

Public Hearing continued from March 19, 2026 for Syringa Crossing Mixed Use Development (H-2025-0007) by Hawkins Companies, generally located at the northwest and southwest corners of S. Meridian Rd./SH-69 and Amity Rd.

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

Lorcher: With that we will open Item No. 2, H-2025-0007, Syringa Crossing Mixed Use Development for annexation, preliminary plat and conditional use permit. We will begin with the staff report.

Allen: The next -- the applications before you tonight are a request for annexation and zoning, a preliminary plat and a conditional use permit. The annexation portion of this site consists of approximately 62 acres of land, including right of way to the section line of adjacent roadways, zoned RUT and L-O in Ada county and it's generally located at the northwest corner and southwest corner of South Meridian Road and State Highway 16 and West Amity Road. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation is mixed-use community. The applicant is requesting annexation of 62.43 acres of land with R-15 zoning, which consists of 9.76 acres, R-40 zoning, which consists of 18.01 acres, L-O zoning, which consists of 3.05 acres and C-N zoning, which consists of 2.07 acres and C-C zoning, which is 29.54 acres. A conceptual development plan was submitted as shown for the annexation area that depicts how the site is planned to develop. The northwest corner of Amity and Meridian Road is a multi-family development consisting of 101 apartment and townhomes style units at a gross density of ten units per acre. Twenty-one thousand square feet of office uses, a 65,000 square foot grocery store, with retail shops, restaurants and a bank. Public, quasi-public and plaza areas are also proposed in the commercial portion of the development. All commercial development is proposed to be a single story in height, while the residential proposed to be a mix of four story apartments and two to three story townhome style units. A mix of at least three different land use types are proposed as desired. However, the proposed development is not functionally integrated in holistic design or integration of uses per the design policies in the comp plan, i.e., the use function -- these uses function as individual components, rather than together as desired. Because of this ACHD is not accepting any trip capture for this development. The proposed density conforms to that desired in the Comprehensive Plan. Community serving facilities, such as hospitals, clinics, churches, schools, civic buildings or public safety facilities are not provided, which increases services and transportation network impacts. Supportive and proportional outdoor public

and/or quasi-public spaces and places connected by pathways are proposed, consisting of plazas, outdoor gathering areas and linear open space areas that appear to be approximately five percent of the development area as desired. At the southwest corner of the annexation area, southwest corner of Amity and Meridian Road, 35,000 square feet of commercial area is proposed, which is anticipated to include restaurants, retail shops, a coffee shop and gas station convenience store. Across the street on the southern portion of the development a 322 unit multi-family residential development is proposed with a gross density of 18.23 units per acre. Commercial structures are anticipated to be a single story in height. Residential structures are anticipated to be three to four stories in height. The development proposed on the southwest corner is inconsistent with the policies in the Comprehensive Plan for the following reasons: The residential area is 72 percent of the site, which is 22 percent more than the maximum allowed of 50 percent and the 3.23 units per acre over the maximum density allowed of 15 units per acre. Commensurate levels of employment and other non-residential elements supporting residents and reducing local vehicle trips are not provided due to the excess of residential area and density provided. A mix of at least three different land use types are desired in mixed-use designated areas. Only two are proposed. Supportive and proportional outdoor public and/or quasi-public spaces and places, such as parks, plazas, outdoor gathering areas, linear open space and schools, do not comprise a minimum of five percent of the development area as desired. Community serving facilities, such as hospitals, clinics, churches, schools, civic buildings or public safety facilities are not provided, which increases service and transportation network impacts. The applicant has requested the overall project be considered for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, rather than two individual projects. The Comprehensive Plan specifically states contiguous mixed-use identified areas that are bisected by an arterial or highway are considered separate and independent areas for use and design integration and will be evaluated independently of each other. Some of the reasons for such include safety and efficiency of the transportation network, pedestrians and motorists alike. This went into effect in the Comprehensive Plan -- I believe it was two years ago; is that correct, Bill? Okay. So, it is not a -- a new change to the Comprehensive Plan. An overall pedestrian plan was submitted as shown for the annexation area that shows ten foot wide pedestrian walkways in blue, five to six foot wide sidewalks in the lighter blue color and eight foot wide sidewalks in yellow, providing connectivity along streets, through parking areas, public, quasi-public areas, commercial and residential areas. Conceptual building elevations and perspectives were also submitted showing what future commercial retail buildings and plaza areas will look like, as well as the residential buildings at the northwest corner of the annexation area. The primary transportation considerations for this development involve the timing and coordination of required off-site improvements, access management along Amity Road and State Highway 69 and completion of internal street and pathway connections needed to support a functional mixed-use neighborhood pattern. The project would add measurable traffic to a network that already experiences operational strain during peak hours, underscoring the need to align development phasing with programmed intersection and signal improvements. Because of its proximity to two major transportation corridors, the design must emphasize efficient site access, safe circulation and continuous pedestrian and bicycle connections consistent with the city's adopted street and pathway standards. ACHD's recommended conditions and findings

addressing intersection mitigation, access spacing and collector completion, reflect these shared objectives and are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and UDC standards for coordinated land use and transportation planning. A preliminary plat is proposed as shown to subdivide the southwest corner of the annexation area, but the northwest corner is not included in the subdivision plat. The plat consists of eight building lots, six commercial and two residential lots on 24.46 acres of land in the proposed R-40 and C-C zoning districts. One access is proposed via West Amity Road and one access is proposed via South Meridian Road, State Highway 69. A portion of a future collector street, Hermatite, via West Amity Road, is depicted along the southern portion of the west boundary of the site and stubs to the property to the south. The portion that connects to Amity Road is off site on the adjacent property to the west and is not proposed to be constructed with this development. A waiver from City Council is requested to UDC 11-3H-4B-2A, which prohibits new approaches directly accessing a state highway. Comments have not yet been received from ITD on whether they already have or will grant the access. The backage road generally paralleling Amity Road and Meridian Road, State Highway 69, is proposed for access to the properties fronting those roads in accord with the UDC. There is a 40 foot wide gravity irrigation easement on the southwest corner of the commercial area as shown. Trees and large shrubs are not allowed in the easement area. A conditional use permit is also requested for a multi-family development on the southwest corner of the annexation area, consisting of 322 apartment units on 16.35 acres of land in the R-40 zoning district, at a gross density of 18.23 units per acre. Three story garden style and four story podium style multi-family buildings are proposed with parking on the ground floor. The podium style units are proposed here around the clubhouse and the garden style units are proposed on the southern portion of the development. Building materials consist of fiber cement siding, variegated board and batten, in a variety of colors and styles, stucco and brick. The final design, if approved, is required to comply with the design standards in the Architectural Standards Manual. The collector street access, Hermatite, is needed for emergency access and should be extended from West Amity Road to the site prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy within the multi-family development if approved. Based on 322 units, a minimum of 1.85 acres of outdoor common open space is required. A total of 3.14 acres is provided, exceeding the minimum standard by 1.29 acres. Proposed amenities consist of a clubhouse, swimming pool and spa, a community garden, shade structure, walking trails, children's play structures and four sports courts. Additional amenities as recommended by staff -- are recommended by staff if approved. Written testimony. No letters of public testimony have been received. A response to the staff report was received from the applicant, as well as a letter pertaining to application updates. Staff is recommending denial of the proposed annexation request and consequently the preliminary plat and conditional use permit request based on the conceptual development plan not meeting the policies in the Comprehensive Plan for mixed-use and specifically the mixed-use community designation as noted in the staff report. The applicant is here to present tonight. Thank you.

