

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:00 p.m. Tuesday, October 14, 2025, by Mayor Robert Simison.

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

Members Absent: Liz Strader.

Other Present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Caleb Hood, Bill Parsons, Nick Napoli, Linda Ritter, Berle Stokes, Steve Taulbee and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

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

Simison: Council, we will call the meeting to order. For the record it is November 14th, 2025, at 6:00 p.m. We will begin tonight's regular city council meeting with roll call attendance.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

COMMUNITY INVOCATION

Simison: Tonight's invocation will be delivered by Kyle Jorgensen. If you would all, please, take a -- join us in the community invocation or take this as a moment of silence and reflection.

Jorgensen: Our dear Father in Heaven, we come before thee this evening as citizens and community members of this great City of Meridian. We are grateful for the blessings that we enjoy living in this country with the freedoms and privileges that we have. We ask thee to bless us that we will recognize those privileges and treat each other with civility and kindness. We are grateful for each of these individuals that are willing to serve. Please bless them for their efforts. We are aware of the difficulties and challenges raging throughout the world and we pray for the leaders of the world and of the nations, that they might be guided by thee and by thy hand and all things we ask for

blessings to be upon us as we seek to learn from thee and to be like thee and we say these things in the name of Jesus Christ, amen.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Simison: Thank you. Okay. Council, up next is adoption of the agenda.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I know we are going to at least discuss it on Item 6, but just wanted to at least notate for those that are here that Item 6 on tonight's agenda has requested to be continued, but with that, Mr. Mayor, I move that we adopt the agenda as published.

Overton: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

PROCLAMATIONS [Action Item]

1. Crime Prevention Month

Simison: First item up is going to be a proclamation. So, if Jennifer and all the team wants to come and join -- whoever is going to be up we will do this. So, we got the whole team with us this evening for this. It's been kind of interesting, for whatever reason my Facebook feed -- I have a lot of other mayors from around the country and I keep seeing them going out for their National Night Out and I'm like why are they going out in October to do national night out and, then, I realize they can only really do it once -- one month a year, where we can do a bit more crime prevention at the right times and spread it out, but we are -- we are here tonight for Crime Prevention Month. So, I will go ahead and read this proclamation and, then, turn it over for any comments that you guys all would like to add on to. Or not. So, leave it up to you. Whereas in 1984 President Reagan designated October as Crime Prevention Month as a time for communities to come together, promote safety and security individually and in neighborhoods and whereas crime prevention is important because it enhances public safety, strengthens communities and improves overall quality of life by reducing fear and promoting a sense of security and whereas effective prevention programs address the root causes of crime, fostering sustainable solutions through encouraging community involvement, education, awareness and collaboration between local law enforcement, schools, businesses and residents and whereas neighborhood watch programs, youth engagement activities and educational forums are just a few examples

of how people can participate in crime prevention efforts in the City of Meridian and whereas the City of Meridian Crime Prevention Team empowers our community to keep neighborhoods safe and build relationships, while working towards controlling crime. Therefore, I, Robert E. Simison, proclaim October 2025 as Crime Prevention Month in the City of Meridian and express our sincere gratitude and appreciation for those who are committed to the power of prevention and work together to make our community safer, stronger and more caring. Dated this 14th day of October 2025. So, on behalf of myself and the City Council, thank you for all -- you all do to make sure that we are working hard on crime prevention here in our community. So, with that I will present this to you and turn it over for any comments you would like to make.

Abrao: I think the proclamation said it all.

Simison: All right. Well, then, we will just do a picture.

Cavener: Council, as the Mayor is coming up I will just share. This month we -- last month we had the Public Safety Day and if you haven't been to that event, man, put it on your calendar for next year. It's a great date -- day date with your -- with your partner. If you got kids or grandkids -- nine year old Pork Chop like the best day of his life going in between the drones and the dogs, you know, in typical fashion our fire department opens up a fire truck and lets them climb around and sprays everybody at the end. So, just -- I appreciate -- you guys do a great job of really embracing and showcasing public safety in our community for all agencies. Great event. Appreciate you.

PUBLIC FORUM – Future Meeting Topics

Simison: Thank you, Councilman Cavener. All right. With that we will move on to -- Mr. Clerk, anyone sign up under public forum?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, Jen Card.

Simison: Good evening.

Card: Oh. Okay. So, Jen Card. I'm in Paramount. I'm here again to talk about Sagarra and give you a little bit of an update. Recently the first duplex went up and it's three stories and talked with my neighbors a little bit and they are like, you know, the duplexes were supposed to be two stories, now they are three. The townhouses were supposed to be three stories, now there are four, and if I recall correctly when I came and we talked about the townhouses, it was because they were signed off by staff level employee, not an elected official, receiving no oversight by Council Members and some Council Members were a little bit surprised at the fact that they were four stories. So, I know some work sessions happened and people talked about getting some oversight for those kinds of things, but I don't know where that's -- that's at at this point. My fear is the same thing happened with the duplexes. I did e-mail the city, the contacts that we have, and he said I did inquire with our planning department regarding your question

about building types and their locations and have been informed that the developer is following approved plans and locations for buildings. That's good to know, but my question was what is being built? Does that match exactly what we talked about in City Council when the development was approved? And that's my question, because there seems to be no oversight. There are loopholes where things get through where we have discussed it, you have discussed it in front of us, you vote on it and that's not what happens. Things change. And that's why I think more oversight is needed on all staff sign off and I know you are tired of seeing me, I'm tired of coming here and complaining to you, because it appears that every issue from building type, design, dust, fence standards, backyard flooding is nobody else's responsibility, even though Paramount residents didn't have these issues before this -- construction of this development began. So, I want to urge you to make the developer accountable for these issues. My understanding Grand View sent out a thing about replacing the fence. Now, it's not going to get replaced. They met with the city, they came to an agreement, they were supposed to reach out to us, now they have sent us a flyer and it's something different and I have notified our contact and sent him the information on that as well. So, it's just frustrating. There is no accountability and I keep getting told, well, the city has a surety bond just in case. Well, that doesn't alleviate the issues that have happened and impacted those residents and nothing has addressed flooding, which is terrifying in my mind, so asking to hold them accountable and start putting things in place so that these things don't happen. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you, Jen. Chris, anyone else sign up?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, no.

RESOLUTIONS [Action Item]

2. Resolution No. 25-2540: A Resolution Establishing the Reappointment of Dom Gelsomino to Seat 1 and Jennifer Bobo to Seat 2 of the Meridian Parks and Recreation Commission; and Providing an Effective Date

Simison: Okay. With that we will move on to Item 2, which is Resolution No. 25-2540, which is a reappointment of Dom Gelsomino and Jennifer Bobo to the Meridian Parks and Recreation Commission. Council, both of these people, hopefully are not a stranger to you all. They have been -- been serving and would like to continue to serve and I think they do an excellent job and would urge you to reappoint them to these positions.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: I move we approve agenda Item No. 2, Resolution No. 25-2540, resolution establishing the reappointment of Dom Gelsomino and Jennifer Bobo to the Meridian Parks and Recreation Commission.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Resolution No. 25-2540. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the resolution is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

3. Resolution No. 25-2541: A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Meridian Reappointing Seoyoon Song to Seat 9 of the Meridian Arts Commission and Divya Danesh to Seat 8 of the Meridian Solid Waste Advisory Commission; and Providing an Effective Date

Simison: Next item up is Resolution No. 25-2541. This, too, is reappointment of two of our youth to our commissions as well. Again, these are -- these are -- our appointments are done in conjunction and talking with our chairs, as well as our staff, to make sure that they are showing up and being active participants and these two individuals Seoyoon Song and Divya Danesh are definitely doing that and so with that we ask for you to reappoint them as well.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Move to approve Item 3, Resolution, 25-2541, resolution of the City Council, City of Meridian, reappointing Seoyoon Song to Seat 9 and Divya Danesh to Seat 8 of the Meridian Solid Waste Advisory Commission.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Resolution No. 25-2541. Discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the resolution is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

4. Resolution No. 25-2542: A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Meridian Appointing Toren Taylor to Seat 9 of the Meridian Parks and Recreation Commission; James Abdel-Monem to Seat 6 of the Meridian Historic Preservation Commission; Advik Bansal to Seat 4 of the Meridian Transportation Commission; and Providing an Effective Date

Simison: All right. Council, next item up is Resolution No. 25-2544, which is to appoint three more individuals to our youth on commission -- commission seats. We followed the process that we have traditionally done with this and reached out to the members of the community and sometimes we get MYAC'ers, sometimes we don't, sometimes we get people from other walks of life in our community and I think that that is reflected in the three appointments that we are asking you to do this evening. First up we have Advik Bansal is a sophomore at Compass Charter, who is interested in the Transportation Commission and he's curious about how cities and other agencies partner to have a shared vision for growth, decision making and translating ideas into actions, in addition already a published author and looking to do that again. I don't know how that works on transportation, but maybe I will make a spot in the -- in that future book. So, that's -- that's who is being recommended for the Transportation Commission. We have a senior from Meridian High School, James Abdel-Monem, been with MYAC since last year when he served as the vice-chair of community service during two terms. Also serve as a youth ambassador for Avenues of Hope, where he helps lead fundraising efforts for many causes and interest in setting politics, public policy, in college, local government, and rebuilt a sailboat last summer. So, hopefully this will give a good overall roundabout experience through that. And, then, finally, we have a new face Toren Taylor, who's a junior at Meridian High, and this -- this individual was an employee of the city in our Parks and Rec Department over at the swimming pool as a lifeguard the last couple summers. Says I express an interest in, you know, seeing one side of the city, the paycheck side, but maybe now see the other side of it about, you know, the work that it takes to put on good programs here in the community, so active in other parts of the community and a standout student and we won't mention the familiar name if -- between one of our Council Members and this individual, but that does have a familiar name. So, with that these are the recommendations for appointments and stand for any questions you have.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: If we didn't have such a full agenda I would ask them to all come up and answer some questions, but given the long agenda I think we will move ahead and I would like to make a motion to approve Resolution No. 25-2542, a resolution of the City Council of the City of Meridian, appointing Toren Taylor to Seat 9 of the Meridian Parks and Recreation Commission, James Abdel-Monem to Seat 6 of the Meridian Historic Preservation Commission and Advik Bansal to Seat 4 of the Meridian Transportation Commission.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second. Do I have any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it. It's unanimous. Congratulations. We look forward to your service on these commissions moving forward and thanks for being here this evening.

Simison: All right. With that we will --

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Can I just compliment you and your office and the youth of our community for wanting to be involved. I think we are probably pretty unique across the country in involving our youth and it says a lot about the -- the quality of our community, the quality of the families that are here, the values that we hold in getting young people involved in their local government at such a young age I think is very admirable and I commend you and your office for placing that as a very high priority.

Simison: Well, thank you. But credit goes where credit is due and Mayor Tammy was really the one that drove this initiative and we have continued up her -- her efforts in this area, but I think it's the right thing.

Whitlock: Yeah.

Taylor: I would also like to compliment you and the work. I think when -- when -- when our youth see just -- have a little bit of their interest peaked in serving, I think the results are -- are borne out years down the road with their desire to serve the community, not just now, but these are really important programs, because it doesn't have to do a lot, just has to do something to kind of give them a little bit of a desire. So, I appreciate the opportunity to have our youth. I mean MYAC has been very impressive as I have got to know them and in particular, hopefully there is a particular young man in the Parks and Rec Commission that will do a good job. He better.

Simison: Excellent.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Just to put a little topping on all this, should go back and remember a little bit of history. Back when Councilman Cavener first came to work for the city I believe he was part of organizing MYAC under Mayor Tammy at that time and helping get that program off the ground and part of the reason that is where it is today is because it had such a good foundation when it started here.

Simison: Here. Here. Okay. With that we will move on to our public hearings for this evening. So, first item up is a public hearing for H-2025-0044 for Century Farm Master Association gravity irrigation easement by Brighton Corporation. I know I read that differently than what's on here, but we have apparently changed the order on me. So, it is what it is. So, I will open this public hearing with staff comments by Nick.

Napoli: Good evening, Mayor, Members of the Council. Next item on the agenda is the Century Farm Master Association gravity irrigation easement vacation. The applicant is requesting approval to vacate a private 20 foot easement for gravity irrigation on Lots 13 and 14, Block 2, of the Hill Century Farm's Commercial Subdivision No. 2. A new easement will be reestablished because of this vacation, which will be ten feet in width. The applicant has indicated that the purpose of this vacation is for a future application that will be coming in front of City Council. In addition to this the applicant has indicated vacating the easement and reestablishing a new one outside the plat -- of the platting process will allow the easement to be dedicated to the correct entity, make it the full length, as the easement is currently missing a portion of the gravity irrigation line. So, this is the existing easement and this is the proposed change. The relinquishment letters were received from Brighton Corporation, as this is a private easement and they were the only holder of it and staff is recommending approval and has received written testimony from the applicant Eli Benski in support of the staff report and recommendation and I will stand for any questions you guys have.

Simison: Thank you, Nick. Council, any questions for staff? Is the applicant here to make a very long detailed presentation.

Benski: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. Eli Benski. 2929 West Navigator Drive, Meridian, Idaho. 83642. Yes, this is a very long presentation. I'm so sorry, guys. As Nick mentioned this is an application for the vacation of the gravity irrigation easement at Century Farm. This is generally located off of Amity and Tavistock, circled in the yellow. As mentioned there was three errors that we found with this easement. First was that it was dedicated to an association that doesn't exist. Second, we were missing a portion to the northwest corner and, then, third, we actually wanted initially it to match the public utility easement. Instead, we made it ten feet wider than the public utility easement. We have gone forward and recorded a new easement that corrects these three errors, but that's all the information I have. I concur with staff's recommendation of approval and request that you guys also approve tonight here the vacation of the easement. I stand for questions.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions for the applicant? Okay. Thank you very much. Mr. Clerk, anyone signed up to testify on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, no.

Simison: Is there anybody present or online that would like to provide testimony on this item? If so, if you are online you can use the raise your hand feature or if you are in the audience and would like to come forward you can do so at this time. Seeing see no one online raising their hand or no one coming forward, would the applicant like to make any final comments or do they waive? Applicant waives final comments. Council, what's your pleasure?

