

Meridian Planning and Zoning Meeting

November 18, 2021.

Meeting of the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission of November 18, 2021, was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chairman Rhonda McCarvel.

Members Present: Chairman Rhonda McCarvel, Commissioner Andrew Seal, Commissioner Nick Grove, Commissioner Steven Yearsley and Commissioner Maria Lorcher.

Members Absent: Commissioner Bill Cassinelli and Commissioner Nate Wheeler.

Others Present: Adrienne Weatherly, Kurt Starman, Bill Parsons, Alan Tiefenbach and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

_____ Nate Wheeler	___X___ Maria Lorcher
___X___ Andrew Seal	___X___ Nick Grove
___X___ Steven Yearsley	_____ Bill Cassinelli
_____ Rhonda McCarvel - Chairman	

McCarvel: Good evening and welcome to the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting for November 18th, 2022. If you are joining us on Zoom this evening we can see that you are here. You may observe the meeting, however, your ability to be seen on screen and talk will be muted. During the public testimony of the meeting you will be unmuted and be able -- and be able to comment. Please note that we cannot take questions until the public testimony portion. If you have a process question during the meeting, please, e-mail cityclerk@meridiancity.org and they will reply to you as quickly as possible. Let's begin with roll call.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

McCarvel: Thank you. First item on the agenda is the adoption of the agenda. This evening Lennon Pointe Community, H-2021-0071 will be opened for the sole purpose of continuing this item to the regularly scheduled meeting of December 2nd. It will open only for that purpose, so if there is anyone here tonight to testify on that particular application we will not be taking testimony this evening. So, can I get a motion to adopt the agenda as amended?

Seal: So moved.

Yearsley: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to adopt the agenda. All those in favor say

aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

1. Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for Meridian Swim School (H-2021-0069) by CSHQA, Located at 2730 E. State Ave.

McCarvel: Next item on the agenda is the Consent Agenda and we only have one item on the Consent Agenda this evening. It's Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for Meridian Swim School, H-2021-0069. Could I get a motion to accept the Consent Agenda as presented?

Seal: So moved.

Grove: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

McCarvel: At this time I will briefly explained the public hearing process. We will open each item individually and begin with the staff report. The staff will report their findings on how an item adheres to our Comprehensive Plan and Unified Development Code. After staff has made their presentation the applicant will come forward to present their case and respond to staff comments. They will have 15 minutes to do so. After the applicant has finished we will open the floor to public testimony. Each person will be called on only once during the public testimony. The Clerk will call names individually of those who have signed up on our website and advanced to testify. If you are here in person, please, come forward. If you are on Zoom you will be unmuted. Please state your name and address for the record and you will have three minutes to address the Commission. If you have previously sent pictures or presentation for the meeting it will be displayed on the screen and our Clerk will run the presentation. After all those who have signed up in advance have spoken, we will invite others who may wish to testify. If you wish to speak on a topic you may press the raise hand button on the Zoom app or if you are only listening on the phone, please, press -- press star nine and wait for your name to be called. If you are listening on multiple devices, a computer and a phone, for example, please be sure and mute those extra devices, so we do not experience feedback and can hear you clearly. When you are finished if the Commission does not have questions for you, you will no longer have the ability to speak. Please remember that we will not call on you a second time. After all testimony has been heard, the applicant will be given another ten minutes to come back and respond. When the applicant has finished

responding to questions and concerns, we will close the public hearing and the Commissioners will have the opportunity to discuss and, hopefully, be able to make final decisions or recommendations to the City Council as needed.

ACTION ITEMS

2. Public Hearing for Lennon Pointe Community (H-2021-0071) by DG Group Architecture, PLLC, Located at 1515 W. Ustick Rd.

- A. Request: Annexation of 10.41 acres of land with a request for C-C (2.01 acres) and R-15 (8.3 acres) zoning districts.
- B. Request: A Preliminary Plat consisting of 43 building lots, 1 commercial building lot, and 2 common lots on 8.8 acres of land in the proposed C-C and R15 zoning districts.
- C. Request: A Conditional Use Permit for a multi-family development consisting of a total of 18 units on 1.18 acres in the proposed R-15 zoning district.

McCarvel: So, at this time we would like to open the public hearing for H-2021-0071, Lennon Pointe Community, to be continued to December 2nd due to a description noticing error. Does staff have anything they would like to add to that or -- okay. Can I get a motion to continue H-2021-0071 to December 2nd?

Lorcher: So moved.

Seal: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to continue H-2021-0071. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

3. Public Hearing for K1 Speed (H-2021-0077) by Josh Shiverick of Cushing Terrell, Located at 1075 N. Hickory Ave. on the northwest corner of E. State Ave. and H. Hickory Ave.

- A. Request: Conditional Use Permit for an approximate 50,000 square-foot indoor recreation facility for the purpose of an indoor electric go-kart track, concession area, meeting rooms, and associated spaces for K1 Speed on a portion of 9.88 acres of land in the I-L zoning district.

McCarvel: Next item on the agenda is H-2021-0077 and we will begin with the staff report.

Parsons: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. I'm filling in for Joe Dodson this evening. Give him a break from his long City Council hearing on Tuesday night. So, if you would indulge me a little bit this evening. So, the first application before you this evening is the K1 Speed conditional use permit. The site consists of 9.88 acres of land, currently zoned I-L in the city limits and this property -- the physical address of the property is 1075 North Hickory Avenue. Back in 2020 the city did approve a certificate of zoning compliance to develop the property with an approximately 204,000 square foot industrial warehouse building that you see here in front of you. This is the approved site plan. You can see here that the applicant is proposing to take up approximately 50,000 square feet of that existing structure located on the south end of the building. Typically with I-L zoning the required parking in that zone is one stall for every 2,000 square feet of gross floor area. In this particular case, based on the square footage, the applicant would have to have over one hundred stalls to serve the proposed use. In this particular case there is well over 200 plus stalls on this particular site, which is consistent and exceeds UDC standards. Staff also finds that the proposed indoor arts and entertainment use meets the specific use standards in Chapter 4 of the code as well. Again, here is some -- the approved landscape plan. So, really, all the applicant is going to need after their CUP approval has come forward with what we call a tenant improvement with the building department and do only interior finishes. Everything regarding the exterior of the building and the site have been approved with the previous certificate of zoning compliance, which was done at a -- at an administrative level by staff. You can see here that the proposed development has two access points -- or, excuse me, four access points that were approved with that certificate of zoning compliance. So, the one thing to note on this particular application is since the applicant is on the south end of the building and this is more of a commercial use than an industrial use, the patrons that come to this will have adequate access to get to the site and not interfere with the additional tenant that is operating on the north side of the building. If you had a chance to look at the staff report, Joe did note that there is a cabinet maker that is operating on the north end of this building, approximately 30,000 square feet. So, if you can see how the site's been developed, it's been situated so that if there is truck traffic for any additional tenant spaces, they could come in or off of Hickory Way here along the north boundary -- or east boundary and circle around and get to the loading docks on the back here and still not interfere with that potential -- the proposed commercial activity that's within this tenant space as well. We also noted in the -- in the staff report the hours of operation are from 10:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m., which is, again, consistent with code. I would mention to the Commission that there is quite a bit of residential that is developing in the area, not only multi-family, but also single family to the west. So, staff feels that this would be a beneficial residential use in the area to serve the area. On tonight's agenda you just approved an aquatic swim center just a little bit to the east of this site. So, you can see although this area is I-L zoned, the PUD that was approved in 1991 allows for all non-residential uses to incur in this area. Here is the rendering of the proposed elevations of the building and, again, you can see my cursor here, this is where K1 Speed is proposing to go. Typically staff would be concerned with a note -- the noise and odor with this associated use, but if you also noted in the staff report these are electrical -- electric go-carts, not your typical gas powered equipment. So, staff finds that this is compatible with the adjacent uses in the surrounding area and we are recommending approval with the conditions in the staff report. I will

stand for any questions you may have.

McCarvel: Thank you. Would the applicant like to come forward?

Hersel: Josh Hersel with Cushing Terrell, 800 West Main Street, Suite 800, Boise, Idaho. 83702. We are in full agreement with the staff report. Noise could be a concern. It's also in a concrete tilt up building that's insulated sandwich panels. It does have loading docks that face the residential, but they will not be used, other than for deliveries of the carts. They will never be opened during operation hours. Again, their hours meet what the city code requires. We are over on parking requirements. So, we are in complete conclusion that it should be fine and work through with the staff's recommendation. Any questions?

McCarvel: Any questions for staff or the applicant? Okay. Thank you. Madam Clerk, do we have anyone signed up to testify on this application?

Weatherly: Madam Chair, we do not.

McCarvel: Okay. With that being said, is there anyone in the room or online that would like to testify on this application? Okay. I'm assuming the applicant has no further comment. With that could I get a motion to close the public hearing for H-2021-0077?

Grove: So moved.

Lorcher: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded, very quietly, to close the public hearing on H-2021-0077. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: I will need to recuse myself from this, because my employer owns the building that this will be in.

McCarvel: Perfect. We will chat with you in a minute. Any opening comments, motions?

Grove: Make a motion.

McCarvel: Okay.

Grove: Seeing as we have staff and applicant in agreement and no public testimony against, I move -- let's see. After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to approve file number H-2021-0077 as presented in the staff report for the hearing

date of November 18th, 2021, with no modifications.

Yearsley: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to approve H-2021-0077. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

4. Public Hearing Continued from November 4, 2021 for Black Cat Industrial Project (H-2021-0064) by Will Goede of Sawtooth Development Group, LLC, Located at 350, 745, 935, and 955 S. Black Cat Rd. and Parcel S1216131860.

- A. Request: Annexation of 130.19 acres of land with R-15 and I-L zoning districts.

McCarvel: Welcome back, Commissioner Seal. Next item on the agenda is continuing H-2021-0064, Black Cat Industrial Project, originally opened on the hearing date of November 4th and we will begin with the staff report.

Tiefenbach: Greetings, Madam Chair, Members of the Planning Commission. Alan Tiefenbach, associate planner with the City of Meridian. This is a request for an annexation of 130 acres with the I-L and the R-15 zone district. So, the majority of the property is on the west side of Black cat Road. This is about 129 acres. There is also a very small -- not quite one acre piece of property that is -- where is my -- there it is. That's right there that is the -- on the east side of Black Cat. Just a quick history. Staff and the applicant have met numerous times on this project. We have expressed many concerns. These include the lack of the compliance with the Ten Mile plan, both in use and design. Potential traffic impacts, probability of low job generation and whether or not the timing is actually right for -- for a development of this magnitude when there is other properties to the east that have yet to be developed. So, again, the applicant proposes to annex and rezone a little bit less than one acre of property to the east as R-15. The applicant proposes to annex 129 acres of property to the west as I-L. I want to quickly talk about the Ten Mile plan. So, the Ten Mile plan -- the purpose of this was to ensure that land use and transportation planning are integrated. It states that the city knows that these are one of the last remaining large contiguous areas of highly visible land, meaning the property that I'm referring to. The Ten Mile plan talks about how this area is intended to look, feel, and function differently than a typical commercial area or a residential subdivision and it goes on to talk about that unlike a lot of commercial and employment districts, the intent here is that the Ten Mile plan wouldn't empty out at 5:00 p.m., it would be sort of a live-work situation with a lot of employment. This is the land use map for the Ten Mile plan and so the property is what you see in the -- in the dotted yellow line. This over here is the one acre property that's being proposed to be rezoned to R -- to be -- excuse me -- annexed and zoned to R-15. That is surrounded by property that's all recommended as medium density residential. On the west side of Black Cat Road, about

one-third of this, maybe a little bit more, is recommended as low density employment. The rest that you see here in gray, this is all recommended for mixed use employment. So, low density -- low density employment, according to the plan, talks about that the purpose of this is to provide low rise office and specialized employment uses, a variety of flexible sites for professional offices and similar businesses, and it also should be designed to provide convenient circulation. One of the things about that circulation is that it's recommended to be designed with elements of traditional neighborhood design. So, that's slower streets, traffic calming, wide sidewalks, more walkable, buildings that front towards the street and buildings in low density employment areas are supposed to range in height between one and three stories. Typically smaller square footage and land use types talk about corporate and business offices, research facilities and laboratories. If you look at the bottom here there is some pictures out of the Ten Mile plan that sort of give examples of what low density employment could look like. The other land use recommendation, again, which is the majority of it, is mixed employment and this is to encourage the diversity of compatible land uses, include -- which includes a mixture of office, research, and specialized employment areas. It also says that what could be appropriate there is light industrial, including manufacturing and assembly and I will talk about that shortly. It should provide for a variety of flexible sites, for small and local start-up businesses, as well as large national or regional enterprises. It's intended to accommodate a wide variety of employers and serve as a primary gateway and all of the -- and as an example, all of the professional office uses along with the -- the restaurant and retail uses, ancillary uses that you see at the Ten Mile and I-84, the example of mixed use employment and that's the type of uses that are proposed in this area as well. So, the applicant's proposal -- and this is the concept plan. Is for seven buildings ranging in size between 6,800 and 33,000 square feet. So, that's what you see directly adjacent to Black Cat. This includes, according to the applicant, flex incubator buildings, which can be divided into spaces and also it includes a future fire station, which is what you see here. This also includes nine large buildings. These range in size from 131 square -- 131,000 square foot to almost 330,000 square foot, with the entire project being somewhat more than two million square feet. This concept plan that you are looking at it shows multiple loading bays. I don't know if you can see it here, but there is loading bays here. They are pretty much inside of all of the buildings. The concept plan that you see here shows a wide collector street, which I will talk about, and this is designed to accommodate large truck traffic and the applicant request is to rezone this entire area to I-L, which would be light industrial. Again, this is still part of the proposals. The narrative states that the Black Cat business center would provide in demand manufacturing, heavier office build out, flex industrial and ancillary retail, warehousing and distribution. It mentions that the mixed use employment designation does allow light industrial as one of the appropriate uses. The narrative notes that the City of Meridian has less than a one percent vacancy rate for industrial business uses and the Treasure Valley as a whole lags behind its peer markets. So, staff believes that the mixed employment zoning is more appropriate for this location, not I-L, to follow what the Ten Mile plan designates. The Ten Mile plan does mention light industrial as one of the appropriate uses in mixed employment. However, light industrial is defined by this plan as manufacturing and assembly. Also the Unified Development Code also has a definition of light industrial, which talks about a use engaged in the manufacture, processing, fabrication, assembly,