Lorcher: Would the applicant like to come forward? Be a button at the bottom of the microphone.

Mansfield: How is that?

Lorcher: There you go.

Mansfield: Excellent. Thank you. Thanks for pulling that up, Sonya.

Allen: You are welcome.

Mansfield: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Ethan Mansfield. I'm representing Hawkins Companies this evening. Is there -- is this a PDF, Sonia? Can -- is there any way you can bring up the PowerPoint so I can change slides?

Lorcher: And also if you can state your address for the record.

Mansfield: 855 West Broad Street. Sorry about that.

Lorcher: Thanks -- thank you. And the arrows should help you move along.

Allen: Sorry about that, Ethan. I downloaded and it went into a PDF, but the clerk has it in your format.

Mansfield: Oh, excellent. Thank you. I can -- I can do it with PDF if necessary, it just takes a little more --

Allen: Yeah. No worries.

Mansfield: -- scrolling and finagling.

Allen: Oh, did it not share? Sorry.

Mansfield: Thanks, Sonya. Good evening, Commissioners. I have already introduced myself. Thanks for having me tonight. I would like to talk a little bit about Syringa Crossing. Hawkins is really excited to be investing in this project. The reason we are excited about it is because of Meridian's success over the past 20 years as a community. We wouldn't be interested in this site if it wasn't a growing community and a vibrant community and we think that this project not only complies with the Comprehensive Plan, but also contributes to the vibrancy and growth of the community, which is why we are here tonight to -- to talk about it. So, just give a brief overview. Sonya touched on it. This is an annexation, zoning of 56 acres. It also includes a single development agreement on the northwest and southwest corners of Amity and Meridian Roads. We are considering this in two phases, again, under a single development agreement and I will talk about why that's important in a moment. Phase one, as Sonya mentioned, is the southwest corner. Phase two is the northwest corner. And we are also considering a conditional use permit for multi-family on the southwest corner and a preliminary plat on the southwest corner as well. The reason we can't plat these together is because there needs to be two different plats processed when there is an arterial between the plats.

That's one of the reasons. The other is because we are excited to have a single development agreement that -- that will kind of tie us to a concept plan that we will come in in the future and plat at that time that it's ready to develop. So, really quickly, I just want to share a little bit of important history about the project. On July 21st, 2020, we came in for a pre-op with the City of Meridian for the northwest corner only. The plan for the southwest corner was to remain in the county. It's now operating as a wholesale nursery currently, Victory Greens. And the plan was to annex the northwest corner with 284 residential units and 130,000 square feet of commercial just on that 26 acres on the north side. So, at that time the City of Meridian said, hey, come back with a master plan for both the northwest and the southwest corners. Consider it under one development agreement. Consider it as a single master plan for the area and given the -- this piece of the Comprehensive Plan below in orange, that says mixed-use projects are to be developed with an overall master conceptual plan for the larger mixed-use area, that makes sense. So, we are coming in with a grand plan for both sides that considers both sides as a whole and I will talk about that in a minute. So, I will kind of run through kind of what we are proposing, how it complies, how the zoning complies and, then, importantly, functional and holistic integration items. So, again, 56 acres on northwest and southwest corners. Homes for up to 423 families. That's 14.9 units per residential acre across the site, 21,000 square feet of dedicated office space that is to be zoned L-O, professional office, medical offices and daycares are some conceptual uses. Anything that's allowed in the L-O zone could go here, depending on the community demand at the time it's constructed, obviously. And, then, we are proposing almost 140,000 square feet of food, service, retail, personal services, that's salons, hair nail salons, other commercial services. So like daily needs -- grocery stores, kind of the anchor of this project, the site. That's surrounded by shops, buildings, where any number of uses could be allowed. This is zoned C-C, so it could be anything from a salon, to a medical clinic, to a dental office, to anything -- and, really, that demand is driven by the surrounding community. It doesn't go here unless it's going to be driven by -- unless it's going to be supported by the community and I think that's really important to remember. Finally, 12 percent of the area is dedicated to quasi-public open space and plaza areas. So, those are circled here and the orientation of these matters. You can kind of see there is a -- from north to south kind of intentional alignment of these areas and we will talk about that a little bit later, too. So, let's talk a little bit about zoning. So, here are the sample zonings -- and I should say everywhere in orange is direct language from the Comprehensive Plan -- from Meridian's Comprehensive Plan. So, anywhere you see that orange text that's Meridian Comprehensive Plan or when I actually snipped the plan. So, sample zoning in the mixed-use community zone -- or mixed-use community future land use area is R-15, R-40, TN-R, TN-C, C-C and L-O. You can see here that residential uses are expected to comprise between 20 and 50 percent. Residential densities from six to 15. We are at 14.9 percent gross residential density. Our residential uses are -- make up 24.4 acres, that's 44 percent of the development agreement -- or development area and you can see down here at the bottom, 9.6 units per acre on that R-15 area, 21,000 square feet of building in the office area, 107,000 square feet of building area on that northwest corner community commercial. Almost 30,000 square feet of building area on the southwest corner community commercial and 18.23 acres on that R-40 area. So, R-40 doesn't mean R-40 here. R-40 means 18.2 units per acre. Just across that particular R-40 area. So, here