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Seeing no further comments, I move that we close the public hearing.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to close the public hearing. Is there any discussion? If not, in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to approve File No. H-2025-0044 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of October 14th, 2025.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve H-2025-0044. Is there discussion on the motion? If not, clerk call the roll.

Roll Call: Cavener, yea; Strader, absent; Overton, yea; Little Roberts, yea; Taylor, yea; Whitlock, yea.

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries and the item is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

6. Public Hearing continued from September 16, 2025 for Latitude Forty Three Subdivision (H-2024-0059) by Rodney Evans + Partners, LLC., located at 675, 715 and 955 S. Wells St.

- A. Request: Annexation of 17.27 acres of land with R-8 (13.78 acres), R-15 (2.42 acres) and C-N (1.07 acres) zoning districts.
- B. Request: Preliminary Plat to re-subdivide lots 7, 21 and 22, Magic View Subdivision, Amended into 79 residential lots, 1 commercial lot and 11 common/other lots on 15.97 acres of land in the R-8, R-15 and C-N zoning districts.

Simison: Council, next item up is a public hearing continued from September 16th, 2025, for Latitude Forty Three Subdivision, H-2024-0059. We will hear from staff on the desire for this item.

Parsons: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, the applicant is requesting continuance of this item again for -- as you know the city is conducting a study for that area, trying to understand the transportation network. We have been meeting with the applicant on an ongoing basis since that continuance of this project and we know that that study won't be done for several more months. So, we are just asking for more time for the applicant so they can continue to work with staff and get that information so that you guys can make an informed decision on the application. The applicant is also here tonight to answer any questions you may have as well to let you know what their intentions are.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions for staff? Would you like to hear from the applicant as well? Okay.

Clark: Hi, everyone. Hethe Clark. 251 East Front Street in Boise. You didn't see me back in May, so I have been asked to help kind of shepherd this along and so I have been part of the conversations with -- with your staff since -- since -- since May. I was able to look at the -- at the video, listen to all the comments. Very much appreciated the comments that the Council made at the time. Also very much appreciated the Council really jumping on this to get this report underway and done in a -- in a timely fashion. You know, that doesn't always happen. You know, I have a lot of clients that get stuck in limbo for a long time. This one we actually see a finish line and so our goal was to -- with this to try to make sure that Council has the information it needs, so we are happy to defer until December. Just one other little bit of procedural I guess trivia is that one of the reasons why we were trying to get this going is that if we have hearings that are scheduled, then, we don't need to start from zero and schedule and notice and be, you know, a couple months out once the staff -- once that staff report is done -- or not staff report, the -- the study is done and in the meantime, as you know, this is one small part of the larger study and so we are kind of monitoring with staff, hoping that maybe there can be some direction on this in the interim. As you might remember from the last hearing -- I think where everyone's feeling pretty good about the northern portion of the project. It's the southern portion that really is -- we would like to have this additional insight on. If the consultant comes back and says, yeah, we know where it's going to be on the southern portion, even though the study is not completed yet, then, maybe we can go ahead as well. So, we are just trying to work with staff to get this done and we appreciate everything Council has been doing to help facilitate getting answers, not only for us, but for the neighborhood as well.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Hethe, I'm happy to see you are working on this project. The application has been continued a bunch of times between Planning and Zoning and City Council and so

trying to find right the right balance of -- we want to get the right information, but also being sensitive to the impact it is on the neighboring residents -- stakeholders in this project and have a very active vested interest and how do we communicate to them here is where we are going to have the hearing without this, hey, we are going to have a hearing, we are going to need to continue it again for another couple months. We are going to need to continue it again for a couple months. So, can you give myself and Council some -- some flavor -- I know there is a little bit that is out of your control -- a lot that's out of your needle quite frankly -- a happy medium in terms of a date that we could continue this to that would give you the confidence that you have had the opportunity to review and respond, that our staff had the opportunity, obviously, to finalize this project, so that we can really communicate to our residents here is the date for this hearing and -- and we really mean it this time.

Clark: Council Member Cavener, you are right that there is a lot of it that's not in our control. It's our understanding that the way -- and the Mayor may be able to correct me -- or staff may be able to correct me on this as well -- that the -- the anticipated date for the completion of the report is January and so we looked at that and said, hey, you know, maybe December makes sense, because maybe we can get some of those preliminary answers by then. If not, then, we are just within shouting distance of having the -- having the consultant's report done at that point. In the meantime, you know, we are happy to continue, you know, collaborating with staff, trying to find out where that stands and we would love to, you know, be as forthcoming with the neighborhood and with staff as possible in terms of making sure that people know what the intentions are. You know, this is one where, you know, it's -- it's -- it's that balancing act of, you know, certainly we want to make sure that the neighbors know and have a -- have a good feeling about what's happening there. We also have concerns on our side of financial issues related to long-term delays, so we are trying to balance all of that together, Council Member Cavener, and still be respectful of our neighbors' time.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I know you talked December with the report hopefully being finalized in January. Would you feel comfortable if we -- if we held it until January and just gave a little bit more buffer? I -- I'm really sensitive to what you guys have been up against; right? And it is this -- trying to look at it from all different sides for all the vested parties and I -- I worry that a -- yet another continuance really doesn't communicate the right message to our residents that -- that we would want to communicate. So, I almost would prefer to error on the side of going a little bit longer by a few weeks than to try and schedule something in December -- and I'm trying to look at it like I'm a resident. Okay? So, I get this notice. Okay. I'm going to come again and, then, a day or two before, right at kind of a busy time of year, I'm going to get informed by the city, hey, it's actually going to be continued again. It's just -- it's trying to be good partners with our -- with our impacted neighbors, but I -- I'm also not keenly aware as to how that impacts you and your client if -- if we were delaying it by a few more weeks.

Clark: Council Member Cavener, you can imagine that it's never fun for me to go back to my client and say, yeah, the project got delayed another couple months.

Cavener: Yeah.

Clark: Never a fun conversation. You know, certainly, you know, we want to be respectful of Council and so if that's the Council's direction, then, you know, so be it. The way I would put it, though, is that in my experience in the development world is that if I don't set a deadline, then, nobody's going to work toward a deadline and so --

Cavener: I agree.

Clark: -- I -- I generally like to have that so that we can have a goal to shoot at and, you know, from our view -- you know, we had originally thought, hey, let's try in November. That didn't work out, so we -- so we talked internally and pushed it another month -- so, two months to December. So, we were hoping that that was a meaningful offer and, again, I -- I would love to have a goal to shoot at if we can in terms of those deadlines,

Cavener: Thanks. So --

Clark: Yeah.

Cavener: -- I will get some more insight from our staff here in a minute.

Clark: Absolutely. Yeah.

Simison: Okay. Council, anything else for the applicant? Councilman Cavener, questions for staff?

Cavener: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, thanks. Bill, kind of back at you. I saw in the -- in the packet that there is at least a whole date maybe for December 16th, the last council meeting of the year. I want to hear from Council here on this, you know, I want to be supportive to the applicant's needs and they are somewhat responsive on some of the work that we are doing. Give me your level of confidence that if we were to continue this to December the 16th that there is not a City of Meridian or a staff related-reason to request another continuance?

Parsons: Mayor, Members of the Council, like -- I'm -- I'm kind of in the -- in the same court as the applicant. I don't have that crystal ball either, knowing when that -- that study is going to be done. I can tell you that I keep getting calls from the residents of Woodbridge and they keep asking any new information, any new information, and at least the positive feedback that I'm getting is they -- like where the project is going. They just want to know where that transfer study is going to land and so they don't like getting whipsawed either. So, it's always been staff's position to push it out and wait for the study. But, again, we want to be sensitive to the applicant's needs as well and try to

understand that information. But in our world getting the information ahead of time and, then, taking action always is better, not only us, but also the neighborhood.

Cavener: Okay. Thanks.

Simison: I think phone a friend came in.

Hood: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councilman Cavener, I did not hear Mr. Parsons' answer, but I thought that --

Simison: No, you -- say whatever you would like. You won't contradict him, I promise you.

Hood: Yeah. So, Carl Anderson, who is our project manager for the study, met with the consultants this week. We are on track. January -- we are more comfortable with January. If the concern really is having a hearing on something and expecting -- we may have a draft report by December, but that's not what -- our scope of work and the schedule with our contractor or with our contracted traffic engineers say. So, we, too, are hopeful that maybe we can get something by December 16th I believe the date is, but I'm maybe not that optimistic.

Cavener: Okay. Thank you.

Simison: Can I ask you a question, Mr. Hood. There is really not very many options to where this can go. Last time I heard they really had settled on an option for this area. Is that not the case? Is there -- are they still evaluating other options?

Hood: Mr. Mayor, maybe you are more in the loop than I am on the project. I have not heard that. I understand they are still evaluating it. We did have some conversations some time ago with the development team -- Mr. Clark's team and some of them that have them -- encourage them to look at some options to -- to come up with a solution that would meet some of our objectives in this area, too. So, I think that's something in the next month or two -- or even three that we could continue some of that dialog and see -- obviously we want something that works for their property as an option or two or three in that general vicinity, because it is, to your point, Mayor, we are pretty limited on some of those connections. The study is larger than just this connection though.

Simison: And maybe, Council, the thing to just -- are you going to want to adopt the study before you hear the application or not? And I think that's -- kind of goes -- we can get a draft. I mean we could probably say please focus on this in the next month and provide a draft of that information back to staff of what's going to be in that for this area, but are you going to want to act on it until you act on the study? Something I hadn't contemplated, but I think it's -- just because the study comes back doesn't mean you are going to agree to what the study says as it pertains to development. So, I throw that out there for your consideration. Thank you.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Just as a point of reflection when we first looked at this the idea came forward that we could look at just the northern portion and I don't think Council was comfortable with breaking this up at that time and wanted to see it as presented as all three parcels, which is one of the reasons why this was sent back to begin with until we understand what we are looking at for that potential development. I would feel a lot better if we had this reset to a date that coincided with when we believe this study will be done, because, trust me, living in Woodbridge I see the group posts by the residents that live there getting all excited and getting all geared up and ready to come to the meetings and, then, we keep having continuances and I would like to see if there is a way -- understanding your needs and desires and the city's, but also the residents' needs and desires to try to limit at this point the number of continuances we have going forward.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I agree with Council Member Overton. I just -- because there has been so many continuances on this project I think it is important that we try and hit the mark on this. So, Council, the date that I was looking at -- and I'm going to look to our good clerk Mr. Johnson, let me know if we are over committed on that date. But January the 13th.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, Council President Cavener, I don't believe we have anything scheduled on that date yet.

Cavener: I don't either, but I always like to double check. So, Council, that's the date that I'm -- I'm looking. That allows -- I'm sure we have got some staff members that have holiday plans. I'm sure applicant and our residents have holiday plans. It allows everyone an opportunity to go enjoy their holiday season, come back, get back to work. Make sure that that study is complete, shared with the applicant, feedback provided, and that should give us I think some good confidence on the 13th and I'm -- I'm proposing that date and if anybody on our staff or the applicant has concerns with that date or ability to meet everyone's expectations for that date, now is a good time to wave your hands or give me an indication. Okay. So, Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: If you will indulge me, I'm going to move, then, that we continue Item 6, public hearing is continued from September 26, for Latitude Forty Three Subdivision to January the 13th.

Overton: Second.

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

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Real quick. I want to commend our clerk staff -- I know they went over time to communicate again with the residents and make sure that they are aware of that, because I think we have been doing a good job of informing them through our own channels, because they have a good communicated network, I don't think we need the applicant to do any type of paid re-noticing or anything like that. So, just want to commend our staff for a job well done.

Simison: Okay. All right. Is there further discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the item is continued to January 13th.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

7. Public Hearing for Modena Plaza Subdivision (SHP-2025-0004) by Jordan Moorhouse, located at 3147 Belltower Dr.

- A. Request: Short Plat to subdivide an existing commercial lot in four (4) separate lots on approximately 1.59 acres of land in the L-O zoning district.

Simison: Okay. All right. With that we will move on to Item 7, which is a public hearing for Modena Plaza Subdivision, SHP-2025-0004. We will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Ritter: Good evening, Mayor and Council. So, what we are looking at is a proposed short plat. It's a resubdivision of Lot 3, Block 6 of Bridgetower Crossing Subdivision No. 2. It's consisting of four building lots on 1.59 acres of land in an existing L-O zoning district. So, these are the elevations that -- for the businesses that are being proposed in this location. This is the landscaping plan that they are proposing. This is basically similar to a subdivision that was done to the -- I think it's to the east of this. So, they are just repeating what was done previously. These are the site photos. So, this is the property. You take access off of Bell Tower Drive. It's 3147 West Bell Tower Drive. And this is the previous one. I think it's like Turner Plaza or something like that that was approved previously. So, they are just mimicking what they did there. I did not have any written testimony for this. The applicant is here if you have questions, but I will be more than happy to take any questions that you might have on this application. It's a pretty simple application. They are just dividing a lot into four lots.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions for staff? Then would the applicant like to come forward? Good evening.

Moorhouse: Good evening. Jordan Moorhouse. 2673 West Tango Creek Drive in Meridian. Like staff said, we -- we did a development just the south of this, Turin Plaza, and we -- we did those four buildings there. When we did that we found a great demand for this type of light office and so we decided to purchase this adjoining lot or adjacent lot and I try to do the same thing there. Like I said, it's been a great need for the community for this -- this type of office space and so we feel like it's a -- it's a good -- a good place for some more commercial construction there. Yeah. Is there any questions for -- for me?

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

Moorhouse: Thank you.

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

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, there are no sign ups.

Simison: Okay. Is there anybody present that would like to provide testimony on this item, either in the room or online? Seeing no one coming forward or raising their hand, does the applicant waive any final comments? Applicant waives any final comments.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Seeing no one coming forward to offer any additional testimony, I move that we close the public hearing on File No. SHP-2025-0004.

Overton: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to close the public hearing. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have been and the public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to approve File No. SHP-2025-0004 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of October 14th, 2025.

Overton: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Item 7. Is there any discussion? If not, clerk call the roll.

Roll Call: Cavener, yea; Strader, absent; Overton, yea; Little Roberts, yea; Taylor, yea; Whitlock, yea.

