

Meridian Planning and Zoning Meeting

February 2, 2023.

Meeting of the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission of February 2, 2023, was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chairman Andrew Seal.

Members Present: Chairman Andrew Seal, Commissioner Maria Lorcher and Commissioner Nate Wheeler.

Members Absent: Commissioner Mandi Stoddard.

Others Present: Joy Hall, Kurt Starman, Bill Parsons, Stacy Hersh, Caleb Hood, Brian McClure, Mercedes Amador, Seth Oaks and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nate Wheeler	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Maria Lorcher
<input type="checkbox"/> Mandi Stoddard	<input type="checkbox"/> (Vacant)
<input type="checkbox"/> (Vacant)	<input type="checkbox"/> (Vacant)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Andrew Seal - Chairman	

Seal: Good evening. Welcome to the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting for February 2nd, 2023. At this time I would like to call the meeting to order. The Commissioners who are present for this evening -- evening's meeting are at City Hall -- and now we are being officially recorded. We also have staff from the city attorney and clerk's offices, as well as city planning department. If you are joining us on Zoom this evening we can see that you are here. You may observe the meeting, however, your ability to be seen on screen or speak will be muted. During the public testimony portion of the meeting you will be unmuted and, then, be able to comment. Please note that we cannot take questions until the public testimony portion. If you have a process question during the meeting, please, e-mail cityclerk@meridiacity.org and they will reply as quickly as possible. With that let's begin with the roll call. Madam Clerk.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Seal: All right. The first option -- or, sorry, the first item on the agenda is the adoption of the agenda. We have got four applications this evening, Artisan Victory Market, H-2022-0066; Newkirk Neighborhood, H-2022-0088; Noodles and Company, H-2022-0087; and Rackham Estates, H-2022-0085. They will be opened for the sole purpose of continuing to a regularly scheduled meeting. So, they will open for only that purpose. So, if there is anybody here tonight to testify for those applications we will not be taking testimony on them this evening. Can I get a motion to adopt the agenda as presented?

Lorcher: So moved.

Wheeler: Second.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded to adopt the agenda. All in favor say aye. None opposed. Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

- 1. Approve Minutes of the January 19, 2023 Planning and Zoning Meeting**
- 2. Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for the Conditional Use Permit for Wienerschnitzel (H-2022-0074)**

Seal: Next item on the agenda is the Consent Agenda and we have two items on the Consent Agenda. First is to approve the minutes of the meeting of -- minutes of the January 19, 2023, Planning and Zoning Commission meeting and Finding of Facts, Conclusions of Law for the conditional use permit for Wienerschnitzel, file number H-2022-0074. Can I get a motion to accept the Consent Agenda as presented?

Wheeler: So moved.

Lorcher: Second.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded to approve the Consent Agenda. All in favor, please, say aye. None opposed. Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

Seal: Okay. At this time I would like to explain the public hearing process. We will open each item individually and begin with the staff report. Staff will report their findings on how the item adheres to the 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 the names individually of those who have signed up on our website in advance to testify. You will, then, be unmuted in Zoom or you can come to the microphones in Chambers. 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 to the -- for the meeting it will be displayed on the screen and you can run the presentation. If we have established that you are speaking

on behalf of a larger group, like an HOA, where others from that group will allow you to speak on their behalf, you will have up to ten minutes. After all those who have signed up in advance have spoken we will invite any others who may wish to testify. If you wish to speak on the topic you can come forward in Chambers or on Zoom press the raise hand button. If you are listening on a phone, please, press star nine and wait for your name to be called. If you are listening on multiple devices, such as a computer and a phone, please, be sure to mute those extra devices, so we do not experience feedback and we can hear you clearly. When you are finished if the Commission does not have any questions for you you will return to your seat in Chambers or be muted on Zoom and you will no longer have the ability to speak. Please remember we will generally 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 or 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 City Council as needed.

ACTION ITEMS

3. Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for the Conditional Use Permit for Wood Rose Apartments (H-2022-0086)

Seal: So, at this time I would like to open the public hearing for Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for the conditional use permit for Wood Rose Apartments.

Wheeler: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Wheeler, go ahead.

Wheeler: I am an employee of Wood Rose Apartments and so I will recuse myself as -- and I will just step in that room for just a bit.

Seal: All right. Thank you very much.

Starman: And, Mr. Chairman, just for clarification, it is not a public hearing, just for your action tonight. So, no public hearing required.

Seal: Okay. Thank you for the clarification. Appreciate that. So, can I get a motion to accept the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law for conditional use permit for Wood Rose Apartments, file number H-2022-0086?

Lorcher: So moved. Do I second it as well?

Seal: I think I have to second it. It's been moved and seconded to approve Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, for conditional use permit for Wood Rose Apartments, file number H-2022-0086. All in favor say aye. That passes.

MOTION CARRIED: TWO AYES. ONE RECUSE. ONE ABSENT.

Seal: Thank you very much, sir.

Wheeler: Just real quickly here. I said actually employee of Wood Rose. I'm an employee of the housing company, which is -- which is developing the Wood Rose Apartments.

4. Public Hearing: Variance Request from a Department Determination Concerning a Proposed Addressing Change for 2201 E. Gala St. by Orme Family and Implant Dentistry

Seal: Okay. Thank you for that clarification. Appreciate it. So, second item of business is the variance request from a department determination concerning a proposed addressing change for 2201 East Gala by the Orme Family and Implant Dentistry and we will let staff lead with that.

Amador: Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission, I'm going to give you a quick summary and a timeline of events. On December 14th of 2022 I received an e-mail from Ada county stating that a request was filed for 2201 East Gala Street. I requested a floor plan from the applicant showing the occupants' entrances, exits to the building. After reviewing the site plan and considering the request for two separate suite numbers to be assigned to one tenant space, it was determined that there was no separating wall or any kind of distinct separation between the two businesses to be located at 2201 East Gala. On January 3rd of 2023 we sent out an official letter of denial to Dr. Orme via e-mail and USPS with further instructions on the variance process. The department has determined that the request must be denied due to City Code Section 827-E-2B when multi-tenants are co-located in a commercial building there shall be a single address assigned. Suite numbers shall be assigned to each tenant space in accordance with this section. Addressing is based on one key factor and it's to ensure that emergency services can effectively and efficiently locate a suite or a building. Our Deputy Fire Chief Joe Bongiorno agrees with this denial, stating that an emergency suite will make it -- or excuse me. An emergency -- imaginary suite will make it difficult for fire and EMS and police department to respond.

Seal: Okay. Thank you very much. Would the applicant like to come forward? Good evening, sir. If you can give us your name and address for the record and the floor is yours.

Orme: Hi. Good evening. My name is Aaron Orme. I am the owner at 2201 East Gala Street. I'm here tonight to speak to you -- actually, let me introduce first -- I'm here with Tricia Bundy. She is our insurance coordinator and Sean Wasden. He represents the other business at our location. I have been there since 2017 and we have had very few issues with our insurance with them billing -- or with them paying and allowing us to be in network for the last six years until recently, the last six months or so they are -- they are giving us all sorts of problems because there are two businesses in one location. So, we have requested for a Suite A and a Suite B, which is common in a lot of locations,

especially in dental, because we have a huge office space, it's about 7,000 square feet, 5,000 on the main and about 2,000 in the basement, and it doesn't make sense to just have one dentist there. We -- we have divided that about six years ago into two businesses. Excuse me. And, anyways, we would love to -- I will have Tricia Bundy come talk to you about the reasons specifically we are having a really difficult time moving forward due to the insurance company's stopping payments -- or stopping reimbursing because of our competing businesses.

Seal: Okay. Good evening. Need your name and address for the record as well, please.

Bundy: I'm Tricia Bundy at 2773 North Rock Cliffs in Kuna, Idaho. But I do work at 2201 East Gala Street and you guys should have copies of what I sent over and just in the last six months we have had two issues when our company -- or when Orme Family Implant Dentistry has been brought up by an insurance company on an address and it has been linked to the other office and because of that one of the issues -- if you look at the Careington fees -- the Careington fee page that I sent -- so, what happened is we ended up on a list with their group according to address that had -- that were listed on the Careington insurance and because of that -- and we are not part of their group, we ended up being canceled and that's the letter there that shows the list that Careington gave them with everyone who was credentialed at that address and there just happened to be one - one that they were like, well, they are not part of our group, so we were canceled. And if you look at the last page it shows how insurances work. Sometimes there is a balloon insurance company and Careington is one of those. They have 87 insurance companies that fall under the umbrella Careington B Guide. So, when we were dropped we had the potential of losing in network status was 87 and we since have rectified that, but there is one insurance company that would not allow us back on that fee guide and it was Humana and now we are getting a lower fee guide just from the mistake of the Careington giving information according to address, instead of business. Or an EIN number. And, then, if you look at the Aetna, this one is the most recent. We became out of network on 11/15 of 2022 for the same reason. There was other -- so, the fee guide that we had with them was under another umbrella. It was a guardian fee guide. And because our address there was direct -- there was dental providers that were a direct contract with them, instead of using an umbrella fee guide, so we were knocked out of network and the only way to get back in that network is to be directly credentialed with them and not using the umbrella. However, their direct contract is really bad. It's 75 percent less than our office fees and the Guardian network it's even 30 percent less than them. So, the Guardian fee guide that we used was already obviously lower than our office fees, but it's even lower. So -- and being not in network -- when you are out of network you are not on the list for people to see that you are in network to come there. So, due to these changes people do not see that we are accepting new patients or that we are a provider, so we lose money that way as well.

Seal: Thank you.

Bundy: Yep.

Seal: Sir, name and address.

Wasden: Thank you. My name is Sean Wasden. My address is 2014 West Silver Creek Drive in Nampa, Idaho. 83686. I'm the operations manager for the second dental office at that location at 2201 East Gala and we have been a -- in existence and co-residing with Orme Family Dental for the last several years and we have appreciated our business relationship very much and our practices have been growing. I very much appreciate the information that Ms. Bundy shared with you and we have been experiencing all of these same issues and, then, what we do is we have many man hours wrapped up in both of our businesses trying to petition the insurances to, please, allow us both to -- to be in network. I think there are a couple of things that I would like to share about that and that is it not only hurts us as a business, but each of our practices serves thousands of members of our community and what that can do is when we are out of network it also makes it so that some of those fees are higher for our patients and our residents of the city and so it has a multi-negative effect. We recognize the decision previously about not giving us two suite numbers and while we hold emergency services in high regard, we also believe that if there could be an allowance made in this situation where if they went to Suite A or a Suite B we would, obviously, let -- you know, let them in, because we -- we reside at the same physical facility and what we are trying to do is be able to protect our business, help our patients and the members of our community, and also, you know, be -- be safe. Thank you.