is some text about the Comprehensive Plan. Additional flexibility is afforded to these ranges through other reference policies. Any mixed-use project must work towards the purpose and intent statements, including availability of goods and services to the community and must offset impacts by providing quality of life opportunities, not typically achievable through other single use areas of the city. So, we are going to talk about how they are different than other single use areas. So, first of all, one of the biggest things that's kind of notable about this development is it is -- you know, it -- it circles around a grocery store. A grocery store is a daily need. A grocery store serves the community. It's an important piece of a mixed-use development. So, the reason this area on the -- why is the northwest corner commercial area larger and the residential area is smaller? The reason for that is because that grocery store and the surrounding tenants have a commercial synergy that is important to the tenant mix there. You -- you know, it's -- it's like when you go to a grocery store you have got your like main grocer and, then, you have got the pads out front; right? You have got your shops building. So, that synergy is important for getting the tenant mix right. The pads won't go if there is not an anchor. The anchor won't go if there is not the pads. So, it's really important that these are provided together on the same side of the road and that's why that area is so big. You know, people still drive here. The surrounding density is 5.4 units per acre. People still drive vehicles to this site. The denser the surrounding area is the fewer vehicle trips as a share will be taken by cars. It's just a simple fact. You know, you are going to -- if you are within walking distance and there is a pathway to walk on, it's going to be easier to walk than get in your car and drive across the development like this. So, another thing to note is that the northwest corner is topographically flatter. It's just easier for larger buildings to be located there. It's also the place where the grocery store wants to be, because -- and -- and I think the community wants the grocery store to be, right, because that's where you have got people coming home from work turning right into the parking area, turning right to access all of the -- all of the services provided within this center and, then, turning right to go back out onto Meridian Road or Amity Road. So, it's -- it's -- and that's when people go to the grocery store coming home from work, not going to work typically. So, that's just, you know, the reason it's on the northwest corner, not the southwest corner. So, on the southwest corner the multi-family component on the southwest corner is a critical component, because it offers additional housing typology not found within several miles of this site. I mean apartments are nowhere to be found around here. This is the corner of a state highway and an arterial roadway. It's the perfect place for density truly. You know, the reason the commercial uses are on the corner is because in this area commercial tenant success relies upon visibility from roadways still. It's because most people drive. And so just kind of to touch on the quality of life opportunities, because that's mentioned in the Comprehensive Plan is a very important thing to offset impacts. We will talk about this in a second, but, essentially, this whole thing is linked with a network of pathways and plazas. So, I'm going to zip through -- basically this slide shows that we have four land use types on -- across the project and if you look at them separately we have four land use types on the northwest -- sorry -- three -- three land use types on the southwest corner, 322 residential units, 30,000 square feet of commercial services, retail services and, then, 7.5 percent of this southwest corner area is dedicated to quasi-public uses. That's very very important. This does not include area reserved for multi-family residents alone. All of these areas are accessible by the

community. And here is the northwest corner, four different types of land uses. So, let's talk a little bit about functional integration and holistic design. So, here is the piece of the Comprehensive Plan that kind of touches on it. We won't read the whole thing, but let's kind of talk about how this is achieved. So, this is achieved through a really robust network of pathways, including ten foot sidewalk, pathways, detached along Hermatite, which backs the whole center -- backs all of the residential and, then, through that significant network through the site -- so, you have got a linear park adjacent to the townhouses. You have got a lot -- a park area adjacent to the restaurant, shops area and you have got a plaza on the corner of Amity and Meridian Road. You also have pathway connectivity to developments to the north and that was actually mentioned as a positive thing by surrounding neighbors at our neighborhood meeting. So, there is really a robust network of connectivity here. There is a plaza that connects office space to the residential space that leads you through to the commercial space. Here are some pictures. We can blow through them really fast. I think you have seen them already and they should be in your packet. And, then, here is the southwest corner. Importantly on the southwest corner this ten foot pathway along Hermatite is continued and it's encouraged for people using this future -- I mean it existing -- will be existing and it will be fully constructed in the future with the adjacent property to the west and -- as well as provide more residential opportunities there. People can walk through this development to the commercial area comfortably; right? Here are all the nodes and here are all the links. So, blues are links, reds are nodes that you can actually stop and enjoy yourself and it's -- the intent is to create a neighborhood here, not just a walled off multi-family development and that's also why we are -- we are trying to open up this western corner and invite residents from other communities into the development to enjoy being here. There is significant grade change across the southwest corner of the site, which does produce challenges to connectivity. We wish we could provide more connectivity and there is literally -- like even at the finished grades, the clubhouse finished floor is 12 feet above these Building G finished floors down here and that's after the grading exercise has been completed and we flattened it out as much as possible. So, there truly is -- I think it's about 25 feet of grade out there right now. So, those grading challenges are significant. One -- these are -- these are just photos of -- or renderings, not photos. This -- this will be a photo in -- in five years hopefully. I also really want to talk about transportation improvements. One big component to this development is the STARS agreement. The STARS agreement that we are looking to pursue with the Idaho Transportation Department makes roadway improvements above and beyond what our developments impacts are possible. So, you know, we are looking at nine to 15 million, somewhere in there, in roadway improvements to the surrounding area. Here they are. They are shown here. And this requires both phases. This requires a phase one and it requires a phase two, because STARS agreement relies upon sales tax revenue from commercial development. So, we need both to be successful here. And so in addition as part of that STARS program it's -- it's - - you know, again, we are working through this with ITD. We haven't solidified it. We can't solidify it, because we don't yet have entitlements for it. But this Hermatite connection is considered as part of that -- part of that STARS program. So, that Hermatite connection will get connected with the rest of the improvements and there is a condition of approval that it be connected with 465 p.m. trips, which basically allows us to -- to construct a multi-family and virtually no more until that Hermatite connection is made

anyway. That's an ACHD condition. So, with that I would like to just wrap up and say thanks for considering this project and we think it complies with the Comprehensive Plan.

Lorcher: Thank you very much. Commissioners, do we have any questions for Ethan?

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Yeah. So, first I guess I will start with the most recent one in mind. Does this STARS agreement with ITD at all rely on your math regarding trip capture or is -- do you anticipate it still being feasible with ACHD's determination of zero trip capture?

Mansfield: Commissioner Smith, great question. It will be feasible -- essentially the recommendations of ACHD are they -- they stand with a zero trip capture assumption, if you will. So, we have a list of conditions from ACHD. All of those are conditioned with an assumption of zero trip capture.

Smith: Thank you. Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: I also have one regarding the northwest -- if you are looking at the site map, my - - so my understanding of the Comprehensive Plan is that, you know, residential and non-residential uses, residential-commercial uses are supposed to be closely integrated and sharing similar, you know, frontage, sharing similar space. I'm curious what went into the logic then of having the office as a transition space when it seems like mixed-use is pretty against transition space, honestly, and saying, hey, integrate them together. So, they could walk -- if you would walk me through that would be great.

Mansfield: Commissioner Smith, this is a fantastic question that I feel gets at the root of some of the challenges that we face as developers when encountering mixed-use land use plans, because in one sense we hear from planners -- as a former planner I used to say this -- like where is your buffer? Where is your buffer between uses to basically prevent impacts from one use from impacting another. Concurrently we hear where is the integration between the two uses and to me that really confuses -- you know, as developers we are like -- well -- well, which one is it? And so, you know, this office space was included at a recommendation of the planning staff to basically create a buffer between the grocery land use and the residential land use and what we are trying to do - - again, staff helped guide us through this -- is say, hey, you know, create a transition. Don't just put up a big wall of office buildings. Create a transition. So, we tried to do that with the ten foot pathway, the little plaza area. It's about -- it's about 8,500 square feet, like a little 8,500 square foot area between the office buildings there where that star is and, you know, if -- if -- frankly, if that gets us over the finish line we can make that bigger.

Smith: Question for staff. So, is that specifically due -- does that buffer ask specifically due to the intensity of the grocery use like specifically or is it something about commercial in general that went into that feedback?

Allen: Well, let me -- let me back up just a little bit. The Comprehensive Plan talks about integration of uses, like having common open space area in between residential and commercial areas and/or a -- a drive, a roadway separating them. It is -- it is difficult. I will -- I will give the applicant that. You know, it's -- it -- it can be confusing in mixed -- in mixed-use areas we do want uses integrated more than -- more than transitioned and more than -- we want them all as one development rather than individual components and that's -- that's staff's issue with the proposed development plan.