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries and the item is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

8. Public Hearing for Solara Estates Subdivision (H-2025-0013) by Jadon Schneider, Bronze Bow Land, located at 1695 E. Amity Rd. and 4940 and 5060 S. Locust Grove Rd.

- A. Request: Annexation of approximately 15 acres across three (3) parcels of land from Ada County into the City of Meridian with requested zoning of R-8 and R-2 from RUT which includes parcel numbers S1132223130, S1132223210 and S1132223320.
- B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 14 single-family lots, including one existing home site to remain and five (5) common lots for a total of 19 lots on 9.72 acres of land (parcels S1132223210 and S1132223320).
- C. Request: Alternative Compliance to reduce the landscape buffer along the street adjacent to Lot 11, Block 1 by 50%.

Simison: Next item up is Item 8, public hearing for Solara Estate Subdivision, H-2025-0013. We will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Ritter: Okay. Me again. So, this application is for alternative compliance, which was an administration approval, annexation and a preliminary plat. So, this site is .1 -- a little over 15 acres of land. It's zoned RUT and it's located at 1695 East Amity, 4940 and 5050 South Locust Grove Road. So, we are annexing in the LDS church at the corner of Amity and Locust Grove and, then, two lots -- the two lots behind the church. The church is basically coming in as a way for the properties to the south to annex into the city. They are not proposing to do any modifications to their property, they are just assisting the applicant with coming in with annexation, because without the church they don't have a pathway to annexation. So, the plat consists of 19 lots on approximately 9.7 acres. They are proposing alternative compliance along the frontage for the existing home, because with the 25 foot buffer that is required it cannot meet the setback requirements. So, what's being proposed is they put that portion of the landscape buffer in an easement instead of a common lot, but what staff is proposing is the portion that is right in front of the house be reduced to -- be reduced to the 12 and a half feet and, then, the rest of it be the 25 feet, but still within an easement. So, they did submit building elevations with this application and, again, we are asking that a condition be

placed in the development agreement that requires homes that are along public roadways provide articulation through modulation, bays, banding, porches, balconies, material types and other integrated art -- architectural elements to break up the monotonous wall plains and roof lines that are visible from these public streets. Single family structure -- single family homes will be exempt from this requirement. This is their open space and amenity proposal. One thing that was clarified in the staff report, I had put that they had a fire pit, but they are -- they do not have a fire pit. They do have the gazebo and the picnic benches as part of their amenities for the open space that is located here. Again, this is the existing home that is proposed to remain and showing the setback requirements per the alternative compliance for the reduction in the landscaping and the easement for it. Again, this is the church property. The church property as it is does not meet current standards. And, again, they are not proposing to do anything, but they will have to hook up to water and sewer based on annexation requirements. But they are not proposing to do anything else to the church. If they decide to do anything to the church they would have to come in compliance with the parking lot, landscaping, frontage landscaping. But, again, they are not proposing to do anything. One of the things that was talked about is that even though there are no development or modifications being proposed for the property for the -- that the church -- we recommended that the Commission and City Council evaluate the need for a five foot temporary sidewalk within the ACHD right of way on the west and north side of the church property. The sidewalks will provide a pedestrian connection from the south to north and east to west and wrap around to extend the entire length of the property along Amity. Again, this would be part of the annexation of approval, as there are no existing sidewalks along here. So, the Planning Commission felt that it wasn't necessary if road improvements were occurring within the next year or two and if you choose to not move forward with this we will remove this condition from our report. The Planning Commission recommended approval of this application. We had several people that were in opposition of this application. Mark Agenbroad, he felt that the lots should be one acre instead of a half acre. He feels that growth is a concern for this area and would like to see something that fits within the existing area. Bonnie Capelle, she was concerned about losing her view. She has a home -- this home right here. She felt that whatever was going to be built in this area would block her view and she would like a provision to be added that would allow a two story dwelling unit in front of their home -- that would not allow a two story dwelling unit in front of their home. Julie Edwards said that traffic is a concern. Left turns may be an issue. Feels that the rules are being bent with alternative compliance, so that the developer can get what they want. At the church -- she wanted to know if the church sells would the zoning revert to R-2 from R-8, because the church is requesting R-8 zoning to allow for a church to be there, because they are not allowed in the R-2 zoning district. So, there were no written testimony and the key issues were lot size, loss of view and traffic impacts. The discussion by the Commission was that the future land use map has medium density to the east of the proposed development, which will allow for a natural transition to smaller lots and he said make sure whomever is buying the lots they understand this transition, so that when they come in they are not upset when they start to build that -- that there will be smaller lots next to them. And, again, they were not recommending the temporary sidewalk along the church property on South Locust Grove and Amity. They

didn't have any outstanding issues for you and we have not received any written testimony since the hearing and at this time I will stand for any questions that you may have.

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

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Linda, just -- could you go over the sidewalk again? The sidewalk is going to be requested on the north and the west side, a five foot sidewalk?

Ritter: So, if you can see my cursor, so it would be here and here to the end of the church property. So, with this development they will be required to put in sidewalks, so a temporary sidewalk along here and along the frontage of the church.

Overton: Mr. Mayor, follow up?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: And maybe this can be addressed by the -- when it's presented as well. But there is usually a lot of times -- in fact, Saturday morning when I went by, because I go down this road all the time, a full length semi parked alongside that church sitting on Locust Grove and if we end up putting a sidewalk in there I just want to make sure as we talk about this this evening there will be no semi parked there on the city sidewalk as this gets annexed into our city. Just want to make sure I put that out there. Thank you.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Linda, can you walk me through kind of what the elevation change is, kind of from where the intersection is at Amity and Locust to where -- I guess the residents would enter into the development? Is there much of a grade change? I just -- I'm over there, again, as well and I'm not intimately familiar, you know, but I -- I know there is lots of hills that kind of converged there and certainly from a traffic safety element with kind of the impact already on Locust Grove, I would like to get some understanding about how the current traffic conditions impact that and if we have any insight about what the redevelopment of that intersection will look like and what, if any, bearing or impact it would have.

Ritter: Are we talking about this area?

Cavener: I guess I would go from right there, as you would continue to head south on Locust Grove. I don't know if there is an elevation change -- it doesn't look like it to me,

but I'm not smart enough to understand when there is a grade change, but I feel like that there is.

Ritter: Okay. I -- we have someone from ACHD online, so I'm going to see if they can answer that question.

Cavener: Great.

Troyer: Good Evening Mayor and Members of the Council. This is KaraLeigh Troyer, 5800 North Meeker Avenue. I'm not entirely certain what the elevation change is there on Locust Grove Road. However, within our staff report, we have conditioned that the applicant go forward and do a sight distance analysis for the intersection of their public roadway onto Locust Grove Road to ensure that that is a safe intersection. Any further questions on that?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Is it -- is it KaraLeigh?

Troyer: Yes.

Cavener: Thanks for joining us tonight. Are -- are you able to get us the elevation changes? I understand you don't have them in front of you and certainly don't mean to put you on the spot, I'm just -- I recognize what was in the staff report. I guess I'm -- I look at that as a reaction to it. I'm trying to be a little bit more proactive in my understanding before I would be willing to be in favor of an approval. Is that a grade change that you are going to be able to get for us this evening or is that -- are you not able to do that?

Troyer: Mayor and Council Member, I believe that that is something that the applicant would have to provide to us and is taken care of during -- is reviewed with our traffic team. That's not something that I have available tonight, but I would be able to get that and get back to you on that if you have further questions.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, maybe one more.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Can you give the Council just a quick update about what the -- the plans -- I know -- I'm sure they are here in our packet, but the plans to redevelop Locust Grove and Amity at that intersection. What year is that planned for? What is contemplated with that expansion?

Troyer: Yeah. Mayor and Mr. Council Member, at this point it is scheduled for design from 2023 to 2024, so it has been designed and, then, the land acquisition year is 2029 and there is no scheduled construction at this point. We do have our draft five year plan that is going to be up for adoption soon and within that the design year has been moved up to extend to 2027. At that point, then, the land acquisition year will be 2030 and, again, there is no construction date for this, so it is not a funded improvement, but it is in the five year plan.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Is it a signalized intersection or a roundabout?

Troyer: That is a roundabout.

Cavener: Okay. One additional question then. Assuming that that roundabout was built and this application would be before us, would the entry -- is the distance between the -- where the roundabout ends in the entrance to this neighborhood begins compliant with ACHD policies?

Troyer: Mr. Mayor and Council Member, yes, the distance from the intersection of the roadway to the intersection of Amity and Locust Grove is compliant with policy. And, additionally, that intersection is outside of the scope of the planned improvement project.

Cavener: I understand that. I just am trying to look at this -- the totality. So, thank you.

Troyer: Uh-huh. Yeah. Of course.

Ritter: Mayor?

Simison: Yes, Linda.

Ritter: Commissioner Cavener, the applicant may have that information for you as far as elevation for that area, because I know the existing house sits up higher and, then, the rest of the property slopes down. So, he will probably have that information for you.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: One last question for KaraLeigh with ACHD. KaraLeigh, my history on this section of road goes back to me being in junior high school riding on a school bus. That's quite a slope coming down Locust Grove and even this last winter when I was over there the pile up of cars coming down that hill was pretty extraordinary one

morning. They didn't make it to Amity. I'm concerned that if you are going to put a roadway with this many houses in there coming in about halfway down that slope, that there needs to be some form of flashing lights or a warning to drivers that are coming north on Locust Grove that they are about to hit a slope and below that slope is a stop sign. Is that going to be an ACHD responsibility or is that the applicant's responsibility to apply for something?

Troyer: Mr. Mayor and Council Member, I believe that if that is for existing traffic, typically that's an issue that is taken care of through our traffic team if that's a concern that is raised through the city or through the neighbors and that's something that can be taken care of typically through that avenue. However, with this development coming in, if that's something that you would like further discussion on, and that's something that the applicant would need to put in as it is pertaining to their development.

Overton: Thank you.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for staff? Would the applicant like to come forward?

Schneider: Good evening. Jadon Schneider. 3770 North Jackie Lane, Boise, with Bronze Bow. I'm the applicant on behalf of the developer and I'm just going to pull this up -- or Linda can. Thank you very much. So, Linda talked about most of the things. I just want to kind of briefly go over it. I will try to give a quick application presentation and, then, try to answer as many of the questions that we have or during the report, anyways, but, yes, Solara Estates it's alternative compliance request, annexation and preliminary plat request for the proposed area to be annexed. It is both the north parcel and, then, the two southern parcels, so three parcels each five acres, so 15 acres in total. The north parcel, as Linda said, is the church parcel and the southern two parcels is what would be proposed as Solara Estates Subdivision itself. It's at the corner of Amity and Locust Grove. One thing specific about this site is the landowners live on the property in that southwest corner and they are intending to stay -- if their subdivision is approved stay in that home and be involved in that subdivision process. So, from their point of view they want a subdivision that looks good and works well for the -- this area, because they have to live with it. So, that's something that's a bit unique to this property, which I see as a benefit. The site area specifically for the subdivision itself is just about ten acres -- 9.7 or so. Again, as Linda mentioned, it's in RUT, Rural Urban Transition in Ada county. The annexation proposed would be to bring it into an R-2, which is that low density residential. With the 14 building lots proposed, 13 of them would be new building lots and the average lot size for the site is just about half an acre. It's a little bit more than half an acre. KaraLeigh from ACHD made a couple comments, but, yes, ACHD provided a staff report that provided their support and approval for the development. Just kind of going back. This kind of ties into exactly what was brought up before, but the view portion and the hill coming down right now. Speaking to it from the subdivision point of view, the hill is a benefit to the existing lots right now, because it provides a nice view. The reason that we grabbed this slide and throwing it on here is because the landowners currently right now have a nice view that looks out over to the

foothills and with the stepping down of this portion of this subdivision it allows for this view corridor and for these homes to be provided in a manner that gives the view step to each of the lots that would be built or the maximum amount of lots that would be built on this. Just kind of touching on this for one comment, one of the things that was brought up in the Planning and Zoning meeting and the neighbor spoke to was concerns about potentially removing a view or keeping away from any sort of existing view for the neighbors. That's not the intent of the developer and I think we have some technical information that should back it up, which kind of loops into other questions involved tonight. The landowner for this parcel is in that southwest corner as mentioned. Their property is at an elevation of about 2,715 feet above sea level. The neighboring parcel to the south, because this is that Locust Grove hill, that is at 2,735. So, they are already about 20 feet higher than the neighbor. And, then, down further from that point, the lot that would provide potentially the largest amount of obstruction to a future view is -- at the finish grade or it would be at a grade around 2,701 feet. So, they are 34 feet higher at the finished ground. So, just at ground level they are already 35 feet higher. So, one other thing that I just wanted to mention -- if you go back to the street view portion that we grabbed as a screen grab -- is that neighbor -- their house is elevated there. So, not only is the lawn elevation 34 feet higher than the potential future lot, they also have a raised patio or a raised deck area, if you want to call it. So, we really feel like there is no obstruction of any views for existing neighbors, which I know people love and it would allow for a potential nice product to be built in the subdivision area where views can be protected. One of the comments that was brought up in Planning and Zoning was is there a way to mention to these homeowners that the land to the -- further to the east is a medium density residential and, hey, people might build in your backyard. Can you understand that you are buying a view right now, is there an opportunity to that -- hard to -- hard to have action to it. We would like to and -- and maybe it's, hey, talking to the realtor who is selling the homes and saying, hey, just so you know this is coming up, but it is a bit of a tale as old as time, someone buys a home and next thing you know somebody wants to develop and they say, hey, I just bought this. So, it's something that the developer would like to do. It's just hard to provide action to it and say, hey, we can really do this anyways. More to the point of this subdivision, we think that this subdivision has adequate view and protects the views to the neighbor. So, we have a bit more concrete information on that going back to that question from the neighbor there, as opposed to what we had at Planning and Zoning. Just kind of overview of where this site sits, just trying to show that it's an area contiguous to development. There is subdivisions around. We feel that this site, even though it is an annexation, isn't annexing as an island, there is subdivisions in the general immediate vicinity. As mentioned this would be a low density residential, which is in the future land use map for the city, next to that medium density residential. So, again, going back to the idea of contiguous development, going from medium density into that low density, having that nice buffer or that nice transition zone between those two zones right there. Just speaking to traffic considerations, what KaraLeigh was speaking to about what is happening in this area in the capital improvement plan and the five year work plan. ACHD's improvements in this area would include a five lane widening of Amity Road, three lane widening of Locust Grove Road, and, then, the big -- the big hot topic would be the multi-lane roundabout proposed at the intersection of

Locust Grove and Amity right there. I did speak to the designer for ACHD and they were able to provide this graphic, which kind of gives a better -- a better idea of what's happening in this area. This shows the roundabout which they are proposing. This is what would be built out there. This is how they would annex -- or this how ACHD would purchase the right of way area and make this fit for this specific intersection. You can see that the proposal for the frontage improvements across the church property are included in the ACHD portion and that was part of the reason at Planning and Zoning that we discussed is this something that we could allow ACHD to handle in regard to that five foot pathway in front of Amity and Locust Grove for the church property? Is this something where we can allow ACHD to handle it? If we come in, put it in and, then, ACHD says, okay, well, now we need to tear it up, because we need to actually buy a bunch of right of way and put all this in. So, that was the comment there. The other comment on top of that was the pedestrian access in this area in this immediate vicinity is minimal, so providing that five foot wide asphalt pathway wouldn't serve that many residents. So, the developer going back to it, they are not trying to skirt the responsibility of providing pathways or providing frontage, it's just there is really not that many people that we envision using this pathway and, two, we think that ACHD is going to be in here building a much better, more improved intersection and tearing it out in the, you know, near future, at least near future in regard to what ACHD works on. So, that's -- that was the comment there and that's where Planning and Zoning agreed and said, yes, we understand that this is something we could go with or remove from the application item.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Jadon, can we jump back real quick? And I know you have got time. I will make sure that --

Schneider: Yeah, of course.