Seal: Thank you. Have questions?

Lorcher: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Lorcher, go right ahead.

Lorcher: So, I just kind of want to repeat back, because I read all the information, but I like to repeat back just to make sure I have it clear in my head. You have two separate practices. You have -- but you are in the same physical building with the same physical space. There is no wall that divides your two businesses. So, you are on the west side and you are on the east side. And so what you are telling me is that six years ago when you all started everything was fine, but now insurance companies are saying we recognize only one of your businesses at the address, not the other, and they are canceling each other out; is that correct? And so when you say, no, that's a mistake, they are saying now you are ineligible to be put back on that business; is that correct?

Wasden: At some of the professional conferences that I have been to recently they talked about some of the insurances and some of the internal audits that they go through and what they are trying to do is avoid fraud; right? So, they you don't have these fictitious businesses that are billing out for services to them or to Medicaid or, you know, different -- different insurances or plans and so just -- I don't know if it's an internal algorithm that they have that they just automatically will match the same address and so, then, they can be, you know, flagged as a warning. Like Ms. Bundy said, several of these insurances have been -- once we explain it they will kind of -- they will work with us to figure out something, but there have been several that have not and we expect that more of these

in the future will have the same things as these insurance companies are trying to omit fraud out of their network.

Lorcher: Even though you have separate EIN numbers and separate ownership and separate filings with the Secretary of State and all that kind of thing?

Wasden: Yeah. We have -- we have absolutely gone through all that with them, yes. That's correct.

Lorcher: And do either of you have P.O. boxes that you have been able to kind of differentiate the businesses with?

Wasden: Oh. No. No.

Lorcher: Okay. All right. Thank you.

Seal: Well, that -- that will -- I was going to say you kind of covered what I was going to ask, which is a P.O. box and I don't know if that's -- I guess a question for staff or anybody, basically, would a P.O. box solve this?

Amador: No. Unfortunately, P.O. boxes are recognized by the mail office when we put them into our system. So, the post office pulls from our system and those are the addresses that they have for the city.

Seal: Okay. Thank you. Question for the applicant, too. If one of you -- or all of you want to stay up here we will probably have more questions on this as it comes through, so -- do you -- do the two businesses share staff as far as the entrance? I mean is there one desk and, then, two businesses or is there two desk, two businesses? How does that work?

Orme: Yeah. There is -- so, you walk through one front door and there are two front desk areas. So, there is a computer set up at one station for one business and, then, you go through a door and that gets you to the front desk area for the second business. We do not share staff, so --

Lorcher: And how many other doors are there in the business? You can only go in and out of that one door? Is that why the fire chief is concerned?

Orme: Well, the public entrance -- you can see there is the -- the two red entries -- yes, right there with the mouse -- that lead through the one main door. The green coloring -- there is for the front desk for Mountain View Point Dental and, then, the yellow front desk is Orme Family.

Wheeler: Mr. Chair.

Seal: Go right ahead.

Wheeler: So, this is all on one level; right? The 2,000 that's in the basement is not being used, except for probably just record retention or whatever; right?

Orme: Right. Mechanical room. Storage. You know, washer, dryer.

Wheeler: Okay. And, then, another thing is where does Suite A and Suite B be marked on here, in case there was a -- you know, a fire or emergency services, something, here, hey, come to Suite B --

Orme: We actually had emergency services come to our office. We had a medical emergency. It's probably been three or four years ago. And it was on our side the -- the three -- sorry -- the five green operatories are Mountain View Point Dental and, then, the five yellow operatories are ours and we had one in operatory seven, I believe, and, you know, we directed emergency medical services right through. I mean they -- they generally don't know where they are going without direction anyways, so they came through -- we -- we made the phone call. Orme Family Dentistry made the phone call and we met them out in front of the building and we directed them, you know, through the hallways -- through the back door, through the hallways, and we didn't have an incident with it.

Wheeler: Yes, please.

Wasden: One thing that had been discussed is -- if you see the two orange doors at the bottom of the page, if one could be Suite A and the other one possibly be Suite B, that -- that would maybe solve the issue.

Wheeler: Continuing on this is -- would there ever -- do you ever see a time when some sort of emergency would only affect Suite B and not Suite A?

Orme: In what regards? What type of emergency?

Wheeler: Name it. I mean just any sort of a fire --

Orme: Fire is the biggest --

Wheeler: Or break-in, something like that.

Wasden: Just my personal and professional opinion is, no, given that the space is all connected. So, if it were at one it would go into the other.

Wheeler: Okay.

Lorcher: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Lorcher, go ahead.

Lorcher: So, are you absolutely convinced that if you have 2201 East Gala, Suite A, and 2201 East Gala, Suite B, that would be enough distinction for the insurance companies to be able to change your insurance? That seems like a very small considerate -- you know, a small designation.

Wasden: In my professional experience that that would be the case, yeah. They -- I really think this is more of an internal audit issue and what they do is they just inadvertently match all of our addresses together as being under one location and one business, even though we have different tax ID numbers, insurance policies, information with Secretary of State, as discussed previously. They just -- for whatever reason their systems require two separate addresses.

Lorcher: Okay. So, you are just -- you are still -- you are still wanting 2201 East Gala, but the only distinction would be Suite A and Suite B, and, then, the objection from the county or the city is because of emergency services; is that correct?

Oaks: Chair, Commissioners, that --

Lorcher: Or is there more to it than that?

Oaks: That's correct. I -- if I might add a couple items. First of all, I'm Seth Oaks, land development supervisor. This is Mercedes Amador. She was the one that presented earlier for you. I think one -- one of the things that I believe Dr. Orme stated when he replied was that this is something that happened -- that -- that's -- that is prevalent. We have a lot of situations like that. We are not aware of any that are -- have this same situation where there is two businesses with no separating walls that have suites. So, if -- we also discussed this with fire. They are unaware of any. So, we are worried about precedent being set with this, that it may end up being something where we get a lot of these types of requests, but the variance code was handed to you beforehand and I have a copy and I don't know if the applicant has a copy, but we have extra copies. And the findings that are required -- one of the findings that are required to be met, which is in Section A-211 down in the letter E, I believe --

Wheeler: Give the address again, please, if that's okay. What you are talking about. A-211?

Oaks: A-211, variance and appeals. It says -- it's D, actually. That the variance requested will not adversely affect the health, safety and welfare of the community, including the accurate dispatch of emergency vehicles or delivery of emergency services. While fire is not here today, our discussions with them and their communication with us, they believe that it will affect emergency services.

Lorcher: Can I ask another?

Seal: Absolutely.

Lorcher: So, if the -- okay. What could the applicant do to be in compliance? Build a wall?

Oaks: Correct. They could apply for a building permit, TI, and build a wall that separates the two businesses.

Lorcher: How big? Could it just be in the vestibule?

Amador: It does need to separate the two businesses throughout the entire building.

Orme: Are we allowed to ask questions?

Seal: At this point go ahead. You will need to -- yeah. You need to talk right into the microphone, please.

Orme: Yeah. It -- can you specify in -- in what regards the fire department would have concerns with entering a building with two separate suites that don't have a wall between them?

Oaks: So, again, I'm speaking for them and just my conversations with them and what Deputy Chief Joe Bongiorno communicated to us was that when they -- when they get a call, not knowing what time of day, when it is and they are told, you know, Suite A or Suite B or whatever -- whatever it may be and also not having a precedent of businesses like this, they are showing up to a building and they are expecting to see it a certain way with the separating walls and separate units and when you don't have that, you know, time is a factor is my understanding and so, you know, there is the concern there that they are not going to be able to find where they are going.

Lorcher: Do you own the building or do you rent it?

Orme: Yes. I'm the owner.

Lorcher: You are the actual owner of the physical building and so you own the land?

Orme: Correct.

Lorcher: And, then, you rent from him.

Seal: I guess my question is how difficult would it be to come into compliance on this? And -- and I -- I mean understand that common sense kind of says, well, when they show up and the building is on fire, you know -- but that's probably not what we are talking about here and I mean if we have got information from the county and from the fire department saying we -- we highly -- you know, we recommend that this is denied and here is the reasoning behind it and here is how to come in compliance, it's kind of difficult to not ask for compliance, simply because if it does set a precedent -- and I in no way, shape, or

form think that you guys are trying to sneak something in here, it's just a matter of trying to deal with, you know, the ever changing field of -- of insurance companies and how they try to not pay, which we have all had to deal with and -- you know, in our own right. That said, for every business that, you know, is not trying to take advantage of a situation there is going to be ten more that do. So, you know, that's kind of -- that's the turmoil here, you know. I mean I would hate to see something like this -- especially if the cost is a burden, you know, force you to leave the Meridian area, for instance. You know, I would hate to see something like that happen. That said, we do have code in place for reasons and if it's been expressed from the county and the fire -- and the fire department that they have reasoning behind that, I tend to try to support that. So -- and they have given a path as far as how to come in compliance with it. So -- so, to me, I -- again, I guess, you know, what if -- if the decision to agree with a denial and push that forward comes out, I mean what -- what are the plans -- what are your plans, basically, at that point?

Orme: So, doing a remodel -- I mean we are talking probably shutting down operations and completely changing the internal walls. We share -- the blue areas that you see on there, we share sterilization, we share -- share an x-ray room, we share a laboratory, we share a staff area and so -- and, obviously, we share the front waiting reception area. So, you know, creating two separate distinct businesses with two physical barriers between them, you know, I don't think that's feasible. What would we do if you deny this? I mean we would lose a lot of patients and a lot of money and it -- or -- or even worse than that, you know, we -- we would have to be out of network and it would be more expensive for those who do choose to come to us with those insurances. So, you know, Sean, maybe you know more about that.

Wasden: Yeah. I'm sorry. So, we recently went through some tenant improvements on one of our other practices and it was about 80,000 dollars and that was without structural movement of walls. So, I -- if I were going to guess, which that's -- that's all I can do at this point, is trying to find a -- a spot inside of the physical space to now, then, create a barrier would really inhibit our businesses being able to be together in that individual space due to the fact that we do have shared sterilization and other, you know, parts of the facility and the cost to do so I would imagine is somewhere between a hundred and two hundred thousand dollars. So, that -- that's quite a burden on each business itself. Or we would have to try and push that burden -- that financial burden to the patient, like was designated, which we don't want to do and would hurt our businesses in the long term.

Wheeler: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Yeah. Go ahead.