treatment -- blah, blah, blah, predominantly from previously prepared materials. So, this would be where your elves would create your widgets and they do the research on the widgets and they bring them to the warehouse and they -- they could store the widgets and trucks can come and get the widgets, but the whole point is the building and the making and the research and the development of the widgets and, then, the widgets can be taken somewhere else. Now, these definitions that I described are very different than what will be allowed in the light industrial zone district. Two different things. The definition of light industrial versus the light industrial zone district are very different. In that particular zone district warehousing, distribution, self storage and other industrial uses are allowed. But these uses are actually specifically mentioned in the Ten Mile plan as being in the industrial area, which is further west of the property directly adjacent to McMillan. I have put this comparison on just to help clarify, because it is a little confusing, but on the left would be mixed employment. These are the kind of uses that are recommended by the Ten Mile plan. They pretty much are exactly in sync what the plan recommends. On the right is what you see as light industrial zone district. This zone district allows numerous uses, which includes by right, warehouse, indoor and outdoor storage, car sales, contractor's yard, equipment rental, sales, and service and all these other types of uses as well. One of one of the major intentions of the Ten Mile plan is to improve the jobs-housing balance and there is some information that I have here. What you see on the -- on the right there, those numbers, what that all is is talking about what the existing jobs-housing balance is in this area. Basically ideal -- in an ideal world you would have one job to one house is what you are looking for. Anything less than that is less of the jobs-housing balance. Anything higher than that means you have more jobs than people. The existing jobs here is that this balance is presently about .2 and, like I said, one is the ideal one. The intended jobs of the Ten Mile plan talks about 20,000 and this -- the intent of this, especially with these employment centers, is intended to promote a reverse commute. As you know to the east there is many subdivisions that are building out now, hundreds of lots, multi-family over the Ten Mile and Franklin and is also like the Ten Mile-Meridian, the gateway, numerous types of mixed use and residential projects. This is a quick list to show you just typically what the typical jobs per acre is. So, for retail you get Ten Jobs, down to like warehousing, which would be five jobs per acre and self storage is very few, one or two per facility if that. West Franklin Road presently is two lanes with no curb or gutter. That's what you see here. Sorry. It's covered by that legend. And it narrows to one lane west of Black Cat. Black Cat Road, which you see here, is presently two lanes with no curb, gutter, or sidewalk. Black Cat Road is to be widened to five lanes between 2036 and 2040. West Franklin Road is planned to be widened to five lanes between 2026 and 2030 and the West Franklin Road over here is eventually to be signalized for State Highway 16, which is eventually going in just west of McMillan. So, the -- the Ten Mile plan, ACHD, both require north-south collectors and a local street. So, one of these collectors you can see purple here, this was provided by ACHD. Another one of the collectors is shown to run through the middle of the property here. Also ACHD is showing a collector running along the northern side of the property along the Rosenlof Drain. It's important to notice that there is actually another local street, which is shown on the land use map of the Ten Mile plan that's not, however, shown on the transportation plats on the ACHD. However, the -- the intent of this local street, obviously, is to connect between these two these two collectors. Staff has mentioned to the applicant that there

should be some sort of northern south connection through the middle of this property. The concept plan that's provided doesn't show this connection. It basically dead ends here at parking. So, although the immediate area -- area is mostly undeveloped, meaning directly to the east and, then, to the north and to the west is also still unincorporated Ada county, there is a significant amount of development that's already been built out or is entitled to that, like I talked about. 330 single family lots and 240 apartments in the Bayara Baraya Subdivision, which is to the east. There is a large amount of commercial and residential occurring at Meridian, Vanguard Village, Ten Mile Crossing and TM Creek crossing. Staff believes that the impacts of two million square feet of new commercial uses could have significant impacts on the surrounding neighborhood. Now, annexation -- annexations do not require a traffic study, but staff does believe just because of the size of this this is one of the things that the applicant should provide and it's one of the things we can look at to see if it's in the best interest of the city. We believe that the uses proposed would generate also a large amount of truck traffic. If you look at what's being proposed, the -- the numerous large buildings and the wide collector, even in our narrative it talks about to provide unimpeded access for trucks. So, you are going to get a lot of trucks going up and down these two lane roads on Black Cat and Franklin or trying to turn and go into Ten Mile. The Ten Mile plan has design requirements regarding the road network, streets sections, walkability and architecture. So, in general there is a Section C, which is sold on the Ten Mile plan, and that is what you see on the left here, this bottom. Collectors here are supposed to be multi-modal, meaning walking, biking, and driving with on-street parking and wide sidewalks and buildings that are brought up to the street. In addition, there is other design standards, such as variation in building height, ground floor transparency, three different elements to buildings. What you see here this little section, there is different sections provided in the Ten Mile plan trying to get an idea of what the building massing and the building height in each area is. What you see here on the right is showing the mixed use employment area that I'm actually referring to and, then, there is -- there is numerous pictures of the types of businesses that would be reflective of that. So, the concept plan that you see here reflects the east-west connector -- collector bisecting the property and being 60 feet wide. So, again, the -- the collectors are supposed to be 33 and that's to slow traffic and to make them more walkable, but what you have here is a 60 foot wide collector. This is easy truck access. There is no on-street parking. There are detached parkways, but all the landscaping is outside of this right of way and you can see much of the parking is along the collector. And, then, the buildings here -- what you see here are they maintain large setbacks. The large buildings don't contain the kind of ground floor transparency that's talked about in this plan to make it interesting and pedestrian oriented. They don't address the public realm and they are all one story in height, even though they are sort of designed to kind of look like two stories and and the Ten Mile plan, again, is recommending that there is different building heights, not just all one story. Now, the applicant's narrative states that due to security and visibility that the industrial uses of these buildings do not support windows across the entire frontage and certainly we understand that. As an alternative they propose enhanced glazing at every -- at the corner elements. So, staff believes that there could be design revisions that could improve the final product, especially some of the buildings that you see along Black Cat, the smaller ones. We think those could probably be reconfigured, reoriented and some additional things done to make those

closer to what the Ten Mile plan recommends. However, it's important to note that given the use that's being proposed, especially with the western part, the majority of it, we don't think that the applicant could design in the type of design that's being recommended by the plan, not -- not as an employment center. I think sort of the point that I'm making here is the Planning Commission should decide whether warehousing, distribution, and storage is appropriate in this location, because that's what I-L would allow. If they do believe that those kinds of uses are appropriate in this location, then, staff would still recommend that M-E would be the -- would be the -- the appropriate zone district and, again, some of those warehousing uses are allowed as part of M-E, they just can't be a standalone use, they have to be part of a larger operation. The applicant proposes to annex and zone the area to I-L, whereas M-E zoning would be more consistent with the plan. The applicant also proposes to annex about a one acre lot with the R-15 zone district just to achieve the contiguity to be eligible for annexation. There is a potential for significant loss of employment generating activity, monotonous architecture, and building massive street design, which is not consistent with what the Ten Mile plan shows. In addition, the traffic impacts of nearly two million square feet of new commercial on the local network have not been analyzed and staff wonders really if this is about time -- if this is time, as much of the -- the development to the east has not yet been developed, the roads aren't ready, and much of the infrastructure isn't in place. The plan says that the city knows -- like we mentioned as one of the remaining last large contiguous pieces of highly visible land within the city's area of impact. With that staff finds the application is not in the best interest of the city. Staff recommends denial and with that I will conclude my presentation.

McCarvel: Thank you. Would the applicant like to come forward?

Tiefenbach: I think we are -- I think we are fighting over the mouse. Hold on sec, Deb.

Nelson: Okay.

Tiefenbach: Okay. There you go.

Nelson: Okay. Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, my name is Deborah Nelson. My address is 601 West Bannock Street. I'm here on behalf of the applicant. So, you can tell from Alan's presentation we actually have met with staff for a long while. We are disappointed we have not been able to get staff support, but at this point we feel we have done as much as we can do to work through these concerns and we need to move forward with this application. I mean fundamentally -- and I think Alan said this as well -- this is a decision about what use can go here and staff's vision for this area is an office park. They asked us to look at El Dorado and Silverstone, instead of this industrial flex park. So, my presentation is really going to focus on how the light industrial zone and a modern business park with modular industrial spaces for businesses of all sizes is actually compatible with your Ten Mile plan and your annexation criteria. Tim Wolfe with A-T Industrial is going to follow me with some information about the market need and support for the proposed industrial flex used in this location. Little project evolution. On the left is our initial concept. Following the pre-app we made some significant changes. We

rotated the buildings to shield the views of the loading docks from the freeway and the collector. We enhanced the entrance and added this central amenity area. At significant expense we purchased and incorporated two outlier parcels along Black Cat to address staff's concerns that they may be isolated as rural residential in the county. We continued through discussions to evolve the site. We changed the majority of the buildings to single loaded and pulled them up to the street to minimize parking at the frontage. We divided the Black Cat frontage buildings into smaller flex incubator spaces. Added walking paths throughout. Improved the collector street east-west to match the plan and we added this fire station site, which we are in discussions with fire about. Here you can see the flex incubator spaces on Black Cat that will serve those small local and start-up businesses with adaptable office like space and here is the outdoor amenity space providing that attractive entry and also serving that as -- as that gathering hub for employees. So, a couple of key points about what the plan provides. Alan mentioned that the majority of our site is mixed employment under your Comprehensive Plan where you have the majority of one designation and mixed designations that calls -- that it's appropriate to use the majority designation, which we have done here with mixed employment. In the zoning compatibility matrix within the Ten Mile plan it specifically identifies light industrial as an allowed zone. All of the uses that we propose are allowed within that light industrial zone. The Ten Mile plan also calls for uses within the mixed employment area to provide a variety of flexible sites for small local or start-up businesses, as well as sites for large national or regional enterprises. We do this in a couple of ways. We have got the variety of building sizes that go all the way from 17,000 feet for the flex buildings up to what we have shown here as approximately 350,000 feet. That is well within the range in your plan for mixed employment areas that calls for buildings that range from 10,000 square feet to one million square feet. The other way we do it is we have demisable buildings. These are all -- demisable down to 2,500 square feet in the small, 18,000 or 25,000 in the larger buildings. This allows tenants to come in a variety of sizes of businesses and then when they grow they can grow into larger space. Ten Mile plan also talks about how one of its goals is to provide for industrial opportunities and consideration of the future improvements to Highway 16. Well, at that time that was long in the future and now it is immediately upon us. The land has now been acquired. This is a priority for the governor and this is expected to be built out in the next two to three years. The east-west collector through our site will provide us a direct connection over to McDermott and 16 as the property to our west develops. There is a lot of details. We don't have enough time to respond to everything that Alan just raised. I will just try to highlight a few things. He talked about how we didn't meet the -- the street section. In fact, we do. He said that we didn't meet it for one reason, because it calls for on-site parking, but, in fact, Street Section C doesn't call for on-street parking. We do have bike lanes. We should have delineated them better. The one addition we have is a turn lane in the center of this, but every other aspect is the same, parkway, hardscape, sidewalks detached. Again, a lot of details about design. Just to highlight a few. Alan talked about the building heights in his staff report. He says you have got to be two to four stories. In fact, for mixed employment it's one to four. We have one and two stories, but our building heights range up to the four story height in there. We also meet the setbacks. The picture illustrates this well. This was also in Alan's presentation. The picture on the left is straight out of the Ten Mile plan. This is our building -- this is from our larger building onset. This is -- our architectural

features are the same. I would say more attractive and you have got the same delineation, the same glazing shown. We meet all of the criteria for annexation. We have services at our site. Public Works has confirmed they have capacity to serve sewer and water here within the existing trunk lines. The area to our east is building out. Everything is either got a development application pending or it's owned by developer land. This area is quickly developing and appropriate for development now. In the end with all of these points, the city certainly can choose to approve light industrial zoning in this location and the industrial and flex project based on the guidelines in the plan and the Comprehensive Plan if this is a use that you determine is appropriate here. With that I'm going to turn it over to Tim Wolfe.