Cavener: -- you get time. But just -- I think this slide is helpful to me. Can you use your mouse and kind of indicate on that roundabout where the entrance to your neighborhood will -- will begin?

Schneider: Yes. It's down generally in this area.

Cavener: That's -- that's my kind of eyeballing it, so I appreciate you commenting,

Schneider: Of course. Of course. And I will come back to this side, because I do want to touch more on that -- on the comments and questions there. Open space. Generally, the idea would be to have that centralized open space, allow for the residents to use it or potential future residents to use it. Kind of go over it quickly here for the alternative compliance request. Linda touched on it. The idea in originally putting this site together, was meeting all of the conditions that ACHD had and the city had which are

ACHD wants a 50 foot wide right of way and the city has requested a 25 foot landscape buffer. If you give up both 50 feet to ACHD and 25 feet to the city, then, the existing home gets squeezed down into a situation where their front yard and their driveway is no longer usable. You can kind of see this is at the maximum. If the city said we needed a 25 foot landscape buffer, and ACHD needed 50 feet of right of way, this is what would happen. There would be two issues here. One, the existing home would lose -- basically lose access to its driveway, because the access point would get too tight and, two, the home would no longer be conforming to a setback. So, in order to provide this as an approval the city would have to approve some sort of reduced setback for this existing home. So, the alternative compliance that's being proposed is this idea of give ACHD all 50 feet of their right of way, then, provide a 12 and a half foot landscape buffer easement, as opposed to a true common lot, which solves the issue of potentially having a setback issue and, then, in -- because we have reduced that 25 feet down to 12 and a half feet for the landscape easement, increase the number of trees in that area and increase the landscaping. So, going back to the idea of alternative compliance, the developer is trying to comply with the idea of, hey, here is a landscape buffer that buffers the street from the existing home or new homes and this is how they are trying to meet it alternatively. So, that's basically what's happening here. Happy to talk on it more, but, generally, we have tried to work with staff to come up with an idea that we think works well on that. Did I have any more? No. This was this one. Again, Linda showed these elevations. So, simple elevations there and, then, here is the side view. I will just try to touch on some of the comments or questions that we had right away to start with it. Going back to the elevation difference here, there is about 50 feet of elevation difference from the south side of the property all the way to the north side of property. So, talking about Locust Grove, how steep is that hill, for that grade of that hill from the top to the bottom has about a 50 feet -- 50 feet of fall in that situation and, then, going back to the ACHD comment, there is a comment in the staff report. It is the traffic engineering letter and I'm just going to try to read from it, so I didn't have it in the report, but I would have, if I had known we were going to talk about it. It should be at least in the applicant material. But generally it comes from the traffic engineer and it speaks to the distance of the intersection and just quoting from the traffic engineer when they did the review from our field observations, placing the proposed subdivision access onto Locust Grove roughly 550 feet south of Amity Road intersection, will provide safer site distances for vehicles entering and exiting the subdivision. It was also observed that vehicles traveling northbound along Locust Grove Road along the Solara Estates proposed frontage were typically slowing down as they approached the stop controlled intersection with Amity Road. So, we did have a traffic engineer review the intersection and the distance there and, again, going back to what KaraLeigh with ACHD mentioned, it is in ACHD's staff report that in order for this intersection that we are proposing to be approved the plan reviewer, the design reviewer for -- plan reviewer for ACHD, would need to read that letter, agree with that letter, and say, yes, this distance works. Otherwise, we can move it further to the south closer to the hill. However, the idea coming from the traffic engineer is separating that -- that -- or increasing that distance closer to the south side of Locust Grove or the property along Locust Grove adds more variation between the crest of the hill and the actual intersection itself. So, separating it from the crest and having it down at the bottom of the intersection is the balancing act of

what we are trying to do in that situation. So, there is a separation distance trying to meet from ACHD for the intersection and a separation distance from the crest of the hill that we are trying to meet as well. The traffic engineer who reviewed it did put their stamp on it and say that they believe that this is a safe site distance. One of the comments about coming down the hill that was brought up earlier was is there something we can do. If that's something where we would want to put, hey, a flashing stop ahead at the south side of the intersection if ACHD allowed it, that's something that we could do to provide some sort of warning or heads up that as you crest the hill. It's a bit of an ACHD call, since it's in their roadway and their right of way. But that's something that would be maybe potentially a viable solution to adding that. I believe I answered the questions. I may have missed one. And with that I would be happy to answer anymore questions or questions that I may have missed. So thank you.

Simison: Council, any questions for the applicant?

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I don't want to sound like I'm beating a dead horse. I like a lot of what you have got here. I like the lot sizes. I'm just very happy it's not multi-family. What I'm most concerned about when I look at this section of Locust Grove -- and maybe, again, this goes back to KaraLeigh at ACHD -- is we know we are going to get a roundabout, but at some point they are going to redo that section of Locust Grove from the roundabout south to Lake Hazel and I believe the current plan is this is going to go to three lanes. But as I watched ACHD on every one of these similar roadways where you have got a slant coming down that hill is part of what their engineers do in planning is they try to level that out -- to take that hill out and make it more level. Same thing they are doing right now from Lake Hazel on Eagle Road coming down. They took most of that hill out. You are right in the middle of that with a driveway that's going to be coming up on Locust Grove with the fact that if they rebuild that and raise that roadway to level out that hill what kind of impact is that going to have on you and I will leave that in KaraLeigh's hands as well, because I see that as being kind of an issue for you coming down the road.

Schneider: Figuratively and literally. Mr. Mayor, Council Member Overton, thank you for that and please -- I don't mean to be rude grabbing my phone. I'm trying to grab an e-mail that I had. We did reach out to KaraLeigh about the actual roundabout itself to try to say, hey, you know, what do we need to account for there? I will -- I can try to find it if you need it, but generally their comment was, hey, we are 50 percent designed at the moment already, so we believe that they are going to have a good idea of what elevation they want that roadway to be and what -- if they are changing the grade what that will be and I do believe that that's the type of thing that the design reviewer for ACHD would analyze and say, hey, your intersection is too low at this stage to meet our roundabout. We are going to need to come up with something that allows us to marry these two up. So, with the fact that ACHD has already -- is already steps and leaps and

bounds ahead of where we are at on the design phase, because we haven't started the design phase, I believe that this is the type of thing that would get handled at the design review phase with ACHD.

Simison: Seeing no other --

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Just a quick question. On the aerial view that we had previously it looked like there was a drainage going north to south through your property or maybe south to north, I'm not sure, but there is definitely a slope in the middle of that pasture area. What impact does that have on the developability, if that's a word, of that property?

Schneider: The biggest impact that it would have would mostly be on this lot that we are speaking of that -- to not block the view and it would be the fact that this lot would have a most likely reduced building envelope or retaining wall at the back in order to build a lot that really has a nice flat building pad. The idea would be in this stage build the road out to a finished grade that matches the existing property level and, then, try to level that ground around that. So, for this lot mostly can this lot find a lot -- find a pad elevation that works really well across the entire site. You get into the hillside drainage thing and you can do things like step level homes and you can do that side, but with this site, just because of where it's at, generally this building pad is the only one that would generally be affected and it's not as affected as it appears in comparison, because the fact that the -- you can kind of see the slope -- the contour lines as they come around the existing home start to gradually even out as they get to the actual lot in question itself. So, we -- I believe that it's a non-issue or it's an issue that can be solved pretty standardly for this type of subdivision.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I have got another question maybe for -- for KaraLeigh if she is still on and at least that would give the applicant an opportunity to respond if needed. KaraLeigh, are you still on with us?

Troyer: Mr. Mayor, Councilman, yes.

Cavener: Great. What is ACHD's policy on length from a roundabout, like the type of roundabout that would be proposed, to the entrance of the neighborhood? Is it 500 feet? Is it 300 feet? Is it 750 feet? A thousand? Help me understand what the distance is.

Troyer: Mr. Mayor, Councilman, yes, earlier I misspoke saying that it was compliant and to clarify, the roadway offset for a local roadway that's intersecting Locust Grove Road from the nearest other intersection would be 660 feet. This does not meet that offset. However, we approved it due to the concerns regarding slope, because if it was pushed further away from that intersection, then, the slope would become more of an issue. So, it is 660 feet and it is only about over 500.

Cavener: Okay. Thank you. I don't think I have anymore questions, Mr. Mayor.

Simison: Okay. All right. Thank you very much. This is a public hearing. Mr. Clerk, do we have people signed up on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we do. Codi Bills.

Simison: When your name is called please come forward and state your name and address for the record and be recognized for three minutes. Good evening.

Bills: Good evening, Mr. Mayor and Council Members. My name is Codi Bills. I live at 5060 South Locust Grove Road. My husband and I are here in favor of the project. We are actually the residents that reside on this project and we are Idaho natives and we have raised our boys there on this property. We bought this beautiful piece of property so that we could teach our kids farming and -- and have some land and enjoy the area and we are surrounded by wonderful neighbors who have been there way longer than we have and we are in the position where we -- you know, we are done with farming. Our boys are moving and leaving the nest and we thought it would be a nice way to kind of transition to our next step of life and create a neighborhood that we are actually a part of. As you can imagine since we moved there we have been hit up by developers nonstop and our neighbors have experienced the same thing and so when it came to our decision we actually went out and interviewed and found a developer that would work with us and create a community that we wanted to be part of that would be a nice transition, because we know the density is all around and so when we had our neighborhood meeting all of our community around us was very pleasantly surprised and very grateful that we were doing low density, because we wanted to be mindful of the traffic. We want to be mindful of the views, as Jadon just mentioned and so, yeah, we are in favor of it and we believe that the traffic issues that are going on now are due to, you know, Eagle Road being closed and all the construction and with it being low density and such little homes it's not going to make a huge impact on the traffic and we just want to be good neighbors and create a really nice neighborhood, low density, that kind of -- something that was mentioned in the Planning and Zoning meeting is that the members of the committee there we are grateful that it was low density, so it kind of transitions into the high density around the area. So, we just ask that it gets passed and that we can work together as the community and we are just grateful that we are ahead of you guys tonight. So, thank you.

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

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, that was everyone.

Simison: Okay. Is there anybody else present that would like to provide testimony on this item or if you are online you can use the raise your hand feature. Seeing no one raising their hand online or coming forward, would the applicant like to close?

Schneider: Only if there are any further questions, but, otherwise, thank you for your time and -- time from staff as well. Thanks for Linda working so hard on this. Thanks.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Maybe not a question for you, but for staff. There is a lot of comments about how you have worked well with the church and they are your path to annexation here. I didn't see anything in the staff report that the church has submitted a letter of support or agreed to annexation. Linda, is that something that we require and did I just miss it?

Ritter: Mayor, Council Member, so the church was a part of our pre-application meeting when we met on this project and they provided the affidavit of interest for the application to move forward on their behalf. So, they are part of this. They just allowed Jadon and his group to do the work.

Whitlock: Thank you.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Just a quick staff clear up. On Commission changes to staff recommendation, this is not recommending the temporary sidewalk along the church property. So, is it your intention that we don't require the sidewalk?

Ritter: If you choose not to. That was their recommendation.

Overton: Thank you.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: To follow up on Councilman Overton's question, was it P&Z's recommendation not to require if there was not to be roadway improvements within a year? Was that -- wasn't that more of the -- what it was recommended?

Ritter: Mr. Mayor, Council Member, so based on the testimony by the applicant at the last -- at the P&Z hearing, it sounded like the project was already funded and would be done soon, but based on the conversation with ACHD today -- so, it's designed. There -- they still have to get right of way, but there is no construction schedule at this time.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor, quick follow up and a comment. So, if we didn't require the sidewalks around the church, but this -- this project would have to have those sidewalks put in, you would have a hundred -- or however many feet long it is of just sidewalks, just -- there. Right. That's kind of what we are looking at if we did not require the sidewalks around the church potentially.

Ritter: Correct. When the roundabout comes in ACHD will be providing sidewalks along there, but until that happens there won't be any. Yeah. Even if it was just for the Locust Grove side having a little something going up. But, again, it is your call on how you want this to happen.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Is the applicant paying for those temporary sidewalks around the church?

Ritter: Correct.

Taylor: Okay.