Wheeler: There is a lot of businesses that they will use like similar stuff, whether it be lounge areas, you know, lab areas, things like that. That happens a lot. So, the blue areas and the -- and the -- even the record keeping get shared a lot in a lot of these spaces. It sounds like there would just have to be some sort of dividing wall in one way or another. And on -- as I see where the green and the yellow up at the very top there

connect, is there any way possible to just run a wall that runs right where that pointer is at, down and just connect into that pony wall that's there and probably some sort of, you know, partition and just on one side be A, one side be B.

Wasden: That -- that would be possible to do. My concern is it's still the open area there on the -- on that south -- south side of the building there out in front of where the yellow operatories are. So, if there is a way to be able to do that in some fashion and -- -- and still make it, you know -- if that's just not a delineation through the entire building and I don't know if that's --

Wheeler: I'm talking about just T'ing into that wall, bringing it over, but maybe having that being some glass wall, so -- I mean glazing is expensive, though, too, but something like that and, then, having some sign that says Suite A this way, Suite B this way that's on the wall -- or on the ground. I mean to me I'm -- personally I'm comfortable with seeing shared use space, because that happens a lot. Restaurants do it. Office spaces do it. Medical offices do it a lot. But if the code is requiring some sort of delineation, some sort of demarcation saying this is where A begins and ends and this where B begins and ends, then, it's really hard to try to -- to not comply with that. - It's really hard. But I also want to make sure that people that offer such services like this that are greatly needed in a growing community, to go on like what Commissioner Lorcher has and -- and -- and Chairman -- all of us -- sorry, this is my fault here.

Seal: Okay.

Wheeler: -- Seal have and we are wanting to make sure that we can keep the people that are wanting to help out the citizens and make Meridian a great place. So, I'm just trying to figure out a cheap way, win-win.

Orme: Would that meet the criteria for the fire department? I guess that would be the question.

Oaks: Yeah. I was going to respond to that, Commissioner Wheeler. I don't believe the way that you were describing the partitions would be enough to satisfy it being called suites -- to separate them into suites. What we consider a separating wall would be to have two separate entrances -- so, they have two doors, so they would have a separate entrance into one suite from the outside door and a separate entrance into the other suite from the outside door. And one other thing I want -- I forgot to mention about -- and not to just belabor the emergency services point, but the city does receive mutual aid from services outside of the city, too. So, it's one thing to consider that, you know, if there is a call that comes in and -- of mutual aid local comes through and is looking for that and they are not used to seeing that as well, that's something that -- that the emergency personnel wanted to point out.

Wheeler: Staff, I got a question -- is it okay, Mr. Chair?

Seal: Absolutely.

Wheeler: Staff -- but, similarly, I mean here in Meridian, right, there are ophthalmologists, there are dentists, there are dermatologists that share joint reception areas for individual doctors that rent out multiple rooms in areas. So, to have a joint reception area to me isn't even that big of an issue, because that's what's -- that's what's going to be there. But to make some sort of noticeable demarcation like that that would allow Suite A, Suite B, some sort of movement, some sort of way that if somebody was to walk in they could walk through and see that. Another thing I think that could go with a nonload-bearing wall is if you come down over there by the reception desk and you just go straight up north of there, if the cursor would be nice to try to follow me just a little bit there, if you go up from there you can see another little spot where you can just go left to right and make just a nonload-bearing wall and the same way over to the left and -- and just mark those off, I don't know if that would suffice what -- or satisfy what code is requiring, but I see, again, just joint -- joint spaces aren't -- aren't a problem, it sounds like it has to do with the divisibility of -- of the space itself, so that there is a clear indication where A and B begin.

Seal: Quick question for the applicant. Have you had any direct communication with the fire department, emergency services, or anyone concerning this?

Orme: I believe through the e-mail. Only the response we got back through our application. Nothing besides that.

Seal: Okay. I appreciate that. I mean I will throw something out there and, generally, we kind of -- you know, we do this for kind of land use stuff, but a continuance is something that is an option here. So, personally what I would like to see happen is you get a chance to talk directly with the fire department, see what their concerns are. Talk to city staff, see what it would take specifically in order to make this in compliance, because, again, if we start to cut up the building -- and I'm looking at the exit in the back of the building, you are going to have to have another exit. There is -- there is other things that are going to go along with this that we are not going to resolve -- I'm not going to resolve. I'm not an architect and I'm definitely not a dentist. So, you know, I understand there is things that are way beyond my comprehension here that are happening. But I would like to see -- I would like to give an opportunity to have a continuance on this hearing, so that those things can happen and I will leave that up to you and staff to actually have kind of in-person meetings and to coordinate that. You know, I do -- I do sympathize for having to deal with insurance companies. So, I have had to deal with one of them on your list before in not such a great manner. So, I do sympathize for that. But at the same time I do try to support, you know, our -- you know, our city staff and, you know, the fire department when they come in with good reasoning. So, I would like to see an opportunity for you guys to get together and hash this out a little bit more, see what it would actually take in order to accomplish, you know, coming into compliance or how that might happen otherwise. If that's amenable to all of you.

Orme: Absolutely. Yeah.

Seal: And, Bill, I will ask you at this point how -- how long do you think we should have a continuance on this in order to make something like that happen?

Parsons: Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission, it's not -- not really planning's call, this is more of a -- turning it over to the -- the experts in the field. So, if they think they can get in front of Joe Bongiorno and come back at the next hearing -- I would imagine two weeks or a month would be plenty of time to get that figured out.

Oaks: I agree. I think we can schedule a meeting and, then, get fire and us in the same room and -- and talk about it.

Seal: Is that something that can happen in the next two weeks or do we want to maybe go a little further than that? And I mean, you know, time is of the essence, obviously. I mean billing is going to happen regardless, but at the same time I want to make sure it's not something that's rushed.

Oaks: Yeah. I can't speak for Joe, obviously, but for us we can definitely make a meeting happen. So, it's just a matter of us getting in touch with -- with fire and -- and seeing if they can get together.

Seal: Okay. And, then, if -- just from my perspective, if you can include the planning staff in this to make sure that, you know, we know how things are going to be divvied up and how that's going to meet code that would be great, too.

Oaks: Absolutely.

Seal: Okay. So, for right now, Madam Clerk, do we have anybody signed up to testify -
- give public testimony?

Hall: No, we do not.

Seal: Is there anybody in the audience that would like to testify? Please raise your hand. That is nobody. So, at this point what we will probably do is we are -- we will -- if it's -- if it's something that's amenable to the applicant, we would like to request a continuance. Okay. So, with that I will take a motion on this and if you guys would like you can go ahead and sit down and we will -- we will leave it up to you and the city staff to plan that out.

Lorcher: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Lorcher, go right ahead.

Lorcher: Move to close the public hearing.

Seal: Actually, we have to leave the public hearing open to do a continuance, so we are right in the right spot.

Lorcher: We do?

Seal: Yes.

Lorcher: So, we need a motion to do a continuance; is that what you are saying?

Seal: Correct.

Starman: Mr. Chair, just to add -- so, that's exactly right. Number one. Number two is if any of the other Commissioners want to comment before you move on from this topic now would be a good time to do that. If others have thoughts or direction for staff or the applicant that's certainly fair game. But the chairman is correct, when you come to the right point in time, whether that's now or two minutes from now, the motion would be to continue it to a date certain -- it sounded like perhaps February 16th.

Seal: Any comments?

Wheeler: I just would like to make sure that as -- as staff works on this and looks at the floor plan and stuff, that they just keep in mind the cost for what it's going to take to remodel and -- and make -- you know, make the two suites that need to be done.

Seal: Okay. Want to take a crack at the motion?

Lorcher: Do we have a file number?

Seal: We do not have a file number, but I think if you read it in completion that is enough.

Lorcher: All right. With that said, Mr. Chair, I request we continue the variance request from the department determining -- concerning the proposed address change for 2201 East Gala by Orme -- Orme Family and Implant Dentistry for the meeting date of February 16th.

Wheeler: Second.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded to continue variance request from a department determination concerning a proposed address change for 2201 East Gala Street by Orme Family and Implant Dentistry to the date of February 16, 2023. All in favor, please, say aye. None opposed. Motion carries. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

5. Public Hearing for Artisan Victory Market (H-2022-0066) by Kindi Moosman, Horrocks Engineers, Inc., located at 2820, 2910, 2960, 2990 and 3020 S. Eagle Rd.

- A. Request: Annexation and Zoning of 14.47 acres of land with the R-15 (13.53 acres) and C-C (0.94 acres) zoning districts

- B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 4 building lots and 1 common lot on approximately 13.6 acres in the requested zoning district
- C. Request: Conditional Use Permit for a multi-family development consisting of 138 units on approximately 13.6 acres in the R-15 zoning district

Seal: All right. So, it was the night of continuances. Okay. So, I would like to open file number H-2022-0066, Artisan Victory Market, and it's for continuation only. So, can I get a motion to continue file number H-2022-0066 for Artisan Victory Market to the date of March 3rd -- or, sorry, March 2nd, 2023.

Wheeler: So moved.

Lorcher: Second.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded to continue file number H-2022-0066 to the date of March 2nd, 2023. All in favor, please, say aye. Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Lorcher: Until March 2nd.

6. Public Hearing for Newkirk Neighborhood (H-2022-0088) by Conger Group, located at 4250 W. Franklin Rd.

- A. Request: Annexation of 23.67 acres of land with a TN-R (Traditional Neighborhood Residential) zoning district.
- B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 63 building lots and 8 common/other lots on 21.11 acres of land in the TN-R zoning district

Seal: Until March 2nd. Sorry. Continuances happen. They -- there was an issue with something, so that is one of the things that can happen with it. Okay. Open file number H-2022-0088, Newkirk Neighborhood. Can I get a motion to continue file number H-2022-0088 to the date of February 16th, 2023?

Lorcher: So moved.

Wheeler: Second.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded to continue file number H-2022-0088 to the date of February 16th, 2023. All in favor, please, say aye. No opposed. Motion carries. - That is continued.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

7. Public Hearing for Noodles and Company at Ten Mile (H-2022-0087) by Chipman Design Architecture, Inc., located at 3103 W. Milano Dr., near the northeast corner of N. Ten Mile Rd and W. McMillan Rd.

- A. Request: Conditional Use Permit for a new approximate 2,200 square foot quick serve restaurant with a drive-through, located within 300 feet of an existing drive-through facility, residential district and existing residence

Seal: We will now open file number H-2022-0087, Noodles Company at Ten Mile. Can I get a motion to continue file number H-2022-0087 to the date of March 16th, 2023?

Wheeler: So moved.