Wolfe: Hi. Tim Wolfe. 675 Sun Valley Road, Ketchum, Idaho. 83340. What I wanted to do is just -- we were -- staff -- we have heard repeatedly from staff that office is a more appropriate use for this location and what I want to do is just take a minute to talk about what the context was when the specific plan was adopted in 2007, what the context is today, how that has changed and how the two uses have changed pretty dramatically over that period of time. So, what's happened is that behavior has fundamentally changed the way both office and industrial use are used in America. Office space per employee has been cut in half since the Ten Mile plan was adopted. So, it means that for every square foot of office you have twice as many employees in it today as you did when that was adopted. E-commerce growth has more than tripled over the intervening period of time and it's had a pretty significant impact on the need for local industrial infrastructure. I'm going to -- I'm going to lay out a whole bunch of things here. You will get the slides. I'm not going to go through a bunch of details, but in the detail we have kind of laid out 2007 and '19 what happened. Obviously, we had an event -- a pandemic event in 2020 and, then, going forward, you know, what does that mean? What does it mean for office? What does it mean for industrial? How should you as a city plan going forward to address the ongoing needs. So, there is a lot of supply chain things that have happened and you will be able to read this. There is a couple of interesting points down at the bottom here that I'm going to pop up. In 2007 when the plan was adopted e-commerce was four percent of total retail sales. 2013 it was 5.8. 2020 it was 14. And it's very close to 20 percent now. So, it's quadrupled, online sales have, and that channel is all going through an industrial channel. On the flip side of that what's happened is that office square footage per employee in 2007 was 396 square feet. 2020 was 196 square feet and now what's happening is with people working from home more and more, that number is continuing to go down. So, the amount of land necessary to meet an office requirement for a number of employees has been cut in half and it's continuing to go down. So, what does that mean for office land in Meridian? More office land is not needed. Obviously, changing maybe forever and there is some things about studies by Price Waterhouse, Coopers and others about how that's happening. So, if you actually go look at the office in Meridian currently there is greater than a 70 year supply of office land that is currently on the market. Office that is existing and built in vacant or office that is in planning process right now. This town ignoring land that's zoned that's not on the market right now that there is also a significant amount of -- has more than 70 years of supply of office. So, we are confused about why office is being pushed on this site. So, what we did is looked at what's the average absorption of the last five years of office in this town and it's

about 200,000 square feet and that includes pre-pandemic when the office uses started to decline. Office space available for lease is about two point years -- two years of supply. Office projects in planning and process is another 3.2 years of supply. Office land listed as available for sale just in the City of Meridian is 415 acres, which is a 67 year supply of office. So, you know, why -- why we would build office in a market that where there is 73 years of supply of current land available didn't make sense to us. So, how does Meridian sit relative to its peers. And we shared this with staff. So, Meridian right now has a 14 percent office vacancy and Boise is eight percent. So, about half of what Meridian is. So, relative to Boise it has more office than it needs. But .09 percent industrial vacancy. So, there is zero industrial availability and what that means is people are leaving Meridian. Existing businesses right now -- we talked -- we talked to a business a day that doesn't have room to grow, doesn't have anyplace to go and talked to two businesses this week that are industrial tenants that are leaving your city because they have nowhere to go and Meridian compared to peer cities, it's 40 percent behind Boise in terms of total industrial square footage, 66 behind Spokane and it -- you know, Meridian is the second largest city in the state of Idaho, so it's -- our feeling is the city should be thinking of itself as a city and -- and from a planning perspective behaving that way as well and to -- I -- our feeling is it shouldn't be a badge of honor to be 60 percent below your peers in terms of the amount of industrial space you have available. So, there is almost no current inventory of land available for industrial. There is no vacancy. There is no room to grow. Future land is many years out. There is a significant amount of infrastructure that's got to deliver that future land and staff itself has said that that is a long ways out. As I mentioned, we have been talking to existing businesses. I spoke with eight this week. They are all growing, they all want to stay here, they all have nowhere to grow. Two of them are leading that I spoke with this week. In addition, we have other tenants that want to be in this location that are high paying jobs and high density jobs relative to the industrial space and so I think -- and I just want to leave with a couple of questions for everybody to think about, which is, you know, are we planning for a diverse and resilient economy by providing all the needed space for the second largest city in Idaho to grow? Are we intelligently responding to the escalating need for -- that e-commerce is driving and that the supply chain issues are driving? And are we really thinking about the declining need for office space, because it has declined pre-COVID and nobody knows what this means post-COVID, other than the fact that more and more people are going to work from home and do we want to force businesses and employees that are successful out of this community? Because that's happening today. That's it.

McCarvel: Okay. Thank you. Any questions for the applicant or staff?

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: Question for the applicant. Out of the -- all the folks that you talked to did any of them submit any kind of written testimony to the fact that they are leaving the community?

Wolfe: No, but I'm happy to get that -- provide it.

Seal: That would be a good piece of information to have.

Grove: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Grove.

Grove: What -- you said that the -- the companies moving out are moving out because of space. What -- what are the space needs in terms of general square foot per business and what does that look like?

Wolfe: So, the eight that I spoke with this week there was a total of just under 300,000 square feet that they occupied with those eight tenants. So, it's, you know, an average of 35,000 feet or so apiece and they ranged from as low as 4a ,000 foot tenant up to as high as 50,000 foot tenant and the employee count for those 300,000 feet was about 300 employees. So, about one per -- it was actually higher employment per acre than what was shown here by about double. So, there is a lot of variability in that employment and the two that were leaving -- one has 30 employees, one has 20 employees. They both really want to stay in Meridian. One of them has already signed a lease to move out -- outside of this town and I'm sure he would write a letter saying why. He grew his business here and wanted to stay here, but at the time there is nowhere to go.

Lorcher: Madam Chair?

Simison: Commissioner Lorcher.

Lorcher: Knowing that the infrastructure for this particular area, Black Cat and Franklin, are not even available yet with, Black Cat not even being widened until 2036 to 2040, why now to change it to light industrial?

Wolfe: Well, there is -- there is need and as I mentioned, you know, you are going to have existing businesses leave, let alone new businesses. Actually, the intersection at Black Cat and Franklin is a fully developed intersection, so it's built to handle the five lanes that are going to go along Franklin. So, the intersection itself can handle the traffic and we have a traffic study that is well along the way and staff has communicated a little bit with ACHD on that and there will be a traffic study that will be complete prior to any building permit issued on this site. It's our -- we acknowledge and understand that traffic has to be resolved, so -- and part of our intent is to enhance Black Cat from the site up to Franklin.

Lorcher: And the three homesteads that are currently there you purchased?

Wolfe: We purchased the two that are -- that end up squaring up our frontage on Black Cat.

Lorcher: And the one across the street?

Wolfe: The one across the street is just part of the annexation.

Lorcher: So, that home will remain for now?

Wolfe: Correct.

Lorcher: But the other two will be removed?

Wolfe: Yes.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Yearsley: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: I have a question for Bill. Since you are probably the only one here that was involved with the Ten Mile plan initially, was State Highway 16 even considered in the plan as part of this Ten Mile specific plan?

Parsons: Yeah. Commission, Commissioner Yearsley, I wasn't part of that charrette when that came through, so I don't really have a definitive answer for you, but what I can tell you is M-E zone wasn't in play when that plan got adopted and so the matrix that the applicant brought up showing industrial and, then, all the different commercial zones that were in there as an appropriate fit, M-E did not exist and we have amended the code since, then, to -- to accommodate M-E zone to go along with that land use and that's why staff was pushing or felt that M-E was the more appropriate zoning for this particular property. But we can certainly look through the plan a little bit and dig into that and see if we can circle back on that discussion for you.

Yearsley: Okay. I was just kind of curious with that, just because the -- the use of this area kind of has a potential change based on access to the interstate just a mile away.

Parsons: Well, if you look at the -- the land uses that -- as you transition farther to the west and connect to Nampa, you see we do go from more of a business park setting to an industrial area around that interchange. So, one would -- would presume that it did contemplate highway -- or State Highway 16 happening, so that you could get that truck -- truck traffic happening and try and avoid that conflict with what's occurring as you transition to Ten Mile.

Yearsley: Okay. Thank you.

McCarvel: Any other questions for staff or applicant?

Lorcher: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Lorcher.

Lorcher: So, if you were proposing -- because I wasn't here for the Ten Mile interchange either conversation. So, if you were proposing this to be more office space off of Black Cat, if a company wanted to do light industrial or manufacturing, where do you -- where were you envisioning to go in the City of Meridian?

Tiefenbach: So, Alan Tiefenbach, associate planner. I was just kind of going through the Ten Mile plan. It does actually talk about Highway 16 in the future improvements and how this employment district was supposed to be buffering and residential from the industrial that was supposed to be directly adjacent to McDermott. So, if you look at the -- the land use plan, which I think I have here, on all of the industrial -- what you will see there is to the west and that's intended to be directly adjacent to McDermott and eventually to Highway 16. The mixed employment area is supposed to, first of all, provide a buffer and, secondly, to provide jobs to help the job balance from the numerous different residential subdivisions that are building out to the east.

McCarvel: Any other questions for staff or applicant? Okay. Thank you. Madam Clerk, do we have anyone signed up to testify on this application?

Weatherly: Madam Chair, we have one. Corinne Caddis. Madam Chair --

McCarvel: Sir, did you want to come forward? And, please, speak right into the microphone and state your name and address for the record.

Eggers: Yes. Thank you very much. I'm Drew Eggers at 2256 North Waggle Place, Meridian, Idaho. 83646. I apologize I got here a little late, so I wasn't able to sign up. So, thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak. I'm a fourth generation Idaho farmer and I grew up on that property and the past 25 years farmed it for my mother and the family and saw over the years the changes that have come around that property. Well, it started back when -- in the early '60s when the freeway went through that property and so I have seen a lot of changes over the years. I -- we accept the Comprehensive Plan that has been overlaid on this property by the area of the City of Meridian or the powers to be and with the growth happening in this area it's bound to -- bound to fulfill or come to fruition, I believe. Light industrial -- this property every year is becoming harder and harder to farm. It was farmed last year. I farmed it prior to that for 25 years. With the growth in this valley machinery going down the road, all the obstacles from farming we were -- stopped aerial application because of population growth. So, I mean I could talk a half an hour on that and I won't, but -- but the -- the Comprehensive Plan for the way things are growing I believe is acceptable to my -- our family and -- and a-- nd the way it's being planned. My family has been involved in Meridian before my life, being a fourth generation farmer. My grandparents came to Black Cat Road in 1921. It wasn't Black Cat Road then. It was changed to Black Cat Road in the '30s when my father -- grandfather named his farm the Black Cat farm for selling registered Holstein cattle and, then, in the '50s everybody called it Black Cat Road because of the sign and so they put Black Cat road up, the county did, instead of Post Road. So, that shows the history we

have out there. I can remember in the '50s Black Cat Road being gravel. We have also been involved in the community over the years. Myself going to the Meridian schools. All community functions. Being involved in the church in this area is part of what my family has done for multiple generations. So, at this point you see we do have a willing buyer to come and do what the Comprehensive Plan wants and so this is why I'm here today to ask for -- for approval of this project. If there is any questions I would be happy to answer them.

McCarvel: Any questions? Thank you.

Eggers: Thank you very much.

McCarvel: Madam Clerk, anybody else that was signed up?

Weatherly: Madam Chair, no one else was signed in to testify.

McCarvel: Okay. Then let's move on to the raised hands. Sir. In the brown jacket.

Goldthorpe: I wasn't going to do this. My name is Kent Goldthorpe. I live at 1355 South Black Cat Road, just above the proposed annexation and rezone. Number one, I'm fully supportive of anything that you decide to do, but I would like to give you a little bit of the rest of the story. I'm giving testimony today as a private citizen, but you probably already know that's not necessarily what my day job is. We have talked about -- a little bit about Highway 16. The Ada County Highway District has absolutely no plans to connect to Highway 16. We don't have any money for it. When the legislature in their great wisdom passed the extension and funded it, they left a 34 million dollar unfunded mandate for those of us living in -- in Ada county to fund to get the loose ends tied up. Right now one of our biggest -- the biggest sense of urgency we have about Highway 16 is to try and convince the legislature to do the right thing and fund the rest of it, so that you don't have to and I don't have to, because it would just be taking money away from every other entity in this -- in this county that we are already ten to 15 years behind on our infrastructure improvements in Ada county and you have probably heard that many times. Black Cat Road, you know, what -- what our plans are as far as when it might be -- might be extended or expanded or improved. That will all be based on whether or not we have the funds and right now we are -- are deferring, we are delaying and we are erasing a lot of projects in our Comprehensive Plan because of the funding that we no longer have. The inflation that has hit the construction industry and in particular building roads, it's almost doubled the cost of building roads in the last four years and that's a lot higher inflation than you see in the general economy. I'm only saying this because you might as well know that whether you rezone this to mixed employment, which I think would be just absolutely spectacular, or light industrial, which, according to the Ten Mile plan and your staff report, isn't necessary -- we will support whatever you do, we just might not be able to afford any of the improvements. Thank you very much. Do you have any questions?

McCarvel: Thank you. There in the back.

Bottles: Madam Chair and Members, Mark Bottles, real estate broker. 839 -- 839 Bridgeway Place, Eagle, Idaho. I almost forgot my address. Good evening. I have been a broker in the community a long time and have worked with a lot of our tenants in the valley and -- local tenants and companies that have built up and grown. The one thing that I hear all the time from our development people at the city, for expansion is calling me saying, hey, we got to save industrial ground, we need more industrial ground, and I hear it all the time. We have a knife -- a business that they manufacture custom knives in Eagle -- I mean in -- excuse me -- in Meridian by Pine 43, looking for space, looked for years, going to have to leave the area and they are manufacturers, good paying jobs, can't find suitable industrial space. Silverstone and El Dorado Business Park -- I have been around a long time, thirty years in this valley, big, parks still not built out with office. Silverstone. We started selling apartment ground in there now. The dirt's converted to apartment ground, because we can't get enough office space and that what I'm stressing here is we need office space. But we have so much of it that's not getting built out and that's not what is needed and I'm fine with the zoning of the apartment ground, but in that business park you have UPS, because distribution in Garden City, we need it right close to our houses where it's coming and not running, you know, all the fuel and all the people running clear across town. So, they are in the business park, as you probably know, in Silverstone in big buildings with parking those trucks inside those buildings, need to be in there, because there is not enough space in a traditional what I call industrial park. Gemtech, which is owned by Smith and Wesson, they make gun supplies is in Silverstone Business Park and it's really an industrial use, but it has gone in there and so they came in and -- out of Eagle -- again, Eagle didn't have enough space and moved out there. I say this is -- and even in the back of El -- excuse me -- El Dorado Business Park, we put apartments in the back of that trying to fill up that park and do some things. Great business park. I understand we got to be and move the way the markets move in that, but the industrial market, which the economic development in Meridian keeps telling me we can't give up space, we need more space. We don't have places. We are the second largest city and we don't have enough ground for that and where they want to be is by the freeway. They don't want to be in the middle of the town, they want to be seen by the freeway distribution. That's the center of the valley. When you have Ten Mile interchange, when you have the McDermott interchange, which there is a push -- I know that from the state level. I'm behind it. They have been making their acquisitions as we speak and -- and they are moving very fast through there and as we say, it's never fast enough, but there is a press to get it done. All I say that is just representing tenants in the valley being in the valley, we need -- we need space like that here. We need it for jobs for our kids, for another folks in here. So, anyway, thank you for the time.

McCarvel: Thank you. And do I see another hand over here?

Cleary: Thank you, Madam Chair, Commissioners. Tori Cleary, economic development administrator. From an economic development perspective I would say that staff does prefer zoning that's consistent with the Ten Mile plan, which ensures that balance of the jobs to housing ratio, which was provided for in the comp plan. The comp plan was a several month long process that included significant community engagement. Apparently they felt that mixed employment and low density employment was appropriate for this

area and they look at the city as a whole to ensure that we do have that jobs to housing ratio that's appropriate. The COMPASS development review that's in your packet estimate 620 jobs for this 129 -- excuse me -- acres. Again, that's 0.2 is the ratio and the COMPASS desired ratio is one to 1.5. Along with Mr. Bottles I will be the first to admit that we -- yes, we really do need industrial. We have worked with three different companies in the past few months to find spaces to accommodate their expansion here in Meridian and I'm happy to talk to any other industrial business who wants to expand and we will do whatever we can to find a spot for them. We do have a lot of in-fill sites that might be appropriate and as Alan said, the mixed employment zoning does allow for light industrial uses that are ancillary to other operations, much like I guess you could say the Scentsy property. Regarding specifically the Ten Mile area plan, I think the vision of that was a mixed use area that would provide jobs and living spaces. As a comparison, although the zoning is different, at Ten Mile Crossing when they were built out with ten buildings -- this was almost a year ago -- that 50 acres that has been developed to date provides over 3,600 jobs, with an average salary of almost 50,000 dollars a year. Let's see. So, the comp plan, yes, not only do we need a -- an appropriate mix of sectors within our commercial use zone properties, that being industrial, commercial, mixed employment, we also need to ensure that we have a mix of uses within each sector. So, manufacturing -- we have got advanced manufacturers. We have got technology manufacturers. Right now, yes, e-commerce is huge. We have significant distribution facilities currently on Franklin in the Ten Mile area, just to the east of Ten Mile, we have got FedEx and we have got 140,000 square foot Amazon last mile facility that will open later this year. There is more industrial coming up, but like Mr. Bottles pointed out, it's not ready today. The infrastructure is not in place. There is more, as Alan pointed out, to the west of this site. There is some to the north and there is also -- there are also properties in The Fields area in the city's northwest quadrant. But, yes, that will require infrastructure in the future. So, I will stand for any questions if you have anything for me. Okay. Thank you.

McCarvel: Thank you. Yes, Alan.

Tiefenbach: Alan Tiefenbach, associate planner. Just -- just a point of clarification. I want to mention the -- the discussion about the knife manufacturing and the gun manufacturing would be allowed under M-E. That would be manufacturing and processing. This is why I put the comparisons. What wouldn't be allowed in manufacturing and processing would be warehouses as a primary use, outdoor storage and distribution. But all these making and developing and shipping things -- parts of guns or knives would all be allowed in the mixed use employment and office is not the only allowed use there. There has been a lot of focus on office, but if you look what's on the left there is a lot of different uses that are allowed in M-E that would be allowed under the Ten Mile plan.

McCarvel: Thank you. Anyone else wish to testify on this application? Anyone online, Madam Clerk, that you see?

Weatherly: Not I see, Madam Chair.

McCarvel: With that would the applicant like to come back.

Nelson: Thank you, Members of the Commission. Deborah Nelson again. A few points in response to Mr. Goldthorpe, just -- just to be clear. In ACHD's report they do note that Franklin is funded to be widened to five lanes in 2026 and that will connect directly to the planned improvements for Highway 16 and was -- as was noted Black Cat and Franklin are already built out to its full configuration to accommodate that widening. The Fields industrial area -- I guess just to touch on a few comments from Tori Cleary. The Fields industrial area is a long way off, not just from time, but also from millions of dollars in infrastructure that is going to be needed. It is a great plan for the future and it's great to see Meridian planning for the future, but not at the expense of avoiding the use of the land that you do have available for industrial now and you are going to need that, as well as The Fields area, really, to accommodate this demand that is already higher than your supplies available. She also talked about how -- you know, the vision of the Ten Mile plan was really to accommodate this -- this living, with jobs all in one area and that's true, there are areas within the Ten Mile plan that that is called for together, but in the -- in the mixed employment area that's not the case. In fact, even retail is discouraged within that area. It's really another opportunity for creating space for businesses, so those employees can live near the commercial and the residential that it's just across the street. So, it creates that integration within the larger area, but it's not intended to be all integrated within one site. I think that the -- the information we try to communicate to you tonight and sorry if it's kind of rushed, there is a lot to respond to -- was that within the plan there is flexibility and you guys know well that comprehensive plans are guidelines, not code. There is always within any designation multiple zones that can be appropriate. Certainly office, certainly M-E is an appropriate zone, as well as the light industrial that is specifically delineated within your plan as one of the appropriate zones. You have a user that's in front of you that is responding to market demand and they are presenting an industrial park that is consistent with the zoning that's called for in your plan. They have laid out details about how they will meet the design elements that are appropriate for that facility and will provide the jobs, the business variety -- the variety of businesses that will be served all for the greater good of Meridian and in the vision of the Ten Mile plan. We ask that you consider that. We do know that you don't have findings before you for recommending approval. We recognize the situation we are in that given what's been recommended to you that we may just be on a course of going to Council with a denial, but we did want to present to you why we are pursuing this, the justification for the application and hope that you may be able to weigh in with the Council in your recommendation about whether this is an appropriate use here and with that I stand for questions, unless there is somebody else wants to add to that.

McCarvel: Any more questions for the applicant?

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: Quick question. I'm -- I mean we have -- there has been a lot of examples of exactly

what wouldn't be -- what you wouldn't be able to do with M-E, instead of light industrial, but the other side of that is what -- what is it about the mixed employment that he would not be able to do -- that this applicant wants to do?

Nelson: Madam Chair, Commissioner Seal, it creates additional conditional uses and so if you have some smaller tenants that want to expand and, then, they, for example, trigger into the distribution, then, they would suddenly need to get into a conditional use permit. We need to provide that variety right from the get go to have the flexibility to allow all of those uses and, again, I think that is called for with your Ten Mile plan where they talk about all the way down from the smaller local businesses up to the large national scale businesses and that's more accommodated by your industrial -- light industrial zone. So, those are the -- that's the -- the business plan we want to put together that accommodates that entire range.

Seal: Okay. And, then, you made the statement that you have proven that you will be able to provide the jobs, but the COMPASS report basically says you won't. I mean the -- the footprint of this is going to supply about 620 jobs. I think they are looking for more like 3,000.

Nelson: Chair -- Madam Chair and Commissioner Seal, a lot of what COMPASS is looking at, too, is the existing development with residential versus what jobs are there. However, you have got large areas within the Ten Mile plan that are already designated for M-E and if you want to go into this detail we have actually analyzed it in that time to get to it. All of the jobs that are available already -- even not counting this site within the Ten Mile plan will greatly exceed the 20,000 jobs within that -- that's the goal of the plan. We also will have more jobs than COMPASS estimates and I think just the examples that were given tonight by Tim, talking about the businesses that he's been visiting within Meridian that are -- have these employees that don't have places to go is already at a greater ratio than that number reflects. I think we would also like to be able to attract the type of large employers that are coming and looking for this type of site, but don't have it ready and they need something that's already available to them. They make decisions too fast to wait for it to be developed, something like The Fields area.

Seal: Thank you.

Yearsley: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: I understand where Commissioner Goldthorpe is coming from with not having the infrastructure and what they are not funding with this -- State Highway 16, but was there supposed to be an interchange at Franklin with the State Highway 16? Do you know if that's the case or what -- what was planned at that -- because I know that there were some intersections that were supposed to be interchanges and some were supposed to be just overpasses and I wanted to confirm that that is an interchange and is planned to be constructed with the State Highway 16.

Nelson: Madam Chair, Commissioner Yearsley, that's the case.

Yearsley: Okay.

Nelson: The McDermott line that comes down there and where Franklin comes in it will connect.

Yearsley: Okay. Thank you.

McCarvel: Okay. Any other questions for the applicant? Okay. Thank you.

Nelson: Thank you.

McCarvel: With that can I get a motion to close the public hearing on H-2021-0064?

Lorcher: So moved.

Seal: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to closed public testimony on H-2021-0064. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Yearsley: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: You know, my first look at this I was kind of like, wow, that's a lot of space, but -- but as you start to think about this -- I mean State Highway 16 is coming like fast and it's going to come hard and fast and this is a great area to provide some good large industrial space for businesses. With my job I look and see what's happening throughout the valley and as I drive out of the -- out of Boise going towards Twin Falls area I have seen several industrial complexes go up within the last year to two years where no house is round and so what you are doing is you are causing all this industrial employees having to go travel long distances to get to work. I think with State Highway 16 here I -- I would support that whole mile from Franklin to Black Cat, from -- to be all industrial or at least some -- a good portion of it, because I think there is a huge area of Meridian that we don't have industrial land identified that I think we could stand to use some -- some large employers to come in. So, that being said, I kind of was swayed that I think this would be a good opportunity for -- for some industrial space. I like the way they have oriented the buildings. I look at what -- what Amazon did and with that building paralleling the Interstate is just -- it's just this huge eyesore sticking out, so -- I don't know about an eyesore, but it's just the mass of that is just monstrous and so I think with making it perpendicular to the interstate will break it up and make it not look nearly as bad. So, I would support that -- this application.

Lorcher: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Lorcher.

Lorcher: I wanted to be clear on what -- what we are voting on tonight. We are voting on annexation and an I-L or just an annexation?

McCarvel: Yes. They are bringing -- the annexation is coming in with the I-L and that R-15 is just that one little -- under an acre on the east side on Black Cat. And that was kind of my question too, Commissioner Seal, is what is it -- so special about the I-L? What is -- because it seems like when they -- the applicant was talking about the project it seemed like almost everything they wanted was fitting in the M-E as far as the vision of what it was. I'm like you, I'm like what it -- what was the big hang up? And I did -- I -- keeping -- getting more land for industrial use I think is -- is appropriate. We seem to be losing it in a lot of -- I know we are trying to protect it every chance we get, but I don't know that there is enough of it the way the markets have changed since we did -- since this was originated.

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: I'm a little torn on this one, to be honest, so I -- you know, when I first looked at this, because this was continued, I just breezed over it and I was like, okay, cool, we are going to put in something that's not houses. Perfect. You know. But I mean looking at it more, as far as the Ten Mile plan -- I mean if we go too far outside of that, then, that just sets the precedent for everybody else to kind of come along and try and do the same thing. So, I -- I trust that staff is looking at that and they are scrutinizing it, as well they should be, because we are trying to do this -- do it once, do it right and make sure it fits for, you know, all of Meridian for a really long time. Hopefully for a long time after we are done doing this as individuals. Some of the things that concern me on this is there is no traffic study. So, it seems like this got here a little prematurely. I know the connectivity of the State Highway 16 will start in 2026. This will, obviously, be completed long before then. So, with no traffic study and the connectivity to the State Highway 16 not coming for a while and somewhat in question on some things, I think it's a little rushed, maybe. Too early. The mixed employment, instead of light industrial, to me that kind of comes down to control. I understand that you want tenants to be able to expand on -- on a whim, but at the same time I don't think applying for a conditional use permit is something that's going to be -- is going to sway anybody from doing so in a building that's going to allow them to do it. So, I think as a -- if I were a business owner and that was one of my choices were to move or to apply for a conditional use permit, I would be filing the paperwork. I am concerned about the jobs piece of it. I mean Meridian simply needs more jobs, period, and a story. So, the fact that this would bring jobs is a really good thing. The fact that it is industrial, we do need industrial. Also very advantageous. The fact that it's not going to bring in as many jobs as we think it's going to bring in -- or that's the opinion of staff and -- and others, that's very concerning. I mean Meridian is -- you know, we are -- we

are kind of suffering from being too successful, basically, so -- I mean we have a lot of houses that are very expensive. We have a lot of businesses that are aching for people to go to work for them. So, that's -- that's a problem. We need to create as many jobs as we possibly can in Meridian in order to keep the people that live in Meridian working in Meridian, which will feed -- can feed into itself. So, all that being said, I mean personally I would be more inclined to give this a continuance, just so we could get a traffic study in. The one thing that I will say that did bother me about this was the -- the little sliver of land that's being done in order to annex the greater property. That seems like you are kind of slipping wanting to get away with it myself. So, that's just my personal feeling on it. I don't -- I think that, basically, the idea is to develop land as it becomes contiguous, not to make it contiguous by a technicality in order to bring in something this large. So, I personally think a continuance might be in order in order to get a traffic study in, to get more solid information on the connectivity to State Highway 16, to understand a little bit more about what the employment would look like in something like this. I mean I understand the flexibility that would be -- that the applicant is wanting in this space, but I think they could provide that and still stay within the mixed employment designation.

McCarvel: Yeah. I'm curious as well as to -- I know there was a comment made about -- that they are going to be assisting in the improvements in Blackhat, but I would like to know exactly what that was and maybe see more of that. Commissioner Grove.

Grove: Thanks, Madam Chair.

McCarvel: Sorry.

Grove: I -- I agree with a lot of what's been said so far by my fellow Commissioners. I have probably a slightly different take on a few things, but I don't -- I wouldn't be in favor of a continuance just for the fact that it sounds like they have gone back and forth with staff enough that at this point for -- for the sake of staff and for the sake of the applicant, I think either approval or denial is probably a better course of action, just because I don't know that we are going to get to -- I don't know that more information will necessarily sway my opinion on this at least and so, you know, I -- I think leaning on the expertise of the staff, of our other community agencies, I would be in favor of denial for the simple fact that I -- I think that as we zoom out of this area and look at what the light industrial for this hard corner -- or close to this hard corner is compared to what mixed employment is, I think we need to be thinking a little bit more for the long term health of the community versus the short term needs of what's being told to us right now from a planning standpoint and so I have a hard time -- I think we do need a lot more industrial, but it -- also don't want to sacrifice an opportunity to get higher employment and kind of look at this a little bit different. Also I think the thing that I'm was worried about the most is what does this look like from the freeway just in terms of -- if we have light industrial and all of a sudden we have just warehouse storage facilities, what does that -- what does that do to the look and character of that general area? So, just kind of being cognizant of that as we go forward. You know, I think Commissioner Yearsley mentioned the giant Amazon facility that's down the road. I don't want to see, you know, a monstrosity like that right off the freeway leading into all these homes, so I -- I can't get behind this one, unfortunately.

Yearsley: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: I forgot to mention -- so, our company is -- is having to move offices. You know, we are a professional office, but -- and so we have looked -- we are -- we are needing about 15,000 square feet of office space and that size of office space is really hard to find, except there is -- there is a lot of office space right there off of Eagle Road and we have debated on it. It's beautiful office space, but my -- my employers have decided to go off of Vista, because they are afraid of -- they don't like the traffic on Eagle Road, especially with Eagle Road not even being built out yet. So, I think the -- one of the big drawbacks for Silverstone and those areas are people -- they are great areas, but people don't want to go there, because traffic is so bad that they don't want to have to fight that traffic and it's just going to get worse. I know Ten Mile right now is really bad, because we are putting so much traffic out there. They want a lot of jobs in this area, which is going to cause more traffic, so I don't know, it's a -- it's a hard one to manage with jobs and traffic and where do you put things and so my feel was this being a light industrial may not have the - the intense use of jobs, but it is a good spot for -- for that. So, that's my take.

Lorcher: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Lorcher.

Lorcher: I agree with Commissioner Yearsley that, you know, Highway 16 and -- and eventually this would become possibly -- you know, whether it says mixed employment or light industrial, but I think the biggest complaint that I hear among my peers is that the infrastructure in Meridian does not support the businesses that we already have and that why can't we put the infrastructure first and the business second and I know it's a circle; right? You need the people to be able to have it and all of that at the same time. But I -- I don't have a problem with the idea of light industrial being here, but I think we are too soon and, you know, I understand that the intersection of Franklin and Black Cat is already built out, but Black Cat as a street is not and if you have ever gone to Compass Elementary School between the hours of, you know, 8:00 and 9:00 and 3:00 and 4:00, you will understand -- you will understand why and adding more industrial to this area when the infrastructure is not there is probably not in the best interest of our city. So, I don't mind the project, but I think we are too soon.

McCarvel: Okay. Comments? Motions?

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commssioner Seal.

Seal: I will throw a motion out there and -- I mean at this point I'm going to trust staff and that's -- you know, for the most part I can see good and bad from either side of it. That

said, I mean when I'm highly in doubt or conflicted on something I generally tend to back staff. I mean they do this -- you know, this is their job, this is what they are paid to do, and I think they do a pretty good job of it. It would be nice if we could control the roads, we could control the infrastructure, things would probably be a lot different, but we don't. So, with that, after considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend denial to City Council a file number H-2021-0064 as presented during the hearing on November 18th, 2021, for the following reasons: That mixed employment is a better use than the light industrial that the applicant is asking for. The jobs -- the amount of jobs that this will generate will likely not meet what COMPASS is looking for. The COMPASS study is looking for. The Black Cat Road is likely not going to be able to support the uses that are defined in here and we won't know that, because there is no traffic -- traffic study at this point.

Grove: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to recommend denial of H-2021-0064. All those in favor of denial say aye. Opposed?

Yearsley: Nay.

McCarvel: Recommendation of denial passes.

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

Yearsley: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: Before we start the next one can we do a little bathroom break?

McCarvel: Absolutely.

Yearsley: Thank you.

(Recess: 7:30 p.m. to 7:37 p.m.)

5. Public Hearing for Jamestown Ranch Subdivision (H-2021-0074) by Walsh Group, LLC, Located Near the Southeast Corner of the N. Black Cat and W. McMillan Rd. Intersection at 4023 W. McMillan Rd. and parcels S0434223150, S0434212970, S0434212965, and S0434212920.

- A. Request: Annexation and Zoning of 80 acres of land with a R-8 zoning district.
- B. Request: A Preliminary Plat consisting of 294 building lots and 25 common lots.

McCarvel: Okay. All right. Next item on the agenda is H-2021-0074, Jamestown Ranch Subdivision and we will begin with the staff report.

Tiefenbach: Alan Tiefenbach, associate planner with City of Meridian. I'm rifling through my work here. Be right with you. Okay. This is a proposal to annex proximately eight acres with the R-8 zoning district and this would include a preliminary plat for 294 building lots. So, the property, again, is 80 acres. It's zoned RUT presently in the county. It's located at the southeast corner of North Black cat and West McMillan. So, the Comprehensive Plan recommends medium density residential for this property, which is eight to 12 dwelling units per acre. This would, again, allow 295 building lots, which would be -- this was just a tweak more than three dwelling units per acre. So, on the low side of this. There are presently two single family residences on the property. Both of those are going to go. The proposed project density, like I said, has about three and a half dwelling units per acre, which would meet the requirements. Minimum lot size -- the smallest ones would be 4,900 square feet. These are comparable sizes to the adjacent subdivisions. This development proposes five points of access. So, there would be one on McMillan here. There would be one here off a Black Cat. There is two stubs here to the south and, then, there is one stub there to the east. The primary access would be a collector off of West McMillan, which is what you can see here. It's got this strange little S curve here. This is about midway and, like I said, there is an S curve here, which I will talk about just in a second. The other three accesses would be local streets. So, this would be a local -- all of these would be local streets. This would be the collector running through the property. One thing to note -- and this has really been the only issue, if you want to call it, that we have worked through with this one, would be North Grand Lakes Way and that, again, is this main collector. The -- the ACHD master street map actually shows this collector aligning with Joy Street, which is here. It's actually over here. The -- the applicant proposes to shift this whole access about 900 feet to the west, so it doesn't actually align with Joy Street. According to the applicant -- they can probably go into more detail about this -- this is because there is existing utility poles obstructing the -- the alignment. We talked to ACHD -- we haven't gotten a traffic study from them yet, but we have had a lot of correspondence with ACHD sort of informally in e-mail and they have already told me what the -- what the issue is, if any, are going to be, so there aren't any surprises, but ACHD does support the shifting of this alignment. There was some discussion from Brighton, who is the one that's developing the property to the south. Originally they weren't sure if they were in favor of this. After talking to the applicant and ACHD they are now in favor of this. The only other comment I have heard is the property owners that live directly here to the north, they will have that access directly in front of their house, so they are not in favor of that, they would have preferred it to shift to the east. This proposes ten foot wide pathways along the north, which would be along here. Sorry. Along the top here. And along this collector. This would actually be a five foot wide sidewalk and that's because all the rest of the subdivisions to the south also have five foot sidewalks, so they would tie into the same size. This came in before our new regulatory changes and based on that they were still required to only provide ten percent open space. In this particular case they are proposing 14.5. It's actually a little more than that. This is the open space exhibit that they provided to us. One thing to note is what you see in yellow there, the collect -- or, excuse me, are the arterioles and based on our

regulations they can actually credit one half of the arterial buffers for qualified open space. They did not do that in their calculations here. So, based on the calculations that they gave us, which, again, come out slightly less, they are at about 14 and a half percent. There are required for this development are four amenities and what the applicant proposes are two large parks -- so, park number one and park number two, and each park has a clubhouse and a pool. These parks exceed the additional 20,000 square foot that is required for -- to be called an amenity. So, these parks and those club houses, those would count as four and, then, the additional land would actually count as two more amenities. So, that's six. In addition to that they have got a pickleball court that is shown here, which is what you see here. There are additional pocket parks shown here. There is a pocket park here. There is another one, but not -- I can't do it on the fly. There is also additional pathways that were not required and the way that the code reads you can count a pathway as an amenity if it is not a required pathway. So, in this particular case they are showing additional pathways. So, there is significantly more amenities than are required and they are providing quite a bit more open space than they would be required. Again, the only thing I have had comments about was about that alignment of the collector. With that staff recommends approval and would stand for any questions or comments.

McCarvel: Thank you. Would the applicant like to come forward?

Jantz: Good evening, Madam Chair, Commissioners. My name is Josh Jantz with KM Engineering 5725 North Discovery Way, Boise. I'm here on behalf of the Walsh Group. We are pleased to present the Jamestown Ranch Subdivision, a single family residential community, with an age restricted component at the southeast corner of Black Cat and McMillan. The approximately 80 acre site is near existing and planned single family residential subdivisions and commercial uses. Consistent with the City of Meridian's Comprehensive Plan, Jameson Ranch proposes single family residential housing styles, including traditional detached and alley loaded homes and an age restricted component. Jamestown Ranch features enhance walkability and pedestrian connectivity throughout and the surrounding subdivisions and services in the area and desired amenities for residential residents, including two clubhouses, pickleball court, and a pond. Applications for this project include annexation and rezoning -- or zoning to the R-8 zoning district with a preliminary plat. We have held one neighborhood meeting, participants in various discussions with city staff -- participated in various discussions with city staff and ACHD and have researched adjacent properties and recent approvals. Approximately five neighbors attended the neighborhood meeting and discussion centered on the number and the density of homes, proposed amenities and open space, proposed access points, McMillan and Black Cat, and other subdivisions being constructed in the area and the rate of growth and the area in general. The property is approximately 80 acres. It is located at the southeast corner of McMillan and Black Cat Roads and it's currently zoned RUT, rural -- rural urban transition in Ada county. Jamestown Ranch is compatible with existing and planned land uses surrounding the property. The property is bounded by north -- to the north by McMillan Road, an arterial roadway, and Daphne Square Subdivision, zoned R-15 and single family homes in the county zoned RUT to the west, by Black Cat Road, an arterial roadway, and Oak Creek Subdivision, zoned R-8, and to

the east by Volterra Heights Subdivision, aka also known as Bridgewater or Bridgetower, zoned R-8, and to the south by the Quartet Subdivision, zoned R-8. Jameson Ranch will connect with several stub streets provided by adjacent subdivisions to the east and south and will complete vehicular and pedestrian connectivity planned in the area. Jamestown Ranch aligns with the intent of the Meridian Comprehensive Plan future land use designation of medium density residential by providing a premier community at a gross density at the low end of the three to eight target density range. As this community proposes to provide age restricted component, as well as traditional market rate residential lots for various kinds of families, objective 2.01.01 is fulfilled by offering housing options suitable for different household sizes and lifestyle preferences. Goal 2.02.00 supported through the community with the provision of various open space areas and amenities that will support varied lifestyle choices. We propose to annex and zone the approximately 80 acre property to the R-8 medium density residential district to accommodate a mixed -- a mix of single family detached homes, including an alley loaded product within the west part of the site, and an age restricted component within the east part of the site. Although R-8 zoning district is requested for the entire project, the differing housing products proposed will support goals 2.01.00 in the Comprehensive Plan, while avoiding the concentration of one housing type in the area. This community will provide the opportunity for residents to age in place as they transition from standard single family residential lots to smaller footprints with less ground to maintain in the age restricted portions. The preliminary plat encompasses approximately 3.3 acres and consists of 294 single family detached residential lots, 25 common open space lots and 15 common access lots, totaling 334 lots overall. The age restricted component of the project will consist of 65 buildable lots, where -- whereas the market driven standard single family lots will consist of 229 buildable lots. An existing home adjacent to McMillan Road at the northeast part of this site is proposed to remain. The home's existing access point to McMillan will be eliminated and access to the home will be provided via an internal connection within the subdivision. The property has been included within the preliminary plat and will connect to city services, along with the Jamestown Ranch Subdivision, upon annexation. Residential lot sizes range from approximately 4,952 square feet to about 10,500 square feet to provide a variety of housing types within the development consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The average lot size, excluding the existing home, was approximately 7,064 square feet. The existing home will remain on approximately 76,888 square feet or 1.77 acres. In alignment with the Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation, the gross density of James -- Jamestown Ranch is 3.66 units the acre. The Creason Lateral is located along the northwest frontage of the property adjacent to McMillan and bisects the site. Traveling to the southeast and through the Quartet Subdivision. The Lemp Canal adjoins with the Creason Lateral along the property's frontage adjacent to McMillan and continues to travel south along Black Cat Road. We would like to request an exemption of Section 4 of the staff analysis, Item O of the staff report, from tiling the Lemp Canal along McMillan Road due to the size of the facility. The Lemp Canal would require at least a six -- excuse me -- a 60 inch pipe to contain it. City Council has regularly -- regularly granted -- granted waivers of this requirement to tile the Lemp Canal, which is consistent with the neighboring Bridgetower West Subdivision. In addition, ACHD has confirmed that we will not be required to relocate the Lemp Lateral from within their right of way and the Lemp Canal will remain

in its current position. We have coordinated with city staff and they are okay with this request. For these reasons we are requesting that the Lemp Canal remain open along McMillan Road. In accord with city code, Jamestown Ranch will utilize city services upon annexation. Water and sewer will be extended from McMillan Road south via the proposed main entrance of the development. We will coordinate with the Public Works Department to ensure that adequate public facilities are available to accommodate future development of the property. The property is within walking distance to the area's commercial center, including a Walmart, various restaurants, a hair salon -- hair and nail salon, a future convenience store, a preschool, bank, and professional offices, among other uses. The future Owyhee High School is located a little over a mile and a half to the west and Ponderosa Elementary School is about a mile to the south and Sawtooth Middle School is under two miles to the east. Recently the City of Meridian City Council adopted a 2022 fiscal year proposed budget, which included funds for the construction of Fire Station No. 8 to serve the northwest Meridian. The fire station will be built near a Owyhee high School and will provide another point in which emergency services will be sourced for the area. Exact timing of the design and construction of the fire station is to be determined, but should coincide with the proposed construction timeline of Jamestown Ranch. Currently Fire Station No. 2 is approximately one and a half miles to the southeast off Ten Mile between Ustick and Cherry Lane. With two potential fire stations available to serve the area, Jamestown Ranch Subdivision will appropriately -- will be appropriately situated should emergency services be required. The primary entrance road for the subdivision will be Grand Lakes Way, a collector roadway that will connect with the Quartet Subdivision to the south. The alignment and design of Grand Lakes Way has been coordinated and approved by ACHD in its current location. A second access point to Black Cat Road will align with an access point to Oak Creek Subdivision to the west. Three stub streets will be connected from adjacent subdivisions, two to the south and one to the east. Grand Lakes will connect with the collector proposed through the Quartet Subdivision, while Sunnyside will connect through the center of the subdivision. This street will be connected from the east to connect to Wheel Horse Street. We are proposing permeable pavers on the interior streets, except for the two collectors, West Grand Lakes and Quintel Street. Pavers will not only help to alleviate some of the challenges associated with the high ground groundwater present in the area, but will foster an exclusive high quality charm for the future residents. Local streets are proposed throughout the subdivision and will be improved to City of Meridian and ACHD standards. We would like -- we would also like to note that Item G under section four of the staff analysis, which states: ACHD is still -- is still discussing whether they will support this alternative. Since this application has been filed we have been coordinating with and are expecting approval on this proposal from ACHD shortly and we actually got that approval this afternoon. Jamestown Ranch will connect existing neighborhoods with planned transit corridors and will aid in increasing and safety and efficiency of pedestrian and vehicular traffic in the area. The project includes multiple pedestrian connectivity connections and pathways with the community and enhanced walkability residents. The city's ten foot wide multi-use path will be constructed along the project's frontage on McMillan Road and will continue to the subdivision adjacent to Grand Lakes Way. Jamestown Ranch offers an opportunity to connect adjacent existing neighborhoods to the east-west and pedestrian walkways and will connect north and south to planned and

currently developed subdivisions. Pedestrian connections will enhance walkability in the entire area and will contribute -- contribute toward fulfilling Meridian Comprehensive Plan Objective 2.02.01 by enhancing the quality of the connectivity by -- of residential planning in the area by linking subdivisions together and promoting -- promoting neighborhood connectivity. A traffic study -- or a traffic impact study has been submitted to Ada County Highway District and is currently under their review. Jamestown Ranch will be constructed in two phases as depicted on this exhibit here. The first phase will include the construction of a portion -- of a portion of the market rate standard residential lots and the entirety of the age restricted lots. An open space lot with age restricted portion, including clubhouse -- excuse me -- pool and pickleball court, a market rate open space lot, including clubhouse, pool, and a play area, access points to McMillan and Black Cat Road and a portion of Grand Lakes Way. The second phase will connect Grand Lakes Way and another stub street to Quartet Subdivision to the south, will connect a stub street to Bridgetower Subdivision to the east and will include the remaining market rate standard residential lots. development will be market driven. However, we anticipate construction to commence in 2022 and be completed in 2024. As mentioned, Jamestown Ranch will include an age restricted housing style community in the northeast part of the site and market rate standard residential lots for the remainder of the community. The age restricted portion of the community has been designed to cater a smaller house footprint with communal open space and a loop road to facilitate -- facilitate walkability and pedestrian scale. This part of the community includes five -- or, excuse me, ten alley loaded homes that will front on green space and we have opted to develop an age restricted portion of the community without a gate to integrate this area with the -- with the Jamestown Ranch community to ensure easy access for residents and visitors. The market rate standard residential lots vary in size and style throughout the remainder of the development. The majority of the standard residential lots are located on the west or south side of Grand Lakes Way, which creates a natural buffer between the age restricted community and the standard lots without any physical barriers. This will allow both sections to interact with one another, while maintaining an individual sense of place. Lots within Jamestown Ranch have been designed to complement the transition well to abutting homes and adjacent neighborhoods to ensure a cohesive community overall. As mentioned, connectivity will be continued through the subdivision with the completion of transportation networks as pedestrian pathways -- and pedestrian pathways. Jamestown Ranch will be an asset to the northwest Meridian by completing this undeveloped section with a consistent product type and neighborhood that will meld well with existing homes. Overall Jamestown Ranch contains 11.63 acres or 14 and a half percent of qualified open space as shown here. Each of the proposed areas within the development are detailed in our open space exhibit and demonstrate compliance with the city code. Two central parks have been included as focal points, gathering places for residents within the age restricted parts of the community and the standard residential lots. Both open space lots will include pools, clubhouse, seating areas and age restricted space will include pickleball courts. Pedestrian walkways are included within the central open space and throughout the development to allow for interconnectivity and easy access to amenities. Several pocket parks are included throughout the development in different phases to provide a variety of places for residents to re -- excuse me -- recreate or gather. All common space will be owned and maintained by the homeowners association. These

next few slides here are just typical elevations for your single family residential traditional type homes. There is a couple of the contemporary style, some farmhouse. The market rate standard residence lots within Jamestown Ranch will incorporate a variety of building materials and architectural styles. Homes will be complementary to the age restricted homes proposed in the northeast portion of the site and those can be shown here. the Walsh Group has -- excuse me. The Walsh Group -- I'm almost there. The Walsh Group will be designing and building homes in age restricted portion of Jamestown Ranch. The Walsh Group's flagship 55 plus active adult subdivision, the Village at Bungalows is located in Meridian with 74 single family homes on 12 acres. Luxury homes are mostly single level craftsman style homes with front porches, extra wide hallways, nine to ten foot ceilings, roll in showers, fireplaces, and a butler's pantry. The community features a clubhouse with a full kitchen, fitness center, and a yoga room. A central park and walkway path. The Walsh Group designed this neighborhood with community connections in mind and had a focus on maintenance free lifestyle with all yard, snow removal, sprinkler maintenance covered by the HOA. So, in conclusion we believe that the proposed zoning, preliminary plat -- annexation, preliminary plat, and zoning as conditioned with the exceptions previously -- previously mentioned, Items G and O under Section 4 of the staff analysis, will complement surrounding uses, fulfill the intent of the Comprehensive -- Comprehensive Plan and provide a unique combination of housing opportunities in northwest Meridian. We appreciate the time Alan and staff members have spent with us to help understand the steps needed to accomplish this project. Thank you for your time. I will stand for any questions. We also have members from the Walsh Group here that may help answer any that I'm not able to.

McCarvel: Okay. Thank you. Do we have any questions for the staff or applicant?

Yearsley: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: So, I may have missed it and I apologize if I did. How many homes are in the age restricted area do you know off the top of your head?

Jantz: Not off the top of my head.

Yearsley: Sixty-five? Okay. So, will the nonrestricted people -- homes be allowed to play in the pickleball and the pool area of the age restricted homes?

Jantz: That I'm not sure, but, like I said, I have the Walsh Group here that can probably help out with that question.

Yearsley: Okay. I would be interested to find that out.

Jantz: Yeah.

McCarvel: Do you have somebody here that --

Jantz: Yes.

Walsh: Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, my name is Ron Walsh. I live at 1485 North Eagle Creek Way in Eagle, Idaho. My son Nick and I comprise the Walsh Group. We will have a clubhouse and possibly a pool in the non-age restricted area, but our clubhouse, pool, and pickleball court will be limited just to the age restricted residents.

Yearsley: Okay. Thank you.

Walsh: As long as I'm up here, if you don't mind, I will give you a little pitch. We appreciate all the work that staff and all the city agencies have done in the -- certainly appreciate their approval of our plat. This is our second age restricted project and we will -- my son and I will do that, build those and market those and I wanted to tell you that through working through our -- our Village Bungalows on Ustick Road near Eagle we learned a lot of lessons with the help of Bill and staff and the city building department and we made a lot of changes in this -- this plat to accommodate those things. We learned side yard setbacks are wider. Lot widths are wider. Lot depths are deeper. Street widths are wider. We limited our alley load lots down and we built in the pickleball court. One thing Josh mentioned that I just wanted to clear up was the open ditch where Josh asked for a waiver, but we -- at the time that the staff report was done -- since, then, we have got word from ACHD that the ditches do not need to be moved and, then, we got a memo from -- staff city staff that they were in support of us not being required to tile those, because there is -- no one's tiled them all the way along here, we would be the first, and, then, the other one is the staff would recommend after the -- the report that we participate in micro paths throughout the plat and we have no problem with that. It was a great idea. We kind of had it implemented into our plat, but not to the degree staff would like to see. And the final thing is that roadway arterial with the S curve, that was a -- kind of a concept that we wanted to stick with, because coming out of Quartet is a much larger subdivision than ours, but coming out of there and going straight through us to -- up to McMillan we felt like it would just be a race track and probably not be healthy for our residents in there. So, I just want to thank you guys and appreciate staff's support. Any questions?

McCarvel: Any other questions for staff or the applicant?

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: The groundwater issues were one of the things that were mentioned in there and it looks like there is a pretty large collection area in the middle. Is that something that -- is that something that's going to be full year around or -- my concern here is if there is groundwater issues that's going to be stagnant water and we are going to have --

Walsh: Yeah. That's actually a -- there will be some overflow in that, but that's predominantly to fill out for pressurized irrigation, the pond, and all the groundwater is stored in -- under the pavers in the streets. So, it's just similar to Bridgetower to our east

and ACHD supported that and I think we actually have more capacity for groundwater than -- or for surface retention than we needed, because we went back and took the arterial out at the request of ACHD.

Seal: Okay. Thank you.

McCarvel: Any other questions for staff or the applicant? Okay.

Walsh: Thanks.

McCarvel: Madam Clerk, do we have anyone signed up to testify on this application?

Weatherly: We do not, Madam Chair.

McCarvel: That being said, is there anyone in the room or online who wishes to testify in this, but did not sign up? Come forward.

Watts: Yes. My name is Rachelle Watts and address is 4676 West McMillan Road and we are directly across the street from this development. I don't have problems with the zoning. What we have problems with is where the collector road is coming out. There have been several comments made about why that is. One of them said that the -- the resident preferred -- which is -- if you will notice up in the right-hand corner, the yellow there, that preferred to keep that property, if that connected through it would come very close to the shop that is located there, but it would connect. Another thing that was said was that they were conferring and asked the Ada County Highway District to ask for a variance, so that the collector road could be moved down further, because of multiple power and utility lines. There is one large power pole that is located there and I did submit -- I don't know if you guys can see it, but I submitted a written letter, along with some pictures. I don't know if you loaded that or -- no? But those pictures I took were from Google and it clearly shows the one power pole that is there. It does come very close to the edge of what the road would be to connect. The other thing they mentioned was the calming of the traffic. There are other ways I think that that could be done to curve through there, as far as the calming, and I know when the Quartet Subdivision was looked at it was specific that that Joy Street would go through and connect up with the collector on North Joy Street, which would be directly -- I wish I had a picture of it. But it would run very close behind that shop that's right there in the yellow. Okay? And it would connect through. And when I look at it, that does not totally obstruct Joy Street. It would be -- that one power pole would be on the edge of that road, but all the way down McMillan, when they put in those power poles, which we were living there when they put that in. We have been there 30 years. They have maneuvered around those. There are ways to do that to connect. Now as that growth continues, which if you look at, there is Daphne, there is Brody Square, there is now Pera Place -- those are all the ones that are surrounding us. Bridgetower West. I think It's Sunset connected in with that. That now flows on to the corner of Daphne and Joy Street and runs out to there. That traffic has increased. At some point that traffic will probably increase dramatically, particularly when you are talking about that many homes coming out onto the road. That is directly across the street

from our house and I have some real safety concerns with even getting out of our driveway where that subdivision is the only -- that -- that was the one entrance onto McMillan where they could go. They are not going to go down -- they could go up Black Cat, but they are not going to go down -- all the way down to connect into Bridgetower West, because that's the far distance. The majority of these are going to funnel out directly in front of our house onto that road. Now, also, I noticed in the information that was on the the public -- on your -- on the website for this hearing that there are things that are missing. I didn't see a traffic study. I didn't see the report from Ada County Highway District, stating that there was multiple, in their words, at least as far as the e-mails, that were between Alan and Bill that I saw in regards to the gal at the Ada County Highway District. I know I'm running out of time. So, that's why I knew it would take some more to do that. But those pictures to me convey that there -- that that connect collector street can be extended to Joy into the correct -- into the Joy that exists now on North Joy and eventually there is probably going to have to be a light there, you know. There is directly across from that home -- I think the reason that they want to keep this is they want to keep that home, they want -- that the main reason for this is they do not want that collector street running directly behind that property. Now, that property was owned by the James family and he passed away. It is unoccupied. It was stated that he wanted to -- Mr. James wanted to keep the son, who inherited, wanted to keep that as his residence. He does not live there. Nobody has occupied that since August of 2020 when Mr. James passed away. Now, he may intend to live there or one of his kids, which is probably why they want to keep that. I understand that. But, again, when we look at the growth all around us and what is happening, I didn't -- I think that that collector street where it comes out is not appropriate and I know that they are talking -- there is going to be a roundabout at the corner of Black Cat and McMillan, that that will -- and I will also tell you -- I know if traffic studies have been done, but as soon as Owyhee school opens -- massive increase in traffic. And Cole Valley Christian School is supposed to be going in down on the north side of McMillan also on the other side of McDermott. So, there will be increased traffic there. I just would like you to take into consideration what the Ada County Highway master plan states in regards to -- and not deviate from that. That I believe that that collector road for Joy Street can be maintained to connect with the other North Joy Street on the north side of McMillan. Okay?

Watts: Thank you.

McCarvel: Thank you. Anyone else in the room or online that wishes to testify?

Pachner: My name is Joe Pachner. I'm an engineer with KM Engineering. Sorry, I was a little bit late to the meeting. Highway 55 just got closed down. My address is 5725 North Discovery Way. I might be able to shed a little bit more light on the -- this road alignment. The first initial one was -- we have -- we have met with ACHD on numerous occasions to discuss their master plan, which shows a dashed line going up to Joy. One of the things that we are looking at with that is what's Joy's future development, because it kind of veers off. One of the biggest things that they came back with is when -- it's not a power pole, it is one of the power towers. It's one of the monster towers going up through there. Then we started looking at the separation between Black Cat, this

proposed collector, San Vito and the separations and what we are looking to do is get a more even distribution through there, so that we didn't -- if we moved it over to Joy the separation between San Vito and Joy is not that significant and it's -- you know, you get more -- you are -- what ACHD came back with is, you know, we are looking at about a thousand feet in between each one of these collectors, so it better fits the traffic movements and the traffic study proves that up. I just wanted to bring that to your attention and -- anything else?