Simison: So, maybe just to highlight that one point, I know one mile north of this we have a temporary sidewalk on the exact same corner that when ACHD did the roundabout they did not put in permanent sidewalk. Whatever happened during that process make sure that doesn't happen in this process. That does say as a -- as something. So, just for note.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I'm happy to at least kick off some deliberation, just kind of at least share where I -- I'm sitting right now. I came in -- many of my Council Members are very excited about this project. Lower density. Honestly, the layout is a good use of the elevation. Small impact to road network that's constrained, but will be improved. Low Impact on -- on the surrounding schools. It checks a lot of boxes for me. The piece that I am -- I'm struggling to get past is how both the residents of this neighborhood and our community will be impacted by -- by an entrance that doing crude math and a Google map looks like that vehicles will enter and exit as the roundabout is essentially splitting and our -- our good Mayor has been very vocal and he and I have had some very robust debates about the benefits or non-benefits of roundabouts. I have traditionally been a

fan, but every day I drive past Locust Grove and Victory at that roundabout and see an accident. Every day I see an accident. I have been a witness to two accidents, because I -- I have been there when they have occurred and so I'm very sensitive to the traffic impacts that they have and they are certainly going to be accelerated by the elevation of -- of Locust Grove there at -- at Amity. So, I love every part about this project, but the access and I don't know how you fix that, but it is to me, tonight, too high of a barrier, because this is one of those things that I live just down the street from here; right? That I can envision ten years from now driving past there to go to the library and whatnot and there is an accident right there and it's going to be the people that are going to buy these lots and it's going to be our residents that live in South Meridian that are going to be involved and I just -- I don't want to create what I think is maybe already a challenging issue with roundabouts in this part of town with having this entrance be on an elevated access. So, I'm happy to hear feedback from my -- from my colleagues, but I'm -- I'm really struggling to be supportive this night, although I love every other part about it.

Simison: Well, since my roundabout views were brought up and I, too, am a stone's throw from this intersection, I don't know that I have an opinion about the distance. I just want to say thank you to ACHD for finally making the decision on what this is going to be. You know, that -- that was a big hang up that we have had, that I have had is, you know, the limboness of what this intersection -- was it going to be an intersection or was it going to be a roundabout and I have asked ACHD to correct me when I spoke with the director if I'm wrong, but if a roundabout goes in at this location this will be the longest non-hill road with roundabouts in maybe Ada county, because you will have three miles of roundabouts, which is quite a huge feat, because that's what they said they want to do is actually create a network of roundabouts. So, unless we are going to go back and say we think another type of intersection is better, I have to defer to the experts that they said this is the best location. Over time our residents will figure out how to navigate roundabouts. I hope. My children included as the case may be. But, you know, this is one of those things where this intersection, irregardless, is going to be a challenge. You know, the -- I'm not so concerned about this elevation, because this one's pretty -- this one's pretty -- you have the crest all the way down. It's a lot longer over down, you know, length versus coming off of the other direction, which is much steeper. So, the -- the elevation changes, the location, I'm not as worried about it once people learn how to effectively navigate the roundabout issue, but this is what you get. You do get more accidents irregardless. They are just not as bad and can hopefully get cleared up sooner. So, just food for thought. That's all I got tonight is food for thought.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I want to clarify just this comment Councilman Cavener made about the -- where this actually intersects. Linda, could you go back to the slide that showed sort of the roundabout design that the applicant had and I don't know if it's to scale or if it's exact, but can you put the cursor, to the best of your guess, about where the access

point -- about right there? So, where does the road actually start to split to -- for the roundabout; do you know? Anybody? Is it going to be this --

Ritter: This should be your median right here.

Taylor: So, the orange would be the median and, then, where you see the two yellow lines that's just kind of indicating the -- there is no median in the roadway, it's just sort of --

Ritter: Striping it looks like.

Taylor: Yeah. Okay. And maybe KaraLeigh mentioned this from ACHD, but the distance from the roundabout to the access point -- they were okay with that. That met their standards. Or no?

Ritter: It didn't meet the standards. It's a little shorter than the standards. The standard is 660. This is just over 500 she said.

Taylor: About a hundred feet. I -- I'm trying to get a better sense what the difference is between what they want to see and what they recommend and what we are actually seeing on the map.

Ritter: So, the recommendation from ACHD is that the distance would be 660 feet, but this location is just a little over 500 feet, so it does not meet the requirement. But they were okay with this location based on the elevations.

Taylor: Then somewhat related on -- do we know what the roadway network is supposed to look like in the future? Because it looked like on the east side of the property that roadway continues on. Do we have any idea where that would continue through and connect to either Amity or somewhere else? Is there any -- any indication or do we have any understanding of what that might look like in the future? I know that's kind of an unfair question for you guys, but I'm just wondering if we have that.

Ritter: So, Mr. Mayor, Council Member Taylor, we are hoping that in the future that these roads line up and, then, come this way eventually.

Taylor: Thank you. That's kind of what I was thinking. There has got to be that -- obviously there is a design here to have the -- another access point out. Probably in 20 years.

Ritter: Right. That's why you see the dead ends. It's more of the cul-de-sac, so they can be extended in the future.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Linda, just looking back at the staff report and the access points for the church and maybe this will get to Councilman Cavener's point, it looks like there are three access points on the church property; is that correct? Two on to Amity on the north and one onto Locust Grove, which would be on the southwest corner of that property.

Ritter: Correct.

Whitlock: ACHD is recommending, at least looking at the staff report, that one of those be eliminated; is that correct? The conditional use permit approved by Ada county required the applicant to eliminate the northwestern access.

Ritter: That was when they received their conditional use permit through the county. They were supposed to get rid of one of those access points and it doesn't look like they did. But that was when they were in the county with their --

Whitlock: It -- it looks like -- Mr. Mayor, follow up.

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: It looks like there may have been an access point right on the corner of Amity and Locust Grove, right in that northwest that is now landscaped and buffered off. So, it used to be four access points, but --

Ritter: Correct.

Whitlock: -- no concern about the southwest access point onto Locust Grove by the county in their CUP process and I would assume there haven't been really significant issues egressing or entering the church parking lot on that southwest corner at this point.

Ritter: Correct.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor, I guess just knowing the -- the kind of traffic that would be there on a Sunday and evenings during the week, I'm not sure that 19 homes would generate significantly more traffic and that excess -- or that access point on the church parking lot is certainly closer than the 660 feet. I guess I don't have as much heartburn about another access point a couple hundred feet away from the current access point on the southwest corner of the church property. I just don't think you are going to generate the kind of traffic that would be generated 200 feet or 150 feet to the north coming and going from the church. It's just my observation.

Simison: I don't know that three wrongs make a right, but, again, Victory and Locust Grove, the access points are as close, if not closer, from the off of Coastline. It's definitely below the 660 feet. You have another access point to the north off of Sagemore. Just to the north it's got to be within 200 feet. I don't -- I'm not -- again, we

see accidents there all the time. I'm not going to say that's -- those are the right things, but, you know --

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Just a quick -- again using a Google measuring device, Coastline to the center of the roundabout of Victory is 750 feet. So, it's actually further distance than what is -- what is being proposed here and, again, eyeballing it again from where kind of the applicant demonstrated where the access would be doesn't fall within 600 feet. It's closer to 450 and I think that's kind of where my heartburn is, you know, and perhaps this is, I think, a good question to the applicant is if they are going to accept a condition if that entrance to the neighborhood, you know, doesn't exist less than 600 feet I could maybe be open to that idea. I just -- I don't want to create a problem here and I think it's -- it's less of a Sunday issue. I look at it as a 5:30 on a Tuesday issue with residents that are headed to south Meridian and while the resident is trying to get in and can't because traffic is also headed northbound, that you have got some traffic problems, or in the morning someone's trying to rush out there and now you have got an accident before you get to the roundabout.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: You know, first flush I really like this and the problem is the more I'm -- I'm looking at it I got concerns and part of that is how close it is to the roundabout. We have had decisions we have made on projects before where initially when we look at it and we look at just this one we think that looks really good. That's just fine. But we are going to put a stub street to the east and we have to be thinking in our minds sitting up here on the dais, that that could develop and push that much more traffic out onto Locust Grove or these folks could go out onto Amity and I think we need to remember that this church is coming in as part of this annexation, so these other two lots would come in and now we could see that property to the east as well come into the city or have an application. Could already be something they are watching tonight. I can't help but look at that and think about how that whole corner is going to develop and how much residential we are going to plug in that close to the corner. I'm still confused on the sidewalk issue, if we are not going to require sidewalks around the church, then, it's an absolute no go for me, because I would never approve sidewalks that end up going nowhere once they leave this applicant's property. I think we would be looked at as fools trying to be staring at this in ten years if the roadway projects are delayed and we still have dirt on the side of the roads, because we never did the right thing and required the sidewalks when we had the opportunity, which is annexation, and that's what we are here for tonight. So, I'm not in favor right now, unless something changes, at least in what I'm told about how the sidewalk situation is going to be. I know I have to trust the experts from ACHD if they think it's going to be fine when it deals with the elevation. I

think when they take that old rural two lane Locust Grove and they make it a three lane, which is in their plans, it's going to raise that road bed, because I have watched them do it other places. I watched them do it at my subdivision to the point that I have got quite a lip trying to get out of it and I think you are going to be dealing with that down the road, because they are going to try to mitigate that slope going down that hill. That's just a matter of timing, because we don't know when that road is going to get built. That's all I got.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I think the characteristics of the site probably don't allow for really a different access point, unless the applicant can show us I think this is -- the access point we are seeing is probably what -- the only option probably is, unless there is another way the site could be redesigned. I know we still -- the public hearing is still open, so maybe we could ask the question if -- is there -- I mean if you want to come on up and let me ask you this question. Is there another way to design the site to allow that access point to be further south?

Schneider: The simple answer is yes. But in my view the correct answer is no, going back to the constraint being the roundabout intersection and ACHD's request to push an intersection as far away from an intersection -- existing intersection on these collector roads as possible. Just to clarify, 550 feet for that intersection there -- ACHD is 650. The -- ACHD is asking to push that intersection back as far as possible for the site access point, because that is a safety concern for them. They say we want to get these intersections as far back as possible, so that we can provide safe entrance, left turn, right turn, however, from an intersection. However, the other constraint is the fact that Locust Grove has that crest there and with the crest there is a sight distance conflict that takes place. So, when you get into the traffic engineering side of it all, which I only took traffic engineering one in college, so I'm not an expert and I would never claim to be. However, where it goes into is the idea that as the car crests the hill they need a certain amount of sight distance in order to crest the hill, see over the hood of your car and see something in front of you. So, the idea is this is the balancing act between pushing the intersection as far back from the intersection as possible, so that there is adequate spacing for ACHD's policy and, then, also the safety issue of can you add that distance on the other side away from the crest of the hill as far as possible. And that's just looking back to why we had the traffic engineer, who actually took way more classes than I did on it, study it and say this is the best location to have it, because it should meet both setback standards. Going back to it again, ACHD in their staff report did say that this would need to be reviewed by their internal traffic design reviewer. They would need to say, yes, we concur with everything. This would make sense there. So, the answer being, yes, you could put the intersection anywhere. No, the intersection is most likely the best in this space based off of the traffic engineer. So, yes and no, I think there. Thank you.

Taylor: Yeah. That answered my question. Mr. Mayor, I will just -- that's very helpful. Thank you. Just some of my thinking here. So, we are going to have a roundabout. I don't think we are going to be having a different type of intersection. So, this problem doesn't change with -- necessarily. I mean this -- this property has this unique characteristics that we are discussing and debating tonight will be true today as it will be in five years or ten years or whatever down the future. I also look at when you -- this map right here it kind of helps you see -- you know, when you stub that road through how many more homes, potentially, would you bring in? Clearly you will have some, but they will also have an access -- or an exit point onto Amity Road. There is going to be other ways of flowing and it's not like we are looking at hundreds of acres that -- a potential development that would come out that -- that roadway that's being proposed to be developed within this subdivision. So, I appreciate the explanation on kind of finding that balance is within under the 660 feet, which I understand why that's a concern, but it feels like smarter people than me have said this is probably -- with this unique property this is the best you can probably do. I'm comfortable I think with -- with how that's proposed, though I certainly may not be smart enough to understand how the roadway grading might be different, but that might be -- that's clearly going to come after this property is probably developed, you know, with -- ACHD doesn't have funding planned to do any construction until I think you said 2029 or 2030, if I'm recalling correctly. Well, actually, it's not even funded yet. It's not funded yet. So, I asked myself, well, if not this, then what? I don't know that the then what changes much from this. I don't -- I don't see what you do differently to give us, frankly, a housing product that we would like more of. These half acres, larger homes, this is -- this is kind of nice this part of town. It matches our future land use with the low density residential. We want to see that kind of stuff. So, if not this, then, what are we going to have? ACHD says they are okay with that and the traffic studies are saying this is how you would lay this out. I'm comfortable enough with that.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Council Member Taylor brings up very fair and valid questions and I think the -- the hard answer is probably the right answer, which is you have got to rely on development to the east to come in first with that kind of interconnectivity that exists with some of the neighborhoods that are already there off of Amity. This, you know, is kind of a weird, small, new annexation, but kind of functions a little bit like in-fill in that it's reliant I think on some other development to occur. Jadon, maybe just a question for you and your team. You recognize, right, we try to work collaboratively and find the right path forward. Five hundred and fifty feet, would you guys also accept a condition that would make your entrance to your neighborhood right-in, right-out?

Schneider: Most likely. It does get a bit tough if somebody wants to go southbound on Locust Grove or the right-in, right-out -- the trouble with the right-in, right-out is in order for someone to turn into that intersection without that roundabout to the south there -- I think if there was a way to do it it would be potentially when that roundabout is

completed it allows that right-in, right-out, so someone could, then, travel southbound exiting the site, because they could travel northbound, right in and there. So, it might be a bit of a clause, that might be the way to do it, say, hey, as soon as that roundabout is done this needs to be, then, converted to a right-in, right-out. It's to allow somebody to come in. But, then, it still goes back to the idea of people trying to get into the intersection coming from the northbound, headed southbound, turning into that intersection. Gets tough unless they go all the way and loop -- if there is an -- you know, an existing roundabout on the south it would work great, because, then, yeah, you have a longer commute, but you do it. So, it's a bit tough. Like, yes, but in theory it works great. It might have some clauses that might help it.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, follow up.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Appreciate kind of the thought of like, hey, let's get that -- let's do that when the roundabout happens. So, let's for a minute look into our crystal ball; right? We heard from ACHD 2029, maybe; right? This project's ridiculously successful, right? As soon as you announce your lots are pre-sold, because everybody wants this type of housing product in this part of Meridian. You build. Everything's long gone and done by 2028, 2029, roundabout doesn't get built to 2032, how does the city come back and get this right-in, right-out done? You guys are done, moved on to many more successful projects, your residents are happy, and yet this issue remains without a mechanism for the city to kind of enforce.