Lorcher: Second.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded to continue file H-2022-0087 to the date of March 16, 2023. All in favor say aye. No opposed. Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

8. Public Hearing for Rackham East Annexation and Rezone (H-2022-0085) by Brighton Development, Inc., Annexation located at 1032 S. Silverstone Way, south of Interstate 84, northeast of Overland Rd. and Eagle Rd. and Rezone located at 1074 S. Silverstone Way, south of Interstate 84, northeast of Overland Rd. and Eagle Rd.

- A. Request: Annexation of a sliver of property currently zoned RUT in Ada County as part of the overall Eagle View Landing project on 0.143 acres of land with a C-G zoning designation
- B. Request: Rezone of 3.938 acres of land from the C-G zoning district to the R40 zoning district for the multi-family portion of the project previously platted as Lots 18-19, Block 1 of Rackham East Subdivision

Seal: We will open file number H-2022-0085 For Rackham East Annexation and Rezone. Can I get a motion to continue file number H-2022-0085 to the date of March 2nd, 2023?

Lorcher: So moved.

Wheeler: Second.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded to continue -- continue file number H-2022-0085 to the date of March 2nd, 2023. All in favor, please, say aye. No opposed. Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

8. Public Hearing for ESI Office Building CUP H-2023-0002 by BVA Development, located at 1044 S. Silverstone Way, South of 84 halfway between Eagle Rd. and Cloverdale Rd.

- A. Request: Conditional Use Permit to exceed the maximum building height listed in UDC 11-2B-3A.3 of 65 feet for the C-G zoning district to allow an average elevation of 84 feet with screen walls extending 97 feet above grade.

Seal: I feel like the guy that reads the insurance small print. Okay. We will open file number H-2023-0002 for ESI Office Building CUP and we will begin with the staff report.

Hersh: Good evening, Mr. Chair and Commissioners. The applicant is here to present their project for the ESI Office Building, which they submitted a conditional use permit for. The site consists of 6.3 acres of land, zoned C-G, located at 1044 South Silverstone Way. The history on the property was that it was annexed, there is a preliminary plat, a conditional use permit, alternative compliance and a development agreement 2022-02633. A right-of-way vacation that was approved. A property boundary that was approved on this subject property and the ESI Office Building certificate of zoning compliance, design review, and alternative compliance under record A-2022-0118. The Comprehensive Plan FLUM designation is mixed use regional and the summary of the request is the applicant submitted a conditional use permit -- is requested to exceed the maximum building height listed in the UDC under 11-2B-3A3 of 65 feet for the C-G zoning district to allow an average elevation of 84 feet with screen walls extending to 97 feet. The original design of -- was a 74 foot tall five story 145,000 square foot office building with 370 new parking stalls that was approved with the original CZC and design review and alternative compliance and to obtain this alternative compliance through UDC 11-2B-3A3 to add additional height, a minimum of ten percent of the building's square footage open space was required and 15,346 square feet was provided as courtyards and usable outdoor space for this project. The open space that was approved with this CZC and alternative compliance will remain with this application. The applicant is proposing the office building number four at Eagleview Landing to be six stories, with approximately 20,000 -- 29,000 square feet of floor space per floor totaling 174,000 square feet overall. The applicant believes that the proposed height is compatible with other uses in the vicinity. Building number five is adjacent to building number four to the east, which has an overall height of 74 feet with screen walls extending to 87 feet above grade. TopGolf is located directly to the west with poles and nets that extend approximately 156 feet in height above grade. The building footprint will remain intact and as approved by the CZC. The only addition is that the sixth floor will be added. The proposed modifications to the square footage of the building require 348 parking stalls per UDC 11-3C-6 and 372 stalls are provided. Staff believes this is an appropriate location for a building of this height,

since it is adjacent to the freeway and located near other employment and entertainment uses. And I just wanted to note that fire did say that they wanted a secondary access and if you see on the site plan there is one -- or I guess the map there is a secondary access provided by the Rolling Hills Drive, which is only fire -- a fire access. Staff recommends approval of the conditional use permit with the conditions noted in the staff report and there was no written testimony for this application. And that concludes the presentation.

Seal: Okay. Thank you very much. Would the applicant like come forward? Good evening, sir. Just your name and address for the record, please.

Peterson: Yeah. Good evening. My name is Tonn Peterson. The address is 1144 South Silverstone Way, which is Suite 510, in Meridian, Idaho. And I am the chief development officer and legal counsel for BVA. I don't have much -- much to add. We appreciate staff's very thorough diving into this and we agree with both the conditions and -- and their recommendation. I would just note, as has been addressed -- I think it's -- the salient point is that this building of the ESI Building, which we refer to as building four, it has gone through the process of a CZC and design review approval, which it did receive, and as was indicated that this CUP only addresses the height and the number of floors. So, the same materials, the same massing, the same general aesthetic. Those were previously approved and those remain all intact without any change. The proposed site, the landscaping, everything stays intact. Parking isn't impacted in any way and the additional 15,346 square feet -- if I got that -- that was provided in addition to the requirements through the previous alternative compliance. The courtyards, usable space, all that remains the same. So, it is -- it is truly just the addition of the sixth floor and we -- we agree with the conditions and we -- we agree with the recommendations and so unless there is any other -- you know, I can stand for questions and -- but -- but that's pretty much the -- the sum of our -- of our presentation tonight.

Seal: Appreciate that. Do we have questions from the Commissioners?

Lorcher: Mr. Chair, I just have one.

Seal: Go ahead, Commissioner Lorcher.

Lorcher: A hundred percent commercial? There is nobody living in this building?

Peterson: Mr. Chairman and Madam Commissioner, that's correct. It's a hundred percent commercial. This is a building just immediately adjacent and to the east of the TopGolf facility, so it -- all six floors will be commercial.

Seal: Thank you very much. Appreciate it.

Peterson: Thank you very much.

Seal: Do we have anybody signed up testify?

Hall: Mr. Chair, we do not.

Seal: Anybody in the audience? Ma'am, come right on up. Good evening, ma'am. Just need your name and address for the record, please.

Adsitt: Lynette Adsitt. 1360 South Topaz Avenue, Meridian, Idaho. I was just curious. We -- I live in -- there is a little cul-de-sac there, residential area, and I live there. So, I was curious if there has been any kind of -- yeah. R-1. Any kind of traffic -- what this is going to do to traffic, because we are having traffic issues already. I was wondering if any study was done on that.

Seal: My understanding is this is for a conditional use permit. So, the building itself has already been approved, which a traffic study was likely done for that and ACHD would have approved or disapproved of that, so that --

Adsitt: For the extra floor? They are adding extra traffic coming in?

Seal: Correct.

Adsitt: So, they could go up to ten floors if they want and traffic would still be the same?

Seal: Well --

Adsitt: I'm just trying to understand the logic here.

Seal: Right. And I -- there is probably a threshold to it, but I don't know what the threshold is. I don't think adding one floor is going to trigger a traffic study -- or that's part of how we would go through this. So, I -- Bill, I'm -- as I flounder here, I will -- I will ask the expert.

Parsons: I don't know if I'm an expert, Mr. Chair, Commission, but I will certainly try to help explain to the citizen here. So, essentially, there is -- there is a couple of different thresholds for ACHD. One is square footage of a building. That could trigger that. In this particular case this one building is part of a larger employment center that has hotels in it, other employers. Entertainment use that -- that we all know about. And so as part of that overall master study ACHD required a traffic study to analyze all of that. So, based on the scope that's before the Commission tonight that did not trigger additional study to address the additional trips based on just adding a story to -- to the building. We recognize -- ACHD did recognize when this project went in and when we were here talking about the multi-family project that is just north of you as well, that Rolling Hills would be an emergency access only to help preserve some of the county residences there, so you wouldn't be impacted so much with the traffic and that's why it was restricted to emergency access only for that sole purpose. We knew that the road in the area could not handle the additional trips, but we felt in the interest of public safety it was best to funnel everyone down Silverstone Way to the signalized intersection, instead of down an unimproved county road. So, again, in this particular case it wouldn't warrant additional traffic study.

Adsitt: Thank you. I just wanted to be concerned that -- we are concerned about the traffic coming in and keep adding and adding and adding. So, just wanted to voice my opinion on that.

Seal: Okay. Thank you very much. I appreciate you coming in to do that. Anybody else like to testify? Anybody online? I don't see any hands going up. Would the applicant like to come back up and add anything? No? Signifying no. So, at this point I will take a motion to close the public hearing on file number H-2023-0002 -- 0002.

Lorcher: So moved.

Wheeler: Second.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing for file number H-2023 - 0002. All in favor, please, say aye. None opposed. The public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Seal: I will throw in my two cents on it. As far as the fit for the area that is being developed, where it's fitting in and what is going up, I think this fits. I'm not concerned -- my concern, honestly, was, you know, would the fire department be -- be concerned and the fire department report does not show much concern for this. So, that said, this is the second one of these we have seen in pretty short order. So, I guess -- I mean I would like to put on the record that -- I mean if our code is 65 feet and we are just kind of going to let people go to 97 feet, we should probably look at our code. So, you know, again, I think that this fits, but, again, if our code is -- you know, if our code is 65 feet and we are going to 97 feet, that's a lot. That is -- that's not a little over code, that's a lot over code. So, if our code is written to kind of rein that in, then, this -- this worries me that's it's going to set a precedent. So, I don't know what else -- what else to say on that really, other than, you know, I'm afraid this is going to help set the precedent that's already been set by allowing, you know, more floors and higher buildings to go in if we truly want to keep some kind of limitation on it.

Lorcher: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Lorcher, go ahead.

Lorcher: I agree that the 65 feet as the basis should be honored, but in this particular complete area it has been ignored the entire time. We have got 74 feet. We have got 156 feet with the nets. We got 87 feet extending above the grade. Seventy-four -- I mean there is numbers all over this piece of paper. So, if we were going to allow it -- if -- anywhere in the city, this group of buildings would be the one, but also a precedent has been set, so if we say no, then, they are like, well, what about this one and what about this one, because they have already been done. So, you know, the nice thing about this Council and Planning and Zoning is that we can kind of look at an individual project and say does it warrant to be in this space? Is it in the best interest of the city? You know, will it bring more, you know, people living here and working here at the same time. So,

those are some of the criteria that I keep in the back of my head when we look at a project and how it fits -- fits best in the city. If we were looking at, you know, a six building at the corner of Ten Mile-Cherry I would say absolutely not. But because it's along the freeway -- but I also agree with your point to city planners and those that make the code, that maybe we re-look at what 65 feet means for the City of Meridian as we continue to grow. So, I'm in favor of it, because TopGolf is still going to cover -- the nets are still going to cover everything when it comes to this building. So, the precedent has been set. I don't think we -- well, I guess we could say no, but I'm inclined to say yes.

Seal: Bill, go ahead.

Parsons: Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission, I just want to clear the record a little bit. It's not really a precedent. It's -- there is a process to do it. It's a CUP. So, they are going through a formal process to request that additional height. But the other thing, too, is, you know, I'm getting ready to kick off the next round of UDC focus -- UDC changes. So, certainly, I'm hearing you tonight. We can add that topic to our discussion with that group and, then, see what they feel as well -- their -- their professional opinion as well and see if 65 feet is the right number or should we increase that, decrease that, or put more book ends on it if you will and I think that will go and probably tie into our next topic as well with kind of the staff -- new staff report format as well. Just wanted to let you know that we can certainly help. I made a note here and I will add that to the topic of discussion with the group.

Seal: Okay. Appreciate that.

Wheeler: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Yeah. Go ahead.

Wheeler: Staff, I had a question. It looks like they increased their -- their total square footage of -- from -- what was it, 154,000 up to 174,000; is that correct?

Hersh: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Wheeler, yes, that is correct. It was 145,000 and now they are going to have 174,000.

Wheeler: Okay. Did the open space increase it proportionally?

Hersh: It did not. It stayed the same, because they applied for a conditional use permit to increase the height. But they are leaving what was approved with the alternative compliance.

Wheeler: Okay. So, they are wanting a CUP to increase the -- the use, but not the open space that we also have; right?

Hersh: Yes. But that's not a requirement of the CUP to add more open space. It was a requirement with alternative compliance and code to add the ten percent open space for

the alternative compliance from 65 to 70 -- or 84 feet I believe it was for the first increase of the building height. This is, essentially, the second one.

Wheeler: So, this is -- okay. So, this is the second time that they have --

Hersh: Yes. So, they were approved --

Wheeler: -- added a layer to the cake. Okay.

Hersh: -- from the director for alternative compliance to increase it 20 percent and that is in the UDC for approval and, then, anything beyond that has to be submitted for a conditional use permit.

Wheeler: Okay. Okay. I look at this and I -- yeah, we got TopGolf; right? It's going to be -- it's a major intersection. It's not like you are going to have -- you know, we do have some of the smaller homes, but they are farther away from the -- the on ramp there. My only concern in going up that much more has to do with the location of where this is at. We do have some R-1 zoning that's here that's still on the county side. We aren't asking to just bump it up ten feet, it's asked to be bumped up -- it looks like over 20 feet, if I'm seeing this correctly, with the screening included. You know, poles I don't count really as -- as a building. It's something that's been -- that you see through, it would be like the same thing saying that the flagpole in somebody's property would be 30 feet and, therefore, their house is 30 feet. I wouldn't see that as the same type of thing. I'm not a fan of this, mainly because of the location and its -- and its -- and its closeness to an R-1 zoning in the county. If there wasn't already existing projects -- or if there wasn't already existing zoning that was county or more rural setting at some of our other interchanges in Meridian it would be -- it would be -- it would be easier to say yes to, but -- and I'm always a big fan of in-fill projects and seeing the -- the way those areas can be maximized, but I think this is really kind of pushing the limit beyond what I'm comfortable with supporting personally.

Seal: Yeah. And I didn't realize -- I -- I thought -- in my follow up I read it incorrectly that, essentially, the common open space and the -- I guess I will ask the question. Is the parking -- does the parking meet the criteria for the expanded -- expanded area?

Hersh: Yes.

Seal: Okay.

Hersh: Mr. Chair and Commissioners, yes, it is -- they are required to have 348 and they supplied 372 stalls. So, it is still over. And I did also want to note that the R-40 zoning to the south with the apartment buildings, those are four stories, just so you know --

Seal: Okay.

Hersh: -- will be blocked by some of the buildings.

Seal: So, the good news is that there is four story apartments that are in the way.

Wheeler: Yes. And I -- that's -- that's quite a hefty transition, you know, R-1, RUT into R-40 and I understand we are right next to an interstate; right? The busiest intersection in the state of Idaho is right there at that on ramp at the Eagle interchange. It's just that its proximity to R-1 zoning when there is existing rural houses is just hard for me to say let's go ahead and not only level up once, but level up a second time and not only just a little bit, but another 20 feet on top of that and it -- and we are not going to add anymore open space requirements for that that they did on the first time. So, that's -- like I said, there is other interchanges here where they don't have these zoning -- or they don't have R-1 right next to it, that I would be in full support of going up this way and encourage and be totally fine with it I should say. It's just its proximity to the -- the R-1 as we can see there now and the RUT that has these larger acreage, these -- it's just more of a rural site setting and I understand they are next to the interstate, but, still, that's -- that's where I'm -- I'm at personally.

Seal: Yeah. And I understand what you are saying. I was going to say -- things like this are tough for me, because there are these little -- I call them havens that are out there that still exist. They are getting less, they are getting smaller and they are getting more crowded. That said, everything that's developing around this fits if you remove that, you know, which is a difficult thing to even say, because it exists. So, for how long? You know, we don't know. Could be there for another hundred years.

Wheeler: Yes. Mr. Chair?

Seal: Yep.

Wheeler: Yes, I'm with you on that and it's one thing to go ahead and go nine feet above where code is at. It's another thing to try to go, you know, 20 feet above over that's next to something in the proximity. That's where -- that, to me, is where there is just a little bit of a difference on my -- in my thinking and processing as the town begins to develop.

Seal: Commissioner Lorcher, anything else add?

Parsons: Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission, not to interrupt you, but just want to let you know the building is several hundred feet away from the R-1 zoning. The apartments are definitely four story. Just confirmed that. And, then, just also want to touch base on the 97 feet. Not -- not to lose sight of that. The reason why that's the case is because our code also requires screening of mechanical equipment on top of the building and so that's really what's driving that additional height on top of that. So, really, the floors -- the stories themselves are 84 feet or 87 feet, whatever Stacy had confirmed. So, again, we laid it out in the staff report. We feel it is compatible given what's occurring in the area and given that it is closer to the interstate than it is the residents and the fact that you have the hospital across the street as well that's probably just as tall. Just giving you more food for thought there.

Seal: Okay. Appreciate that. The screening is probably there for when I hit my golf ball over the net. If we are allowed to dream.

Wheeler: And if you hit your golf ball that far, congratulations.

Seal: Right.

Wheeler: Yes. And so adding the -- I understand that you have to take the RTUs and other mechanicals and be able to screen them so people drive by they don't see them and I -- and, then, if you add that to it with -- with it you are looking at 30 feet. So, almost a full third of the building -- 30 feet above where the zoning height restriction is at for this mixed use regional. So, like I said, it's one thing to go ahead and say, hey, can we bump it another ten? Can we bump it another 15 for the screening purposes. It's another thing to say let's go 30 feet higher with screening and that's where --

Seal: Yeah. The original permit came through and went from 65 to 84 and that was approved. So, I mean essentially they are adding another floor on to this. It's going to go from 84 to 97 feet with the screen. So, I mean they are -- they are coming back in and asking and again and again, that's where -- you know. I mean I guess -- I guess the rub here is how tall is tall enough. So, I struggle with that. I think that the location of the building, in my mind, as I look at it and -- you know. And I have been in this area and we have seen all these applications come through for it, so I think it's appropriate for that area, but at the same time I struggle with where our code is today. You know, if our code is at 65 feet, that's what people are -- find acceptable and it's been allowed to go to 84 feet and now they are back with the conditional use permit to ask for yet another to go to 97 feet, that's where I -- you know, that's the struggle within me is are we serving our community? Because if everybody's at 65 feet and, then, we see things that are going higher, you know, that said -- I mean we have -- you know, there is one person that testified as far as the traffic that it's going to generate, not necessarily the height of the building. So, that's -- that's where I'm kind of landing on it. It's -- it's difficult. I mean this is a difficult decision. So, we want to represent the community and -- and responsible growth. So, is this responsible growth? I don't -- that's why I'm happy I don't have to make a motion tonight. So, if either one of you would like to have more comment or make a motion, I'm more than happy to listen to either. Shall we flip a coin?

Wheeler: What are your thoughts, Commissioner Lorcher?

Lorcher: One of the things I like about this Commission is that we can take an individual project and evaluate for what it is based on -- on the location that it is individually. We are not saying this idea of City of Meridian is all going to be one thing. With that in mind, the building has already been approved. It's already been approved for five stories and between the screen and the additional building, before construction begins if you are going to add another, as you say, layer on the top of the cake, it's easier to do it before construction than adding it on later. As our community continues to grow in the services that we need to do, if they find that they go into a four story or five story building, maybe

a year from now that they have outgrown that building, then, they leave. So, if they are planning on being able to fill that building with people who are going to work and live here, in an area that already has buildings that are very similar and I wouldn't say it would be universal across our city. I support this project, because it fits into what's happening right now with the buildings that have already been approved. So, with that said I would not approve a building of six stories at say, you know, Cherry and Ten Mile, because it wouldn't belong there; right? It's all more housing and different types of things. So, we, as a governing body, you know, are able to create these conditional use permits individually. That allows us to take a look at the area, the impact, the employment and what's in the best interest of the City of Meridian. Having people work and live here and attracting people who want to be here is, obviously, very important and you are already in a complex of areas that are supporting these services through businesses that are already existing at this location. So, to me, personally, I don't see a problem with this. But if it was someplace else in the city and it was a standalone project or in-fill someplace else, I probably would. So, if you would like me to make a motion I can and, then, you can vote how you see --

Seal: I am -- I am always willing to take a motion.

Lorcher: Did you have any other comments?

Wheeler: No. I mean I -- Mr. Chair?

Seal: Go ahead.

Wheeler: The -- yes. And I -- and like I said, this is the busiest intersection in the state and I get that as in -- as the traffic -- I get that with the use that's going on here; right? I see that and maybe I'm just myopic and seeing the R-1 and the RUT that's there with these -- with these ranches, these small little farms that are right there and it's one thing to do that than it is to -- to have it in an area where -- where you are going to be up to that height and you don't have anything for half mile or more of any other sort of larger, more rural settings, and that's just where -- where my -- my only concern is that -- and the open space didn't increase proportionally as the square footage did. The parking spaces, that's great that they went over on what they -- what the requirements were. There is a lot of developments like this where they come in and they ask for exceptions for parking or they are just barely above it or have to figure out some way to -- to have cross-access agreements. Yeah. And, then, again, we have the -- you know, we didn't have a -- we didn't -- we don't have this area filled up with people complaining about what I'm saying. So -- yeah.

Seal: Anymore discussion or a motion?

Lorcher: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Lorcher, go ahead.

Lorcher: After considering all staff and applicant and public testimony, I move to approve file number H-2023-0002 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of February 2, 2023, with no modifications.

Seal: Do I have a second? Kurt, you might have to help out here.

Starman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So, two thoughts. One is you are -- you are not required to, but the chair can second a motion if you choose to. That would be one choice. The second choice would be Commissioner Wheeler could second it for the purpose of discussion. He's not committed to voting in favor of it, it would just allow debate and a vote. And the third alternative would be the motion fails for lack of a second.

Seal: Okay. And knowing that I will just -- one point of discussion that I will make before I move forward here is I agree with what you are saying and, like I said, I -- I hate to see these little havens disappear. Where this is it's going to end up, like a discussion we had earlier, where you don't recognize an area that you drive through anymore. With everything that's going in here I think this is one of those areas, unfortunately, and with that I will second the motion. So, it's been moved and seconded to approve file number H-2023-0002 ESI Office Building CUP. All in favor please say aye.

Starman: And ask for nay votes.

Seal: Oh. All opposed say nay.

Wheeler: Nay.

Seal: Okay. Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIES: TWO AYES. ONE NAY. ONE ABSENT.

Seal: Thank you very much. It was a tough one.

Parsons: Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission, before we move on to the staff report, our computer decided to do computer updates right now, so if we could maybe take a quick recess and reset this computer and pull up the staff report again would appreciate it.

Seal: Absolutely. That sounds good.

Lorcher: Are we pausing the whole thing or --

Seal: No. We have got one more that -- we have got -- yeah, the -- essentially the staff is going to walk us through the changes that they are going to try and make to --

Lorcher: Oh. Okay.

Seal: -- the staff report, so we will take a five minute bio break and we will be back after

that.

(Recess: 7:16 p.m. To 7:25 p.m.)

DEPARTMENT REPORTS

10. Staff Report Format Discussion

Seal: Okay. We are back. Bill, the floor is yours.

Parsons: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission. So, staff is here tonight to talk about some updates to our current staff report template. Just some history on this particular topic. You know, I have been with the city for almost 16 years and looking at some of the old files and old projects I can tell you it's definitely changed over the years. In 2018 there was a major revamp of our staff report where we went in front of City Council and, of course, this body and let you know some of the changes and some of the additional information that we were going to add. Probably the two major changes that came about was the city planning actually facilitated several meetings with other city departments and we added a city metric -- a community metric section to our staff report, which reported ACHD's conditions, police and fire concerns, school district numbers, all - et cetera, et cetera. And that was a -- I thought was a pretty inventive use of a table at that time and, then, we also added more graphics for you. When we approached you back in 2018 we wanted to make sure -- we were growing rapidly and we -- as we continue to do -- do so, but we wanted to make sure that our staff reports were transparent, had relevant information and that allowed you to make more informed decisions for our community. Well, a few months ago we were approached by our liaison -- City Council liaison and she had asked staff why is our -- why are our staff reports so long and are there ways to improve upon that and, you know, like any good community, we should always -- at some point in time we should stop and look at ourselves and say how can we improve things and what can we do better, just like we do with the UDC and the Comprehensive Plan. And so tonight Brian and I are here to discuss some potential changes with you. It's a dual effort. I will go through -- through some of the changes of the staff report and I will let Brian kind of dive into some of the new graphics and analysis that goes into those graphics. And, then, of course, we will open it up to Q and A session and, then, ask for some of your feedback. And, please, feel free to chime in at any time. This is not by any means a real formal presentation, it's more of an open dialogue with all of you. One, informing you, but also getting your opinion and feedback as well. So, really, the goal -- or at least from my perspective in dealing with this -- Caleb, myself, Brian, we have met many times going over the format of this staff report. Caleb and I were in front of City Council a few months back, also sharing with them -- asking for their feedback. Caleb and Brian also put together a survey and asked what Council liked about our staff reports and where could we improve upon that and that's -- all of that data that we have compiled has gone into some of this staff report that you see here. Now, I would mention to the Commission that this is -- this is a draft. There -- there could be different other changes that come about just after our discussion tonight or even other discussion with Council and other city staff members. Again, even current planning staff, Sonya and

Stacy, have been part of this process, because they are the ones that have to generate these staff reports and present this to you and the City Council. So, the staff report -- it may or may not get longer. It's -- like anything it's always going to depend on the complexity of the project. But what we want to do is create a consistent template, one that has relevant information that not only you, staff, and the Council can understand, but also the public. A lot of times as we sit here and we go through that public hearing process, we have so many residents come up and go can you tell me where -- how many residential units have been approved in this area? What do we say? We don't know. We don't have -- we don't keep tally. We have that data, but we don't present that data in the staff report. I won't steal all of Brian's thunder, but that's -- that's some of what we are going to try to achieve with this new version of the staff report. So, very quickly I'm going to go through several of these pages and let you know some of the changes. Again, not really a major overhaul this time, it's just reorganizing the staff report and putting it in a -- I think a better format for not only you to understand, but staff and the residents to understand as well. So, again, we will keep the vicinity map. One thing we did add was we are going to include applicant's name here at the beginning. We did expand on the project overview. Typically this is a section that explains what they are applying for. But some of the feedback that we received from the Council is they want to know about the issues early on in the staff report and so that's why we broke this out, so not only do you know what they are applying for, but what are the major issues associated with the project, so you can be aware of that as soon as you look at the front page of the staff report and, then, of course, staff's recommendation will be right at the beginning as well.

Seal: In the issue section, is that mainly from staff perspective or is that going to involve other departments in that -- fire department, for example?

Parsons: Good question. Don't know exactly at this point. What the intent is -- again, the purpose of this is fire department's comments will be at the end of the staff report that you can get to more easily, but also if there is something major that really is a detrimental to the project, absolutely will be here, so you know that.

Lorcher: Has the recommendation been on the front page the entire time?

Parsons: It has -- in previous versions of the staff report it was and we had actually moved that towards the end of the staff report when we revamped it in 2018.

Lorcher: It's like telling you the end of the book at the beginning.

Parsons: Yeah. We are giving you a peek behind the curtain before you even get to all the meat of it.

Wheeler: So, you know, that like -- I'm in the reserves; right? And we always call that the BLUF. They call that the bottom line up front. That's what they call it. And so that's actually what they call like Army writing style. The bottom line up front. So, that way you can skim it -- okay. where am I supposed to engage and go? So, I like that upfront, actually. Thank you.

Parsons: And I think we are going to try to achieve that in some of the tables that we have inserted in the staff report, too. So if there is an issue we can create a hyperlink for you to click on that page and it will shoot you right down to that section of the staff report, so you can immediately learn what that issue is and bring your eye to it, so you don't have to scroll through 40 pages of a staff report, it will be instantaneous, click on the link and get to -- get to the information. So, again, these -- these tables you are familiar with. They are currently in the staff report. We just broke them up and presented them differently to you. Some of this may stay in, some -- some may go away. I know some of the comments that I have received from current planning staff is there -- they question why we want pre-application meeting dates, neighborhood meeting dates, site posting dates in the staff report. Those are all part of the public record that's on laserfiche that you guys have access to. Again, it's something we will discuss as staff. Again, it may stay in, it may not, depending on our discussions with legal as well. They are part of this and they want to make sure that we have a staff report that's defensible as well. Community metric. Again, this is nothing new to you. It's still staying in this particular area. But what we are trying to do is what we have in table form we want to actually present it to you in more of a graphic form. And that's where Brian will come and explain a lot of this to you once I conclude my presentation. But we will -- we will go back to this section as I -- I get through the rest of these pages. And, then, it also breaks down even transportation analysis for you and, then, service impact summary, which is -- again, coincides with a lot of this data that we populate in our community metric section. Yeah. We do, too. Next section. Again, staff analysis. This is what you typically see. This is actually what we call the meat of the staff report where we are analyzing the project against. We are giving you that overview. We are letting you know of any issues. We are letting you know history on the project. Is it going to be phased? Are their canals that run through the project? How is it consistent with the comp plan? What are the policies that are applicable? And all of the code sections that go with our analysis. The one -- one innovative thing that we are trying to do here is not only do I want this a consistent document, but I wanted it as a document that it can be used as a training document for new associate planners or even assistant planners that who -- that aspire to be -- you know, grow within the company -- or within the organization and go to that next level and become an associate planner. So, what you might see in the next version of the staff report is all of these sections will remain in the staff report, but we will have the ability to either expand that section or keep it collapsed. If we expand it you will see analysis. If it's collapsed you know it's not applicable to this particular project. So, we won't necessarily delete it, we are going to call it hide it. Keep it there in the staff report for training, but also just let you know that these things may pertain to some projects and they may not, but keep them collapsed, so that if they are warranted at least we will have -- the planner doing the staff report will know it pertains or know what code sections to go to. So, it's one not only to get you familiar with what we are looking at, but also the public and the planner who is working on the project to get more familiar to -- with those pertinent code sections. It's an opportunity to do that anyways. Here is the conditions of approval. So, all the city agencies, again, will become section four. I think there is section six or seven sometimes in the current version. So, we are just moving that up into the -- earlier in the staff report and, then, along with the findings, so the findings will coincide right with

the conditions of approval, so they are linked a little bit better for you. In the UDC there are multiple applications that have findings and so in this particular case, just as I was explaining about collapsing some of the sections above, all the findings will be included in this Word document, the staff report, but only those that are applicable to that project will be expanded upon and show up in the staff report. The others will just have a heading and stay collapsed, so they won't be relevant. And, then, here is the action. So, there is -- this has staff's recommendation. Again, this may get blown out as we have it up to the top -- the top of the page already with our recommendation, but this is where after you guys make a recommendation or approve a project, this is how we update our staff report after you guys take action on it and we summarize what occurred during the hearing. So this, again, is currently already in the staff report, just in a different location. Here is all the maps that you see currently. So, again, back in 2018 these were the four graphics that we added for you to help let you know what was occurring in the area and what we have done here with this current draft version is we are trying to consolidate all exhibits in one location, so that you guys can click on the exhibit tab and go all the way down to the end of the staff report and look through the zoning map, the plan, the aerial map, landscape plan, site plan, plat, all of those things -- elevations in one comprehensive review, rather than having to go back and forth between the staff report. But -- and, then, they are all labeled in here. Again, the same approach. If it's -- if it's inserted in the staff report you will see it there. If it's a collapsed heading, it's not relevant, it's not part of that application. Again, mostly meant for a training opportunity for staff. With that, I will go ahead and let Brian have all the thunder and show you all the exciting things he has been working on with -- and show you how we use the data that we compile when an applicant submits an application and uses our Enterprise software and how it interfaces with our GIS system to create those graphics for you.

McClure: Good evening. So, Bill did steal my thunder already. He already showed it to you. I do -- so, a few notes here. Everything graphic here is Enterprise based data. It's automated collection and reporting and it's already working data. We don't necessarily have to do what you see here, but it's not -- it's not just an idea, it's proof of concept that works. None of these are final. They are examples that we think are useful. Some we really like, some will still have revisions. We have already had some staff comments on them. Some of those will have notes, terminology, and, then, some of them will -- we will just have new ones, more different. Some of this data is specific topics of regular concern and some of it's a little bit more roundabout when considering other facts and indicators. So, you know, sometimes you have to triangulate, you know, what do these three points of data mean together? We can't always give you this is yes or this is no. Some of this has to be read between the lines, because it's more policy driven, like the comp plan. So, is it in-fill, is that not? We don't have a specific metric for that. And some of it would be more aligned with code. Does it -- yes. No. And then -- and, then, lastly, just in some of the disclaimers. Some of these are for all projects. Some of the ones you don't see here, because we haven't necessarily done them yet, could be for specific application types. They could be for small projects, big projects, you know, we could customize some of this depending on the needs. So, generally these ones you see tonight are ones we think would be good most of the time, but it doesn't mean we can't have more for some of the time. And, then, we are happy to take feedback you have on these tonight. I know you

haven't been able to really dive into them. Or you can give us that feedback later, so -- I'm not going to -- I will try not to bore you too much. This first one you see here is partial data. We are using that to determine whether they are actually in the city or near the city. You know, this is sort of an indicator as to whether it's in-fill or not. That's really what it's sort of getting at. We don't have a metric that says it's in-fill or not, so we gave you some data to sort of what do you think? Household change. Just level of activity. This is relevant. A lot of times it's usually not relevant directly to anything, but it's good consideration for most things. So, that's why it's there. It doesn't have to be. This is one I hear frequently. What is in the area. So, residential single family specifically here. What is the lot makeup? What's nearby? It goes to residential diversity. I can't tell you whether we have a townhome, duplex or triplex with our data, but I can tell you whether it's R-2, R-4, or R-8 and whether it's single family or multi-family. So, what you see there are a number of units in that -- in that first top zoning one and, then, you see the average size of those in that area and, then, you see the min and max. I will note -- you saw this at the beginning. Let me jump. All this data I'm showing you currently is one mile analysis. So, everything within one mile. I don't know that this graphic will remain here. It's just for you tonight. If it remains we will have to put a notation or symbology to there, but that mile you see there is where all this data came from, that orange line, so -- and, then, the second number here tells you the average density and so we get questions on density all the time. This would be net density, not gross density, which is what the Comprehensive Plan speaks to, but if you wanted to know what R-4 actually looks like in this area, it's actually a little bit more than R-4, it's -- it's what R-4 used to -- what to think anyways. And, then, you see some residential address data and some commercial address data here. So, how much single family is in the area, how much multi-family is in the area and how much commercial -- commercial is in the area is based off the address data. And, then, the big one we get all the time is what do our entitlements look like. So, you know, this is a rolling average and we don't have a perfect system that tells us when some of these have been built, when they have -- when they have been lingering there for ten years, but we can tell you this body and Council have approved X number of lots. So, you have X number of single family, X number of multi-family and, then, whether it's been approved, pending, or whether they are proposing that tonight. So, you can see sort of what their proposal would impact and how it impacted other existing conditions. Bill mentioned these two already. This information can be pulled from ACHD staff reports for the ACHD summary metrics and the service impact summary is something that -- it's already been adopted, but we haven't really done a fantastic job of implementing, but you will see a summary here and, then, the full sort of report would be included in an exhibit down below.

Seal: On the ACHD, can that also incorporate information graphically as far as road improvement timing. Meaning if they are on adjacent to -- let's use McMillan, because because I like to cut deep. Like basically information on when that road will be further developed.

McClure: Yes. We could probably be more specific -- specific than what we are here. So, on the bottom right you will see program integrated five year work plan. So, that's within five years. And, then, the program CIP is their 20 year program, so --

Seal: Okay.

McClure: -- certainly adding a specific date if it's planned could be something we could add, yeah, but you do have a higher level of that as well here. The next section -- we did, as an example of -- not all applications, but some applications. I don't remember where I buried it. There we go. So, this is stuff we could propose in mixed use areas. So, this is not one mile analysis, this would be within the area contained within a mixed use area. So, mixed use neighborhood, community regional. Will note we do separate those mixed use areas out across arterial roadways. We don't generally like people walking across those, particularly Eagle and Overland. So, it's bound by that mixed use area. So, you - - everything you see here is what the makeup of that is now. I don't -- we don't -- again, we don't have specific policies that say whether this is a yes or a no. We do have things that say we are looking for diversity of things, though, so you can see the way we are getting out here currently and the data we have is the type of addresses and, then, the acreage of zoning and we are giving you, then, a blend of what those two things look like together. So, address split, whether it's single -- whether it's residential or not. Zoning, whether it's residential or not. And, then, address zoning mix, sort of a hybrid. The reason we do all three is because you can get 500 apartments in C-G that aren't necessarily commercial, but they are still in there as residential, at least in terms of use, and address can be misleading, because you can have a Home Depot that's huge, but you only have one address for it. So, there is a blend here and you have to sort of read between the lines with what we currently have, if you are interested in the data at all. Again, then, you have entitlement tracking and, then, broken out specifically the type of -- of addresses. So, single family versus multi-family versus commercial. Single family and multi-family what we typically get. That's it for what we have prepared now. If you have any other data that you consistently wish you had or for certain application types you wish we had, if you have common questions that come up and we haven't historically provided that, love to have any of that feedback.

Seal: For me it would be nice to have a graphical representation like this that broke out some of the information we get from West Ada School District. Just -- I mean it's -- sometimes it's a little monotonous just to read numbers and what they may mean and I know that we have -- more analysis has been done on that by city staff in order to provide better numbers as far as, you know, where we are going to grow with it. Be nice to see some of that done in a graphical -- graphical manner as well. The other thing might be, you know, that's near and dear to my heart, kind of the pathways, trying to incorporate how, you know, an application might add to that. You know, I don't know if there is a way to do that well, but if we can do it for, you know, car traffic, if we could do it for bike traffic or pedestrian traffic as well might be helpful.

Lorcher: Didn't you have that on the other one where it was green, yellow and red? Wasn't pathways one of the categories?

Seal: On the --

McClure: Yes, pathways, it's part of our service tool. It tells you proximity. It doesn't tell you whether the -- what the impact of the current development would be, though. It just tells you whether it's there or not.

Lorcher: Oh. Okay.

Seal: Okay.

Wheeler: Is this -- I'm sorry, are you still --

Seal: Go right ahead.

Wheeler: So, up here where it says the mixed use analysis by land use area, that's by like acreage -- by actually like square foot kind of stuff?

McClure: Top left?

Wheeler: Yeah. So, land use area by zoning districts, that's by square footage -- square feet?

McClure: That's currently -- that's currently by acres. Really, what it was trying to show you is split right now, but if -- if understanding the actual acreage was important to you, that's something we could add.

Wheeler: No. No. No. I was just -- I was just making sure I saw it right in my mind.

McClure: Yes. It's based -- it's based off of acres.

Wheeler: And, then, I know one of the things that we get a lot, too, is like -- stuff like, hey, well, ACHD, you know, their traffic counts or, hey, when was that last done or when did they do -- what was their approval of this building back when, based upon a certain use or something like that, that would -- that would be helpful saying here was their last traffic count study for it. The -- the picture that comes to my mind is that one on Records when we were putting that forward and they were going from an office to the -- to the mixed use -- or, excuse me, to the apartments there, remember, and they -- they said -- Brighton's comments were, hey, the -- the study was -- that ACHD did was there wasn't really a difference what we were going to see between the two and it would have just been -- that was something that popped up on my mind like, oh, it would have been nice to see what they -- what they said and when that was.

McClure: This is all good. Thank you.

Seal: And I -- yeah. I like -- I like -- I like the look and feel of this. So it is -- you know, especially when -- you know, we have a really busy week, you know, we have several applications, sometimes it's -- it's -- it's difficult to dig through all the data in just text format alone where things like this that can help, you know -- especially as we start to see over

time, I think it will be helpful, you know, as we train our eyes to different things that, you know, might be concerning to any one of us, you know, to recognize that, you know, what we deem as good, bad or indifferent, you know, I think this formatting will help with that for sure.

Hood: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Yeah. Caleb.

Hood: If I can that -- that actually feeds pretty nicely to what I was just going to -- going to clarify. I mean Bill and Brian did a good job explaining -- walking you through this. We do want everything that's in the staff report to be purposeful and helpful and the things that you want to see are likely the things that others in the community are interested in knowing, too. So, I appreciated the couple of few things that you all mentioned with ACHD and the school district and pathways and some other things that we may be able to also include here. So, you know, we don't want to grow it any longer than it needs to be, but we do want to provide you the data points and the information, the analysis that are going to assist in making those decisions. I want to -- one thing that Bill didn't talk about that I just want to highlight for you that will be different in the new staff report format is we are combining a lot of the UDC and comp plan analysis into one. So, it will be by element. So, parking is addressed in the comp plan and parking is addressed in the UDC, but in the staff report it's duplicative. You hear about it up here in the staff report and, then, it's repeated, essentially, down below in the UDC analysis. So, instead of looking at it -- you know, evaluating a project against the document comp plan and, then, evaluating it -- we will look at it together and say here is how it complies or doesn't with the comp plan and here is how it complies or doesn't with the UDC. So, we think that's an improvement and, again, one of the things we are trying to do is remove some of that duplication -- duplication and some things, if it's like ACHD, and you want to hear more about that, even though their -- their full staff report is linked below, you want that, hey, what were the traffic counts, we may be able to provide some of that and -- but we are trying to limit the -- saying the same things two and three times in the staff report, just to be -- in favor of saving trees a lot of times even just virtual trees and your time in having to read them multiple times. The last thing I just want to say relatively quickly -- and we haven't quite - - we don't fully understand how this is going to come into play, but very talented staff. One of the things we are not fully versed in is making this super cool bells and whistles all the way with hiding or whatever the right terms are for formatting Word documents that can be super sexy, cool. So, we will probably have to hire a consultant to help us with some of those things to just make it function the way we need it to. That said, we don't want to wait too terribly long to get something like this similarly out and start using it. So, what I'm thinking is going to happen is here in the next few months or so -- Bill mentioned it -- we will go back to Council kind of say, hey, this is what we are thinking. Let's test drive it for the most part, see what works and doesn't and, then, take that and send it to a consultant say, hey, can you make this actually work the way we thought it was going to work? So, that entire process will probably take about a year. I'm envisioning another few months to maybe get this out there, start using it. A few months of using it and getting some more feedback and, then, getting a consultant on board that can help us -- you

know, just make it snappy and so it's easy -- user friendly is how I have kind of couched this whole thing. We want it user friendly for our staff to use to put them together, for you guys to use and understand and read and same with the public and developers and anyone that picks it up. It's -- it's easy. It's intuitive. So, anyways, I just wanted to put a finer point on -- these guys did a good job. Just wanted to kind of put that in and to reiterate what Brian said, you know, any feedback you want to -- more feedback you want to provide now or ears to, go ahead and e-mail us, call us, whatever with, oh, yeah, I forgot to mention I would really like to see something on -- whatever else that -- that you might want to see a graph on or a chart or -- can't guarantee we will do it. But let us know and we may be able to. Because, like Brian said, we are trying to have this be automated out of our Enterprise software, not so much manual, or you have got to crunch the numbers to make the thing, but it's already in our system and it just puts it in there for you. But -- but -- but don't -- don't confine your comments, so that you think we can and can't do automated, let us know what you -- what you want or are hoping for.

Seal: Well, one of -- I was going to say that one of the comments I will make is can -- can we make sure that it's all done in pirate, like what seems to be on the screen here, so --

Wheeler: Can we make that official? Official font?

Lorcher: Only pirate talk.

Seal: Only pirate talk. Right. Can we condition that. Former Commissioner, soon to be Commissioner Grace, would you like to make a public comment?

Grace: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Patrick Grace. 531 Fox Run Way, Meridian. By way of feedback, I'm not sure I have a specific recommendation, but generally whatever you can put in it that helps -- in particular, the public appreciate or understand a little better what the nature of the decision is that's before this Commission would be helpful. It would be helpful to me, probably as well as a Commissioner, but not that I'm trying to discourage public comment, but we do get a lot of comments where the chairman in his -- his eloquent diplomatic way has to say we don't have any control over that. So, I'm not sure how much the public looks at these, but if you just kind of have that in the back of your mind, anything that can help couch or help the public understand what is the actual decision that's in front of this body might be kind of helpful. So for what it's worth. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Seal Thank you. Appreciate it. Yeah. That's -- it -- it's -- I mean, as my mind is working here and what was just commented on, one of the things that came out of -- for me personally when the city changed its website recently. So, it was like going to the store and they reorganized it, which happens every once in a while. So, one of the things I found interesting was I found it difficult to find information and I made some comments and some changes were made, but I -- you know. And I hope that the city is trying to kind of see that from somebody walking in the door or clicking on the website that has no idea how to find any of this stuff, you know, for public hearings and how they might be able to have public input on it, so -- and what's relevant and what's not relevant. You know, for me, personally, I would love if we had postings out there that showed all of the applications that were coming through and when their ACHD hearing was going to be,

because I would go to some of those. But, you know, that kind of information is really, really difficult to mine out of it. So, I like what Commissioner Grace had added to that, just, you know, making sure that we have kind of a focus on what is relevant -- what may be relevant to the public and how that can be addressed and what's relevant to the discussion that we have going for any given application.

Hood: So, Mr. Chair, can I comment on that --

Seal: No.

Hood: -- real quick?

Seal: Yeah. I'm just kidding. Go ahead, Caleb.

Hood: It won't add --

Seal: I have always wanted to do that.

Hood: That's probably the right answer, because it's not going to add a whole lot to the discussion, but I just -- I feel obligated to respond, because you were spot on in the comments, too, that -- again, the nature of decision and our processes are not intuitive by nature and so we are trying to make it, again, user friendly and intuitive for somebody picking up a staff report, because it's the one and only time the vacant field in their backyard is going to be developed and they haven't done it before and they will probably never do it again, but we need to give them some help. That said, we also have subject matter experts, like yourself and developers and the Council, that say cut to the chase.

Seal: Yeah.

Hood: And so we are trying to balance all of those things and I just want to put that in perspective a little bit. We hear that and that is something we're trying to do. But I will just -- we have a Council Member that's like two page staff report. Just tell me the issues and off we go and it's like -- and, then, I have legal saying we need all the findings and you got to make all the records, so we can defend this in court; right? So, again, there is -- there is a lot going on here that we are trying to streamline, not make it overly lengthy and that's why I'm back to purposeful. It needs to be purposeful and it needs to be for somebody, if not everybody at the same time.

Seal: Yeah.

Hood: So, just -- I appreciate your understanding and knowledge that we are trying to make this so it isn't intimidating to read, but, quite frankly, some of it's still going to be -- it's going to be technical sometimes, because it has to be. But we are going to try to make that so people can get the gist of it, understand and -- and it's helpful for everybody. So, again, just appreciate the comments.

Wheeler: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Yes. Go ahead.

Wheeler: So, another thing just to think about is if you look through -- if you can go back up or down, I think, it has the graphs that are on there. Or do you -- a couple things here. One is do you see some of these graphs just kind of redundant, kind of like slicing the pie and just turning the plate, like you are just looking at the pie from a different -- or different data from different angles -- same data from a different angle? Is there some of that that maybe will show up? And, then, another thing that I know that once this gets played out, as you guys probably know, too, that there will be some graphs -- or some data will just start not being salient as things move on and, then, all of a sudden be like, yeah, I don't know if we really need that kind of stuff and that will be -- so it's a living document and living report, all that kind of thing. But I'm, honestly, more like do you see some of the graphs and data that's just rephrasing of the same thing?

Hood: Go ahead, Brian. Yeah.

McClure: I can't speak -- so long range -- or comprehensive. I can't speak to the staff report overall. I can say one of my huge pet peeves is when data gets distorted, abused and so what you will see in a lot of these is the same data presented in several different ways. So, you know, sometimes you will get an applicant who will say the density is only five. Well, they didn't tell you that it's 30 on one end and, then, two on the other end and, you know, there is still some very real impacts to the people who are closer to 30. So, you're seeing density, you're seeing total units, you're seeing that from several different perspectives. So, yes, in some ways it's redundant, but it's also meant to be comprehensive in the sense that you can see from all angles. I can't say -- I have tried to do that in a few other areas. That's always sort of my goal. I -- someone probably needs to tell me to knock it off and be a little bit more succinct. I don't know. There is -- there is a balance there. That's my two cents.

Wheeler: With that still said, you are pulling this from Enterprise data; right? So, it's just more -- it's not that much, I guess -- I guess that's maybe not the right way to say it, but not -- not exasperatingly more work to just put in a different poll of data; correct?

McClure: So, I haven't shown you this for -- if you guys want me to I can. This is meant to be as easy as possible on the current planning staff. So, in GIS you click on a point, you copy the data, you paste that into Excel, it gives you all the charts and you can drag those over to Word. So, there is no additional sort of finding all of this for this page. Some of the ACHD, school stuff that we don't generate, that people give us, that will be a little bit more manual. However, someone has to retype that anyways, so it's not necessarily more for even that. But this data here is click, copy, paste.

Wheeler: Okay. Good. Good. That's -- because it did seem like some of the information was just being rephrased on it. But if it's just that easy to pick up and plop in and if it's okay with, you know, the way that they are using it, then, great. Fantastic.

Hood: And I will just say -- so two things. You asked that kind of a question geared towards us. I would just put that back to you. If you only like one of the top three and you're like this is the same information three times, I only like, you know, the one out of eight. I like to see it that way. Give us that feedback. We don't have to report it the way Brian just said it. That's what he would recommend and it's comfortable with, but we can get comfortable with -- again, we want it to be user friendly. So, if you think we can -- you know, this is the most important piece of that and we only want it reported with addresses only within a mile and don't break that down by, you know, some of the other things, we can add, remove -- you know, these various charts, make it half a page instead of a full page. So, those are, again, some of the things to consider. And, then, I don't know that we need that example that Brian just -- in my mind I saw him do that into Excel and, then, into Word. Again, send us other things, though, that you are -- you are curious that you think would be helpful that we could maybe even replace some of these with. I think there is a bullpen of a few other things that didn't make it into this report that we could also add. If you didn't come up with them, they are kind of on our shortlist, but let's test drive this for a few months; right? And, then, again, if you're like this is just taking up room and it doesn't add any value, at least that we can -- we do have opportunity. This is a living document. We don't want to change it all the time, but we can change it and -- and tweak it. But we are all kind of creatures of habit, so we want to get in the habit of using these things, seeing these things, knowing where they are project to project. What's the density? Okay. I know where to go find that.

Seal: One of the comments I will make -- take off my Commissioner hat and put on my technology here is as I have been involved with different technology trends as they have come along -- I mean, essentially, here is what you're trying to build -- what you are trying to make is more akin to a web page. So, maybe approach it that way. There is a lot of tools out there that will allow you to break out of the -- kind of the Microsoft confines that are out there for Word and Excel and things like that and have more of a dynamic web driven interface to it, where you can -- by clicking buttons bring a staff report that is everything that's relevant to a specific report and nothing that's not, instead of having to include different things that are in, even if they are collapsible, or not. So, that's all I will say about that. Well, thank you all very much. Appreciate the presentation and I really like -- I personally really like where this is going. I like their -- you know, the graphical representation of -- you know, of -- of all the numbers, essentially. Of all the data, of all the analysis and just different ways of looking at it. You know, Brian, I really like -- and we have had people come in on applications that will tell us exactly what you're saying is they are -- they are trying to hide something here, you know, and, you know, you have got 30 on one side and five on the other and the people that are, you know, dealing with the 30 are like, hey, wait a minute, you know, we are averaging it out here. So, if we can use some of that to, you know, help -- help people understand that, you know, a little bit better and understand that nobody's trying to hide anything. There are ways that we do have to measure this and it fits or, you know, something might come out of that where somebody looks at it and goes, yeah, that's not right. So, I really appreciate all that. Commissioners, anything else? I was going to say, I don't think we have to close that or anything, we just had a discussion. So, is there anything else that anybody wants to add?

Okay. I -- I will take one more motion, then, for the evening. Thank you very much.

Wheeler: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Go right ahead.

Wheeler: I would like to make a motion we adjourn.

Lorcher: Second.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded that we adjourn. All in favor say aye. Motion carries. We are adjourned.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:05 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS.)

APPROVED

ANDREW SEAL - CHAIRMAN

_____|_____|_____|

DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK