

**Public Hearing for Linder Storage Condos (H-2022-0091) by
EVstudio, located at 300 N. Linder Rd.**

- A. Request: Annexation of 0.98 acre of land with an I-L (Light Industrial) zoning district.
- B. Request: Vacation of the 30-foot wide easement along the east boundary of the property.

Seal: And with that we will open File No. H-2022-0091 for Linder Storage Condos and we will begin with the staff report.

Allen: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission. The next applications before you -- or, actually, there is only one -- annexation and zoning. There is a concurrent vacation application, but that will only be heard by the City Council. It does not require Commission action. This site consists of .98 of an acre of land. It's zoned R-1 in Ada county and is located at 300 North Linder Road. This property was previously included in the Hepper's Acre Subdivision as Lot 4. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation is general industrial. The applicant is proposing to annex the .98 acre piece of land with an I-L, light industrial zoning district, for the development of a self-service storage facility consisting of two structures containing a total of eight storage units. These units will be designed to accommodate RVs, boats, cars, et cetera, with large overhead doors and separate man doors to each unit. The proposed zoning and use is consistent with the general Industrial future land use map designation. The subject property is one of a few lots in a larger enclave area surrounded by city annexed property. Annexation of this land will provide more efficient provision of city services. Industrial uses, zoned I-L, exists to the west across North Linder Road and to the east. A single family residential home exists to the north, zoned R-1 in Ada county, and a commercial birthing center exists to the south in the C-C zoning district. There is an existing home and accessory buildings on this site that are proposed to be removed with development. There is also a 30 foot wide easement depicted on the Hepper's Acre Subdivision along the east boundary of the property that is proposed to be vacated with this application, shown there on the plan on the right. The type of easement is not identified on the plat. This application does not require action from the Commission, as I mentioned. Only City Council. A conceptual development plan was submitted that depicts the location of the structures, drive aisles, parking, access and landscaping. Access is proposed via a driveway from North Linder Road, an arterial street, to the south of the existing driveway. ACHD recommends the driveway is shifted further to the south in alignment with the driveway on the west side of Linder Road. In accord with the UDC, in an effort to combine and limit access points via the arterial street, staff recommends driveway stubs and cross-access easements are provided to the properties to the north and south for future interconnectivity. The property to the south was required to provide an access easement to the subject property at the time of future construction on the site and/or expansion of the existing parking lot, which has not occurred. A fire department turnaround is proposed as shown on the site plan. Off-street parking is proposed in excess of UDC standards. No parking is required if there isn't an office associated with the use, which there is not

with this development. A total of nine parallel parking spaces are proposed. A 25 foot wide landscape street buffer is required along Linder Road. A 25 foot wide landscape buffer is required along the north property line abutting the residential use to the north. The applicant is requesting approval from City Council of a reduced buffer width of five feet. A letter was submitted from the affected property owner Ronald Hatch agreeing to the reduced buffer. A portion of the site is within the Meridian Floodplain Overlay District. A floodplain development permit with base flood elevations and flood protection elevations will be required with development. Conceptual building elevations were submitted for the proposed structures as shown. The structures are proposed to be pre-engineered metal frame buildings, which will be designed with large overhead doors and man doors for each unit. Building materials are proposed to consist of stucco in two different colors with reveals, fenestration and stone veneer wainscot. The design of the structures is required to comply with the design standards in the Architectural Standards Manual. Staff is recommending the design is required to comply with the design standards for commercial buildings, so rather than industrial buildings, because the property fronts on an arterial street Linder Road and will be highly visible. Detailed review will take place with the designer view application submitted with the certificate of zoning compliance application. No written testimony was received on this application. Staff is recommending approval with the requirement of a development agreement per the provisions in the staff report. Staff will stand for any questions.

Seal: Thank you, Sonya. Would the applicant like to come forward? No? Okay. That's the first time that's happened to me, so kind of caught me off guard with that one. Is there anybody in the audience that would -- would like to testify on the application?

Hall: I have a Tim O'Donnell signed up to speak.

Seal: Come right up. Good evening, sir. Just need your name and address for the record.

O'Donnell: Yeah. Tim O'Donnell. 4877 West Grand Rapids Drive, Meridian. So, this may be a little bit different testimony than you are probably accustomed to. I'm not against this proposal, but not informed enough either to say I'm for it. However, I wanted to make some comments about the process as a citizen looking at it from the outside, with little knowledge of the lingo or the legalities involved. Number one, I found it very helpful that most, if not all, of the documents related to this matter are all online. I could see drawings and maps, other entities weighing in on impacts from road, traffic, digging concerns, that type of thing. Second -- and, again, found it very helpful. Second, I spoke with somebody in the clerk's office and I found them very helpful and cordial. Most important to me -- number three, most important was how this impacts the people in that area and I -- I had learned from the county -- or the city website that anyone within 300 feet gets notified and I didn't see any concerns or objections posted on the -- on the -- the portal, so -- and, in fact, the person who I would think would be most impacted is the neighbor to the north -- immediate north of the property and I saw that on one of the documents online that they had signed off on the project. So, in summary, I'm pleased with the transparency in the process and the availability of information for citizens to investigate. I may disagree with

the overall speed with which development is going on in Meridian, but I will save that for another time. Thank you.

Seal: Thank you, sir. Appreciate the feedback. Do we have anybody else that would like to testify? The applicant does not want to add anything? Just give -- give you one more chance before we close it out here.

Miller: Julie Miller. EVstudio. 725 East 2nd Street in Meridian. One thing that we are still trying to work out is the driveway approach. When we initially met with staff they preferred it to be at the north side of the property. However, ACHD wants it to align with the driveway on the other side of Linder. So I have contacted ACHD and I'm going to try to negotiate with them to get the approval for the driveway to be in its proposed location.

Seal: Okay. Great. Thank you very much for that. Appreciate it.

Miller: Thanks.

Seal: Council -- sorry. Commissioners, do we have any questions for the applicant? Oh. Sorry. It looks like we got a question.

Grace: Mr. Chairman, maybe more of a question for staff, if -- if I could.

Seal: Yeah.

Grace: You mentioned that you were going to require that the design standards be in accordance with commercial rather than industrial. Just generally what's the difference?

Allen: Chairman, Commissioners, basically the difference is the buildings have a little higher quality of design on commercial buildings than industrial. There will be some requirements for modulation in the building. They -- they already do show some different textures, some -- some nicer wainscoting and some architectural features on this building, but there are -- there is just a higher quality of design on commercial buildings. I'm not sure if the applicant's looked at those standards to make sure they don't have any issues with those, but --

Miller: I -- I am aware of those standards and if they only apply to the elevation facing Linder I think we will not have any issue achieving those standards.

Allen: I believe the way it reads, just in response, Mr. Chair, correct me if I'm wrong, Bill, but it's the -- it's the elevations that are visible from public right of way or public space. You are probably going to see a little bit of -- you are going to see a little bit more than just the west end of the building, but we can -- we can work with you on that.

Miller: Okay. So, maybe just the first building on Linder. Maybe. We could -- we could work that out. I don't see any issues with making that comply with your standards.

Allen: If the applicant has an issue with it, it -- it would be good to bring it up now as a --

as an issue.

Miller: No, I don't think so. From my previous experience with another design package, as long as we have some modulation in the building I think we can definitely achieve those standards.

Seal: Okay. Question just for my sanity. Would -- do the design standards or anything about that make it possible for -- like if somebody wanted to run a business out of one of these, instead of storage? Let's say a detail shop. Wouldn't be able to do that? Okay. Just wanted to make sure.

Allen: The specific use standards prohibit that.

Seal: Okay. All right. Any other questions? No? Thank you very much. Appreciate it. One more time. Anybody else want to testify? No. Okay. So, with that I will take a motion to close the public hearing for File No. H-2022-0091 for Linder -- Linder Storage Condos.

Smith: So moved.

Grace: Second.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing for File No. H-2022-0091. All in favor please say aye. None opposed. Motion carries. The public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Seal: This one looks pretty straightforward to me, so if anybody has anything additional to add or anything along those lines or I will take a motion.

Grace: Mr. Chairman, I can provide a motion.

Seal: Go right ahead.

Grace: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council of File No. H-2022-0091 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of May 4th, 2023.

Smith: Second.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded to approve File No. H-2022-0091 for Linder Storage Condos. All in favor, please, say aye. None opposed. Motion carries. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