Smith: But -- so, I guess what I'm curious about is -- is the applicant mentioned getting feedback of asking for some transition space, you know, to the south. Is that specifically because of the grocery or is there something else regarding -- was there maybe miscommunication regarding transition versus integration? That's kind of what I'm trying to get to, because I look at this and I say, hey, this should be more integrated, but the applicant is saying that there was kind of desire for transition space between. I'm just trying to get --

Allen: Yeah. A little both. You know, we -- we don't want to see the -- the big box retail right next to the residential, so --

Smith: Okay.

Allen: Bill, do you have any more to add to that? I mean -- I talked to the applicant when they -- when they continued the first time about maybe making some revisions to their plan that might incorporate a street or -- or common open space area and possibly shifting the offices to along the collector street or along the internal drive aisle. They did float a plan past us that showed the two end units on the left -- on the west more oriented towards the collector street and the one on the east more oriented towards the north-south internal drive, with a larger common area in between and that -- that did, you know, work a lot better. I encourage them to maybe go a little bit more that way and, then, they ultimately decided to stick with their original development plan.

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Do you have alternative transportation concept plan if ITD does not approve a right-in, right-out on either or both sections?

Mansfield: Commissioner Perreault, great question. I will just briefly talk about our -- our access kind of in general and answer that question specifically. So, on the northwestern corner the right-in, right-out is a deeded access, so we do have ITD approval for that access on the northwestern corner, pending Council's approval for a waiver to approve

it. On the southwestern corner ACHD is limiting us to a single access on Amity, which I think the absence of a right-in, right-out on State Highway 69 would make circulation for future residents of this site and visitors to the site very challenging. We have spoken with ITD preliminarily about this right-in, right-out and they have given us good feedback preliminarily. Again, obviously, they haven't approved anything; right? We have no letters. But, you know, they have looked at it and they said, well, yeah, I mean ACHD gave you one access here. It makes sense that you would have a right-in, right-out, you just have to prove that to the ITD board and so we have commissioned traffic studies to do that and it does seem very supportive of a right-in, right-out on State Highway 69.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Oh, Commissioner Smith.

Smith: I have --

Lorcher: You are fine.

Smith: -- a couple more questions. I just didn't want to hog -- I don't want to hog all the time. Okay. So, again, I -- I say that -- I asked this knowing that this is a difficult plan and I'm not trying to, you know, bring the hammer down or anything or a gotcha, but I -- knowing that the Comprehensive Plan kind of asked for -- I think it -- you know, reducing vehicle trips by having frequent accessible and safe pedestrian connectors and if we are -- if we are to treat this as one development, walk me through -- if I'm on Building G, what's the path that I -- without getting in a car what's the path that I get groceries? What's the path I take?

Mansfield: Commissioner Smith, that is a fantastic question. I have asked the development team and myself that many times, because I knew you were going to ask it. Yeah. So, if I'm walking to get groceries or biking in my cargo e-Bike, I leave my front door, pick up my bike and -- I mean jump on my bike that's in the secured bike parking and I can do one of two things. Probably the fastest way is going to be for me to jump on the ten foot pathway on Hermatite and go north and, remember, this future roadway isn't so future, especially considering the STARS agreement and considering the, you know, ACHD condition for 420 vehicle trips. So, this future roadway is pretty imminent. So, I'm jumping on this future roadway, I'm jumping on this pathway, I'm taking this ten foot path and I'm ending up at the Hermatite-Amity intersection, I'm pressing the pedestrian crossing button, I'm crossing, I'm turning right, left, and, then, I'm at the front of the store. Does that -- are you following me?

Smith: Yeah. Yeah.

Mansfield: I get a little blinker.

Smith: I'm following that. I guess I'm also looking at -- you say if I were to go -- say it was at Pad F, the closest -- but maybe not even getting groceries, if I'm just trying to go to the

non -- the closest non-residential, is there -- I guess my larger question is is there anywhere in the site plan that a resident can get to a non-residential use without first putting themselves in the path of a potentially moving vehicle? And -- and if -- if not, do you think that that is in compliance with the -- the spirit and the -- the text of the Comprehensive Plan saying, hey, pedestrian connectivity should be prioritized and not secondary.

Mansfield: Commissioner Smith, this is a great question. I -- I think there is ways to do this extensively -- well, actually, no. On both corners this is not possible, but only because there are small drive aisles that need to be crossed or small parking areas that need to be crossed, not because there are large multi-lane roadways to be crossed. So, for example, if I'm in the -- I got to go to my southwest corner here, so I can read the -- I wish I had a little pointer for you. I'm sorry. So, if I'm in one of these Building E's, right, which is just south of the kind of four story core buildings at the center here, I can jump out onto the ten foot pathway, go north past the amenity, past the clubhouse into that central area. Now, there are two crossings here, because there is a -- a drive aisle that is actually supported by the Comprehensive Plan we think, because there is actually language in the Comprehensive Plan that says you can do like you should do, drive aisles or, you know, small drive areas to separate uses and, then, I get to the parking area. The challenge with this community commercial corner -- the challenge with programming this is the UDC development ordinance, development code, requires that buildings front the street. That's Amity and Meridian. If buildings front the street the parking has to go somewhere. So, what we are doing is we are trying to plan a -- a non-invasive parking field, so that we can get that ten foot pathway through what has to be a parking field, because the UDC conflicts with this Comprehensive Plan vision of not having to cross a parking lot and we have to provide that parking, because as you saw the surrounding density is 5.4 acres -- units per acre. So, people will drive here and tenants need that parking. So, that's a challenge that we are trying to work through here with this site and I think we succeed, because we take that ten foot pathway and we put it directly to these two shops buildings that provide, you know, eight to ten different uses in them. So, I will admit it's a challenge, but it's a point well taken.

Smith: Okay. Thank you.

Gelsomino: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Gelsomino.

Gelsomino: Quick question. Ethan, so as a recently former city parks commissioner I'm going to bring a little bit of my experience on that commission to this question. On the civic -- civic park open space if the central park is genuinely, you know, quasi-public civic space, is there an agreement where -- is there a plan to record a public access easement on that parcel as a DA condition? Without it -- you know, the space is a private residential amenity and the southwest corner only has two land use types and a quasi-public open space drops to just about three percent below the five percent minimum.

Mansfield: Commissioner Gilsuma -- I'm sorry, I butchered your last name. Commissioner, that's a great question.

Gelsomino: That's all right. Gelsomino.

Mansfield: Gelsomino. Thank you, sir. That is a great question. We have not considered it, but are happy to, because the intent is for it to be quasi-public, not simply an amenity. So, we are very open to that idea.

Gelsomino: Understood. Thank you. And, then, Madam Chair one follow up question.

Lorcher: Okay.

Gelsomino: And I apologize, Ethan, if you may have answered this question to either Commissioners Perreault or Smith. I want to make sure I -- I'm not repeating any questions that have already been asked. But, you know, the -- the fire department conditions adequacy of multi-family access on completion of the South Hermatite Avenue, if I'm not mistaken you do not own the -- the adjacent parcel that the connection must cross; correct?