Schneider: I think what happens in those scenarios is ACHD would be in charge of the road and what's in their right of way and if -- and KaraLeigh can -- if she's still on and hopefully she is not bored to death with my talking about what she says or not. I think what happens in those scenarios is the city goes to ACHD and says, hey, we have a problem that we need to address. This is a point that we would like to handle. Can -- ACHD, can you do something about this intersection? So, yes, it does get tricky in that scenario to say, hey, can we pin this to the developer and can the developer provide some sort of appeasement to it. I think what happens right now is ACHD has reviewed it and said we are good with it at this point and there -- I think, you know, the ideal scenario in a right-in, right-out is the parcel to the east, the 20 acres or so to the east develops, and, then, all of a sudden there is, hey, there is a great secondary access somewhere else. You know, this developer doesn't own that land, they -- yeah. If it was a master planned community it would be a much easier way to say this -- this access is very limited. We can't make this access work for two lane or something like that.

Cavener: Just for your -- sorry, Mr. Mayor.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I don't know where the rest of the Council is. This has been a good conversation. I think if I were to be supportive it would be a condition you guys would

need to do it. You would probably need to do it with development of the neighborhood. I want to make sure I'm being real transparent with you. I hear what you are saying on be great later on. I don't want to -- again, I won't -- I won't be here at that time to, then, somebody remember to say, hey, ACHD, the Council talked about this seven years ago. Go build this. They are going to say, well, you should have conditioned that if that was something that you wanted. So, just trying to be upfront with you. Like if -- if I were to be supportive it would be based on a condition that you guys would build this right-in, right-out upon construction development of your neighborhood.

Schneider: Can we flesh it out a little bit more? Just with it -- I don't want to -- you know, if that's okay. I guess the intersection to the south -- so, Amity, Locust Grove, if anyone remembers what the intersection of the south would be, that one further down Locust Grove.

Simison: Lake Hazel is already a roundabout.

Schneider: And so that's a roundabout in that scenario. In that scenario the ask of the lot owners would be instead of making a left-hand turn -- you are traveling southbound on Locust Grove, instead of making a left-hand turn into your intersect -- into your subdivision here you have to travel a quarter mile, three quarter mile down, turn around and get into it. I guess if it's between a denial of the subdivision and a right-in, right-out, there is probably the idea that a right-in, right-out would be -- would be agreeable, you know, potentially. My disagreement might be different with it. But, yes, if it -- it was a -- this is the death penalty or you can take this plea deal, we are probably taking the plea deal on that one. Yeah. All right. Thank you. Yes.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilwoman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor. Council. I am really liking this development. I think it's -- we don't have enough of these. I think that we get a lot of demand for this and I love seeing -- excuse me -- the generational, the family that farmed it, that raised their kids, that are still staying there. I think all of that is about as good as it gets. Little concerned about the road. You know, I wish it was longer. I'm sorry. It's allergy season for me. That we don't have the full 660 feet that ACHD would like to see, but with that slope I certainly understand their concern. My concern with making a right-in, right-out is I have seen so many people lately when they can't get to where they want to with their intersection, are making turns in the middle between intersections and I think that -- especially when it probably really wouldn't be needed to start with until that roundabout got in it wouldn't be convenient, I think we just encourage people to do what's convenient if it's really not the right thing and that's not going clear to the roundabout to get turned around and so at -- at this point where ACHD didn't bring it up, I would be fine with just leaving it as it is and -- and move forward with this development. Not sure about the sidewalks to be honest. I don't see creating sidewalks that are going nowhere and, hopefully, then,

when ACHD puts the roundabout in, then, we have nice sidewalks instead of temporary sidewalks.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Unless Council wants to continue to discuss and ask questions, I would like to make a motion to close the public hearing on Item 8.

Overton: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and second to close the public hearing. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Simison: A lot of really good discussion. This is kind of a hard one given some of the circumstances, but I want to focus on what I think is really good about this. First off I think it's a great story. I love that you can come, you can have a piece of property, you can raise your family there, you can then -- then evolve into the next phase, what that looks like. We believe in personal property rights and the ability to have control of our -- our future and our destiny and I really -- I really think that we should be trying our best to work to help the citizens of Meridian, Ada county, Idaho, to -- to live that and to flesh that out. So, to me I think that -- that is something important to consider. This is a housing type that we don't see a lot of that I think we want to see more of. This is a great part of the city that is -- hopefully we can see more of that, but I like how the property is laid out. I think the applicant's tried to accommodate the neighbors really well. I think that the way they have designed the development makes sense. I think it's good. I think they have done the best that they can. And, frankly, I don't really see what would be different in the future with what we may see here. So, I hate to stand in the way of something that we see would be there. So, given that ACHD has not indicated that this is a major problem where the access point is and that we have done our best to find that middle ground, I think that bodes well for this application. I won't make a motion yet if there is other Council Members that want to continue to discuss this a little bit now that we are -- we have closed the public hearing, but I will be making a motion to approve this application at the appropriate time.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: I would just echo a lot of what Councilman Taylor said and if not this, then what and that what doesn't get any better than what we have here I believe. So, I'm -- I'm also in the same camp of leaning on the expertise of the Ada County Highway

District that have looked at this, looked at the crest of the hill, balanced the safety concerns, as well as the ingress and egress into this property and -- and signed off on that access point where -- where it's proposed. So, I have to rely on the experts from -- from that standpoint. And, then, as well, you know, if we have got concerns about access on Locust Grove, then, we probably ought to have concerns about the church's ingress and egress there on Locust Grove as well. That church has been there a long time and I'm not aware of significant issues that they have had on the Locust Grove side on Sundays or Tuesdays or Wednesday evenings when youth groups are there, I'm not aware of major concerns with that. So, again, just echoing a lot of what Councilman Taylor says -- said, I think this is a good project. I like the story behind it. I like the fact that this is a product that I think is in high demand and it's 19 homes. It's -- it's not a huge impact. It does open up opportunities to the east, I recognize that, but those properties to the east also have an opportunity to have access points onto Amity Road. So I'm -- I'm going to be in favor of this project tonight.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I guess the one -- before I make a motion -- and maybe Council can weigh in a little bit as to what to do with the sidewalks. I go back and forth, because temporary sidewalks to get pulled -- you know, torn up here in a few years, but maybe a few years is a long time. It's strange to me to just put a few sidewalks in the middle of, you know, what is still a fairly rural area. My inclination is to still require the sidewalks throughout -- across to the church, as the city is recommending, and not to -- to waive that requirement. So, unless anyone disagrees, that would be my intent -- my motion. Okay. Mr. Mayor, I would move that we approve application H-2025-0013, yep, as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of October 14th, 2025, and to clarify that we do intend that the sidewalks be extended around the church property as presented.

Overton: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second. Is there discussion on the motion? If not, clerk call the roll.

Roll Call: Cavener, nay; Strader, absent; Overton, yea; Little Roberts, yea; Taylor, yea; Whitlock, yea.

Simison: Four ayes. One nay. And the item is agreed to. Best of luck.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. ONE NAY. ONE ABSENT.

9. Public Hearing for UDC Text Amendment (ZOA-2025-0001) by City of Meridian Planning Division, located citywide.

- A. Request: UDC Text Amendment to revise the specific use standards associated with drive-throughs and secondary dwellings in Chapter 4 of the Unified development Code (UDC).

Simison: Council, do we need a break or we just want to move on? Okay. All right. Next up is Item 9, which is a public hearing for UDC Text Amendment ZOA-2025-0001. We will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Parsons: Good evening, Mayor, Members of Council. The last item on the agenda was -- I labeled it part two of our UDC discussion. I was here before you in August talking about all the changes that we had shared with the UDC focus group. Council at that time elected to hold back two additional items, one being drive-throughs and the other being secondary dwellings or accessory use -- accessory dwelling units and so wanted to at least give you some context. I think probably all of you have seen the public record, received some public testimony on this item. Given the circumstances around what's happened with a previous application that you acted on at that same hearing on the 12th, but I know the Council is aware, but I surely want to make the public aware that we have been messing with the drive-through standards for over a year. This is the third time that I have been in front of you trying to get the standards better. As I mentioned in my previous presentations we have seen a large amount of drive-throughs coming through our -- into our city, not only fast food and as you all know drive-throughs aren't all the same and we have talked about that numerous times at our various hearings. Under the current code a drive-through is an accessory use and so, therefore, it goes in concert with some other use and as we have talked at previous hearings, a bank with a teller window or an ATM is still considered a drive through, but they don't function the same. A Dutch Brothers with two drive-throughs functions quite a bit differently, but under our code it's the same and depending on whether or not you are within 300 feet of another drive-through or 300 feet of an existing residence would dictate whether it's approved at the director level or at a public hearing through a conditional use permit. So, again, that's what's on the books today. A CUP is only required when those two things exist. You are within 300 feet of another drive-through or 300 feet of an existing residence. So, the purpose of what I was trying to -- of what we have been trying to do as a city for the last year and several meetings that we have had -- it's better to define our drive through standards. The intent was never to make the process easier or get out of a process, it was meant to say we understand that all drive-throughs are not the same and we need to get a handle on what that is and so the proposal that I have shared with all of you brings that to you. It comes with a tiered approach to treat them differently, because they are different. Over the years with our conversations we also talked about the requirements, what other things do we need to put into the -- what other standards do we need to make sure that they don't impact adjacent property owners? That was what I had in my proposal to you as well. So, again, that goes to highlight number two, what are we trying to do. Better define drive-through businesses, what they are and how to differentiate. We are doing that. Two, more express standards. We are doing that. And I will get into my presentation a little bit more. And, then, three, probably what you have seen in the public testimony is we are trying to make it easier. Probably the biggest difference between the changes that

are on the books today and what I have -- the UDC focus group and staff has proposed to City Council is whether or not we want a CUP -- you can't hear me? Okay. Sorry. What we are trying to do is not require a CUP when another drive-through is adjacent to another drive-through, but the current -- or the proposed change still requires the CUP if the drive-through is next to an adjacent residential use. So, again, that portion of the UDC changes are staying consistent with what we currently have on the books. Also noted here just a few other things. The UDC does not grant -- currently grants the City Council authority on conditional use permits. That is granted to our Planning and Zoning Commission. So, again, if you have looked at the public testimony it implies that you guys would -- would lose that right to do that and you -- currently you don't have that unless somebody appeals either the director's decision or the Planning and Zoning Commission's decision and that's why that application a month ago was before you. As part of my presentation tonight, too, I wanted to -- these are word for word the exact standards in the UDC. A currently states that -- goes back to what I already stated, that if you are within 300 feet of another -- a residential use or drive-through, conditional use permit. Unless you are separated by an arterial street or if you are in Old Town zone you are doing a conditional use permit. So, that's really the only requirement for a CUP currently. And, then, everything else is basically showing us your stacking, your windows, your ordering, similar to what we have in our current code. Now, about a week ago -- or at least a month ago when I approached City Council with the changes, you guys wanted me to take it back, go back to our group, the expert that I had been working on the drive-through standards and define the tiers a little bit better and so about a week ago I was able to formulate that and disseminate that information to you so you guys could digest that before tonight's hearing. So, I truly wanted to be transparent on what we were trying to achieve here and not go outside of process. So, you did get a strike through underlying version of the drive-through standards and I didn't compare -- I didn't give you a comparison of what I presented to you a month ago, but what I did in the table I highlighted what I changed and the reason for the change. So, I remember based on that -- our discussion back on August 12 you guys said -- I remember Council Woman Strader asking why do we allow drive-throughs in Old Town. So, she had asked us to look at that. So, I went ahead and honored that request, based on what she had said, and, again, all of this is on the table for your deliberation tonight, of course, but I removed the requirement to allow -- or proposing anyways to remove that element from our Old Town zoning district. C, the highlighted section C, the types of drive-through. That currently is not in our code. As I mentioned, we do not define the different drive-through types. But I know this was a topic with discussion on our August 12th meeting. You felt -- were -- you -- I quote Council President Cavener. Words matter. And so I went back to the gentleman that I was working with from -- that has done drive-throughs throughout the country and I said, hey, I have gotten this feedback from our Council, what can I do better? Or what can we do better to come up with some more express standards to make it clear what a tier one is versus a tier two and what a tier three is and so tier one, two and three has been rewritten from what you previously saw a month ago -- or back in August and so one of the concerns was that with a tier two I had -- including mobile options, mobile ordering only and you thought that implied that it could still be a dual lane drive-through and I was like, no, that wasn't the intent. But in discussions on working through and taking your feedback, we realized that even

somebody with an online mobile -- mobile -- mobile service or online ordering service could have a one -- could be low impact. Order online, go pick up your food and not have a lot of cars stacking or impacting the neighborhood. So, we went ahead and made that change and took it out of the tier two and the tier three and made it explicit as a tier one, similar to the other less impactful uses. So, really, with the idea behind the tier one, the tier two and the tier three, we are trying to go from least amount of impact to the most amount of impact. So, with tier two and tier three, again, primarily those are associated with our restaurant uses. Again, a restaurant is a principally permitted use in many of our commercial districts. The only time that would require a conditional use permit is if they had that drive-through component and they were within 300 feet of another residence, so, then, the ability for a CUP is still there under the proposed change. But what the previous code had versus this code -- it did not designate that it would only have one ordering point, one stacking lane, one escape lane and one pickup window. So, we provided more express standards there that if you have all -- these four items you are going to be classified at tier two. And, then, tier three, again, is that that more impactful use. Your -- your Chick-fil-A, In-N-Out, double stacking and so even your McDonald's, because if you have been at a McDonald's sometimes they will have two ordering points, but only one stacking lane, and, then, they have pull forward lanes if they get backed up. So, tier three went one step further and said if you have two ordering points and one stacking lane you are still a tier three. So, we built in all of these different scenarios so that we would clearly define what a tier three would be going forward. I think we have got it right this time. I feel better based on the feedback that I heard from Council. I think this does define -- at least define a tier one, a tier two and a tier three, a lot better than what I had previously presented to you on the 12th. The other part of the change that I wanted to share with you was the comment that the Mayor made about pull forward or designating parking stalls and, then, I went back to McDonald's and remembered how they operate or how sometimes some of these other fast food restaurants like to have their customers pull forward into even parking stalls. So, again, if at any time the director and/or the Commission or City Council deems the capacity is insufficient, there is the ability to require pull forward parking or pick up parking, so that people can help guide traffic through the drive-through. And, then, of course, as I mentioned to you last time, if an applicant does not want to meet any one of these standards, they have the right to get in front and go through the conditional use, the public hearing process and convince the Commission that the way they operate they can operate better than what our standards are. So, anyways, I know we have part two to our discussion, but I will go ahead and pause there. I know you guys have had a chance to look at these drive-through standards, but just looking for any feedback or comments from the Council at this point.

Simison: Counsel, any questions?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Bill, just first start with a compliment. Appreciate the efforts on -- I mean I think night and day difference between kind of the definitions of tier one, tier two, tier three what we are seeing today versus what is presented. I hope you know, too -- and while we appreciate good public feedback, I think Council is well aware of the -- the long process that we have been going through and, you know, certainly, right, we have had some drive-throughs serve as a good example as to why we have been doing this work for so long. So, I appreciate it. Couple just food for thoughts and, you know, kind of gut responses, and I'm looking forward to hearing from the rest of the Council. I would need a little bit more convincing about removing drive-throughs from being permitted in the Old Town region. I understand -- my good colleague is not here tonight, had some strong feelings on that, but one of the things about -- I think Old Town is that we contemplate lots of different types of uses, sometimes untraditional uses, and I -- I am always going to be a little apprehensive about potentially creating a little bit of a vacuum that takes away maybe a particular type of use recognizing, again, that you have got, you know, a coffee shop that classifies as a drive-through that's here in Old Town. You have got some banks that classify as drive-throughs in Old Town. So, I -- I'm not quite sold on that and I don't know if staff has a recommendation or that's just being responsive to the -- to the Council. When it comes to kind of staff level decisions versus not, I think we talked about this last time, tier ones to me I think are -- personally think are a no brainer. That's an easy staff level decision. It's tier two and tier three and it's not that -- necessarily that it needs to land on our plate or on the Planning and Zoning's plate, it's that I think it's important that we have a public hearing component associated with that and so giving our residents that opportunity to weigh in on the real world impacts that those proposed uses would have on them, whether that, again, stays with Planning and Zoning or comes to us, I don't have necessarily a dog in either fight. I just do think that that public hearing process, that component, is going to be critical. So, that's kind of my general thoughts and, again, credit to the Mayor for kind of flagging the importance of kind of additional parking for -- for mobile drive-through. So, I'm supportive of that addition as well.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Bill, if you could just touch on -- I mean we define tier one, tier two and tier three. What's the difference in the process each one of those tiers goes through when they apply with the city. What is a tier three different from a tier one when they come in and apply through the city for that drive-through?

Parson: Yeah. Mayor, Members of the Council, the only difference you are going to see is they have got to meet those requirements and still provide the stacking that's defined in all of those sections below. So, any -- if a tier three were to come in and it was next to a residential use, we are going to tell them that's a conditional use permit. If a tier three -- tier three came in and it was right in the middle of a commercial development with nothing around it, it was just a vacant lot, it's -- it's staff level and that's how it is currently today. If -- it's the same thing today. If someone were to come in at Ten Mile

and they were the first drive-through in and they met the standards, we are approving it administratively, because, again, the code says a drive-through is accessory and it's only -- if you hit those things that require a conditional use permit. So, it's always been staff level, contingent on where it lands in relationship to either another drive through or residential use. So, that's why I don't want the Council or the public to misconstrue that we are trying to take it away from the public realm. We are not. It's -- it's there still. But the reality is regardless of this change or keeping the current code, it's -- it's still whether or not you are next to another drive-through or next to a residential use. That's -- again, if it's somebody in Ten Mile, they are the first restaurant in with a drive-through or a coffee shop or bank with a drive-through, if they meet the standards we are approving it administratively. The director has -- that's what the code says. We -- we can do that. It's accessory to that primary use, which is either a bank, a restaurant, dry cleaner, the list goes on and on.

Overton: Mr. Mayor, quick follow up.

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: So, let's say we are looking at the one we just talked about, which was across a private drive from a residential area. That's a no brainer. What about when we are opening up some of our open areas of the city and there is nothing out there except now, we have got a tier three wanting to come in, but it's next to what should become a residential plat of land. Do we look at that as just an empty piece of land and they are the first ones built or do we look at that as future residential, in which case a tier three should go through the process?

Parsons: Mayor, Members of the Council, Councilman Overton, we are looking at it as vacant land and they will know it's there when they build something next to it, because they are the first one in. That's historically how we have -- we have looked at industrial adjacent to future residential. We have got a -- they have -- you know what you are buying next to because it's there. So, Council President Cavener, if I can give you my recommend -- if you want staff's recommendation in Old Town, yes, it was more of --

Simison: Bill, speak into the mic.

Parsons: I'm sorry. Council President Cavener, it's more of -- it was something that I heard from the Council, so I put it on the table, but staff doesn't have one -- I'm with you, we have some drive-throughs in the Old Town zone. Don't want to -- definitely don't want to create a nonconforming issue if we don't have to, but it's something that I heard, so I thought at least be cognizant of that and show you that that is an option if that's what Council wanted to do.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Yeah. Just on that issue I spent a lot of time in the last six to nine months thinking about Old Town and downtown and all that kind of stuff. When I saw you strike that I was a little bit puzzled. I understand the desire, but I don't think it makes a lot of sense to me personally. I would -- my opinion I would like to see that put back in. One thing I have really appreciated, though, just moving on to another kind of different topic, I have appreciated the -- sort of the thorough discussion we have had and kind of clearly identifying the distinctions in different types of uses with the drive-throughs. Generally I'm pretty supportive of allowing for greater efficiency for people working with the city to have staff level approval of these, but only if there is a lot of clarity around what we have empowered staff to do. We -- we have seen in recent actions that having more clarity is more helpful in staff understanding the -- what we want to see and what -- what we don't want to see. I think we have -- we have -- we are quickly arriving to what I think is enough clarity that's not only good for those working with us, but as folks are looking to -- to bring projects forward, they -- they have a lot of clarity about what to expect when they are working with us. So, I really appreciate that. You know, maybe when this is over we are going to start calling you Bill, the Drive-through King Parsons, so -- you have spent -- you have spent a lot of time on this and as I have said before to my utter amazement. I never thought I would spend so much time on drive-throughs in this position. But I like where this is going. I think we are pretty close to having something I think is helpful. But my desire, as -- when I look at efficiency and customer service, is how can we make things more predictable, more efficient, move things along. So, I like where we are headed with all this.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor. Bill, thank you. Appreciate all the work that you have done on this. Yeah. I was concerned when I saw the Old Town and automatically not doing any drive-throughs. I think that with the ones that we have and -- I think we should -- it's something I think we should stay open to and just be extremely careful with any in the future. But I think that the clarity we are getting is -- is great and can be very helpful in that situation. So, really happy with the work that you have done. So, thank you very much.

Simison: So, would you like to take public testimony on this stuff right here right now or do you want to keep going and, then, come back to any comments from the public?

Parsons: Mayor and Council, I'm happy just to hit on the ADU real quick and, then, we can open it up for public comment, because we got just one little change to the ADU. Is very -- I remember our -- if you -- if you are good with that. All right. Perfect. Thank you. So, the second item -- and, Caleb, thank you for hanging out with me tonight, but he was the one that said keep them paired together, so we can just do one ordinance was the goal I think at the end of it. But, basically, we were here talking with accessory use -- accessory dwelling units or secondary dwelling, whatever you want to call it, but I did make the change that I heard from, again, the Council during that meeting where

you thought it was appropriate to remove the requirement for residents to live on the property six months out of the year, so that -- that language has been removed. So, it should be good to go to move forward based on the feedback that we got from that hearing. And with that I would stand for any questions and allow you to maybe open it up to public testimony.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any additional questions for staff at this time? Okay. Mr. Clerk, anyone signed up to provide testimony on this item?

Johnson: We had one sign up. Wade Ramsey.

Ramsey: Good evening, Mr. Mayor, Councilman -- Council Members. My name is Wade Ramsey. I am at 4013 West Lost Rapids in Meridian. Full disclosure. On September 9th you appointed me to SWAC. Thank you. This has nothing to do with that. I am also the elected president for Bainbridge, the HOA that was here on that same meeting to keep you here until 11:00 o'clock, talking about -- chatting about In-N-Out. I was out of town, but our vice-president spoke. This topic of the drive-through thing has obviously touched some nerves in our neighborhood, so I just wanted to bring some thoughts there. But first, more importantly, you don't hear thank you enough. Thank you. Year after year, issue after issue, Planning and Zoning and the City Council has been great partners for our neighborhood in our area in Ten Mile and Chinden for the neighborhoods there and we appreciate it. You don't hear that enough. But if it's important enough for -- for us to keep Planning and Zoning here until 11:00 and you here to until 10:00, it's important enough for me to show up and say thank you in person tonight. So, regarding UDC amendments that you are considering, clearly some of this is work that you have been doing for quite a while and there is some issues that -- common threads here that I wanted to comment on. Some of the amendment language, if it's reported accurately and I'm not going to repeat some of it, because I assume it's not, but there is some noise about that social media wise and reporting and on BoiseDev, that sort of stuff. And, look, our neighborhood and our community benefited greatly from that process, the public -- public testimony process and those sorts of things regarding In-N-Out and I know In-N-Out and Raising Cane's were the two issues that kind of touch on this issue most and pull at the heart strings most -- most over the last several months you guys have dealt with. From our standpoint we benefited from that as a neighborhood and we don't want to -- for you to do anything that denies future neighborhoods from being able to voice and take advantage of that same process and that's our concern. If what I hear is correct, tier one we have no issues with clearly; right? Tier two and tier three are where we have issues. Or tier four; right? But we greatly benefited from that. Other people are going to benefit from that. And so I would encourage you to consider that piece; right? Anything that comes from -- not to take anything away from the staff who does a fantastic job. Obviously the efficiency piece is a big deal, but taking -- taking anything away from the elected officials and public accountability and public hearing is -- is not what we want to see, so -- is what I wanted to say. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you.

Simison: Council, any questions? Okay. All right. Is there anybody else that would like provide public testimony on this item? Good evening, Sally.

Reynolds: Good evening, Mr. Mayor, Members of City Council. My name is Sally Reynolds, 1166 West Bacall Street. So, I'm kind of here at the request of several residents that are in my area and I will start off by saying I have been on open space committees, I have been on city code committees with Bill and so I understand the process and the work and the amount of, you know, drilling down to the exact words that go into this and so thanks -- thank you, staff, for that. I think I will just echo everything the gentleman before me said. I think that at least people on my side of town really appreciated being able to weigh in on that and I know that there are members on this Council who appreciate the public process and are willing to listen to the residents, even when it can be a little bit hard, but that is what makes Meridian great and so I don't want to see anything taken away from that. I do appreciate the different tiering. I think that that's a wonderful job. I do agree with -- I would like to see with Council Member Overton on tier two and tier three -- I mean at the minimum having a public notice and a public hearing, whether it's at Commission level or coming before this body. I think the reason that you saw so much public testimony come in about this is because of what happened in my area with the Sagarra-Orchard Park development and it happened from planning staff making a unilateral decision under accessory use and that's what this is. So, people saw accessory use and they were thinking -- they are going to have unilateral decision making abilities to just put drive-throughs wherever they want, because we just saw that happen. I have a four story building in my backyard that was supposed to be three stories, so that I think -- if you want a little bit of explanation where that's coming from, but I would really really recommend that we hopefully have public notices and public hearing on tiers two and three, even if they are in the middle of any -- or, you know, nowhere, because I think that the future land use map and potential development does need to be considered. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions? Thank you. Is there anybody else that would like to provide testimony on this item, either in the room or online? Seeing no one further wishing to testify, Council, your direction.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: At least for the easy ones, I don't see any need to make any changes to the language changes on the ADU. I don't know if anybody else on Council has -- didn't hear any comments, so check easy one. I think, Council, it's probably important for us to at least deliberate and discuss about drive-throughs being permitted, not permitted in in Old Town. I know it was stricken. We went back and forth. I don't know if -- I know, again, we have got one Council Member who had a strong opinion who is not here. I don't know if there is more Council that shares that same opinion. I have tried to weigh in on that, but I also want to be -- I'm trying really hard to not bulldoze one decision or another on this particular one tonight. I guess maybe to put a better question, would

anyone be opposed if we removed the strike through that is before us about not within the -- I guess it's on one of the other pages -- about -- about drive-throughs within the Old Town. Is there anyone opposed with removing the strike through that was put in by staff? Okay. Maybe move forth with that one. Mr. Mayor, Council, any concern about the definitions that have been provided for tier one, tier two, tier three, or I guess any additional changes that have come from staff?

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: President Cavener, I feel like I'm getting really picky here, but in the world of what's approved to be built, simply stating that if a tier two, tier three drive-through comes in first next to an area that's supposed to be R-8, but there is nothing there, then, an R-8 application comes in and they start building single family homes before the drive-through gets built, those people aren't going to know which one was filed first and they are not going to care, they are going to know that we have a drive-through within 300 feet of a residential area and I somehow would like to see that if we already know how some of these areas are going to be zoned, that we somehow try to capture the fact that the 300 feet, in instances where we know we are going to have residential built, counts for as though residential was already built. At least have a discussion on that. Otherwise, we can end up in a situation where we are approving drive-throughs in an area that eventually they are going to say why in the heck did we do that?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, maybe a question for my colleague.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Council Member Overton, are you -- are you suggesting, then, that it be modified that within 300 feet of a resident -- residential area as identified on the future land use map?

Overton: Definitely an item for discussion.

Cavener: Okay.

Overton: I think that would be more inclusive of what we were looking at, as opposed to being you are first in, get approved, and, then, whatever else comes around you. I think we -- I think we always have to be looking a step or two down the road for who that next development is going to be and who is going to live there.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Councilman Overton, I think I'm tracking with what you are -- what you are proposing. You are trying to just make sure that we are doing as much due diligence as possible for potential impacts and, you know, from my perspective is if twos and threes are having a public hearing, then, that's at least giving that -- that voice and there is no change in terms of operations I guess at that point. So, I would want to get some -- some feedback from our staff about what that impact would be to them and maybe -- I'm sure that they have considered this, so why -- why that was ruled out and maybe they can give us some context that we don't have in front of us. Mr. Mayor, if that's okay maybe you just hear from -- from Bill and Caleb on that.

Nary: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Mr. Nary.

Nary: Or the planning could add legal context maybe to put around that as well, because I understand where you are coming from, Council Member Overton, but the way the code is established, conditional uses are based on existing uses that are surrounding that use and so the problem you have is -- I'm trying to envision the basis a council could use to deny a conditional use for a drive-through in an area where there is no existing people around it, unlikely to have very many people even testify, because they don't live there and what basis or grounds would a council be able to say we won't allow a drive-through there when our zoning allows it. So, I think if your concern is if you don't want to -- and I think it's a very legitimate rationale that you have posed where you could -- what you are trying to avoid is a drive-through business trying to be first in. Well, just get approved today, get bare ground, there is nothing out here, nobody's going to complain and, then, we will just build it ten years from now when there is actually people and you are right, you are going to have people saying when did this happen? I didn't know about it. I had no idea. So, how do we address that? And I think from a legal standpoint you are going to have to figure that out more in the zoning context than the CUP context on what you might allow or not allow, but it would be more problematic I think to try to do it in the way you are proposing. Although I agree with what your concern is, I don't think this is the avenue we can get there. So, that's something -- but, again, planning may have a different perspective or a different way of approaching it, but that would be my concern is I don't know what grounds we would have to deny it just because it could impact somebody who isn't here, who doesn't exist yet and may not even -- and may not be built, may not be there before the drive-through is there. So, I don't know. That's the concern I would have.

Simison: Or they might come in with a different zoning request -- you know, change the comp plan for an adjacent property before or after.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Maybe -- and if I'm hearing Councilman Overton correctly -- it's more clear to say we don't want to see that happen without a public hearing around that. We don't want to say staff can make those approvals without the opportunity to vet it. Am I -- and I just want to make sure I'm kind of tracking this correctly, because I -- what Bill is proposing -- or what staff is proposing with this -- that's not going to change anything in terms of P&Z would still be allowed to grant these CUPs or are you -- and, again, so many words here. I'm just trying to make sure I'm following this correctly. With the new proposed changes, would P&Z still have the same role that they have today with what you are suggesting. That doesn't change; correct?

Parsons: Mayor, Members of the Council, Councilman Taylor, that is correct. If -- again, only if they were within 300 feet of a residence or the applicant did not want to comply with the standards, then, they would -- they could voluntarily go through that -- that -- that CUP process. Now, I would also mention to Council a lot of times with the C-C zone or a C-G zone there is hours of operation that are locked down when you about about a -- and there -- there may be an opportunity where you could see a CUP for extended hours of operation for the drive-through to operate. So, there is other -- like Mr. Nary was explaining, there is other avenues that kind of get you there. It goes back to our discussion on the 12th is if we really want to prevent bad things from happening, then, that's where we look at annexation and say your concept plan has eight drive-throughs. I don't want eight drive-throughs here. I want two drive-throughs on your site. That's where we probably need to focus in and say if we are looking at the bigger area and we are wanting to annex you with the concept plan, that's where we need to dive in and maybe look at those details a little bit more, at least from staff's perspective that's where you have that ability to say this is -- this is residential next here. Why do you have a drive-through next to it? Because that's where neighbors don't always call us and say, hey, what's planned next to me? Because a lot of times with a CUP you are expected to build that within a certain time frame and if you don't, then, you ask for a time extension or you start over. It just depends what process you take. But the expectation is you have two years to start that -- that use under the code.

Overton: Mr. Mayor, follow up?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Try to clarify my thoughts here a little bit. So, Bill, help me out. I'm a tier two, tier three and I'm the first one into a big open area of the city. I'm still getting a public hearing. I'm going in front of Planning and Zoning?

Parsons: Mayor, Members of the Council, Councilman Overton, if it's annexed and zoned and it's consistent with their concept plan and they are the first one in they are getting an administrative approval --

Overton: Okay.

Parsons: -- for that accessory drive-through. If it's consistent with their -- their entitlements. Their zoning.

Overton: That's what -- that's what I thought. Thank you. So, to answer your question, here is my concern. I have met with builders and developers multiple years ago on projects they are planning. They are laying them out. They have got this. They want to do it, but they haven't come to the city yet and applied and now before they do in this area, then, a drive-through comes in and administratively gets approved. There is no public hearing. But yet I have -- I know I have looked at this, but it doesn't exist yet, because it hasn't even started the city process. That's the situation I'm talking about. I feel like I'm not doing my job and somehow I'm dropping the ball on how this can happen.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: This predates me serving on the Council, so maybe this would just help clarify and -- I mean we have had two In-N-Outs. There is one that was not approved a couple of weeks ago. There was one that was approved several years ago. Did that require a conditional use permit in that southwest corner of The Village parking lot, which is probably half a mile from residential. Again that predates me, so I don't know what the process was, but it will help me refine my thoughts here.

Parsons: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, Councilman Whitlock --

Simison: Can you speak into that -- eat the mic.

Parsons: Yeah. Usually you guys hear me pretty well. I will have to start talking like Nick I guess. Get a loud voice. But that -- in that particular case that drive-through was not within 300 feet of a residential use or another drive-through. It was approved at staff level. The director approved that. So, yes, administratively approved. It did not require that --

Whitlock: That -- that helps. Mayor, follow up?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: And Councilman Overton kind of started down the path that I was thinking. You have done a great job defining the types of drive-throughs, tier one, tier two, tier three. But when I first read it it was, then, so what. I mean we have better definitions of what a tier one, tier two or tier three is, but looking here it looks like the only reference to tier two and tier three or a reason for having the tiers are down in Section D(6) dealing with stacking lanes and I think what we heard from public testimony was, you know, is -- is there something in tier two or tier three that ought to generate more scrutiny, more

public involvement and maybe even a decision by a governing body. So, again, I'm being a little crass when I say so what, but so what.

Parsons: Well, Mayor, Members of the Council, what we don't -- what we are missing in the current code is we don't define the width of a drive-through. We don't define the width of an escape lane. We don't require a minimum stacking capacity in our code. So, this is what's -- that's the -- in my opinion that's the so what. We don't require that queuing exhibit to show us how many -- show us -- demonstrate that you can fit those vehicles there. We just have words that say do these things. But now we have defined standards that here is some dimensional things you have to show how it works. As I mentioned to you on the hearing in August, I can't come up with standards to -- to attack to mitigate an In-N-Out. Fifty cars. That's -- it's just -- it's -- it's impossible. And I -- like I said as we have talked over the last year about this, we all know things are popular and they slow down. We all know drive-throughs aren't going away. And so we try to prevent bad things from happening through zoning codes and this is -- this to me is above and beyond what I have seen in other places, other jurisdictions, on -- on what we have looked at. I feel pretty good at where it's at today. The other thing to keep in mind is that it's code. This -- this isn't set in stone. So, let's say, for example, Council says, Bill, you are the drive-through king. We love it. We are going to approve it as is tonight and someone complains and they don't like it, someone can change the code. You can have some -- you can have staff change code. It's something where we -- I don't know if we will ever get it right, but we don't know unless we try sometimes.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Something for Council to chew on, maybe staff to chew on. So, tier one is all administrative, okay, that's an easy one. I guess kind of where I'm sitting is, okay, tier two, kind of following our traditional process, that -- I think I can understand that, but tier three, regardless, goes and has a public hearing either at Planning and Zoning or the City Council. So, that way the more intense use, the more it triggers that either Planning and Zoning or City Council public hearing involvement and sometimes we are going to see traditional tier twos before our Planning and Zoning Commission. Again, you know, Taco John's isn't in town, so I will just pick them. Taco John's moves all the way out to the outskirts of town. They buy a huge lot. They are going to put a Taco John's in. They are not touching anybody. Administratively nobody's impacted. Great. Move on. But, again, Taco John's wants to do three stacking lanes. Doesn't matter they are going to be out in the middle of nowhere, it still would constitute a public hearing, either before the Planning and Zoning Commission or us. I guess that's kind of where my head is. I don't know if that works for Council. I don't know if that works for staff. But I'm kind of looking at it is the greater the use, the more it should constitute a public hearing with Potato Ole's and chocolate tacos I completely agree.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Overton.

Overton: Council President Cavener, when we first started this system I was -- my understanding was that the reason we built these tiers was so that the highest tier three, heaviest use, would be the ones that would come in front of us, just because it's a very limited number of drive-throughs, but it's the one that have the heaviest impacts wherever they are at. I'm okay with that.

Hood: And, Mr. Mayor, if I can just maybe add to the last couple of comments if that's okay. I mean we really are here to serve at the pleasure -- we have taken feedback working with UDC focus group. You tell us. It's on the table tonight, but we have talked before about the Planning and Zoning Commission being the ones to have these public hearings. If you want to change the code, it's your code. If you want all those drive-throughs to come to Council -- that's within your purview. Again, that's not noticed tonight, but that's the type of direction staff's willing to take. So, I appreciate the sentiment. You know, if it works for staff -- we work for you and the community. So, you tell us what the standards are and we will administer them. This is what our -- we thought we were hearing and, you know, Bill's tried to represent that here, but tweaks or however you want it to read, we certainly can make that happen.

Overton: Mr. Mayor, quick follow up to that.

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Trust me, I appreciate Caleb, Bill, everything you guys do and I know that your heart's in making this the best process, but we have had two tier three drive-throughs. The first one was approved at the P&Z level and only came in front of us as an appeal, but the belief was that it was an entitlement and even some that I think weren't in total agreement with it didn't believe we could turn it down because we didn't have the right argument to turn it down and it's about to have its grand opening. The second one P&Z turned it down and, then, it was appealed to us and we unanimously backed up Planning and Zoning. I guess my issue is that's a lot of pressure that we put on Planning and Zoning on a tier three drive-through to make the right call every time and I would much rather have us, as the Council, be the backup to good job, good call, we agree. I know it causes a more -- more delay --

Simison: And that's where I was going to go actually is my -- my thinking is -- from what I have seen, experience, drive-throughs -- not just those two, but drive-throughs as a general rule have been some of your biggest challenges and the more you put this down the longer it takes to get through the process. Now there is sometimes there is a good part of that, but if it's truly about whether it should or should not exist, you actually speed up the process and make it easier for everybody just to do it once and do it here. Yeah. I don't know how that relates to everything else that P&Z does when they look at things, if necessary, but in my opinion you actually do everyone a favor by bringing it here and having that, because the noticing is no different. The timeline doesn't take anymore and all you -- it does eliminate the appeal by either side on the issue, one way

or the other. So, it gets to the resolution as quickly or sooner in my -- in my opinion. And, you know, whether it's a Wienerschnitzel or a coffee place or Taco John, you know, these are all the issues that you are really -- have been struggling with is when -- when it's around a drive-through in the commercial areas.

Hood: And if I can, Mr. Mayor, respond -- and, again, we can add that to our next round of code changes potentially and go through this process and, you know, see -- see if that's where we want to go. I have heard that -- again, is something we can change and have it skip P&Z and go right to Council with a recommendation from staff, you know, and that -- and that even add another layer of that. That could be for tier two or only tier threes. We could still have them look at tier two and Council get tier three. Yeah, there is options here, depending on how you want to sort of slice that. So, good feedback. That's not -- tonight I wouldn't feel comfortable doing that, because that is a separate section of our code that we haven't noticed the public on that we are going to change. There is a table that talks about who has roles and responsibilities and decision making authority, that we would need a notice and have that -- but we will add it to the list and we can -- we can talk about that for drive-throughs. A little bit -- be careful what you ask for. You will see a lot of them where you are going to have no one in the -- you know, here in the audience, but that's fine. You read the staff report. We do the analysis.

Cavener: So, Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: It sounds like, then, really the only -- come back to us on, again, the -- the flow of who would review drive-throughs. That's a future conversation. Preferably sooner rather than later. But what's before us tonight planning -- the public hearing's still open. So, Mr. Mayor, unless there is anyone else that wants to provide any additional public testimony, I move that we close the public hearing on UDC Text Amendment ZOA-2025-0001.

Overton: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to close the public hearing. Is there any discussion? If not all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have been the public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Cavener: So, Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I going to move that we approve the proposed changes to the UDC text amendment with one addition, which is to remove the strike through on number three, to remove drive-throughs from being permitted in the Old Town zone.

Overton: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve ZOA-2025-0001 with an amendment. Is there discussion? Okay. If not, clerk, call the roll.

Roll Call: Cavener, yea; Strader, absent; Overton, yea; Little Roberts, yea; Taylor, yea; Whitlock, yea.

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries and the item is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

ORDINANCES [Action Item]

- 10. Ordinance No. 25-2100: An ordinance (Ten Mile Flex – H-2025-0027) annexing a parcel of land located in the southeast quarter of the northeast quarter of Section 34, Township 4 North, Range 1 West, Boise Meridian, City of Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit “A”; rezoning 5.545 acres of such real property from RUT (Rural Urban Transition) to the I-L (Light Industrial) zoning district; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; repealing conflicting ordinances; and providing an effective date.**

Simison: With that we will move on to Item 10, which is Ordinance No. 25-2100. Ask the clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. It's ordinance annexing a parcel of land located in the southeast quarter of the northeast quarter of Section 34, Township 4 North, Range 1 West, Boise Meridian, City of Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit “A”; rezoning 5.545 acres of such real property from RUT to the I-L zoning district; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; repealing conflicting ordinances; and providing an effective date.

Simison: Thank you. Council, you have heard this ordinance read by title. Is there anybody that would like it read in its entirety? If not do I have a motion?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 25-2100.

Overton: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and second to approve Ordinance No. 25-2100. Is there discussion? If not clerk call the roll.

Roll Call: Cavener, yea; Strader, absent; Overton, yea; Little Roberts, yea; Taylor, yea; Whitlock, yea.

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries and the item is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

FUTURE MEETING TOPICS

Simison: Council, anything under future meeting topics or do I have a motion to adjourn?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Move we adjourn our meeting.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Motion and second to adjourn. All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it. We are adjourned.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:50 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON
ATTEST:

DATE APPROVED

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK