south do we want to count that toward the total open space or kind of require kind of -- from our discretion that they remove that additional building to kind of gain additional open space? I'm of the -- the thought that I don't think they need to remove that building. I would be in favor of -- to moving it south, not moving the unit. So, that was the intention of -- of my motion. I guess, Nick, is there anything -- okay.

Napoli: That clarifies it. Thank you.

Smith: The second stands?

Stoll: Yep.

Smith: Okay. Cool. It's been moved and seconded. All those in favor, please, say aye. Any opposed? Motion passes. All right. Thank you.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

4. Public Hearing for Tong (H-2025-0049) by Dara Tong, located at 485 E. Overland Rd.

- A. Request: Annexation of approximately 0.496 acres of land from R1 in Ada County to the R-4 zoning district. The applicant entered into an agreement with the city to annex within six months of receiving City Utility Services due to a failed septic system.

Smith: Next up is Item No. 4, Annexation -- it says Tong Annexation, H-2025-0049. We can begin with the staff report. Well -- so, we will start with the staff report and, then, we can -- no. You are good. I will call you. You are good. Thank you.

Ritter: Good evening, Commissioners. So, tonight we are looking at an annexation. So, this is an annexation of 0.496 acres of land from R-1 in Ada county to the R-4 zoning district and it's located at 485 East Overland Road. So, the applicant entered into an agreement with the city to annex within six months of receiving utility service due to a failed septic system. No new development or redevelopment of this property is being proposed at this time and the use will remain residential for the foreseeable future. There is an existing outbuilding -- detached accessory structure on the property that encroaches into the rear setback. Because no development is being proposed the applicant must either remove the structure or obtain approval from City Council to allow it to remain as a legal nonconforming grandfather structure. So, that's basically the gist of this application. They are fulfilling their duty to come in and annex with the city after receiving services. So, that's basically what I have for you.

Smith: Any questions for staff? Would the applicant like to come forward? And can we begin with your name and address.

Tong: My name is Dara Tong and the address 485 East Overland Road.

Smith: Thank you. And, then, do you -- yeah, if you wanted to add any comments or anything?

Tong: No, I don't have any comments. I'm good.

Smith: I guess I do have one question for you regarding that -- that outbuilding -- that rear building and is it -- is the -- is your intention to ask City Council to allow that to be grandfathered in, to not have to -- to not have to remove that structure?

Tong: The --

Smith: So -- yeah. So, the -- as staff was saying is you have a structure that's the structure in the rear if we are looking at the -- this building -- or this map -- this image. You have the structure here that the mouse is pointing to that doesn't conform. It's -- it's not aligned with kind of what city code requires and so if -- from what the applicant -- or from what staff is saying is that when we annex that either needs to be removed or you can ask City Council to be grandfathered in. Is that to be -- to be allowed to -- to remain there, because it was already there?

Tong: I didn't remove anything. It's just a --

Smith: Okay. So, the goal is to -- the goal is to not remove that? Is that -- I don't want to -- I just want to make sure we have a proper understanding of the conversation --

Ritter: The conversation is he wants to keep the structure there.

Smith: Okay. He wants to keep -- okay. Cool. Okay. Thank you. No, I will -- any -- any questions, Commission? Okay. Thank you. Madam Clerk, is there anyone signed up to testify?

Lomeli: Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chair. No one has signed up.

Smith: Okay. Is there anything else you would -- you would like to add? Anything? Okay. Thank you. Commissioner Perreault?

Perreault: Mr. Vice-Chair, I move that we close the public hearing for application Tong, H-2025-0049.

Stoll: Second.

Smith: It's been moved and seconded. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Smith: I guess I will just add something. I -- I think based on -- I just wanted to make sure we are clear about kind of the implications of that. I don't have a problem with letting the -- the structure stay there. I would be comfortable even recommending to City Council that that's what they do. Obviously, they can take that or leave it, but that seems fine where it is. That's the only thing that I would add. But I don't know if anyone else has thoughts.

Perreault: Mr. Vice-Chair?

Smith: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: I agree. I don't -- I don't have a concern about that accessory structure in the back and would recommend to Council that we allow that to be left.

Smith: Commissioner Stoll, Commissioner Sandoval, anything you guys would like to add?

Stoll: Just what do you guys have stated captures my sentiment.

Smith: If I can get a motion then.

Perreault: Mr. Vice-Chair?

Smith: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council of File No. H-2025-0049 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of February 5th, 2026, with no modifications.

Smith: Is your intention to -- I guess I think if you -- if you wanted to recommend that staff -- or the City Council keep that I think that would be a modification.

Perreault: Mr. Vice-Chair?

Smith: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: I wasn't of the understanding that staff was -- staff recommending that it be removed? I didn't think staff was recommending it being removed. So, I don't think we have to make that modification.

Smith: Okay. Okay. That's fine.

Stoll: Second.

Smith: All right. It's been moved and seconded. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries. Thank you.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

5. Public Hearing continued from December 18, 2026 for Shafer View Ridge Subdivision (H-2025-0047) by Gregg Davis, Breckon Land Design, located at Lot 18 of the Shafer View Estates Subdivision at the intersection of S. Meridian Rd. and E. Shafer View Dr.

- A. Request: Annexation of 15.2 acres of land from RUT in Ada County to the R-4 zoning district.
- B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 38 lots (29 building lots and 9 common lots) on 13.437 acres of land.

Smith: All right. Next on the list is -- next on the agenda is Item No. 5. That will be the Shafer View Ridge Subdivision, Item H-2025-0047. We will begin with the staff report.

Ritter: Just a second. Sorry about that.

Smith: No worries.

Ritter: Misplaced a page of my stuff, so -- so, the next item is for an annexation and a preliminary plat. It's an annexation and plat for an annexation of 15.2 acres of land from RUT in Ada county to R-4 zoning districts and a preliminary plat consisting of 38 lots and 29 -- 29 building lots and nine common lots on 13.437 acres. Apparently there is a

discrepancy in my minimum lot size. It's supposed to be 8,030. I got excited in writing these and the largest is the 24,000 square feet. So, the minimum lot size in the R-4 district is 8,000 square feet. This is your annexation exhibit. This is the preliminary plan. So, access to this property will be via Meridian Road, which is an arterial, and Mondt Meadows, which is a collector road. So, a couple of issues and waivers that are being asked for on this. The block length exhibit. There is a waiver for the block length as a block face for the proposed development on the south side of the existence street. It exceeds the 750 feet requirement between South Snowdon Way and South Mondt Meadows Way. So, the applicant will be requesting a waiver from City Council for that. And at this time sewer is not available to the eastern portion of development, but sewer -- and sewer is dependent upon the Mondt Meadows Subdivision bringing sewer to and through to the development. The final plat for Mondt Meadows has been approved already, so they will be moving forward with their final plat signature, so they can start putting those improvements in. And there is one common driveway with this development as you see outlined here. This is their landscape plan. So, we have a ten foot pathway along Meridian Road. We have a five foot pathway along the southern portion of the property with landscaping on both sides of that pathway. We do have amenities in this area. We have a playground and a bench as you can see here, along with our open space exhibit. So, they do exceed their open space exhibit. They are required to have 12 percent, which is 1.61 acres and they have 22 percent, which is 3.04 acres. So, they do exceed that. They submitted six conceptual building elevations and so what they -- buildings are designed with the elevations that create interest through the use of broken planes, windows, fenestration that produce a rhythm of materials and patterns. Design review is not required for single family detached structures, but because the specs of -- it's along Meridian Road we are asking that -- that the rear and sides of the homes that are facing Meridian be incorporated with articulation through changes in -- to a more -- the following modulation, projections, recess setbacks, pop outs, base banding, porches, balconies, these type of things that we are looking forward to break up the -- just the plain structure and as you can see from the design of these it looks like they have done a lot of that. Single stories are not included in that. So, the irrigation district -- the Boise-Kuna Irrigation District has some requirements for this application and the applicant is aware of this and the purpose of this requirement is to ensure that the patrons have the use of their water as they have historically and that no harm has been incurred from the newly proposed development. Adjoining landowners will not have their conveyance ditches altered or restricted regarding water entering or departing their respective properties. So, the applicant will have to meet these requirements with the irrigation district. They submitted a letter with these requirements. Again as this property is in close proximity to a state highway, noise abatement is required. The applicant is proposing to use the existing cut bank along Meridian Road, which will act as a berm and, then, combination with a wall extending ten feet above the -- the highway center line. There -- the fence will be designed to incorporate architectural elements and to break up this -- monotonous wall plains as required. So, they are meeting that requirement for noise abatement. And this is a table from the school district showing what the program capacity is for the middle school and the number of students they have for the elementary school and the number of students they have enrolled, as well as a high school -- the middle school

and the high school. So, we try to call out -- I try to call out what the schools have sent us, because I know this is kind of something that you guys and the Council like to see. So, we did have written testimony on this. So, Debbie Boyd submitted comments that it was like a -- a letter and had a bunch of signatures from some of the homeowners, so she was representing the Shafer View Estates HOA. So, the concern -- the safety concerns regarding this was increased traffic volumes on the existing roadways and its impact to motorists and pedestrians. The addition of homes from the proposed Shafer View Ridge and approved Sky Ranch Subdivision can be expected to significantly increase daily traffic on Shafer View Drive, since currently the single line road possesses -- poses safety hazards due to a limited visibility, especially when turning onto Meridian Road or Shafer View Drive and the view corridor is further impacted by a rise to the south. Drivers must pull past the white line for a clear view and the traffic rarely adheres to 55 miles per hour speed limit. The lack of a deceleration lane forces many to use the side medium, which is unsafe. Turning from north onto Shafer View Drive is completely -- it's complicated by blind spots caused by road curvature, making it hard to see parked cars or oncoming vehicles and she had also mentioned something about where the school bus stop is located, it used to be on Meridian Road, but they moved it inward on Shafer View Lane, helping to reduce that issue. But, apparently that's still a concern. So, based on this information staff is recommending approval of this application with the conditions that are outlined in our staff report and with that I will be happy to stand for any questions that you may have.

Smith: Thank you. Are there any questions for staff? All right. Would the applicant like to come forward. Begin with your name and address.

Breckon: Jon Breckon. 6661 Glenwood Street, Garden City. I have a presentation to walk through here and I guess, you know, a couple things to add. You know, we had a good time working through this with -- with Linda and -- and team. It's a challenging project just because it's kind of in-fill and an odd shape and you may remember when we came through with the Mondt Meadows project previously to the south -- we have been working on both of these projects together. Mondt Meadows is almost approved through land design. We are waiting on final improvement from ACHD for an easement and, then, I look forward to starting construction on that project and that's the one to the south that we connect to and I will -- I will probably go pretty quickly through some of these slides. I think Linda covered most of the overview stuff. I just wanted to add a little more detail. So, here is the Mondt Meadows project to the south and it connects to Sublimity Avenue on the east side, which is a collector street, and that -- actually, I will keep going, because I have got a better slide. Speak to that one. The zoning and how we fit into that -- that zoning context. Sky Ranch to the south has a -- has a higher density and, then, we have been in -- part of our goal on this project is to have a transition between Sky Ranch and, then, we have got some existing one acre lots on the north and east and, then, previous Shafer View project that the R-4 to the northwest there. Here is our school locations that Linda mentioned. Services. Fire stations. I have got -- that are close by and, then, here is kind of our overall plan and you can see -- you know, one of the things we did to -- to buffer the Sky Ranch to the south is have that -- that nice common area and landscape buffer with a pathway that connects from

that westerly street all the way over to the east of Mondt Meadows Way. Here is a little connectivity map that speaks to traffic circulation a little bit. Just for overall and adjacency. You can see Meridian Road there on -- on the west and we did explore options there. That letter that was sent in spoke to the access off of Shafer View Drive. We actually did quite a bit of work to change that access off Shafer View Drive, so that it would be moved further to the south, essentially aligning with where we have that proposed driveway and, then -- oh, the mouse does work. Yeah. Right here where that driveway is. We were going to -- we were going to move this -- we were going to block this off and do a turnaround and we -- we looked at that concept and we were going to move the access down here, but it ended up being cost prohibitive. So, we talked to the ITD, they were going to require us to install thousand feet of a concrete buffer, which is part of their long-term plan for Meridian Road is to have a center median all the way through there and, then, turn Shafer View Drive into a right-in, right-out. So, anyway, we -- we did make some modifications in any case there to help with the safety of it. Right now as you exit Shafer View Drive onto Meridian Road there is a -- the embankment on the south side is very -- is -- kind of blocks the view, so you can't really see the oncoming traffic very well and so you can see we have got that triangle shaped lot right there where we are going to -- we are going to grade that -- that whole hillside back, so you can -- you can see the oncoming traffic. The other thing we did was -- based on neighborhood meeting was we relocated -- we shifted this driveway connection over so that headlights would not shine into the house across the street. It's aligned with a common lot right next to it and, then, overall traffic circulation -- I don't really have a plan -- actually I think I might have a plan of -- of the Sky Ranch to the south. I can show you that later if you would like to see it. But, you know, you can see the red arrows here that show traffic connectivity and circulation. Like I said, Mondt Meadows is -- you know, we anticipate starting construction on that very soon and, then, that would be a connection point here and, then, that all connects over to Sublimity Avenue, which is a collector street and it also connects up and over to Quartz Creek, which connects to Meridian Road. Here is the block length item Linda mentioned. You know, Shafer View Drive, existing road, and, then, you know, as I mentioned trying to lay this out proved quite challenging. We went through several revisions to get it to work and -- and to get lot sizes to -- to transition as you can see and so we are -- we are slightly over that 750 foot threshold between these two access points. Another item was ACHD was -- or I think actually the -- excuse me -- the city was wanting to -- wanted us to build a sidewalk on the north side through here and kind of went back and forth trying to work that out. We had landed on doing a -- a striped pedestrian route on the road, so that we wouldn't be tearing up the people's front yards and ACHD was not supportive of that, but, you know, part of what we are planning is to extend crosswalks for -- you know, we are doing a curb, gutter, sidewalk on the south side and all the new -- within the new development and, then, connecting up to the neighborhoods to the north with crosswalks where there is sidewalk over on the -- on the west side. And I have got some detail here on utility connections. You know, water, we are connecting to the west and, then, also to Mondt Meadows to the south. Here is the irrigation or, I beg your pardon, the sewer map. So, the east side -- the way this grades out east side will sewer to the east and connect to Mondt Meadows and, then, the west side sewers to the west and connects to the existing sewer. Shafer. Oh,

Irrigation. Irrigation. This was -- this was a fun one, too. So, it was good that we go to work on both these projects at the same time, particularly on the irrigation front. There is -- so, our head gate is a little off the map here to the north and, then, there is a pipe -- you can see it right here that comes down and has historically fed gravity irrigation to this property Mondt Meadows and, then, the neighbors to the south and -- and these folks down here and -- and they -- you know, we found out as part of this and working on the Mondt Meadows project, they -- they really don't get their irrigation water just because of the grading it's just -- they -- they can't get it there. They tried and had a lot of issues with that and so what we agreed to was to do a joint pump station with a -- an irrigation pond at this location and -- and, then, do a pressurized irrigation system that would not only serve this development, but Mondt Meadows and, then, these neighbors to the south that are adjacent and so I was just reviewing that the other day. I think we have got that all figured out. This is a picture of the playground that we are proposing and the open space. Open space. And the -- and the homes. Stand for questions.

Smith: Commissioners have any questions?

Perreault: Mr. Vice-Chair?

Smith: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Can you tell us the -- the width or the -- I should say maybe the depth of that transition -- that landscape transition between -- on the south side and also kind of how the lots will line up? I can kind of see very faintly the -- the grid lines here, but help us understand more about that transition. It looks like that there is a lot of density in Sky Ranch in comparison to this.

Breckon: There is. I think -- Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, there is -- yeah. This landscape buffer through here, that was one of the reasons we wanted to have that in there is because we do have a bit of a jump on the -- on the lot sizes and you -- yes, on this one in particular you can see, you know, these are -- these are quite dense and -- and so in order to provide a nice buffer there -- now the width of it -- I don't remember the width of it off the top of my head. It's 15 or 20 feet. Is it 20? Twenty wide. So, it's -- it's comfortable I guess I would say. I think it will be -- I think it will serve its purpose there, so that we can get some sizable trees in there and -- and provide a -- a decent buffer. Fencing as well is per code. Yes. So, we have got -- see if I can remember. It would be solid fence on both sides of that, I believe, because of the backyards.

Smith: Could you explain why ACHD wasn't supportive of -- or isn't supportive of the sidewalk or -- or path on the north side?

Breckon: Mr. Chairman, yes. So, that -- I'm just going to go back to that slide. I don't know if I have a road section of it, but -- so, there is an existing road there and those one acre lots are -- they are still in the county and so county standards -- there was -- when they were built there was no requirement for a sidewalk at that time and so there was never a sidewalk installed there. There is a curb and gutter, but no sidewalk. And

so, you know, beings what it is, an in-fill project, staff wanted us to install a sidewalk along there for those -- those three folks then -- through their yard and -- and, you know, that would disrupt everything they got going on in their front yard. Anyway, that -- the -- the pathway, what we were trying to get in there, was a striped pedestrian way. So, I guess it would be similar to a bike path, right, where you have a -- a separate stripe to delineate a pedestrian area from the drive aisle, if that makes sense, and they were not supportive of that.

Smith: So, I guess to -- to -- to clarify or -- or to give additional context, in our prep meeting and make -- and to make sure I guess I'm on the right page -- in our prep meeting I was under the impression there -- there is an existing pathway coming off of Meridian on the north side that connects -- or that -- that end somewhere, is -- is that right?

Breckon: There -- there -- there is -- there is -- so, there is one -- this -- this previous phase of, you know, Shafer, this was done just a few years ago where these three lots -- this all connects up to the north and, then, these green lots here are the -- the older one acre lots and so, you know, when these -- when these went in more recently they have curb, gutter and sidewalk and so that sidewalk -- this dead ends here at the -- I -- I don't remember if it's at the common lot or at the end of this lot and so that's -- I think that's what we were trying to do is, you know, connect that sidewalk and extend it along this frontage over -- over to this east side. Now, we have got, you know, curb, gutter, sidewalk on -- on the south side and so, you know, I guess, our -- our fix or -- or whatever you want to call it was to provide a crosswalk that would connect from the north to the south and, then, you know, people can walk along a sidewalk on the south side and, then, also provide another crosswalk over on this side. So, if these folks want to walk over and enjoy the park they can -- they at least have a crosswalk there and stuff.

Smith: So, I believe we have eight feet of right of way. Is there anything -- because, personally, I don't like just that -- just nothing happening there. I don't like the lack of connection there and just letting that kind of -- just kind of be in a state of -- of being incomplete. So, we have eight foot of right of way, five feet of -- five foot stripe attached -- you know, attached pedestrian walkway. Is there anything outside of ACHD's displeasure, if they have done -- you know, is there anything that would preclude you from being able to do that if that was a requirement?

Breckon: Oh, besides ACHD? I -- Mr. Commissioner, I don't think so.

Smith: I mean I guess the question for staff is that's city right of way, is it not? Is that -- does ACHD have the ability to control -- that seems like that would also be a city -- that's city street.

Parsons: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, it's -- it's all ACHD right of way. It's not the city's purview.

Smith: Oh, it is.

Parsons: Yeah.

Smith: Okay.

Parsons: Correct. It's -- we defer to them. I know Linda and I tried hard to understand why we wouldn't do sidewalk and -- because we do have comprehensive plan policies that say complete streets are required or desired as part of the Comprehensive Plan and we all understand it's difficult when you have a county subdivision and, then, you are building around it, trying to get the infrastructure to align with what's currently in the area. Historically in these types of situations we would prefer to have the property owner's agreement, because it does impact their property. There is landscaping and those -- there is a lot of obstructions in the way and that's why ACHD kind of said, well, we are -- we are not going to require the sidewalk and so the applicant worked with us -- we thought, well, could we stripe it? They are like, well, you know, if -- we don't need the striping and so we kind of landed on the crosswalks where they were.

Smith: Okay.

Parsons: But we -- at staff we still felt it was important to have some kind of pedestrian delineation on the -- on the north side of the road, whether it was striping or the existing sidewalk and that's why in our staff report we left the condition as approved by ACHD. That way if they say, yes, the applicant can do it. If they say, no, the applicant can meet the condition, so --

Smith: Okay.

Parsons: So, we left it pretty -- pretty open-ended for the ACH -- the road authority, transportation authority, to make that -- that call. Again, this one's going in front of City Council as well, so if -- if Council -- I'm sure they will weigh in on that topic as well.

Smith: Thank you. Sorry, I was under the impression arterials and collectors are ACHD and local roads are Meridian. I know it's not always cut and dry. In this case I guess -- I guess not. It's not. Okay. Thank you. Commissioners, any other questions? Commissioner Stoll?

Stoll: So, the sequencing of all the projects is what I'm kind of struggling with. So, the -- the development to the north that was part of Ada county. Is it Ada county approved? How -- how long ago was that? And you all were -- you and the developer -- same developer did it or is it different?

Breckon: No. Mr. -- Commissioner Stoll, the -- the -- yes, the area that's in the county I think -- this -- this shows it. Yeah. So, we have got these -- these gray lots here, that's still in the county and that was done when the -- 2003.

Stoll: The Mondt Meadows is the -- you were involved in that one?

Breckon: Yes, sir.

Stoll: Is that under the county or is that under the city?

Breckon: That is city and that --

Stoll: How long ago was that?

Breckon: That was approved just last year.

Stoll: Last year.

Breckon: Yes.

Stoll: And, then, Sky Ranch -- Ranch coming our way.

Breckon: That has already been approved.

Stoll: It's already been approved.

Breckon: Yes.

Stoll: Okay. When was that? Sorry? I'm new, so -- pardon?

Breckon: 2024.

Stoll: Okay. So, how come they didn't all come together?

Breckon: Well, Commissioner Stoll, I -- I do not know. You know, we -- we tried to get at least these two to go together, but the -- the different ownership and ownership of Mondt Meadows didn't want to wait and so I moved forward and -- yes. I mean in reality if -- if we can get -- you know, if -- if we achieve approval here relatively soon on -- on -- on this project construction of -- of the Mondt Meadows and this project could essentially happen at the same time. We will start at one and kind of work our way through the other one would be kind of the expectation.

Stoll: Was there a traffic impact analysis required for Sky Ranch?

Breckon: I'm not sure about that. I -- I don't think so.

Ritter: They did not require one, because there had been one done in this area previously and so they went off of that and it was more of a rezone, so it -- because it was already annexed in.

Smith: Thank you. Any other questions? Commissioner Sandoval, do you have any questions?

Sandoval: No. Thank you.

Smith: All right. Okay. Well, thank you. Continue to public comment. Madam Clerk, is anyone signed up to testify?

Lomeli: Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chair. We have Gail Ward.

Smith: And if we could begin with your name and address.

Ward: Yes. My name is Gail Ward. 152 East Shafer View Drive. I have some pictures. Can I give them to you? Okay.

Smith: Pass them around.

Ward: Thank you. That's just some pictures that I have taken that shows you a little bit of traffic on our street on Shafer View. I was going to say that, you know, our Shafer View Drive was designed for 15 homes in a rural area. Now, you have got Shafer View Ridge is coming in with 29 homes. You have got 188 homes coming in in Sky Ranch, which there was never traffic studies done for that and you have got them all channeling and funneling to Shafer View Drive. So, you have got 230 homes coming down Shafer View Drive, which is not accommodating for them any cars -- or for that many homes. It's just a small road and as you can see the pictures that I gave you you can see when cars are parked on the street how hard it is to get by. There has been many times with those constructions of those three homes that have come in on our street that just gives you a demonstration of how we have had to maneuver to get out of our road and coming into the road. There is blind spots, there is curves and, then, as you could see at the first page it's a slope down. Even, you know, learning tonight, you know, where they are wanting to take out that one lot and making -- taking part of that hill, it's still going to be a hard one to see, because Meridian Road to the south of it from Lake Hazel -- it's got a slope, so we have to pull way out to even be able to -- oh, excuse me -- to see the traffic as it comes down and I mean they are not going just 55. I go about 55 and I -- they -- I think I'm sitting still sometimes because they pass us so quickly. And so you have to -- you can't even see them until they are up on you and if it's getting dark or dusk you -- you can't even go out, because the traffic -- you don't know which lane they are in and so you have to sit there until you are up on it and if you have got these 230 homes and they have all got at least one car or more and they are coming out on Shafer View to get out to Meridian Road -- I mean it's just going to be a nightmare. It -- it just can't -- I -- I mean it's just not going to work. Anyway. And, then, when you have Shafer -- or Costco coming in only a half a mile, that's going to increase traffic, which it's going to be even harder for us to even get out of our street. I have sat there sometimes five, six minutes just to get out onto Meridian Road turning right, not turning left, but just turning right. So, you can imagine if you have got that many cars backed up on Shafer View Drive trying to get out on Meridian Road what that's going to

do? It's -- it's terrible. And, then, learning tonight about the sidewalks, you know, to cross the street, you know, to go walking on the -- you know, the south side of the -- the road, I mean how are you going to get across when you have got that much traffic zooming on Shafer View Drive? I mean that's dangerous to have people in a crosswalk trying to even get to another sidewalk. We, as a subdivision, did you say that we would be happy to close off and -- and, you know, Shafer View Drive, which would be great. We would have to travel farther -- farther, but that's okay to us. I do understand that it's an expense for the new developer and the new subdivision, but there would be a straight line of traffic. They would be able to have a straight road to Meridian Road. It would be straight on Meridian Road. They wouldn't have to see any hills or anything. The traffic -- you know, they would be able to access a lot better on Meridian Road. even though taking out that one lot you are still going to have that incline on Meridian Road, which is going to still be dangerous for that much traffic to -- to go out onto Meridian Road from Shafer View. So, I'm just begging you to please not pass this through yet until more traffic study is done, that this is going to be an accident waiting to happen. Our neighbor got hit on the subdivision going -- with a car going a hundred miles an hour. So, something needs to be done before building can proceed. So, I beg you that you would look at those pictures, see what we are talking about and take that in consideration before this is approved. Thank you.

Smith: Thank you. Oh, if you had -- Commissioner Perreault, do you have a question?

Perreault: Yes. Thank you for being here. So, you are in the -- you are in the county parcels; correct?

Ward: Yes.

Perreault: So, I'm really surprised there is this many cars parked on that street given the lot sizes that you have. Are they construction vehicles?

Ward: Those -- some are construction, some are looking at the homes, you know, to -- for sale. But you figure people have company. We have company. And so they park on both sides. So, you got this one lane road that you are going to have cars on both sides and with the new subdivision those houses are going to be facing Shafer View, too. So, you have got houses -- we are going to be looking at more houses in front of us and if you are parking in front of your house or you have company -- and we are, you know, having company, there is going to be cars and there is going to be hardly any traffic -- you could never get two cars by, especially as fast as they go. You just -- it's going to be a nightmare.

Perreault: Mr. Vice-Chair?

Smith: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: So, cars parking on both sides of the street is allowed publicly in every subdivision.

Ward: Right.

Perreault: So, you are saying what's unique to your subdivision is that the -- that there is curves and that is making the line of sight more difficult? The applicant said that they are going to take down some of that big berm that's on the south side, so that folks can have more of that view, you know, for those coming --

Ward: It doesn't take out the slope coming on Meridian Road. There is a slope that comes down from Lake Hazel to our street and you can't see beyond that. So, that doesn't -- yes, it may open it up and you can see maybe a little bit better, but you still can't see up that hill or what's beyond that hill, so -- but that's different than our -- parking on our street. Parking on our street you are going to have cars on both sides and, then, you are going to have traffic in the middle of it. You have got 230 homes that are accessing Shafer View with cars parked on both sides.

Perreault: Mr. Vice-Chair?

Smith: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: So, I have been doing this for about ten years now and in my experience most folks try to take the shortest route to get to the main roads. So, I haven't seen the -- the map of -- it's been a couple years, so I have -- I don't remember the map of Sky Ranch and where those folks are kind of driving out to get to. I assume they are going to Lake Hazel and Meridian Road. So, I -- I don't know what you mean when you there is 200 and some homes that will be accessing Shafer View. I would be really surprised if Sky Ranch was going through there --

Ward: If they want to go to Meridian Road they can. It's accessible to them. So, if they -- otherwise they can't get to Meridian Road. They would either have to go to Lake Hazel or they have to go towards Locust Grove. They cannot go to Meridian Road unless they access Shafer View Drive.

Perreault: Yes, they can -- if they can access Lake Hazel, then, they can make a right onto Meridian Road at the light; correct?

Ward: That is correct. So, I'm sure all the ones closer to Lake Hazel will do that, but the ones closer to us -- probably going to be using our road.

Smith: Commissioners, any other questions?

Ward: Thank you.

Smith: Madam Clerk, is there anyone else signed up to testify?

Lomeli: The next person signed up is Marv Ward.

Smith: And if you could state your name and address for the record.

Ward: Excuse me. Marv Ward. 152 Shafer View. Thanks for taking our -- our comments, Commissioners. This has been quite a -- a process for us and our subdivision. Even a few things have come to light tonight that weren't expected as far as some of the things that have been proposed that we had not heard of recently. As you have heard, the -- the road design is -- is fairly old. From edge of asphalt to edge asphalt is only 32 feet. So, if you park a car on each side you have got -- you can't get two cars to go past that. The main -- the main problem is -- if I can get this -- is there another -- well, anyway, coming into Shafer View right here that -- that -- coming off on Meridian Road you are about four or five foot difference in height for Meridian Road to the -- the height of Shafer View. So, you are coming into there, you are coming on and as soon as you make the little crest on there it makes a right turn and, then, you go about a house length, a house and half length, and, then, you make another left turn. So, it's -- it's -- it's kind of convoluted in there and with the traffic on Meridian Road nobody hits that little hill at 15 miles an hour, which is the posted speed limit -- or 20 miles an hour, so it's -- it's all kind of coming around there and I am just a little worried about what's going to happen with this extra traffic and the Sky Ranch has no access to Meridian Road without going through a different subdivision of some kind. That down here -- where did my -- where did my mouse go? There it is. Right in here there is -- there is no access. The reason for the proposal was to -- to allow the traffic that's -- that's -- the street that comes in off of Sky Ranch and goes up into this was to put that little road right there, because right where that road is -- is -- it's flat with the little hill that's there. So, people coming down Meridian Road past Lake Hazel coming down and it has a little dip down, so if you are down in our little dip and looking to the -- to the south you can't tell exactly where all those cars are coming from. At night when the headlights are on you can't tell which lane those folks are in until they are almost there. So, that's -- that's been a -- a real -- a real big concern. I mean we -- we deal with it now, because that's what we are used to. Have been there for 22 years. But it just keeps increasing with all the traffic that's coming. So -- so, the line of sight with -- you know, we don't always know when people are visiting. If you have cars on both sides emergency access equipment is going to have a hard time. So, anyway, those are kind of my thoughts and I appreciate your time.

Smith: Thank you. Commissioner Perreault, do you have a question?

Perreault: Vice-Chair, yes. I think I remember you from the application to the -- or the subdivision to the north. Did you come?

Ward: I was -- I was going to thank you for that, but I didn't think any of you have been here on -- when we did that, so --

Perreault: Oh, my goodness. No, I have -- I have been either on Planning and Zoning or City Council since 2017. So, I remember a lot of these.

Ward: You did make some concessions for us when we put those three lots there and I do appreciate that. I have -- so, that was -- that was a good consideration. But now they are kind of in the middle of that whole thing that's going on, so --

Perreault: I do remember having a lot of conversation about this access and the slope and no left turn lane into -- into the subdivision and I'm -- I'm not recalling off the top of my head what concessions the developer made, but I was of the understanding that they were supposed to -- to -- to make some improvements to that, so the line of sight was better. Is that not the case or --

Ward: Nothing was changed as far as the line of sight for the road. All of the entryway has stayed exactly the same as it was when that approval was made. The one concession that the -- that the Council -- City Council made was for them to put in circular driveway or some way, so that they didn't have to back out onto the road. Well, there is no circular driveways in those three houses, but they do have kind of larger driveways, so that they could back out of the garage and -- and come out forward. So, that they kind of -- they kind of did that, but it wasn't exactly what City Council recommended at that time.

Perreault: Okay. Thank you.

Ward: Yeah.

Smith: Thank you very much.

Ward: Thank you.

Smith: Madam Clerk?

Lomeli: Mr. Vice-Chair, the next person is J.R. Hawkins.

Smith: Would you state your name and address for the record.

Hawkins: J.R. Hawkins. I live at 7034 Catfish Creek and that was my mother-in-law and father-in-law and we go over to their house and visit on a regular basis and when I -- we have been going over there with the new construction, with the contractors just parking their vehicles besides those, that's when it was a real eye opener of it doesn't take much traffic to where that's going to end up being a very dangerous area and I just wanted to stress to you guys, please, do a proper analysis of that street before opening that up, because I hate seeing -- and I have seen it time and time again -- where we go the easiest route -- it's not always the best route and, then, when something bad happens, then, we change it and I just really wanted to, please, stress do a proper analysis of that street before we open it up to more traffic. Thank you.

Smith: Thank you. Excuse me. Thank you. Madam Clerk.

Lomeli: Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chair. The next person -- I apologize with the handwriting I can't quite tell. Is it Oriole or -- first initial O. Last name starts with an M. I'm not sure.

Smith: And if we can get your name and address for the record.

Morgan: Dave Morgan. 498 East Shafer View Drive. I'm also the acting president for the last 20 years now for Shafer View Estates. So, kind of speaking also for the other, what, 13 homes that aren't here, so -- yeah. As far as the entrance on that, I know that's -- it doesn't meet current view corridor requirements for that. A lot of thing is, too, since the houses on that do face, you know, south you will have company that does -- going to park on -- you know, they park in the front of the house if somebody comes over, which, then, narrows that down. Whereas if you had the entrance more to the south those lots are aligned -- that's the sides. So, just basically -- basically cars can come in, get in, you are either going straight or -- oops. Sorry. Off to the left. So, it makes the flow a little bit better with that and, like I said, we were willing to -- the whole subdivision have it blocked off. You could even put a nice bus stop down there, because a lot of times we do get -- of course in the winter it's not just the kids coming out and the parents come down, they park their cars and, then, wait until the bus gets there and, then, let their kids out, so -- which cranks it down and I do know in wintertime a lot of times we have had -- I have had a couple cars run off into our entrance trying to turn in, because they are -- you know, they are going probably too fast for the situation, but a lot of times even coming in in dry conditions if they are not -- you know, everybody is going -- they -- I think that's highway -- not Highway 69, it's probably Interstate 69 is what it's kind of turning into, but -- and I do know that's supposed to go seven lanes here at some point at least to Lake Hazel and I'm guessing that will probably go maybe all the way to at least first phase for Columbia due to Shopko being in there. So, I think an entrance more to the south -- and if they need to do -- I know you may lose a lot on that. Well, then, since they are at 21 percent, take a lot out of the -- reduce the open space on the other side. Take it somewhere. They will still be within the parameters. And, yeah, the sidewalk is a new thing. I know those three. Of course, Marv and Gail will be in the first house there. The other two houses -- all your light posts that we have everybody install for our subdivision, all your mailboxes, everything is all right in that and I don't think any -- none of them really care if they have a sidewalk in front of their house just to go to cross the street to another sidewalk. You know, we have been doing it for 25 years now, so it's not that big of a deal and, then, I'm not quite sure on -- I hadn't seen before that second entrance coming in down past the third lot, if that necessarily also has to be an entrance, because that's going to tend to feed more traffic in the Shafer for the people on that side. Yeah. I guess it'd be -- oh. Yeah. Anyway right -- right there in that area there.

Smith: I got Mondt Meadows Way specifically or --

Morgan: Yeah. I'm sorry. What?

Smith: Are you talking about Mondt Meadows?

Morgan: Yeah. Mondt -- you all -- no, not -- yeah, I guess Mondt Meadows Drive. Yeah. Yeah. I didn't know we had that connecting into there, but -- that's -- of course everybody from there is automatically going to feed onto that, too. So, that increases a lot of your traffic on there. And, of course, I know for Sky Ranch, yeah, it's not everybody, but, you know, you are going to get your 50-50. So, if that's 140 homes, whatever, you are going to get at least 70 coming through there. Everybody is going to go -- if you are close to Lake Hazel you are going to go that way. So, you are still going to be over -- well over a hundred homes trying to go through that. So, that's why we would just prefer to have it -- do it the other way, so -- and we know eventually, too, we are not going to get a left out. Once they go to seven lanes it's right-in, right-out. So, it's like whatever. If it's a couple years early that -- that's -- that's okay. We know we are going to lose that -- maybe -- you are taking your life in your own hands going to Kuna, but that -- we would be okay with shutting that off now. So, thank you very much. Any questions for me?

Smith: Commissioners, any questions? Thank you very much.

Morgan: Thanks for your time.

Smith: Madam Clerk.

Lomeli: No one else has signed up and no one online has their hand raised.

Smith: Is there anyone else who would like to testify? All right. Would the applicant likes come back forward?

Breckon: Jon Breckon. 6661 Glenwood Street. I think a couple things on this whole circulation item. The one is there is a traffic study that was performed for this overall development, which -- and I'm speaking for Sky Ranch, because that's the bigger property to the south, a different developer, that -- we were not involved in that project, so I don't really know the history of that. Now, I -- I do have -- actually, let me see -- I have a print of Sky Ranch. I don't know if this is the latest version, but this was the one that we were able to obtain when we were working on planning and connectivity. I don't think this is the latest one, because I think we have since slid our southwestern connection, which would be the -- the -- this northwest connection over, but it's -- it's similar, so that we have got this for reference. One thing I would point out here is that -- actually, I will go back to the -- the previous one that I had just a second ago. I think what you will find is that traffic study contemplates what's been improved for roadways, the roadway connectivity and some of the upcoming improvements that are -- that are planned. We all know that Meridian Road is very busy and it is planned to be widened. I think it's three lanes each way, center median, and at that time Shafer View will very much change from the way that it has been historically. It will go to a right-in, right-out only and there will be a -- and we know this, because when we considered that we were coordinating with ITD and looking at those various options and so it will be impossible to make a left-hand turn to go to Kuna that way and I point that out, because part of this overall plan is that everybody will, for the most part, go to the east first and go over to

Sublimity Lane, down to Lake Hazel or up to Quartz Creek on the north where traffic signal lights are and at -- you know, if you want to go down to Kuna you will have to go down to Lake Hazel and, then, to the intersection and, then, take a left-hand turn at the light and -- and so that's -- that's an important point to make. So, Mondt Meadows coming in and in that connection to the east over through here will facilitate that connection. Solemnity Avenue is a collector road and that will -- will be signalized and, then, the other thing to consider is just the phasing of all this. The Sky Ranch, it's -- I don't know how many phases it has. It's got a lot of phases. But they will start construction on the east side, because that's where the sewer is and, then, move slowly to the west and, then, at some point, once they finish up, they will connect up to where we are -- have that stub road to the south for Standards. We have looked at many many concepts on this and I would be happy to have a -- a dead end right there where we have got that connection to the south, but that's not allowed. So, you know, I -- I can't speak for the other developers. There has been other developers involved with this, you know, the -- you know, there is the three lots to the north and on -- on the -- that -- that other Shafer project and, you know, I know one of the concessions we made there was we had four lots in there at one point, we brought it down to three and, then, the other thing I would point out here is on this -- on that corner that, you know, what we are really -- I want this thing to be safe, too. I mean this -- this is -- the way it is right now it's -- it's terrible. I have been out there. There is big conifer trees in the way. I mean you can't -- you can't see. I mean you got to really kind of watch your P's and Q's to -- to even to make a right-hand turn, so -- and so, you know, here you can see -- I mean this is all -- I mean that's why this -- we have this gigantic common lot here so that we can just cut that whole hillside back. This -- this -- this part of the road slopes and so, you know, cut -- cut that all back so that you can see and you can see what -- we moved our -- you know, one of the requirements, too, on Meridian Road, since it's an interest to the city, is to have that berm -- ten foot berm with a with -- a -- a fence on it and a nice landscape buffer and we have we designed -- we have actually designed everything from here north up to Amity, but what you will see here is that at this location, because of the safety concern, what we did is we pulled that berm back and that landscape buffer back, so that it's at the back of these lots and so this will be very very open, just turf area. So, it will really facilitate that -- that view. But, you know, all that to be said, I mean once this connection is made to the east anybody wanting to travel south will find that it's a lot easier to go to east down to Lake Hazel and, then, over, instead of trying to take your life in your own hands and -- for the -- for the short term and -- and make a left-hand turn on Meridian Road. So, they -- wanted to provide a little bit of clarity there. The -- and, then, that connection to Sky Ranch, you know, yes, we have that stub road there as we were required, but I would also note that that's -- that's a few years out as far as phasing goes before that connection is actually made and those folks will all, you know, be -- be traveling to the south and -- to Lake Hazel, because that's where the -- the light is. Stand for any more questions.

Smith: Commission, questions? Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Mr. Vice-Chair, thank you. First I want to say thank you for this presentation. We see some interesting ones and -- and your presentation is clear, so that's nice. So, I

was just looking at -- and it might have changed, but I was just looking at the colored rendering of Sky Ranch and how they -- their traffic was going to flow and if you wouldn't mind bringing up your -- your traffic rendering as well. Not that one, the -- the larger one you have. Yes. Excellent. So, the property to the south of Escalation Street is still in the county, as well as that county parcel that has the -- has the home there. and so there won't be any connection for Sky Ranch into that area anytime in the near future; right? So, we kind of have to lose those -- those connections for a while and so since that's the case anyone who is directly south of -- in -- in Sky Ranch of the -- of that first curved street that we have here, they are likely going to go up through Shafer View to get -- you know, to get out to Meridian. So, if I'm understanding correctly what you are saying is that they would need to travel all the way south towards the waterway and head out south on Sky Ranch to Sublimity in that -- in that southeast corner to get to Lake Hazel and that the motivation for doing that would be to be able to be at the light?

Breckon: Commissioner Perreault, I'm going to go to this -- on here, because I think this is what you are referring to on the circulation pattern in Sky Ranch. I don't know if it's the same one you are looking at, but there -- these connections to the south I think is what you are talking about.

Perreault: Yeah. Let me see. That -- that might have -- and so maybe that's where the difference is. It may have changed since I last saw that. So, yes, so the -- so, you are anticipating that anyone over here in this northwest corner of Sky Ranch is going to head south and hit that Lake Hazel access?

Breckon: Commissioner Perreault, I -- I think that's anybody's guess, but I think it really depends on which -- where they are wanting to go. I mean if you want to go down to -- if you want to go downtown Meridian you are -- you are going to want to get on Meridian Road and go north and so, sure, I -- I would agree that there is going to be a -- a component of people here that are going to short circuit and want to come out Shafer View and go to the north. No, I -- I think what I was trying to point out is that, you know, the phasing of -- of this project will start over on this east side and work its way over to the northwest and as such, you know, these folks are all -- well, they are right there on Lake Hazel. There is no reason for them to try to cut through the rest of the development, even if they were planning on going to the north and, then, to your point on, you know, the -- the -- the folks that are still in the county here just to the north there is this roadway connection here, but that -- or one of the requirements was to gate that off, so that -- well, that doesn't show it either. I will go back to the other one. So -- so that all these folks will be required to come out on this Escalation Street and that will -- that will -- and -- and by doing that, then, they will go on Sublimity either to the north up to Quartz Creek or to the south down -- down to Lake Hazel.

Smith: So, just to make sure I'm understanding right, that Sky Ranch thing, kind of that -- the -- and I don't know, what is -- what is the name of this I guess curved street immediately off of Meridian? So, I go to -- on to Shafer, right, and it's that -- that first immediate right. This looks kind of -- yeah, this --

Breckon: This one right here?

Smith: Yeah.

Breckon: Well, I think we have got three different street names there.

Smith: Okay. This is the one I'm referring to.

Breckon: The S curve. Yes.

Smith: It seems to me that most of the people in Sky Ranch -- just to make sure I'm reading this right -- that westernmost connection to the north at Sky Ranch is this road; right? Not Mondt Meadows. Mondt Meadows is the one that's kind of currently -- okay.

Breckon: Correct.

Smith: Okay. That's helpful. Thank you. Just wanted to make sure I'm aligned. Commissioners, any other any other questions? Commissioner Stoll.

Stoll: Not a question, but I just wanted knowledge -- and apologize. I -- for some reason I thought you all had developed Sky Ranch and that was my point of my question earlier. Now that you have clarified -- and I appreciate that clarification that you guys did not develop Sky Ranch, so --

Breckon: No problem, Commissioner Stoll, and I -- yeah, we were -- actually it was -- we had our hearing for Mondt Meadows same night as -- as Sky Ranch and, actually, we were requesting that we had a little more transition than Sky Ranch, but, you know.

Stoll: I'm fine with the questions you guys have asked have answered my questions.

Smith: Any other questions, Commissioners? Commissioner Sandoval, do you have any questions?

Sandoval: Mr. Vice-Chair, nothing for me.

Smith: Yeah. All right. Could I get a motion to close the public hearing?

Stoll: So moved.

Perreault: Second.

Smith: Moved and seconded. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Smith: Who wants to go first? Lot of thoughts.

Stoll: In-fill.

Smith: In-fill stuff. Commissioner Stoll.

Stoll: In general from a transportation viewpoint folks are going to go towards spots that are going to make -- provide them the easiest access to the points that they want to go. In some cases, because it's a right-in, right -- eventually a right-in, right-out onto Shafer View Drive, some folks are not going to be taking that route. However, the layout of Sky Ranch doesn't provide a lot of connectivity for -- given the volume of people they are going to be there. There is going to be a large number of folks that are going to go towards that S curve or whatever that road is and accessing Shafer View Drive. That is going to be a challenge and has to be acknowledged. But I'm not sure -- I'm not sure what else -- oh, I'm sorry. I'm not sure what the other solutions are on that. Providing additional access onto Shafer View Drive is going to be even more problematic. I was initially having a problem with the -- the lack of additional roads to provide access onto that, but it provided additional traffic onto Shafer View Drive and would be an additional burden. That was just my first thoughts. I will let you guys --

Smith: Yeah. I think my -- my -- my biggest issues are not in the hands of a developer. I -- I don't like how Meridian Road operates there. It's not under the developer's control, under the cities, even under Ada county's, it's under ITD's control and -- and that is actually -- it's -- it's not ideal to say the least. I think when it comes to the conditions on Meridian Road I understand there is likely to be more internal congestion in some areas. I understand -- I'm actually not as concerned about traffic flowing from Mondt Meadows. I do think the people who are likely to go directly to Meridian are in this western most subdivision and so I think -- we call it Snowden, Lake Hasner Street, whatever -- whatever this -- this curve is, I think that's going to be the main source of access onto Shafer View Drive from the south and -- and when I kind of do -- look at kind of the number of houses I know it's -- there is the larger kind of congestion question, but I am glad that there is things like that and so I -- I do think it's also kind of the -- the -- the nature of -- of like the -- the geometry of that -- of that road necessitates kind of more careful driving. I live just off Meridian more north and we have -- often have cars parked on either side and that in combination with the shape of the -- the -- the actual path of the roads that actually I think makes -- a lot of times it makes me feel safer, because I feel like all the cars on my street are driving 10, 15 miles an hour when there are kids around and not 20, 25 and so I feel oftentimes that -- that, actually, it's -- it's the pace is a little calmer. It may not feel comfortable -- as comfortable, but that's also part -- part of what makes people slow down. So, I'm not as concerned about internal safety, I'm mostly concerned about safety on Meridian Road and I think, if anything, that this project alleviates that more than -- more than exacerbates that. So, I'm generally in favor of this. I understand the desire to kind of cap off that interconnectivity with Mondt Meadows, but that's -- the interconnectivity is -- that -- that's kind of the -- the purpose of some of this development. I don't know if it's explicitly in code, but I'm pretty sure it is or, you know, the developer is required to have that connectivity. So -- but -- but, yeah,

I -- I understand this kind of change is hard. I understand there is a lot of construction into the parking and -- and things. I -- I fully empathize with that from previous experiences, but I -- I think on net this -- this addresses some really serious safety concerns on Meridian Road and helps alleviate that. Doesn't make them perfect, but helps. Hopefully provide a little bit more visibility and I know -- I'm not concerned about internal safety on this as much. As for the sidewalks, again, I think that's another thing that's out of our control. I really would love having those -- those northern sidewalks and walking paths and having a contiguous, you know, safe pedestrian path, rather than having to cross the street, but I don't know that there is anything we can do there, so I will -- I will -- I will wish upon a, star but that's about all I can do. Beyond that I -- I support this plan.

Perreault: Mr. Vice-Chair?

Smith: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: I'm not a plat engineer by any means, but I have seen a few hundred of them and I -- just wondering if -- if -- this buffer is fantastic. Rarely do we see something like that and that well thought out to have a buffer like that. But wondering if that -- you know, could there be a roadway that would -- that could go there that -- where Sky Mesa heading north -- or Sky Ranch heading north they would make a right, then, and kind of fill out onto Mondt Meadows or something along that -- along those lines. I assume that there is a need for two streets in here for safety or -- or fire access, but if a street could be used as a buffer there, instead of that landscaping I -- that was a thought that crossed my mind. But I -- I really feel -- I mean I really feel for our -- our member -- members of the community here. I live off Ten Mile and when I bought my home Ten Mile was not a raceway that's basically equivalent to Eagle Road. So, I run the gauntlet every day to make a left out of my house and sit for five minutes to make a right out of my house. So, I completely relate with -- with you all. But our purview is really just to decide should we annex into -- this into the city and is it appropriate -- is the design of this appropriate for this -- for this location and appropriate for the city as a whole and a lot of thought has been put into this design. We respect the -- the owner's property rights to -- to -- to make an application like this and so as far as what the applicant is able to do with the restrictions that they have in and of their ability, I feel like they have addressed a -- a good majority of whatever they could address and so in that regard I'm -- I'm happy with what they have done so far. I don't see any reason that we didn't necessarily recommend denial, because there isn't anything that they haven't complied with with what the staff has asked. So, that's the tough part for us in that -- in that regard as well, so --

Smith: I think really the -- the only way to recommend denial is -- is just as deny the annexation as a whole and not based on any issues with the -- the plat itself, because, yeah, I don't think there is anything in the -- in the plat specifically that they haven't complied with. Commissioner Sandoval, do you have any thoughts?

Sandoval: Yeah, Mr. Vice-Chair. I agree, you know, that -- the traffic has already been addressed. I'm not going to talk about that. The buffers are great on this. I think overall it's a -- it's a good plan and definitely in favor of recommending approval.

Smith: Commissioners, any other comments, thoughts, motions? I can make one if you would rather --

Stoll: Nope. I will -- I will do it. That's fine. Mr. Vice-Chair, after considering all staff, applicants and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council of File No. H-2025-0047 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of February 5th, 2026.

Perreault: Mr. Vice-Chair?

Smith: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: I would like to second the motion and I would like to say one -- one thing. I would encourage you all to go to the City Council hearing and share with them what you have shared with us, because they are a different body and they take different things -- we have a -- kind of a different purpose to some extent than they do. So, they will -- they will take your -- your concerns and consideration there as well. So, I second that motion.

Smith: Moved and seconded. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Smith: With that I will take one final motion.

Stoll: Move to adjourn.

Perreault: Second.

Smith: It's been moved and seconded. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed?

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:03 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS.)

APPROVED

JARED SMITH - VICE-CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK

_____|_____|_____
DATE APPROVED