Mansfield: Commissioner Gelsomino, that -- that's a lot. Commissioner Gelsomino, that is correct. We do not own it. We do have a good relationship with the landowner.

Gelsomino: Okay. Is there a potential for an agreement that would guarantee that offsite extension is complete before the first certificate of occupancy?

Mansfield: Yeah. Commissioner Gelsomino, we could -- we could certainly look at that. I think we can agree to that here. Yeah.

Gelsomino: Understand. Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, Ethan.

Lorcher: Thanks.

Stoll: In terms of the STARS agreement, you estimated nine to 15 million dollars' worth of improvements. Was that estimate something that you discussed with ACHD and also ITD or is that just your estimate at this point in time?

Mansfield: Commissioner Stoll, that's a great question. We have actually gotten some estimates from ITD. That -- the estimate that we are providing here tonight it -- it's, obviously, a huge range -- is based on our own pricing of these improvements. So, we actually looked at these improvements, looked at the quantities and requirements needed. We are working with Kittelson, who is an expert at, you know, doing public roadway work and we priced it based on that. We also spoke with ITD. So, there is some input there as well.

Stoll: So, Kittelson provided the cost estimate and did ITD feel like it was in the ballpark or did they --

Mansfield: Commissioner Stoll, we received some design -- some cost feedback from ITD, but we have -- we have yet to sit down with ITD and actually talk about that face to face. We basically just said, hey, we are interested in doing a STARS agreement. They said, yes, we are very interested in you proceeding with the STARS agreement. Let's talk about what it's going to look like, what it's going to include and this is what we are proposing.

Stoll: And the primary revenue generator would be the grocery store?

Mansfield: So, Commissioner Stoll, any commercial activity would generate revenue, but that grocery anchored center is kind of a requirement to get the STARS agreement off the ground if you will.

Stoll: The ones I'm familiar with, Cabela's up north, The Village, usually have a larger anchor and I'm periodic with -- periodically the legislature talks about doing away with the grocery sales tax and I'm just curious what your assessment is of the revenue continuing on to pay off the STARS agreement?

Mansfield: Commissioner Stoll, yeah, that's a great question. We are currently commissioning a sales tax study right now to just kind of look at our term -- you know, like length of time to pay off, kind of what this all looks like. So, we are kind of in the midst of that right now. Noted about the, you know, removing the grocery sales tax, that would certainly have a potential impact on this -- this project. But I do know, you know, there has been immediately to our south -- for example, on Lake Hazel and State Highway 69 is using the STARS agreement there --

Stoll: Costco.

Mansfield: Yes.

Stoll: A little bit different. Okay.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: So, I heard some terms of, you know, pricing feedback and, you know, potential impact if the sales tax goes away. Now, help me understand magic wand STARS doesn't exist. What does that look like for this project, this development? Say the agreement doesn't go through or you can't align on price -- you know. What does that do to the potential improvements here?

Mansfield: Sure thing, Commissioner Smith. That's a great question. I was thinking about that earlier, too. So, much of this -- much of these improvements remain due to their requirement in the project. Not all. So, Amity will be constructed both on the north side and the south side. Hermatite Backage Road From Lyra down to Amity. Hermatite

Backage Road going north up to -- you know, where it leaves the property would be constructed and, then, the frontage along State Highway 69 on our side. What would not get done and what is I think a big win for the community and ITD and the state and really everybody, I mean us, too; right? Is the full cross-section of State Highway 69 gets constructed from where the last STARS agreement ends up at -- the Lake Hazel STARS agreement, where that ends on its north side we go -- then go north almost to Lyra with a full, you know, construct -- like fully constructed ITD, State Highway 69 section.

Lorcher: In regard to roadway improvements -- not talking about Highway 69, but your north-south access and Hermatite, are you providing any signalization to be able to have that cross-access for people to be able to come through or is it just a pedestrian walkway?

Mansfield: Commissioner Lorcher, are you referring to kind of that -- that plan north -- that like four way intersection there?

Lorcher: Not on Highway 69, but --

Mansfield: On Amity.

Lorcher: -- Amity. Yes.

Mansfield: Yes. So, like the plan north.

Lorcher: Yes.

Mansfield: Yeah. Okay. So, that is planned to be signalized.

Lorcher: And are -- is that something that you are going to provide or is -- you are waiting for ACHD to do it?

Mansfield: So, we would -- if -- if we -- it's kind of a complicated thing, but, essentially, we would either build it or pay our fair share through a signal agreement with them, depending on the timing of when it gets installed.

Lorcher: Okay. And, then, in regard to Hermatite, you said that the future roadway. So, you will be responsible for the -- the east side of the -- Ten Mile -- or the -- the wider pathway and, then, the road improvements will be done by the developer to the west; is that correct?

Mansfield: So, on our -- Commissioner Lorcher, on our property boundary we would basically be responsible for the ten foot pathway and, then, as this cross-section works, which is a ten foot pathway, 26 foot road section --

Lorcher: Right.

Mansfield: -- and, then, another buffer and, then, ten foot pathway, that ten foot pathway buffer and road section all would occur on our property.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you. Any other questions?

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Could you pull up the slide at the very beginning where you reference the prior application where you said that there was an encouragement of the two sections to be -- to be developed as one. Right there. Yep. Absolutely. So, did you happen to have a conversation with staff about this?

Mansfield: So, Commissioner Perreault, we did bring it up in conversation and we kind of got to this place where it was like we are not budging on our position about the two sides being treated differently. Two sides being treated as separate projects. That's kind of where we ended up. I understand that's part of the Comprehensive Plan, but --

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Just to be clear, you are saying that City of Meridian feedback, you are saying that this was a sentence in the staff report for that original application in -- in 2020; is that what you are saying?

Mansfield: Commissioner Perreault, I think I misunderstood you. I know I misunderstood you. This was the recent conversation that we had probably like two weeks ago about this particular application back in 2020. So, that's what I was talking about. So, in 2020 we did not make an application, because they encouraged us to come back with the full thing. Both sides. At that time there was no -- that -- that was what was said. There -- is that your question? I guess I'm --

Perreault: Yes. I'm just trying to understand, you know, the -- the concern you are presenting is that you believe this was -- was said by staff or was in writing by staff, but now staff is saying, no, they need to be applied separately and developed separately, because that's what the Comprehensive Plan says. So, just trying to understand from your perspective how those two disagree with one another.

Mansfield: Commissioner Perreault, yeah. So -- this is a great question. So, we heard come back and develop it as a cohesive project and, then, when we made the application as a cohesive project about in -- I guess mid to -- I guess early February we received the staff report -- initial staff report for this project and it said these need to be treated as separate projects. That is the first time that I heard about that separate project requirement.

Perreault: So, you are saying that this was -- this was something that was mentioned in a meeting or verbally or a pre-app meeting?

Mansfield: Commissioner Perreault, that's correct. This feedback on the screen here was mentioned in 2020 to us in a pre-application meeting.

Lorcher: All right. Any questions before we take public testimony? All right. Thank you very much.

Mansfield: Thank you.

Lorcher: Madam Clerk, do we have anybody signed up to testify?

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. I have Cooper Sharp.

Lorcher: Good evening. If you can state your name and address for the record.

Sharp: Cooper Sharp. 3578 South Falconers Place, Meridian, Idaho.

Lorcher: Okay.

Sharp: Good evening, Commissioners. I'm -- I'm expressing my support for this project. I'm a resident just a couple miles away from this project. Had the opportunity, lived at this address for about five years now. Had the opportunity to see a similar development go up at Amity and Eagle, which was greatly needed with the Albertsons improvement there and the surrounding commercial developments around it and it also has a -- a multi-family component along the boundaries. I think a lot of the -- the similarities of this project and that is what it offers from a mixed-use standpoint isn't necessarily in one building itself, but from the entire development as a whole and for my family specifically that development on Amity and Eagle has greatly reduced the amount of travel that we have to do on a daily basis to get groceries, to go grab lunch, to go grab dinner, things of that nature and -- and it's improved our quality of life. So, similar on this site. There is several other, you know, residential communities in the neighboring vicinity and would similarly have the same impact, as well for us we are always looking for opportunities to stay south of Overland Road and not have to go up Eagle or down Overland to -- to find shopping centers or things of that nature. So, it would drastically have an impact to -- again to our quality of life as well. The other part of it -- I think it would be a shame to deny a project like this due to not having a third use. There is several in the vicinity. There is several churches that are already existent within a mile, two miles away. Meridian just opened a brand new library facility kitty corner on -- on Locust Grove and Lake Hazel within, you know, very close proximity to this project. So, a civic facility or a church facility. There is multiple school facilities in the vicinity as well. And so thinking of a project like this getting denied just because it doesn't have a third use feels like it -- there is a lot of benefit that the public is missing out on due to a technicality. So, if a development like this I think has a lot of benefit and I think the surrounding citizens would have a lot of benefit from it with

what they are providing to the community from a shopping center offer standpoint. You know, that's all I would like to share. Thank you.

Lorcher: Thank you very much.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, no one else has indicated they wish to speak. There is one person online, but they do not have their hand raised.

Lorcher: Is there anybody else in chambers that would like to speak before we invite the applicant to come forward? Would the applicant like to come forward one more time, please. Any final comments since we only had one piece of public testimony?

Mansfield: Commissioner Lorcher, I have just a couple remaining comments. I would first like to address the -- just thank the person who testified. Thank you, Cooper. I do also want to clarify that we do think this will have a civic use associated with it. It's a quasi-public -- you know, a string of quasi-public areas that are open to the public. But I think what he is referring to is like a church or an actual building that houses some sort of, you know, church or something like that. I would also like to say, you know, Commissioner Smith, regarding your comment about the office and the -- and the integration there, we are more than happy to take a look at, you know, kind of messing around with that office space to -- to make -- to make it feel more integrated if that gets us over the finish line. I said that before, I just wanted to make sure I was clear on that.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Oh, wait. Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Yeah. You -- you mentioned kind of the -- the civic nature of -- of the quasi-public space. One thing I'm struggling with is -- is, you know, even like the -- the green space exhibit, you have commercial green space and multi-family green space and they -- they feel very separate to me. Commercial green space a lot of it -- or the commercial open space even a lot of it looks like plazas and with concrete and fountains versus the residential is a lot more, you know, parks and things like that, save for kind of this dining area, this triangular shape in the northwest corner. I guess I -- it's a similar question to the one I had about the -- kind of this G Building thing, but, you know, I'm looking at, for example, you know, Building C -- dot C1 dot O and Pad F, you know, if I'm -- if I'm in like -- I'm struggling to understand what shared open space they have and what quasi-public space they have that is clearly intended. Like we can say, hey, illegally they are -- you know, someone's allowed to go to the grocery store and, then, hop on over to the park down here, but what signage what -- what design language is -- is -- you know, when I look at the site plan I don't understand how that's communicated to someone in the area.

Mansfield: Commissioner Smith, yeah, I will go into that a little bit more. I have a couple examples. The first I would like to share was actually expressed by someone who lives on Lyra Street on the east side of the development at a neighborhood meeting. So, we

presented this plan at our second or third neighborhood meeting and, you know, I asked if they had -- if attendees had any feedback. One big piece of feedback that I heard -- and it lasted like 30 or 45 seconds of just talking about how excited they were, they were just excited to be able to hop onto a pathway, a ten foot pathway and walk to a shopping area and so to me that communicates that someone from an adjacent development is looking at this and saying, hey, I'm really stoked that I don't have to get in my car to drive somewhere to go shop. So, I think that example is really kind of a real example of, you know, someone who actually lives in the surrounding area being excited about doing it and they can very clearly see this ten foot pathway and I pulled this up to kind of talk a little bit more about a couple things. So, on the northwest corner we have this connection to the surrounding housing developments. We also have off of -- that T that goes north off of Lyra that continues down to the south. This pathway is kind of separate from those; right? It's separate from the vehicular connections. It runs past the multi-family. You know, these are kind of like -- these are going to be like townhome style; right? So, you are kind of out on your patio, but there is like runners going by and cyclists and they are cycling down to this green space down here where, then, of course, there is going to be a softer language in the residential areas and there is going to be more of a hardscape language in the commercial areas and I think that's just due to the nature of the spaces. But there -- the idea is that they are still integrated, you still travel from one place to another on foot or on bicycle and it's comfortable. On the southwest corner we have a connection that was required by the subdivision developer to the south. We have made that a ten foot pathway. It was required to be a five for him. They are going to come back in preliminary plat and I would hope that it will be a ten for him, so that it will be continuation of a ten foot pathway. But we have this ten foot pathway that goes from the very southern edge of the development up to the north. You do cross a drive aisle, but the challenge is people have cars here. You know, we have to provide parking. What we are trying to do is soften that and so if you cross these drive aisles and you end up in this public park here or quasi-public park. This park is an acre -- at 1.3 acres, so an acre and third and you continue north through that, you come into this little community garden space, again, across a drive aisle and, then, you really don't cross anything until you get to the very north end of this multi-family neighborhood and so I think we -- what -- what I like to do is think about this not as like some big multi-family development, but as like kind of a -- a neighborhood of multi-family buildings -- of bigger buildings than we are used to seeing in a single family home development, but it's still designed to be this comfortable neighborhood and it's immediately adjacent and well connected to this commercial area, so you can walk seamlessly from one to another. That's kind of how I envision it. That's the language that we talked about when we talked about designing it this way. Staff mentioned this. We bumped -- we beefed up the pathway size. We beefed up the number of pathways. The -- the -- where the pathways go. So, this was something we wanted to pay close attention to as we designed it.

Smith: Thank you.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much.

Mansfield: Thank you.

Lorcher: May I get a motion to close the public hearing?

Smith: So moved.

Stoll: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing on Syringa Crossing. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Lorcher: A couple of thoughts on -- on this. I -- I commend you on looking at retail uses really before the residential uses. So many times retail won't come until there is rooftops and you have taken a different approach where the retail will drive the improvements to add to the residential. I also agree that all of the retail should be on the streets. You know, you want that visibility to be able to see that it's there. You don't want them tucked away, even though some of your office space is kind of tucked up towards the northwest corner. But the signage, obviously, is important for -- to attract retail customers. I disagree with only having one development agreement. I think that we have had developers come where they have had both sides of the street and each application, although flow together, and I -- I would have to go back to see if we have approved or not approved things in the past, but typically they are treated as separate applications, even though in a meeting we may do one together and the one that comes off the top of my head is that -- I live off of Ustick and Black Cat. Toll Brothers is doing two different projects across the north and the south side of Ustick. We treated that -- we -- we presented them together, but they were treated as two separate entities with two different sets of rules to be able to do mixed-use or whatever their code -- or designation was, which I don't remember off the top of my head. So, I disagree that this is one project. I think it should be two and, therefore, to fulfill the mixed-use of having three different uses on both sides collectively -- or I mean independently should be looked at compared to what you have. So, that would be something you would have to take to Council and be able to justify and, then, finally, the open space towards the south that is surrounded by the multi-family housing, the way I see it right here is that that's an amenity. I -- if somebody was on Amity or on Meridian Road, because of the buildings facing Highway 69, really there is no way to know that there would be any open space there and so maybe it takes signage. I'm not really sure. Again I will give you an example. Autumn Fair off a Black Cat has a very big park in the middle. I have lived there for ten years and I just recently discovered the park was even there; right? Because I don't necessarily always go into that neighborhood, but they do have signage saying, you know, we have got this huge park, but -- and it's open to the public -- to everyone, but, obviously, the community uses it more than others. So, to me that -- that's not obvious to me that that looks more like an amenity than something that's available to the surrounding communities. So, I'm on the fence as far as whether to give you approval or denial for this. I'm really kind of hung up on the development agreement in following the rules. Also in the fact that I understand it's kind of like the cart before the horse, you need the entitlements to be able to work with ITD,

but you even -- you haven't even had those meetings yet and one of the things that we look at when we look at applications is that is this in the best interest of the city at this time; right? Right now. There is no doubt that the south part of Meridian can use the retail support, just like Cooper said, to be able to not have to cross 84 to be able to get those services and in regard to your retail and your integration of some of the -- the residential definitely works, but, again, I don't support the single DA and because you don't have those -- you haven't really had those one-on-one face conversations with ITD yet and stuck in my head is this the best interest of the city at this time? So, I would like to hear from the other Commissioners on their thoughts as well.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Yeah. I -- to be candid, I -- I came into this -- I came into this hearing a little bit more ready to -- to bring the heat and I forget that the applicant -- that Ethan is such a decent and affable person that it's -- it's hard to hold it against him and -- and I see -- frankly, if this -- this feels to me almost like three different developments personally. It feels like it -- there are three -- there is a really solid multi-family, pretty good commercial and, then, another pretty good multi-family. But I -- they -- they just don't have the connectivity to me that -- that a multi-family needs. I think if I -- I live just north of Settlers Park on Wausau just off Meridian and to me I wouldn't call Settlers Park part of my neighborhood and part of my community, because the best way to get to it is to go along Meridian Road and it's to leave my neighborhood. I could kind of take a -- a winding path -- or I guess I could go down to Elsinore a little bit, but it -- really the -- the quickest way there is -- is to leave my -- my development and it seems like treating this as one development. If my quickest way from the south side to -- kind of a lot of these amenities is to leave and to take Hermatite or to get out onto Meridian, it feels like there is a lot of that connectivity that's missing and it -- it -- a lot -- I -- I think a lot of my frustration with multi-use -- or up to this point -- mixed-use up to this point, thank you, has been this kind of salami slicing a part of like multi-family or -- or residential, non-residential and, then, some more residential scattered throughout and I think the developer has -- has been very thoughtful. I think there are a lot of challenges and I think there are some economic realities that, you know, I would love to see more of the -- of the residential, you know, closer to the center, but I understand that commercial on the corner is really valuable --

Lorcher: Yep.

Smith: -- and so I understand that there are a lot of economic realities and so I can't fault the developer or the applicant for that. But -- but this really kind of gets to a lot of the things that I'm frustrated with about how developments come in -- or how applications come in regarding mixed-use that just aren't and I think we -- again, we have a limited pool of mixed-use in the city and we really have to get it right and I just -- I think this is, again, thoughtful in a lot of areas, but the -- the connectivity, the -- the integration of uses. If it were just down to the offices and the transitional space I would be happy to, you know, let the applicant work that out, but I think it's much more than this. I understand the need

for the grocery store, et cetera, for -- if you attract these other -- other tenants, but there are just a lot of things we are trying to have happen all at once and, then, as a result we are being pretty not great and mediocre at a lot of them. Not to call this mediocre. That feels very insulting to say. But I think, you know, we can't have everything. And so I don't know what the ideal looks like. I think there are a lot of different things in tension here. I just think this is really far off the mark and it's too much for me to support.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you.

Gelsomino: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Gelsomino.

Gelsomino: I will echo a lot of, you know, Commissioner Smith's sentiments, but my -- my particular hesitation will be closer to your comments, Madam Chair, especially with the State Highway 69, just the -- the conflict with the UDC, especially not having an ITD recommendation, it just puts me in a position where I think that, you know, it -- it would be best to have that ITD recommendation or that ITD report, you know, so that that's -- that's my thought at the moment.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much.

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: So, when I look at this I see Linder and Chinden and Orchard Park similarities and I very clearly remember all of the applications related to that and one of the big conversations we had was, again, about pedestrian safety and mobility and there was a reassurance that that would be pedestrian safe and -- and that there would be, you know, an encouragement to walk between the library and -- and -- and Paramount and all those things and you never see anyone walking anywhere and that's because there is just so much movement with vehicles and like you -- and -- and like you said, Ethan, you can't get away from that. This is -- this is a vehicle friendly area, but I'm trying to imagine -- I'm -- I'm -- I am up in that Orchard Park area quite frequently and I'm trying to imagine there being a big park in front of that Winco there and that's, essentially, what this is going to look like, is that there is going to be a big park in the front of the Winco next to Chinden and it's -- and that's what that's going to look like and feel like and so I -- I -- I would love to have a beautiful commercial multi-family development in this corner. I am not against the idea as a whole. I think there is some really really good elements that were put in here. I think there is some very well thought out things here for sure. So, I -- I'm -- this is -- you know, this is turning over in my mind of like, you know, what -- how do we address this technicality with a Comprehensive Plan while still encouraging you all to -- to move forward on -- on something similar to this, because I think it's very much needed. I think you have excellent bones and I know it's very expensive and very difficult to do these redesigns. It's complicated, it's frustrating and I have a great appreciation for that. I also have concerns about the connectivity -- the pedestrian connectivity. You know, as a -- as

a Commissioner and, then, Planning -- and -- and, then, City Council member and now Commissioner again, I have heard hundreds of applications and where developers say, well, okay, if we put a lot of multi-family in this area, then, clearly those folks are going to use the commercial services and clearly it's going to keep, you know, the -- the mobility within the development and we just haven't seen that honestly to be true in the City of Meridian. You know, I -- people are still getting in their cars and driving down the road on Ten Mile and the interstate to get something to eat and that kind of thing. So, I'm not -- this is not you. I hear this same -- and conceptually it would make sense, yes, okay, everybody would stay within their same community, but it's just, unfortunately, not really actually happening and so getting that transportation piece right is super important, because I -- I don't know that -- and it's not for effort of the developers that that will really contain all of that movement in the way that -- that, you know, there would be a hope that it would. And, then, no, that's not specific to you and that is not meant to, you know, comment on -- on a downside of your project. So, there is a lot of things like as I said. The two things I have concerns about as far as the concept goes is the plaza areas that are on the hard corner there. I don't think folks are going to use that as a plaza. It's going to be noisy, loud, traffic coming through. There is big huge trucks that fly by. I just don't think those are very well placed, if there is going to be dining facilities there and just general maybe like small events there. You know, wine parties or -- or whatnot, it -- I don't think that that's going to be a very comfortable space to be and so -- but aside from that, you know, whether these are to be approached as two applications or not, I don't have a problem with them coming in as one application, but I also believe that our Comprehensive Plan is decided by our public and it's something that we take really really seriously to follow and I don't know what the -- I don't know, you know, the -- the pre-application meetings, I don't know why staff might have said that, you know, that -- in 2020 was when we were still going through the Comprehensive Plan change and I don't know if that has something to do. I don't know if that -- if that requirement of the two -- the two separate applications and development agreements I don't know if that was not required at that time in 2020, that would be something that I would imagine staff would have talked to you about. So, I -- I like a lot of things about this. I wish I could say yes. I want to vote, you know, that way this evening, but I just -- it's so important to me to uphold our Comprehensive Plan and I don't know whether a Comprehensive Plan -- I mean it's not a map amendment -- amendment change, because you are really not trying to change the use of the two areas, so -- yeah. That's my thoughts.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you.

Stoll: I will try to be brief, because a lot of what I was going to say has been said already. I am sympathetic to the idea of having it considered as one application and I wish that was the case, but as has been pointed out the Comprehensive Plan was updated in between that meeting in 2020 to the present and Amity Road does cross the -- the application and really makes it two different parcels that we need to consider. But my overall preference is one application in general. I applaud you for looking at and exploring STARS. Certainly it's one of the key ways that we are going to be able to do improvements on our transportation system and this particular corridor and State Highway 69 is a corridor that needs to be improved. I just wish we had more of a response from

ITD on what their position was regarding the STARS agreement and whether they concurred with the cost estimates that you are providing and whether they can go forward on that. Also as has been said, I would like to be more of a true mixed-use application to get my go ahead. With that I will stop.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much.

Parsons: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Mr. Parsons.

Parsons: Madam Chair, if I could just add some context to one development versus two developments. I -- I don't want that to get misrepresented on the record. Staff has always wanted the applicant to come in with one annexation request, because they do own both corners. What we -- what we didn't want us -- and -- and where some of the confusion lies is that when we started discussing this project with the applicant the mixed-use standards in the Comprehensive Plan were different. It didn't have that element that you couldn't cross an arterial roadway -- or you could do that at that time. So, of course, when we started off these meetings that makes a lot of sense, because it will be one development and they own all the property. Well, throughout that process it -- it was an iterative process. We met with them multiple times, shared our feedback with them, and all -- all the time was we got closer and closer. We explained to them that we would be doing a Comprehensive Plan text amendment to change our mixed-use standards and if that goes into place before they submit, they are going to be held to those new standards and that's why we are here this evening saying it can be one application, we are just saying you can't sacrifice residential on the north side and get more -- more residential on the south side. That's what the Comprehensive Plan doesn't allow us to do currently. The other part is -- and I appreciate all the effort that the applicant's made in the open space. I -- I -- I do like a lot of the elements in this plan as well and I want to go on record as saying that, because we spent a lot of time with the applicant. But we can't also allow the applicant to double dip, to say I'm providing a quasi-public open space when their multi-family requires amenities and open space. So, we have to kind of differentiate those two things as well. While I appreciate that everyone can use that space, we still have to analyze the project and make sure that the multi-family development portion of the site has the required amount of open space and amenities as well. So, you can't say this is an amenity and open space for the multi-family development and, then, say, oh, yeah, this is also our quasi-public open space. It's -- that's -- that's what we can't -- we can't allow that to happen. We haven't done that historically. I think the one piece that was missed in tonight's public testimony and I just -- I want to commend the applicant, because he has done a pretty good job of -- of defending his project, but there is also properties to the west and even farther to the west waiting for sewer and this applicant -- although ITD hasn't given us any comments -- or -- on the access, they have allowed the applicant to go into their right of way, bring the sewer up, go through their site to the west and provide sewer for adjacent properties to tag -- to connect into that and allow them to develop as well. So, that's why the applicant is saying we have a good relationship. There is a church about a half mile down the road, Stonehill Church, waiting for sewer. They

constantly come to the city and ask for how can we get utilities to develop our church. So, I don't want that to get missed -- missed either. You are right, there is some valid concerns with this project, but I don't want anyone to think that the applicant hasn't been trying to work and solve some of these issues. So, I just want to go on record and state that. So, thank you.

Allen: Yeah. And, Madam Chair, if I may tag on to that just a little bit. This is one application and staff's in agreement with that. It could be also be one development agreement. Staff's also in agreement with that. But the differentiation there is the analysis of the northwest corner and the southwest corner separately for consistency with the mixed-use development guidelines. So, just wanted to clarify that. Also, as I remember the conversations initially back in 2020, we had told the applicant that we wanted to see the northwest corner come in if they were coming in with the southwest corner, because we didn't want to have leapfrog development so to speak. So, that's a little more background on that. I -- I do think it's a good commercial and -- and multi-family development. I did speak to the applicant about applying for a comp plan map amendment, if that's what they are truly wanting to do. It's just impossible for staff to support a project that's not consistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan. So, that's where staff sat tonight on that. So, I just wanted to add a little bit more information on that. Thank you.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you. And we also recognize that you have some geographic and topography issues, too, which is why you have some of the buildings placed the way you do. I think you said that that civic park in the middle towards the north had a big difference in elevation and so -- and, obviously, having the commercial surround the -- the two roads is going to be imperative for the success of this -- of this project, but it's just a little bit off balance. Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Oh, if there is no other --

Lorcher: Any other comments?

Smith: -- ready to make a motion.

Lorcher: Go ahead.

Smith: All right. Madam Chair, after considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend denial to the City Council of File No. H-2025-0007 as presented in the staff report for the hearing April 2nd, 2026, for the following reasons: Inadequate integration between residential and non-residential uses. Lack of prioritization of pedestrian mobility within the project. And existing open space as proposed failing to serve residential and non-residential use users adequately under the Comprehensive Plan.

Gelsomino: Seconded.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to deny Syringa Crossing Mixed-Use Development for annexation. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.