McCarvel: Okay. Thank you. Anyone else in the room or online that wishes to testify? Okay. Would the applicant like to come back? No comments on anything? In that case can I get a motion to close the public hearing on H-2021-0074.

Lorcher: So moved.

Seal: Second.

McCarvel: It's been moved and seconded to close the public testimony on H-2021-0074. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

McCarvel: Thoughts? Concerns?

Lorcher: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Lorcher.

Lorcher: I think McMillan has some challenges because of those large power towers and being able to work around them. I understand the homeowner's concern for things kind of connecting perfectly aligned, but I mean without -- we don't have a picture of -- we just had a picture of the Jamestown Subdivision, so it's hard to see what's going on across the street. Like she had said, we just approved Pera Subdivision. I think Brody is going in there. It's going to be just more of the same. ACHD is going to have to do something in regard to traffic, because McMillan is still only, what, two lanes each way and you are introducing 294 new homes on top of for other subdivisions that are all going in at the same time.

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: While I'm looking at the two areas and knowing that the age -- age restriction area has basically exclusive rights to the -- to that area and they there was a clubhouse and pool that's good -- that makes more sense as to why there is two of them. One of the things the applicant might want to consider is putting in a water park or a water feature, instead of a pool. I know there is mixed feelings on pools out there. So, they tend to be

good for some things, bad for others, and I think long term, you know, something of a water park, water feature, is going to last a lot better than a pool. One of the things I will say about the application is I think you have won the contest if you were trying to have one for common driveways. I think there is 12 of them in here. So, just for your information it's something that most people up here don't like to see in there and -- or to have it minimized. So, I would love to see this, if you go forward into City Council, it would be nice to see if you could get a little more creative and eliminate some of those, especially in that age restricted area. That's a smaller street, you got quite a few of them hanging off the end of that thing and, you know, we see the service trucks and anything that's going through those -- or trying to navigate those common driveways, it becomes a big hassle and kind of a pain to deal with for anybody trying to navigate those, much less with a service vehicle. On the canal, hopefully, with the -- I mean it sounds like the staff is in agreement with not tiling the canal. Hopefully you will take care to make sure that that -- since you didn't have to tile it maybe spend a little bit of that money that would have went towards that to beautify it, make it more of a walking path, more of something, you know, that people are going to be happy to be living out and, you know, that little bit of nature that's left out there. Other than that I mean it looks like a whole lot of houses in a little tiny area on some of the maps, but looking at the density and how it's just barely above the three per acre, I mean it is what it is, so -- but I think it's pretty well planned out. I wish the infrastructure was more built out to handle it, but, again, we don't control that. As far as the -- the intersection right there being moved on McMillan Road, you know, looked at some of the -- the frontage property there for the -- the residence that's to the -- to the south of this where the road will be coming out and I guess if the house was right on the road or something like that or there wasn't a lot of vegetation in there to mitigate, my main thing would be noise and lights especially. You wouldn't want light shining in your living room all day and night from coming in and out of here and it looks like there is a lot of vegetation in there that's going to mitigate that on its own.

Grove: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Grove.

Grove: I'm pretty in favor of this project. I think the -- the issue with the collector actually might -- might help a little bit just in terms of offsetting where those congestion points are along McMillan, especially with it not being, you know, all the way built out perhaps. One of the things looking at -- from a usability standpoint for residents on the far east side is looking at possibly putting in a pathway -- micro pathway to be able to get to the amenities a little bit easier than having to walk to the south piece of -- you know, if you are in that cul-de-sac up by the yellow area and you have to walk all the way down and around, especially since the age restricted as its own, you are going quite a ways away to get to the amenity. So, if you can find a better cut path through there that would probably be something to look at doing. I think overall, you know, having as many amenities as you have and lining things up with the -- the other subdivisions that are going in and being able to work through that with them versus against them, it sounds like you all have worked through whatever issues needed to be done. So, I appreciate that and I would be okay with moving this forward.

Yearsley: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: All I can say is I'm sure glad I don't live in that area and I -- it's not -- not you guys. I think ACHD kind of really messed up with that area. You have got four collector -- or are going to end up with four collector streets hitting McMillan and none of them are in the right location for a roundabout or some sort of a signal, so it's going to be a disaster through there, especially with the canal right next against the road. I just -- yeah. I would prefer to see Joy -- the collector tie into Joy and make that an area for a roundabout. I think that's -- you know, yes, you have to add in probably two extra towers to make that fit, but I think long term I think that would be a better fit. You are starting to see development hit Daphne Street, which is the one just above it and so you are going to have people wanting to dump out there to get to McMillan. So, I see Joy getting busier, because we just approved a subdivision just to the north of there that's dumping traffic out onto Daphne, so -- and, then, the other concern that I have is -- I actually feel that the nonrestricted age area is being underserved with open space. Yes, you are showing one subdivision, but you have got -- are you one pool -- but you have got one pool and a pickleball court for 65 homes, but yet you have got one pool and an open area for 229 homes. I think that's -- you are favoring the age restricted homes for -- over the others and so I think we should -- I think we should -- there should be more open space or more amenities on the 229 home spots. So, as Commissioner Seal mentioned, it's a lot of homes and a little space and so I would be in favor of adding a little bit more open space to the non-age restricted area.

McCarvel: I guess my -- that was the first thing I noticed about it, Commissioners, was the amount of common driveways and I know it takes out a lot, but I mean charge more for -- it makes a couple of nice big corner lots in there somewhere. I mean it -- that's a lot of backing up for the service vehicles and trash day, it's just on every corner -- it's just -- common driveways I thought were originally allowed to be more the exception than the rule. It just I just don't see how it creates for good neighbors. So, I just -- I -- I think that would be my biggest suggestion and I do agree, I mean with as many amenities that are here it is underserved a little in the nonrestricted and I'm not a traffic expert, but I will yield to those on the panel that are and I guess it would make more sense and more connectivity later on to be able to have that intersection line up with Joy. I'm not sure where that really leaves us for --

Lorcher: I know. Madam Chair. So, if truly a roundabout is going to be planned for Black Cat and McMillan -- I'm assuming ACHD approved your -- your collector streets off of McMillan already, knowing that that was going to happen, so they have -- they have to know that there is enough room to be able to make it there; right? Unless they think that's just a problem for another day.

Yearsley: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: Kind of to answer some of that question, so, you know, right now I think McMillan and Black Cat is supposed to be a roundabout, but if you go just a half a mile to the west of there at the midblock they actually have a roundabout there already built and I think what they are trying to do is do roundabouts at the main, but also have a mid -- midblock round about and I think with moving the collector road over and not tying it into Joy, which one of those four collector roads that tie into McMillan do you put a roundabout and, you know, I just -- because I think -- I think Joy is going to end up being a collector street, as all that land gets pressured to redevelop. I mean you have got a lot of five acre parcels there that are going to redevelop because the development pressure is going to be big enough they would be stupid not to sell, you know. So, that's my only concern is -- is which one of those do you put a -- does ACHD put a roundabout on. So, that's why I like having to tie into Joy Street and -- and having that be a roundabout, so you actually have some decent access out on the McMillan.

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: I hadn't considered the roundabout aspect and the -- the way the traffic patterns are tied in there and Commissioner Yearsley brings up some good points, because we did just approve, you know, subdivisions that we will be using that as they spill out on onto there and I live very close to this myself, so I don't -- I don't kid myself in any way to think that Black Cat or McMillan are ready to handle anything along these lines of -- of the amount of traffic that's coming their way before they are even slated to be improved. I think probably taking into consideration anything we can do to improve that when they get developed is something that we should probably take serious consideration of. So, I would be more inclined to either continue it or deny it based on trying to get that Joy to line up the way that it, you know, honestly should, as well as some of the age restricted area. Like I said, the common driveway and there is just -- the instant I saw that it just looks like trouble. I mean there could be some creative ways to provide the micro path through -- like Commissioner Grove had brought up by eliminating that common drive -- the lot at the end of that driveway or eliminating that all together, shifting the whole thing over, whatever you would want to do in order to provide for Joy Street to line up with that subdivision. So, with that I'm -- I'm at a point of either supporting a denial or a continuance.

Lorcher: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Lorcher.

Lorcher: Well, one of the reasons why we denied one of the first ones we did today was because of the lack of infrastructure before, you know, more goes in. I think I would be interested in hearing more what ACHD has -- I mean if the street of McMillan and Black Cat aren't going to be approved for, you know, five or ten years, then, putting 294 houses, even with age restrictions in, and along with the four or five other subdivisions at Brighton already is working on in that same area, it's just -- I mean McMillan is going to be a parking

lot, whether you go to a school or or any other businesses going on there. I don't know anything about -- what did you call them? Common driveways? I don't think I have ever seen one, so maybe I need to get out a little bit more, but --

Grove: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: -- I have no comment on that.

McCarvel: Commissioner Grove.

Grove: I understand what Commissioner Lorcher is saying. I think the infrastructure piece for me is kind of apples and oranges on this one compared to the other one, just in terms of how much has already been approved in what's being planned and how it's being planned and what -- you know, where it's at in its lifecycle with -- in terms of development. I think we are -- we are completely different places. I would be probably in favor of doing a continuance and -- and having it conditioned around the redevelopment of being able to connect to Joy and I think as a few of you have pointed out, the amenities are great overall, but when we are looking at them for who they are intended for and where they are at, I think there is some room for improvement and I think if we are talking about realignment of the street that it's going to have to be addressed anyway, so kind of making sure that it is understood what we are looking for, so that we -- we give some direction on that.

McCarvel: And I guess I would add fewer -- way fewer common driveways.

Grove: Yes. Always.

Seal: Madam Chair, quick -- quick question for -- quick question --

McCarvel: I -- it sounded like your voice, but it sounds like it's coming from --

Seal: It's my ventriloquist act. Question for staff on the ACHD report that we are waiting on, is that a two-way communication that we can have with them as far as the concerns that we have as a the city, you know, looking at that intersection and how it aligns with Joy, so that they can take that into consideration into their report?

Tiefenbach: I can certainly e-mail Paige, who is the one that's working on this, and tell them what your concerns are?

Seal: Okay. I think that would be -- I mean if we do a continuation here I think that would be probably relevant to the report, because, again, I think Commissioner Yearsley brings up a really good point, so if they can speak to that in their report that's going to make, you know, a continuance worthwhile I think.

Parsons: Yeah. Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, more than likely won't get a roundabout. There is not one showing on the master street map that I have in front of

me. But alignment is always the preferred route for -- for staff and ACHD when it makes sense. So, certainly whatever you do this evening, Alan and I just request that whatever changes you want made to the -- to the plat make sure the applicant knows what those are and, then, brings back what you want to see.

McCarvel: You seem to have a line on --

Yearsley: So, I guess the big question is when do we want to have this date continued to I think is going to be the big question, because what we are asking is has all significant change and -- you know, I don't want to push it to next week or two weeks and not have enough time to at least address the issues in a perfect manner. Will we need to open it back up?

McCarvel: Alan?

Tiefenbach: Alan Tiefenbach, associate planner. Yeah. I agree. I mean we are talking about having to get a -- some pretty big design changes and having achd weigh in on them, so, you know, the next Planning Commission meeting isn't going to work. We are talking month or six weeks. I can't control -- and I can't control how quickly ACHD turns around the traffic part, especially based on some changes. So, it won't be -- it won't be quick.

McCarvel: I would say January 6th or 20th then.

Tiefenbach: January 20 would definitely give us enough time.

Yearsley: With the holidays in the middle of all that I -- I would almost recommend January 20th.

Tiefenbach: Yeah. We are going to lose -- we are going to lose a lot of time because of people being out and everything else, including staff, so --

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: I move to continue file number 2021-0074 to the hearing date of January 20th, 2022, for the following reasons: So, that we can get a final ACHD report and that the city has time to communicate our concerns to ACHD and that we -- and that the alignment of the collector to Joy Street be something that can -- that they look out for -- yeah -- future growth and that we want to see a reduction or even possibly an elimination of the common driveways.

Yearsley: Madam Chair? Point of order. Can we -- do we need to reopen the public hearing first?

Seal: Oh, you're right.

McCarvel: Oh, yeah.

Yearsley: I apologize. It was a great motion, by the way.

Seal: Thank you. I will just rewind. Good point.

McCarvel: Do you want the motion to open as well or do we want --

Yearsley: I will motion to open the public hearing on this application.

Grove: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to reopen the public hearing on H-2021-0074. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: Okay. I move to continue file number H-2021-0074 to the hearing date of January 20th, 2022, for the following reasons: So, that they can get the final ACHD report and they have a chance to hear our input from the city planning staff. The alignment of the collector to Joy be strongly considered for the reasons presented in the Commission hearing this evening and that we see a reduction or possible elimination of the common driveways.

Grove: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Grove.

Grove: Could we add in a condition for the open space and amenities to be better distributed through the non-age restricted areas?

Seal: And what Commissioner Grove said.

Yearsley: I will second that.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to continue H-2021-0074 to the hearing date of January 20th. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

6. Public Hearing for UDC Text Amendment - Collector Street Setbacks in Residential Districts and Landscape Buffers Along Streets (ZOA-

2021-0003) by Brighton Development, Inc.

- A. Request: Request to Amend the text of the City's Unified Development Code (UDC) pertaining to the Dimensional Standards for the Residential Districts in Chapter 2 and Landscape Buffer along Streets Standards in Chapter 3

McCarvel: Last item on the agenda is Item ZOA-2021-0003, UDC Text Amendment, and we will begin with the staff report.

Parsons: Let me pull that up real quick again. There we go. Let's finish strong this evening. Last item on the agenda tonight is UDC Text Amendment. This one actually comes from an applicant, so it's not really city initiated, and we are -- we are here tonight to really discuss cleaning up some code conflicts with you. We have been working with the applicant here for several months on trying to solve this puzzle for them. So, over the last year or so this -- this body has been seeing more and more homes that are fronting on collector streets and the purpose of that is, one, we want to have these walkable, livable communities. We call it a traditional neighborhood design where you have on-street parking, tree lined streets, detached sidewalks and, then, homes that provide connectivity to those walking paths and what we realized is through some of those approvals that we have done we have realized that our residential districts don't align with that design concept and what I mean is in order to achieve what we are talking about this evening an applicant would need to go through the alternative compliance to do it and so by us working with the applicant and bringing forth this code change we are eliminating some steps in the process and trying to get the code to align to allow these types of things, which is actually more consistent with our traditional neighborhood zoning districts. We have two. We have traditional neighborhood commercial districts and we have traditional -- traditional neighborhood residential districts and if you were to compare these side by side in the TN-R zone person could do what the applicant's proposing this evening under that zone by -- and all they would have to provide is the on-street parking, parallel parking is typically what we see, a six foot parkway, a five foot sidewalk and an eight foot setback to the living area. But that's, essentially, what we are doing here and you would not have to provide that in a common lot. So, currently the -- the two code -- two code sections that we are trying to amend tonight is, one, the residential districts in Chapter 2 and, then, also the requirements for landscape buffers that they are allowed to either be in a common lot or a landscape easement and addressing the maintenance of that and how that would be addressed. So, that's what I really want to hit on tonight. If the applicant wants to go into some of the ACHD requirements and all of that, I will let him do that, but I'm not going to do that tonight. I'm just trying to lay the context for you that we have a conflict, we are trying to align with other sections of the code, and, hopefully, this makes it better for others to do the same thing and we get more variety in the city -- allow people to do this throughout our community and start getting shorter block lengths and more walkable communities, particularly in our mixed use areas. So, the graphic that I have before you this evening is really just one snippet of the changes. So, this really does affect all of our districts from R-2 all the way to R-40, but the language is consistent throughout. So, essentially, what the applicant is doing is adding a footnote -- or modifying the footnote to

say that when you have -- front the homes on collector roads and you are having alley access or local street access to that you are able to take advantage of a buffer easement, rather than a common lot. You do a minimum -- eight foot on-street parking, eight foot tree-lined streets, five foot sidewalks and, then, your setback will be ten feet, for a total setback of 23 feet. At the end of the presentation there is a nice little illustrative graphic that the applicant's put together to show you how all this is tied together. But, essentially, under the TN-R zone, to put it simply, they can have a 19 foot is all that's required for the building to be from the back of curb. This scenario 23 feet. So, again, the goal is to get the building set back from the street, but not so far back that it's defeating the purpose of what we are trying to achieve here. So, again, after the revision of the staff report the applicant came up with some of this language, but you can see as Today I see that through logic some common sense approach took place and we decided -- he decided to provide a preferred language. Staff looked at that and said it makes a lot more sense to combine it into one cohesive sentence. The only thing that staff would ask to the preferred language highlighted below is that you add the word homeowners as part of that sentence. So, it would say maintained by the property owner or a homeowner or a business owners association, because it's going to be either residential or commercial and, then, I will go ahead and transition to the graphic here to show you how this will all work. So, essentially, like I described to you, there is the planner strip. There is the parking. the parallel parking. Bike lanes. Sidewalk. And, then, overall setback of 23 feet while still maintaining the required parking standards. So, I also mentioned to you that this does comply with a lot of ACHD's templates as well. So, again, we are only -- we are cleaning up a conflict. We are trying to align with what ACHD will allow as well and try to eliminate future, you know, add greater flexibility to code. So, with that I will conclude my presentation and stand for any questions you may have.

McCarvel: Okay. Why don't we hear from the applicant first.

Wardle: Madam Chair, Commission Members, Mike Wartell, Brighton Corporation. 2929 West Navigator in Meridian. It is unique that we are here as an applicant, because this is actually something that would apply to and benefit any such developments in the community. I'm going to ask Bill -- just so that you can kind of understand a little bit more background of what it is that we are proposing to do and why and it's not really that complicated, but particularly in our Pinnacle project or Apex Subdivision out in south -- south Meridian we have some alley loaded lots and in the phase that's coming before you soon to the west of that we have some local street loaded lots that would face -- these homes would all face onto that residential collector and the -- the graphic to the right simply shows that there will still be the 20 foot landscape easement. It will be maintained by the homeowners in this particular case, but at least we don't deviate from the anticipated benefits of the spacing and the type of tree canopies and so forth that would be desired in a more traditional neighborhood. There are two graphics that I just want to show you from ACHD's livable street design guide. This first one is actually the residential collector with front loaded housing and the reason that I have circled this is to simply illustrate that that's exactly the street that we would be proposing to construct in this Pinnacle project where you have the five foot detached sidewalk, eight foot planter strip, the -- the parking bay that will be just as it depicts here, will have elements of the -- the

corners that will identify that, then, bike lanes and, then, the part -- the travel lanes. They do have the -- the second graphic in their manual shows a rear or alley loaded product in this particular case, though, they don't show the bike lanes that we have on the street. So, I just wanted to show that they -- they have provided both possibilities for a residential collector street in their street design guide. We go for the -- the bigger and more appropriate and, then, Bill showed you this where we actually maintain the parking off the alley or the local streets, so there is no -- you know, no limit to the off-street parking behind the garages and, of course, the -- the green outlined landscape buffer and, then, the ten foot from back of sidewalk set back to -- a minimum ten feet to the face of the homes. Bill mentioned the traditional neighborhood zoning. That goes down to eight feet, but in this case we are saying a minimum of ten. Now, Bill showed you this particular item and the footnote simply states that it has to be alley or rear loaded, has to be on a collector that has the landscape buffers and a minimum of ten foot setback and it applies -- just this footnote -- modification applies to all. When we were going through this process -- and it's been actually over the course of the last three or four months, my original recommendation was the top part of this was kind of trying to finesse something that was really unclear, but, then, staff came back with the recommendation -- the or and we agreed with that is the better way to go, because it clarifies it in much simpler language and we certainly don't have any issue at all with the inclusion of homeowner maintenance. So, obviously, we encourage you to -- to do this. But one of the reasons that we are doing it is based on our own experience. We developed -- beginning about 22 years ago a project -- and this photograph actually is from September of 2006 -- of the Mill District at Harris Ranch and I have two photographs. The one -- the first one will be the one looking to the west down -- I can't remember the street name, but this shows what character we are trying to achieve. Interestingly enough in this particular case, even though this is kind of the collector street going out to Eggart Road, we would actually have a little bit -- well, a wider sidewalk, wider planting strip, the on-street parking, plus, then, the bike lanes. The homes depicted in this particular photograph range from about 78 to 85 feet separation from face to face as you go down the street and there is articulation, because not all of them are, you know, set to a rigid standard. There are some closer, some a little bit further apart. The next view is looking to the east and, again, it shows kind of how those -- those homes are relatively close to the street. But in this particular case, again, the sidewalk is new standards a little bit wider. The planter strip is three feet wider. There are bike lanes on the street and so we -- we provide actually a better scenario than this and looking down that street the closest separation that I saw on this one when we measured it was about 78. Now, the reason for it is that we could land a Boeing 737 Max under the current standards, because it would be -- under the way it's -- your current code works that's exactly 113 feet face to face across the street, which in a traditional kind of a feel is a big separation. If we go to the proposed amendments it actually drops 20 feet out of that, goes back to about 93 feet of separation. But it gives you, then, a streetscape that provides the type of living environment that I think we all want for the community. So, it only applies where there is a collector -- a residential collector street. Has to have on-street parking. It may or may not have bike lanes, but in our particular project it would and, of course, now that the standards are the eight foot planter strips and the five foot sidewalks and, then, a minimum ten feet from the back of sidewalk to the face of the home, it gives us the canopy, it gives us the separation, it gives us all the elements of a

livable street and accomplishes something that in this particular case is fairly small, because it's -- some of the conversation that we had with staff we noted that if -- and I think Bill alluded to it -- we would only have to have about three and a half acres of T-N zoning in there to accomplish at all, but it just didn't seem appropriate to throw a little bit of a T-N into a project and we could do this and we agreed with staff that alternative compliance was really not the best way to do it, because that leaves so much subjectivity in the process. So, amendment is the proposed and preferred way to accomplish it. Be happy to answer any questions that you have, but we ask for your recommendation to the Council that these amendments be approved.

McCarvel: Thank you. Any questions for staff or the applicant?

Yearsley: Madam Chair?

Wardle: Semi applicant.

McCarvel: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: So, I'm just trying to get a feel around this. So, we are talking about a residential collector. Are we talking like the mid-block collector road or is this -- I'm not quite sure what -- what type of -- what road we are actually referring to as a residential collector.

Wardle: You mean specifically here or in any circumstance?

Yearsley: Well, in this circumstances, you know, because when I -- when we -- well, just as an example, we have just looked at that last subdivision that came through, they have that -- pretty much that main mid-block collector. Is that -- that section of road that you are referring to would that be applied to that piece?

Wardle: Yes. Madam Chair and Commissioner Yearsley, those mid-mile collectors that ACHD has in their master street plan is that type of roadway.

Yearsley: Okay.

Wardle: Now, let me just go back to the illustration that's on the screen. This particular road system -- you will see that the ones to the right are not a collector, but because of the way that the -- the grid works there is a draining -- you know, a collection kind of a thing that's occurring and this particular roadway just happens to have a wider requirement from ACHD than we would do for our local streets, but, you are correct, any of those mid-mile collectors would be a residential collector and could use this type of standard if they chose to design that way.

Yearsley: Okay. And, then, with that ACHD shows on those mid-mile collectors access to homes off of that collector. Is that what we are proposing or is this mostly just alley -- we are only allowing alley loaded facing those homes?

Wardle: I was surprised, frankly, when this -- I was searching through ACHD's information and found this particular illustration where they have a front-on -- you know, front loaded.

Yearsley: Yeah.

Wardle: Obviously, in their planning they anticipated that that could occur. I don't know that I have seen one that would be -- at least in recent approvals. Certainly there would be streets from older designs in older subdivisions that would be that particular case, but they may not have, you know, the -- the type of parking and the bike lanes and so forth that we would have in the modern standards. So, this was the one that -- that we are looking at, frankly, is -- it would either have to be an alley -- could be a common drive. Kind of a nasty term. Or it could be a local street and it will be unique in this particular one, because the -- the homes will be, essentially, the same -- looking across the street one will be served by an alley, the other will have a local street and so on that local street people will be looking at the rear of the homes for about ten or 12 lots versus the front that they would typically see, but the streetscape going into the project on the residential collector would have a consistent design and relationship -- functional relationship would be consistent all the way through.

Yearsley: Okay. And that's what I was just curious about, because I -- I don't know if I -- actually, this is -- I don't think that this is a bad proposal for an alley loaded home to bring them a little closer, but I was really concerned that we were going to start allowing access onto those collectors, which is not what we were -- not what I have typically seen or --

Wardle: Yeah.

Yearsley: -- I think we don't typically want. So, that's what I was just wanting to clarify.

Wardle: Well, Madam Chair, I agree with that and I don't think you are going to see a lot of it. I think it will only happen when you are designing a traditional type of product, rather than a conventional lot. I just don't see conventional lots coming forward, because -- and this is the other item that -- that we worked through with staff. Under the current code technically that 20 foot landscape buffer would have to be a common lot. Well, in this particular case, going back to -- it would mean that the lots on the east side of that collector, if they had a common lot, the alley could not be public, it would have to be private, because now ACHD has this strange requirement that if the -- if the lot doesn't directly have frontage you can't have a public alley.

Yearsley: I see.

Wardle: So, we are just trying to solve a number of little interesting twists and turns in the city's code and ACHD's requirements and we think that, again, it's -- it's not a dramatic thing, but it accomplishes an objective that I think will foster good design and --

Yearsley: I agree. I think anything we can do to get rid of private roads in a subdivision

like that is beneficial, so --

Wardle: I appreciate your time and just ask that you pass it along with an affirmative recommendation.

McCarvel: Any other questions? Okay. Thank you. Madam Clerk, did we have anybody signed up to testify on this application?

Weatherly: Madam Chair, we do not.

McCarvel: Okay. I'm assuming no more comments from staff or the semi-applicant. With that could I get a motion to close the public hearing on H-2021 --

Grove: It's not H.

McCarvel: Oh, ZOA. Sorry. ZOA -- there we go -- 2021-0003.

Seal: So moved.

Lorcher: Second.

Grove: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to close the public hearing ZOA-2021-0003. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

McCarvel: Staff and everybody agrees and -- insert -- add the homeowners association in their for them.

Seal: Actually, quick question on that. Madam Chair, for staff, is homeowners or homeowners association?

McCarvel: I think he said property owner --

Parsons: We make it grammatically correct.

Seal: Okay.

Yearsley: So, what you are asking for is a modification to change property owner to homeowner in the motion; is that correct -- what I'm hearing?

Lorcher: I think he's adding it. Property owner might not be the homeowner.

Parsons: No. I want to make it clear that if it's a common lot that's maintained by a

homeowner's association, but if it's an easement, then, it will be owned by the property owner -- or maintained by the property owner, unless --

McCarvel: So, property owner or homeowners association or business owners association. You want all three of them in there.

Yearsley: Oh. Okay.

McCarvel: Yeah.

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council of file number ZOA-2021-0003 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of November 18th, 2021, with the following modifications: That the language submitted by the applicant be added and the w-- ith the inclusion of the word homeowners being added to the text.

Yearsley: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to approve -- recommend approval of ZOA-2021-0003. All those in favor -- with modifications. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Yearsley: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: I move we adjourn.

Seal: I second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to adjourn. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:58 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS.)

APPROVED

RHONDA MCCARVEL - CHAIRMAN
ATTEST:

_____|_____|_____
DATE APPROVED

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK