

Meridian Planning and Zoning Meeting

August 7, 2025.

Meeting of the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission of August 7, 2025, was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chairman Maria Lorcher.

Members Present: Commissioner Maria Lorcher, Commissioner Jared Smith, Commissioner Brian Garrett and Commissioner Matthew Sandoval and Commissioner Matthew Stoll.

Members Absent: Commissioner Jessica Perreault and Commissioner Sam Rust.

Others Present: Tina Lomeli, Kurt Starman, Nick Napoli and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

<u> X </u> Brian Garrett	<u> </u> Jessica Perrault
<u> X </u> Matthew Sandoval	<u> X </u> Matthew Stoll
<u> </u> Sam Rust	<u> X </u> Jared Smith
<u> </u>	<u> X </u> Maria Lorcher - Chairman

Lorcher: Good evening. Welcome to the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting for August 7th, 2025. At this time I would like to call the meeting to order. The Commissioners who are present for tonight's meeting are at City Hall and on Zoom. We also have staff from the City Attorney's and the City Clerk's office as well as the City Planning Department. If you are joining us on Zoom this evening we can see that you are here. However -- and you may observe the meeting. However, your ability to be seen on screen and talk 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 of the meeting. If you have a process question during the meeting please e-mail cityclerk@meridiantcity.org and they will reply as quickly as possible. If you simply want to watch the meeting we encourage you to watch this streaming on the City's YouTube channel. You can access it at meridiantcity.org/live. With that we will begin with roll call. Madam Clerk.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Lorcher: The first item on the agenda is the adoption of the agenda. There are no changes in tonight's agenda. Please note that Item No. 2, CapEd at Ten Mile and Item No. 3, Ten Mile Flex Space have both requested a continuance. So, if there is anybody here to testify on these applications we will not be taking public testimony this evening. Could I get a motion to adopt tonight's agenda?

Garrett: Move to approve.

Stoll: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and a second to approve tonight's agenda. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

1. Approve Minutes of the July 17, 2025 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting

Lorcher: The next item on the agenda is the Consent Agenda and we are going to approve the meetings of -- the minutes of the July 17th Planning and Zoning meeting. Could I get a motion to accept the Consent Agenda as presented?

Stoll: Madam Chair, I move to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

Garrett: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to approve the Consent Agenda. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

Lorcher: At this time I would briefly 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 our Comprehensive Plan and our Unified Development Code. After staff has made their presentation the applicant will come forward to present their case and respond to staff's 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 only once during public testimony. The clerk will call out the names individually of those who have signed up on our website in advance to testify. You may come to the microphones in Chambers or you will be unmuted on Zoom. 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 a presentation for the meeting it will be displayed on the screen and our clerk will run the presentation. If you have established 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 we will -- you will have up to ten minutes. After all those who have signed up in advance who have spoken we invite any others who would like to participate. If you wish to speak on a topic you may come forward in Chambers or if on Zoom you may press the raise hand button and if you are listening on a telephone you may press star nine and wait for your name to be called. If you are listening on multiple devices, such as a computer and a telephone, please, make sure to mute those extra devices, so we don't experience feedback and we can hear you clearly. When you are finished if the Commission does not have questions for you you

will return to your seat in Chambers or be muted on Zoom and no longer have the ability to speak. And, please, remember we will not call on you a second time. After all testimony has been heard the applicant will be given another ten minutes to come back and respond. When the applicant has finished responding to the questions and concerns we will close the public hearing and the Commissioners will have the opportunity to discuss and hopefully make final decisions or recommended to City Council as needed. So, we have two items that are going to be continued and we are going to call on each one of them individually, so that we can get a future date.

ACTION ITEMS

2. Public Hearing for CapEd at Ten Mile (H-2025-0026) by Megan West, Slichter Ugrin Architecture, located at 657 S. Vanguard Way

- A. Request: Conditional Use Permit for a detached two-lane drive-through for two self-service automated teller (ATM) kiosks within 300 feet of another drive-through on 1.489 acres of land zoned C-G.

Lorcher: So, Item No. 2 on the agenda is H-2025-0026 for CapEd at Ten Mile. They have requested a continuance. Madam Clerk, do we have a date in mind for this application?

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. We have August 21st.

Lorcher: Can I -- may I get a motion to continue the application for CapEd at Ten Mile for August 1st?

Garrett: So moved.

Stoll: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to continue CapEd at Ten Mile on August 21st. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

3. Public Hearing for Ten Mile Flex (H-2025-0027) by Jeff Hatch, located at 4255 N. Ten Mile Rd.

- A. Request: Annexation of 5.55 acres of land for the construction of approximately 15,900 sq.ft. of flex space and

Lorcher: Item No. 3 is also a continuance for Ten Mile Flex. Madam Clerk, do we have a suggested date for that application?

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. The same date for that one, August 21st.

Lorcher: August 21st. May I get a motion to continue Ten Mile Flex for August 21st?

Garrett: So moved.

Stoll: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to continue Ten Mile Flex for August 21st. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

4. Public Hearing for Farrington Heights Subdivision RZ, PP, MDA (H-2025-0016) by Studio H Architects, generally located at the NW corner of E. Pine Ave. and N. Adkins Ave.

- A. Request: Rezone of 4.68 acres of land from the R-4 to the R-15 zoning district.
- B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 4.68 acres of land from the R4 to the R-15 zoning district, consisting of 30 building lots and 7 common lots.
- C. Request: Development Agreement Modification to terminate the existing development agreement and establish a new one.

Lorcher: All right. Now to the good stuff. We actually have an application. Item No. 4 on the agenda is H-2025-0016 for rezone, preliminary plat and a DA modification for the Farrington Heights Subdivision at Pine and Adkins and we will begin with the staff report. Nick.

Napoli: Sorry about that. Good evening, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. The next item on the agenda is the rezone, preliminary plat and development agreement modification for Farrington Heights and I don't want to -- before I start my presentation I did want to on the record make a clarification in the site posting. On the site that was posted at -- the sign that was posted at the site said medium density residential, which is correct, that is the FLUM designation. However, the R-15 zoning district is the medium high density designation.

Lorcher: So noted.

Napoli: So, the applicant is requesting a rezone from R-4 to R-15 zoning district, a preliminary plat consisting of 30 build -- 30 building lots and seven common lots on 4.68 acres of land and development agreement modification to replace the current development agreement with a new one. The site is generally located at the northwest

corner of Pine Avenue and Adkins Avenue. I show on the screen the existing zoning is R-4 and the FLUM designation is medium density residential. There is the rezone exhibit. The subject properties were annexed in 2000 as part of the Farrington Opal application. The zoning granted at that time -- at the time of annexation was the R-4 zoning district. With the annexation approval the properties were subject to a development agreement that restrict the property to adding one additional home on the 4.68 acres. The existing DA will be replaced with a new DA to update the concept plan and provisions for the improvements relevant to the current proposal. The proposed subdivision is a gross density of 5.77 units per acre. That proposed use and density are consistent with the medium density residential FLUM designation of three to eight units per acre. The surrounding landscape consists of single family detached homes to the north, east and west, while the south is Pine Avenue. The average density for a one mile radius is 6.1 units per acre, which is higher than the 5.77 units per acre the applicant is proposing. Single family detached dwellings are listed as a principally permitted use in the R-15 zoning district per the UDC and the applicant is proposing to keep the three existing homes on the property in addition to this. The applicant is proposing to complete the subdivision in a single phase. However, due to the size of Lots 20, 21, 22 and 23, staff recommends the southern portion of the site retain the R-4 zoning district, as this is the more appropriate for the existing lot sizes and if Commission recommends this to Council, the applicant shall submit a revised legal description and exhibit for the rezone prior to the City Council hearing. Staff discussed providing a one-to-one transition with the applicant to provide a better transition to the existing homes and now applicant ultimately lost three building lots as a result, but the transition remained the same on the north portion of the site. In addition, staff encourage the applicant to converse with the neighbors early on in the process and after their neighborhood meeting the applicant indicated the neighbors had minimal concerns. With the knowledge of this staff is supportive of the in-fill development, but still has concerns with the lack of regional parks in the area for residents to access and use. The proposed development of 4.68 acres falls below the threshold as there is -- and is, therefore, not subject to open space and amenity requirements outlined in the UDC as five acres is the threshold. However, staff has engaged in multiple discussions with the applicant regarding the value of including open space and amenities especially given the absence of a regional park in the surrounding area. While not -- not required by code, staff is concerned about the lack of recreational space and amenities for future residents. Therefore, staff is recommending one amenity in the form of a picnic area be included in Lot 19, Block 1, and, then, access to the property is proposed from North Adkins Avenue, a local roadway on the eastern portion of the site. This local road is shared between the proposed subdivision and the existing subdivision to the east and north. The applicant is proposing two access points off of North Adkins Avenue, with a common drive accessing three properties on the southern portion and a common drive on the northern portion accessing three more properties. The proposed design -- the proposed design includes variations of two-story homes each featuring a two car garage. The elevations showcase a range of architectural styles, designs, elements, including lap siding, neutral color accents, brick and stone veneer, varied roof profiles and different home styles. Review confirms that these elevations adhere to the city's architectural standards and comply -- comply with our required design criteria. Staff is

recommending approval with the conditions and a new development agreement and we have received written testimony from Don Flaten with concerns about building heights, privacy and transitions to the existing single family home -- homes and I will stand for questions at this time.

Lorcher: Would the applicant like to come forward? Hi.

Heggie: Good evening. My name is Jessica Heggie with Studio H Architects, 1335 North Main Street, Meridian, Idaho. 83642. And I believe, Nick, are you going to -- perfect. Thank you very much. Thank you, Nick. I don't have a whole bunch to add to what Nick just presented, but just a couple items, just on the open space for one. Yes, our property is underneath the five acres, so we don't have it -- necessarily dedicated open space per City of Meridian requirements per the zoning code. However, we do have landscaped areas and open space as in the fact that there won't be building areas. So, on the exhibit that Nick is showing now on the right-hand side is our colored landscape plan. In the center of the subdivision buffering between what Nick is asking for R-4 and, then, the R-15 northern portion, we have a landscaped buffer area. There is a drainage area in that and as well as fully landscaped. In addition to that we are -- have -- we have a very large landscape buffer down along Pine, so that we do not have a dedicated open space area. We do have areas that are heavily landscaped and open with outbuildings. I don't think we have issues with the request for a picnic area on Lot 19.

Lorcher: Which one is Lot 19?

Heggie: Nick, is it the east side --

Napoli: Madam Chair, so, yes, you know, staff was open -- this is technically a Lot 19, smaller lot. Staff is open to a different location for it -- if the applicant's amenable to that. We just put it in a location that we thought would provide a little bit more space.

Heggie: I don't -- I don't think we would have any issues with any of those. We do have drainage in 19 and 18 -- sorry, I can't read the numbers. I believe the 18 -- the largest to the -- the west of 19. However, we don't have any drainage in the green area north of the east parcel. So, that will be an opportunity we could add a small picnic area and not conflict with any of the drainage area and, then, on the next slide just wanted to reiterate the architectural look that we are proposing for the subdivision. There is a couple builders that are lined up for this build out and so, like Nick said, lots of material. They meet City of Meridian requirements and all in all these are nice homes, single family homes detached. That is all I have to add. If you guys have any questions I'm happy to answer.

Lorcher: What's the average square footage of the houses that you are proposing for this area?

Heggie: We are not the builders. I can't exactly say, but I would assume they would be 2,000, 2,500 square feet roundabout with a two car garage and a full driveway.

Lorcher: And everybody has a small backyard?

Heggie: Yes.

Lorcher: And I think one of the comments that were made would you -- would the builders be amenable to possibly doing some single family homes where it abuts up to the backyard of another home in another subdivision?

Heggie: Can you explain what you mean?

Lorcher: So, if you go back to the slide behind -- behind it, Nick. The properties to the west -- those backyards back up to other people's backyards; is that correct?

Heggie: That's correct.

Lorcher: So, one of the written testimony came in -- wondering if single family home -- single story homes -- maybe I said it wrong -- would be an option for when it's a one-to-one ratio?

Heggie: I don't think the -- the size of the lots would be conducive to a single family home. There just wouldn't be enough square footage for them to be able to sell them, just from the price of land in -- in -- in the city. I think they are going to need to get two stories of square footage to make a home even pencil. It's going to be -- if you did a single story home on these, not only would they be forced to push the single story all the way to the back setback, which would only be -- which would be really really close to the backyards of these properties, you would end up with just mostly a garage and a shotgun style house. So, it really wouldn't be a high end type of finish if we were restricted to a single story home.

Lorcher: All right. Commissioners, any other questions for the applicant at this time? No? All right. Thank you -- Commissioner Stoll.

Stoll: So, can you explain to me the outreach process that you went through with the neighborhood?

Heggie: Yeah. We -- we did our neighborhood meeting with -- we held a neighborhood meeting. I think we had probably 15-ish neighbors come around. The questions were really about traffic on -- on Adkins. We did explain to them that we are widening Adkins and we are improving it per ACHD requirements. So, there is going to be additional asphalt. There is going to be full, curb, gutter and sidewalks. That was a plus. Obviously, traffic is always a concern when you bring in additional people. They did bring a concern of adding some form of traffic mitigation, which I did indicate that we would have to discuss with ACHD whether or not that would be -- just some way to slow

traffic down -- not necessarily based on the subdivision, but at the current ones that they have with people speeding down Adkins towards Pine. So, that was one issue. The additional issue is just nobody wants development. Nobody wants it in their backyard. They just don't want to see the land developed. So, that was -- that was the major one and it's pretty consistent with all the projects that we work on.

Stoll: As you heard the chair ask the question about whether you can go with a single level place -- and I understand that doesn't pencil out -- are there other treatments that you can recommend to try to mitigate the transition from R-4 to R-15?

Heggie: Yeah. I think there is a couple different ones. First grading, making sure that the -- the grading is similar. There has been some subdivisions in the Meridian area where the grading is substantial and one -- one neighbor is higher than the other one and so it gives a very easy direct view into the backyard. These ones won't have that necessarily. So, that would be one area. And, then, of course, landscaping is always the big one to help with -- with privacy. We foresee those -- these homes having covered patios. They are going to have kids. These are single family homes. So, I think it's going to be on both sides. Everyone wants their own privacy in their backyards.

Lorcher: Okay. All right. Thank you very much.

Heggie: Thank you.

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

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. The first person is Stephanie John. She has a picture that I will share as well.

Lorcher: Hi. If you can just state your name and address for the record that would be great.

John: Sure. Stephanie John at 1111 North Adkins Avenue. Can I go --

Lorcher: Yep. Go ahead. Thank you.

John: So, I'm at the north end of the subdivision, which -- this is my property and they are trying to put five -- five houses backing up to it. We are the ones with the concerns about the privacy and the single -- or the double house dwellings. Five backyards looking into it. If you look that's my driveway and my front door is facing the field and I know that's hard to overcome on developer's end, but that's my existing house. That's where we park, that's where my kids come in and out of the front door. There would be no -- everyone looking down on them. In the back there is a detached garage further back that sits right on the property line. We would have no reprieve. We would have no privacy. Nowhere for my kids -- I have three daughters. Where do I send them to play basketball without somebody staring down at them? I'm very concerned about that. I'm

so concerned about the traffic. They are showing it coming off of Adkins. Well, I take them to school going down Pine. Pine is already a disaster. I'm turning right going down to Barbara Morgan and we have a dispatch center there and police cars coming out. We have Ada County -- our Ada County paramedics coming in and out, which they need to get to people. Across from us is commercial and they have trucks backing in and out. So, I'm concerned about that. The intersection at Pine and Locust Grove is a disaster. Trying to get in and out of there is not easy. I'm very concerned about that. The same with -- if they go through the subdivision at Shellbrook and Pine -- at Pine. That's -- something needs to happen there. There is a lot of traffic. I'm also very worried about the diminished value of my property. I mean we are -- we have a lot there, but where our house sits and how they want to come in it really leaves us nowhere to go. We can't move our house back on the lot. It just is what it is. We are an existing house and so we kind of just have to work with it. I'm worried that the fire trucks, the public services won't have enough time or access to these areas, including our homes on these. Another fire -- we have one across from us. Is that enough? I'm also worried about the grade. Are they sure they can grade it enough that people can't look down on me? Five different homes is a lot to look down on -- on us. I'm also worried about the light. That's the south wall for me and so that sunlight in directly it helps with heating. That's all my main living areas. That's my living room, my kitchen, my formal dining room, all of those face that -- that field and so having houses back right up to us is a big problem. Zoning and Planning Commission, they serve the people that they are here for. You guys have a chance and could guarantee -- to guarantee light, air and privacy for all of us, not just me as an existing resident, but for the residents that you are going to be building for. I ask you to keep that in mind. Thank you.

Lorcher: All right. Thank you. Madam Clerk?

Lomeli: Madam Chair, the next person is Bob Flaten.

Flaten: Hello all of you. First off I would like to say thank you very much for giving me time out of your day. I would second off like to apologize that I'm not better prepared because this is incredibly important to me, but --

Lorcher: If you could state your name and address for the record that would be --

Flaten: 1111 North Adkins Lane. I have lived in that house basically since I was five. My name is Bob Flaten and this is our home. It has been for many years since before really anyone in this room has actually been there. I have been walking down to what was the old existing home to meet with Opal Farrington. She used to always give me candy. Long story made short, this is a place we have been for a long time and I had hoped would be a safe environment for my children, my three daughters. I have a lot of concerns about this. Not -- three minutes is definitely not going to serve me right with all of this, but I guess my main ones for them would be security and equality. I look at the houses that are there right now. Yes, they are single family dwellings, but if you stand in my driveway you will literally see one and only one two-story house and from all

angles. This is not equal. That means all the people that come in now have a way to look down. With all due respect that very much diminishes our security, our way of life, every bit of the usability of our property. We don't have places -- we won't have a place for the garden now. There is a lot of different things that are going to be affected by this that I don't think need to be as a result of the density. I understand that people have a right to move. It's very literal to my job. I'm a mover. I welcome them every day from all over the country. But I see issues with density in places that I move. I see people fighting and bickering over the silliest of things, because they are too close because people don't want to go out and rub elbows, they just want to be able to go in their yard and maybe a little casual wave to a neighbor that they get along with, but they don't want to be fighting with speeders out in front of their house, which that they actually did touch on that. That is an enormous problem. I have called ACHD a couple times. They ran the little strips out there to check speed. They admitted it. The police have been out there and checked, wrote many tickets. It's already a problem. It's certainly not going to get better with more people. I also don't believe crime is going to go down. I think our property values will. I think that's a pretty big issue. I think we have a right to hopefully be able to somewhat protect that. The applicant or whatever we refer to them, he stated that she said there were no concerns. Well, there were many concerns. I was there and I -- with respect to her and everybody else, I feel very much like David and Goliath here. I don't feel like I have a chance. I don't feel like my family has a chance. I think the money wins and I'm trying to understand and just navigate this as reasonably as possible considering our -- where we are in this process. Again, I wish that I could touch on a lot of things, but I guess, really, the last thing and it's kind of off kilter, but I think of Thomas Jefferson the first time he was trying to write the Declaration of Independence he spoke of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness being inalienable rights. Every one of those is being attacked at our home. I get that maybe people don't feel like that that come there, but we don't get to have our lives to way -- I don't have the liberty to let my daughters roam free in our driveway anymore for fear of people looking down on them, somebody stealing them, a random dog running up and attacking them, all things that happen in higher density places and I don't feel -- I don't feel like their happiness is protected as a result of all of these things and, again, I know we are just trying to survive like everybody else, but I'm all for people being able to have homes, but I don't feel that this is right for that area. I feel it's right for some people in certain areas, but I don't think this is the right match up for us and I haven't met one person 📞 that feels differently. Thank you so much.

Lorcher: Thank you for coming. Madam Clerk, do we have anyone else to testify?

Lomeli: Yes, Madam Chair. The next person is Karen Blanton. Sorry.

Lorcher: Hi. If you can state your name and address for the record that would be great.

Blanton: Madam Chair, it's Karen Blanton. 1418 East Sothesby Street, Meridian, Idaho. 83642. So, I live on the street north of the development -- the proposed development. The only reason why I was able to come to the meeting that they had outside on the property was because my neighbor across the street got the notice

because of living within 500 feet. So, the people in that community area, in Danbury Fair, I wasn't given a notice about the development at all. I'm really in agreement with the people that have testified so far. My concern really is extensively for the children of that block. The home that I live in right now -- it was broken into last night with just the kind of development that we have there -- normal situation with people coming in from out of state. I grew up in Chicago. I know what high density does. To go ahead and have dwellings that are good enough to house children with no real space for them to be playing actively, they go roaming around the community and if they find an open gate, an open door, an open window, something that seems available or vulnerable they have a tendency to think that they can accommodate themselves to take whatever they want to do -- whatever they want to do. I'm very much in agreement. I watch the children playing down Adkins and it's -- it's like a Norman Rockwell kind of community that's going to change tremendously. The lives of people are going to be so impacted. I love their home that they are talking about. It's -- it's the most beautiful, pristine -- it reminds me of why I came out west from Chicago and now we are going to be bringing in developments that's going to make it more like Chicago. So, with my home being broken into with just the amount of people that we have there, adding this many more houses, with that many more cars -- also my neighbor is elderly and trying to get out onto Locust Grove is a nightmare. People don't want to merge when you are coming into Danbury Fair if you are going north, the people across the street from Locust Grove going into that development have to meet at the exact same Meridian in order to get their developments. There is no lights or anything to help that traffic. So we travel down Adkins to get out on Pine, so we can get the light and I almost had an accident with somebody today. There is not enough space to be turning in and out, just with the amount of traffic that we have. To add something that's going to have that many more two car garages with the residents maybe owning two cars and other family or friends coming to visit, it's not only going to change the environment and the value of the property and the feel of why people wanted to move there, but it's going to be putting a lot of people at risk and a lot of children at risk. So, I hope you take that into consideration to keep the density as it is and not increase it. Thank you.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, the next person is Dave Barnes.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you.

Lomeli: I have a Brian Turner.

Turner: My name is Brian Turner and I live at 1345 East Shellbrook Drive just west of the first two speakers.

Lorcher: Okay.


Turner: I would like to state up -- state up front that I welcome the development of this land, but -- that's being considered for the Farrington Heights, but I do have one strong

disagreement that's already been touched on and that is to have the two-story homes. If you look at this land it is naturally elevated, so they have to grade significantly to make it even reasonable. It's out of place to -- with the existing homes and it would take away the privacy of all of our backyards. A wonderful example of my disagreement is the Avebury development that is off the Pine just north -- or just south of Danbury Subdivision. These two-story homes look completely out of place with the Danbury -- Danbury Homes and on the west end that home -- it just looms over the backyards. It's like arm's length from the backyard or the fence and I have lived in Danbury since 2001 and I have talked in -- I haven't talked to anyone that is happy with the Avebury Subdivision and this is going to be larger and just as -- built similarly as it's been explained. I know they are single -- there is options for single level homes. The first example is the Locust Grove Place duplexes that are on the east side of Danbury off of Locust Grove Road. They are single level and blended well with Danbury Subdivision. And also a second example very recent is the Fire Prairie Subdivision that is north of Ustick off of Locust Grove directly behind Fire Station No. 3. They are all single level homes. So, saying that there is -- it's not cost effective I don't believe that and those homes look really nice and I would be happy with a home like that in my backyard. To whoever -- to whoever has the power -- the decision to whether or not to build two story homes, the seller, the architect, developer, the city, I frankly don't know, because I don't know the process. Whoever it is please please please do not build two story homes due to greed and lack of foresight. Two story homes will anger all the neighbors for decades to come and will look completely out of place on this plot of land. Thank you.

Lorcher: Thank you for testifying.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, the next person is Marilee Turner.

M.Turner: Hello. My name is Marilee Turner. I reside at 1345 East Shellbrook Drive, Meridian, Idaho. 83642. I also reside west of the first two speakers and while I am not opposed to the development of the land being considered for the Farrington Heights Subdivision, I am more than minimally opposed to the rezoning of the 4.68 acres of land from the R-4 to the R-15 zoning district. By rezoning the land the development -- the developers will be able to build approximately 30 buildings, a much much denser development than all its bordering sides in all directions. Not only will the development be denser, but the buildings will be two stories, while all the homes surrounding the development with the exception of one will be two stories. While our neighborhood isn't upscale, our homes have existed for nearly 30 years and we value -- very much value our way of life. A development such as this will impact families adversely for decades. I implore you not to build as closely and as densely as legally allowed. Please allow for landscape buffers on all sides of the development, which may mean putting the access road around the perimeter and planning for green spaces bordering the road. Thirty two story homes looming over our backyards will negatively impact our ability to enjoy our yards and spend time in our yards. And I echo the concern about lighting. That is a huge concern. I plead for you to consider single story homes on this property. It is doubtful that anyone would welcome the proposed scenario as an adjacent subdivision to your own property and we would very much appreciate respect for our way of life

also. Secondly, I'm concerned that the development will bring on average about 50 to 60 more vehicles coming and going at least twice daily in and out of our neighborhood. Also it will increase delivery traffic as well. The street bordering the planned development is Adkins and Adkins is so narrow it might be considered a one way street. The intersection at Pine and Adkins is already dangerous as has been spoken and other -- the only other convenient intersection that drivers might use to exit or enter the proposed subdivision is located at Locust Grove and Shellbrook. That intersection, due to the completed development directly across the street and upcoming planned development, is extremely dangerous and will become even more precarious. Due to the development of the Avebury neighborhood I believe a very many turn lanes added to the Pine and Stonehenge intersection. However, this -- this entrance will not be convenient for any of the residents and it is very dangerous. Beginning at Locust Grove, Pine, as you are aware, is only a one lane road and Pine is extremely busy at nearly any  --

Lorcher: You can finish.

M.Turner: Okay. At nearly anytime of day, both morning, midday and evening, these intersections make exiting and entering our neighborhood very difficult. I can't imagine what a denser development will bring. I hope that anyone with decision making powers will be wise and look with foresight into the future. Please.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, the next person is Jack Harp.

Harp: I'm working on it.

Lorcher: Okay. Mr. Harp, if you can say your address for the record that would be great.

Harp: Jack Harp. 1038 North Adkins.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Harp: In Meridian.

Lorcher: Okay.

Harp: This little lady that just talked hit the nail on the head. My concern is after living there for 23 years now, seen a lot come and go. The infrastructure alone would be a project. It would be an awful big project, not just the houses, but, like she said, the road, the intersections, et cetera. I don't think the Ada County Highway District is going to do that. But, yeah, two-story homes that close together will be like those ones they just built over here on Pine, what, 15 feet apart, two stories high. No. If you are going to do something there at least one story and not so gosh darn many. The going rate for

rent now it will take three or four people just to rent one of those and that brings up an awful lot of people in such a small area. So, yeah, I can see someone making some money, which is what this is all about, but, there again, that infrastructure alone -- it would just be like playing when you get down here to Main Street. Nice wide street. Boom, you are in a bottleneck and it's already getting bad around Locust Grove and Pine. All the wrecks -- it's just not a good idea to do that. Ideally would be a senior -- well, not so much senior citizen, but like what they got behind St. Luke's. Single story. Probably older people, but you build this the young ones will come and they have no idea what blood, sweat and tears are to own a home. So, all heck will break loose. It might take a year or two, but it will come. Thank you.

Lorcher: Thank you for testifying.

Harp: Uh?

Lorcher: Thank you.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, no one else has signed up.

Lorcher: If you would like to come up in Chambers.

Salladay: My name is Rick Salladay. I'm at 992 North Stonehenge Way. My property backs right up to the existing development.

Lorcher: Okay.

Salladay: I can tell you I have -- I'm one of the first ones in that end of the subdivision. The road was not even all the way through on Stonehenge when I moved there 33 years ago. I also knew the -- the owners of the original property out there. She came to me and said she lived on a hill. That explains the elevation issue. I had to look for a long time where this hill was what she was talking about before it was explained to me. It was right behind me. So, there is -- there is about a three four foot elevation from my house to that field. So, to build a two-story, it would be ungodly. It's going to put it way too high. You want to grade that down two, three, four feet fine, I would suggest basements. Once you spend that extra money you are going to be making all these houses dig down and put a basement. There is your two-story house. And we could put a level on this. Traffic. God help you on Adkins, because I live on Stonehenge. This Avebury, two story houses they built, they didn't grade down, they built up. This is what I would expect these guys to do, too. They will go in there and they will tear up the topsoil and they will put in their foundations, which is going to raise it up. Tear out all that good soil and they will bring back in gravel and crap and pour it back in there. Adkins Lane, you are going to see tons of traffic. That little Avebury Subdivision, I didn't know the name of the subdivision. They put in the two-story places. They are all -- most of them are renters. They don't own those places. Those places were over 250,000 -- almost 300,000 or more. How much are you guys going to make? On 35 houses. Let's not be a money grabber. Let's be reasonable. Let's think about what you

are putting in there and I see what's moving here. I welcome people coming to this state. A lot of people from the state left in the '80s and the '90s and they are coming back. They are coming back from California and everywhere else, but they are bringing all that shit and toys with them. Excuse my language. I'm sorry. But I have got one that just moved in the subdivision right in the -- right in the cul-de-sac. He has got every toy imaginable. Up and down the street on his motorcycle, up and down the street in this big old loud diesel truck. These Avebury people ripping through on their motorcycles and their little go kart or the little zoom zoom cars and their loud music. God help me. I never thought I would ever say that. I'm a kid from the '70s and the '80s. I blasted my music. Here I am. But my music did not rattle the windows. Anyhow, that's what I got to say about this subdivision. I welcome the subdivision. I knew it was going to come. I have been there 33 years. I knew Kurt. I spoke to Kurt when he owned the property right behind me. When they were building that big white house they came and asked me how far back should we go? I said go back this way. Go -- go to toward Pine. Please. And they did. Now I know I have no choice. I know it's going to be developed, but let's be reasonable, folks. Let's put in less houses. Think about your motivation🔔 and that's all I got to say.

Lorcher: Thank you for testifying. Anybody else in chambers that would like to speak? Madam Clerk, do we have anybody on Zoom?

Lomeli: Madam Chair, no one is on Zoom.

Lorcher: Would the applicant like to come forward and address some of the concerns of the neighbors?

Heggie: Thank you. Do you need my name again?

Lorcher: No.

Heggie: Okay. Thank you very much. Well, I am a resident of Meridian. Lived in Ada county, so I fully understand and I'm a native of Meridian, so I have seen the growth and I completely understand the neighbors' concerns. I do want a couple -- address a couple of things. There are 30 building lots in this property. However, there are three existing homes and some of these parcels are larger. So, we are stereotyping the whole subdivision as -- as if it's a development that is I believe a quarter of a mile to the west and it is not the same. So, that's not entirely fair, nor accurate. Another issue that I have is labeling the new residents as vagrants and thieves. That's not fair. We are -- we are looking at these homes being in the high 500, 600 thousand and they are for sale. They are not rental homes. Granted someone could buy them and rent them out and we can't control that, but that is not the intent of the development. We were looking to convert three existing homes and their parcels and create homes that are starter homes and that is what starter home is in Meridian, Idaho, is a half a million dollar house and so those are going to bring in the younger demographics. Those with kids that do take care of their homes. They have their kids in their backyards or in -- in the subdivision teaching them how to ride their bike. These aren't vagrants. Aren't people

that are living and going to steal your kids and your bicycles. These are just hard working people that want to have a home and they want to live in this amazing city in particular right outside of downtown Meridian, which is growing and vibrant and we want these people in downtown Meridian. My office is down here. It's got so much room for growth. There is so many areas that are very dilapidated. They are old and they are coming up and we have got in-fill properties right by us and they are duplexes, they are single family homes, they are five feet from the property line. It is what it is and the people have moved in and they are great. They have a single family home they have a brand new house and their kids are out back playing in the yard. Our office is next door. It's Old Town. You know, we are -- we are a mix of uses. This isn't Old Town, but it's right next door. So, I think the use is appropriate and we want to see a mix of density residential commercial in these areas and watch this area develop and grow into an amazing downtown, which it can be. I know there is traffic issues and I do feel for the residents. I don't think it's entirely applicable to our development. We are only talking about a few new homes. However, I think it definitely needs to be something addressed between the City of Meridian police and ACHD and we, obviously, are going to do everything that ACHD requires of us, none of which is any -- anything at the intersection of Adkins and Pine. However, it was talked about with Adkins being very narrow. However, Adkins with our improvements of the additional asphalt will be the full width required by ACHD and it is the full width that they are going to require in the future. So, unfortunately, that is -- is where it is at. And, then, I guess the last item I wanted to talk about is the elevation change. So, that is, obviously, something that will be addressed as we are moving forward in the process. Our civil engineer, unfortunately, is not here tonight, but he is working through those items and I do not see it as an issue in the future.

Lorcher: Commissioners, do we have any questions for the applicant?

Garrett: No.

Lorcher: All right. Thank you very much.

Stoll: Actually --

Lorcher: Oh. Okay. Sorry. I looked over at you and didn't acknowledge. Okay. Commissioner Stoll, what would you like to ask the applicant?

Stoll: So, there is discussion about grading existing property to lower it down. You don't have your engineer here to answer this question, but one of the concerns I have is if you grade it what's going on with the surface water drainage?

Heggie: So, one of the -- one of the major items that I know as an architect, not necessarily as a civil engineer, is we can't drain onto other people's properties. So, no matter what we are going to have to address the grading change between the properties and we have to keep all storm water on our own property. So, there won't be

a grade change down to their property, we will keep all of the water, storm water on site. So, that will be -- that will be addressed kind of as we are moving forward.

Stoll: Okay.

Lorcher: Did that answer your question?

Stoll: At this stage, yeah.

Lorcher: Okay. All right. Thank you very much.

Heggie: Thank you.

Lorcher: May I get a motion to close the public hearing? Oh, wait. Jared and Matt, did you have any questions for the applicant? I'm sorry. Before you left --

Sandoval: Madam Chair, I do.

Lorcher: Oh, can you come back up again, Jessica? Sorry. I forgot about our Zoomers. Go ahead.

Sandoval: Yes. Yeah. So, in historic applications we have seen some line of sight visuals provided as far as what that height difference is going to look like. Did you guys have any of those prepared or available that we can look at and interpret?

Heggie: No, we -- we have not. That's really not been discussed at this point. It would be something we can definitely look at. It's going to vary, obviously, greatly there. The houses are various distances from the property lines, whether to the west or to the north. So, like I said, we haven't looked at it specifically, but the -- the houses are pretty far back. We don't see any issues with lighting, all of that stuff. There is no views to be taken. It's already -- it's already got houses all the way around it. The houses aren't going to be huge. I mean we are talking 20 feet total to the peak standard. So, we are not putting some three story townhome next to all these homes. It's not -- it's not going to be as intrusive as I think the neighbors are fearing.

Sandoval: Okay. I think the average two-story house is closer to 28 feet to the peak, but, yeah, typically we have just seen some kind of average; right? It could be from -- whatever the median setback is to the height of that second story window into the backyards of the adjacent properties. So, you do not have that prepared; is that accurate?

Heggie: No.

Sandoval: Okay. Thank you.

Lorcher: Okay.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: I have one question and I'm still trying to figure out where I'm -- I'm at on this northern abutting property. I am just -- I'm just curious and I don't know how to phrase this, but I'm -- I -- I -- I kind of get it. Five -- five homes abutting to one is -- is -- I know there is no way to fully get around it. There is going to be a couple or a few homes there. I'm just curious if there has been any discussion on ways to limit -- you know, I'm -- I know this is -- this in-fill. There is not going to be a way to do any one-to-one transition space, but has there been any discussion on ways that that could possibly limit -- be limited in terms of transition space down from five?

Heggie: Our strategy when we were looking at these was trying to keep the backyards to the backyard, so that the houses between them were as far away from each other as possible. That was our -- our strategy to mitigate it, just from the nature of the shape of the land and, then, having to have the -- those southern parcels that are a little bit larger and we have the existing homes to work around. The northern subdivision portion, the smaller lots, the -- the nature of the land kind of required that horseshoe shape and that's what lended to how the property -- how we are proposing it be subdivided, but, like I said, we did try and get as many backyards to backyards and -- I believe all of them are backyard to backyard and, then, the remaining part -- parcels in the center are just into each other. So, they are only going to be looking at themselves.

Smith: Thank you very much.

Lorcher: Okay. This time I think it's for real. Thank you.

Heggie: Thank you.

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

Garrett: So moved.

Stoll: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing for Item No. H-2025-0016, Farming -- Farrington Heights. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Lorcher: I'm a little torn on this one. Everybody has a right to sell their property and everybody has a right to buy their property and when you are walking into an in-fill situation it's always a square peg into a round hole. You have all been used to having open land around your properties for a very long time, but it's not yours. It belongs to

someone else and now it belongs to a developer and, you know, if that's where your -- your kids were playing that's great, but, you know, technically it belongs to someone else and they have a right to be able to develop and create it. We, as a governing body, look and see if it adheres to our future land use map, our development codes -- our Unified Development Codes and all of those kind of structural things. The density in this area is consistent with what the applicant is suggesting, but also understanding that you need to take a look at the whole picture and not just the parcel that is involved, because it is in-fill. I'm not comfortable with the two stories. I'm comfortable with the density, because it fits based on the current neighborhoods that surround it, but I agree that the two stories, especially on the west side and the north side to the single family home, would be cumbersome. City Council ultimately makes the decision on this, so we will have to see what they have to say. I appreciate the R-4 on the southern portion of it. I don't -- I know that the open space is not required, but I just don't think there is enough to create a buffer for the families that are east-west and north of this. So, at this point I think I would probably say no.

Garrett: You know, I'm looking at this and the other in-fill project we have had over the past couple of years. It's always a difficult situation trying to deal with in-fill. Now, in this case I happen to be in support of this application, because I -- I go by this site almost daily and I see the -- the issues and it is in-fill and you have got to try and build what will sell in a market to provide that type of housing for those people who want to buy homes and, you know, that not necessarily do they want big yards or -- or larger house or a larger situation and this fits their needs and so I'm -- I'm in support of it and I -- I understand it's in-fill and there is some current concerns with people who have lived there for a number of years and this is, obviously, going to be a change of lifestyle for some and, you know, for that I'm sorry, but these are the things that happen with in-fill projects and we have had a number of people who have come forward to -- with concerns, but there is just no way to get around an in-fill situation.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Yeah. I -- I -- I -- I'm a little torn, but I think I tend to fall closer to Commissioner Garrett. You know, if -- if you could, you know, pull up and you flip the sides and -- and flip the north and south of the properties, I think I'm -- I'm probably -- it's probably the easiest yes I have seen, you know. I -- I think having -- I think there is some issues created by the desire to retain those existing homes as part of the plan. That forces some of the density north and I understand, then, that's the developer's decision. I -- I think that creates some issues and I don't love everything about this, but I understand their reasoning. I understand the desire to kind of keep some of the variants and same thing with the five to one transition. While I don't love it I understand the desire to keep the actual housing buildings away from each other as much as possible. I -- I -- I -- I think I'm -- I'm inclined to support this and what -- one -- what's -- what the -- the thing that I think is -- is pushing me over the edge into support is kind of the -- the wise words of our former chairman Andy Seal. In-fill is always hard and, you know, if -- especially

with an in-fill project like this I think this is a naturally difficult plot of land to develop and I can see possible ways that a future project could be so much worse and I'm not -- not to say that this project is bad, but I think that, you know, while we have some concerns of this project I think there is a -- there are ways that can come to mind that are compliant with code that a project would be -- you have a lot more concerns for me, so -- and given the -- the density that -- yeah, they -- they would be afforded and things like that. And so I think I'm -- I'm inclined to support this. I do have concerns. I do wish -- you know, I -- I don't love the two story, but I understand the desire to use two story to keep the houses away from the other backyards of the neighbors as much as possible. I get that. And I personally -- you know, I -- I personally live in a -- in a place where my -- my house is one story and I have multiple two-story houses within, you know, a hundred feet of me -- or a hundred yards of me and it doesn't bother me. I understand there are people that it does bother, but I -- I do -- I do think that this is a net good for the community.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Stoll: Madam Chair, if I may?

Lorcher: Commissioner Stoll.

Stoll: I'm also torn on how to vote on this particular project. There is aspects of it that I do like. There is aspects of it that I don't like. I would caution everyone on making generalizations regarding density, that it all fits within a particular box or not. It doesn't -- density does not necessarily equate to high crime and degradation of property values and often cases it increases -- depending on the type of density that's put into place they actually can increase your property values. Many of the problems that were discussed earlier regarding traffic -- I drove Pine for 23 years and down Locust Grove to Pine for 23 years. It has its problems. It has certainly changed, but the problems as far as the accidents that have occurred are design issues and the -- where the location of the property fences are to the northeast -- northwest and driving speed and I say that based upon somebody that's been pulled over on that particular segment, but from a traffic standpoint the capacity is there to absorb 33 units on Pine and on Locust Grove and it's -- in itself it's not going to cause the issues. But I do have problem -- a problem with the transition from R-4 to R-15. It just doesn't -- especially two stories and the surrounding homes are one story. It just doesn't fit within that community. With that said, though, if you look at the mile radius, the density is occurring and I have heard from testimony that there is problems with some that have been approved and it doesn't necessarily equate that that's going to mean that there is going to be problems at this location. Growth is a challenge for us all as our Idaho way of life is changing and these particular properties that we have been used to for many years being open space, being developed and changing for us is frustrating. My own personal example -- I remember when we bought our property and we were living there and none of the houses were built yet and my wife loved to send out her dog to run on the various properties and, then, as the houses started building up she was getting frustrated with -- it's like what did you expect from development? It's going to -- it's going to happen. So,

I'm still not sure how I'm going to end up voting. I look forward to hearing -- I guess that's it.

Lorcher: Well, we will see if Commissioner Sandoval has any comments. Would you like to chime in on this or are you good?

Sandoval: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Sandoval.

Sandoval: Yeah. I -- I will chime in.

Lorcher: All right.

Sandoval: So, I had a lot of reservations initially and I still do have some, especially that there is -- those site maps and projections as far as line of sight and the screening provided, you know, that's a big concern of mine going from surrounding one story homes to two-story. The biggest hang up I have on this, however, is the open space and although it's not a requirement it's just under the threshold of five acres, it just doesn't make sense to me; right? And having a picnic table right next to the road equally doesn't make sense. I mean I understand there is other issues with drainage swales and placement of that, but there is just not enough open space in this project and while not a requirement I think we really need to consider that and when you look at the map and the surrounding areas, yeah, there may not be a lot of open space present in adjacent properties, but that's more of a reason why we should at least ask for it in this project. So, all in all with everything considered, especially with the open space, I would not be in favor of supporting this.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much. With that in mind, after considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend denial of File No. H-2025-0016 as presented during the hearing of August 7th, 2025, for the following reasons: The lack of buffer between the surrounding subdivisions for a one-to-one basis based on two story. The density going from R-4 to R-15 not being a smooth transition and I think I'm going to call it at that. So, the transition and the buffering and -- of the two story. Do I have a second?

Sandoval: Madam Chair, I'm not sure the procedural terms, but may I add on that motion to include the concerns with open space throughout the neighborhood.

Lorcher: Well, they are legally not required to have it, but you want -- you want me to put that part of the motion?

Sandoval: Well, I certainly think it should be a consideration, yes.

Lorcher: Okay. So, the buffer between -- okay. Let me try it one more time. One second.

Starman: Madam Chair, as you are making your notes there it might be helpful -- I'm kind of reluctant to jump in, but I do want to make one observation in terms of -- in relation to open space, for example, and what the city's code required or doesn't require. I just want to remind the -- the Commission and I would say the same thing to the City Council, but this is a property that's a little bit different in the sense that we have -- we have an existing development agreement and existing zoning and they are asking for an amendment to a development agreement and a change to zoning that would change from the DA. So, this is a situation where the city does have more flexibility, because a development agreement, essentially, is a contract and both parties have to be amenable to amending the contract and so this is not like a blank slate, we have an existing development agreement in place and so I will just offer that as some additional information for your consideration.

Lorcher: Okay. Let me try this again. After considering all staff and applicant and public testimony I move to deny File H-2025-0016 for the following reasons: The buffer between the existing house, which the applicant is proposing two story, to consider the position of the open space and the changing of zoning being too abrupt from R-4 to R-15.

Sandoval: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to deny File H-2025-0016. All those in favor say aye. All those against.

Garrett: Nay.

Smith: Nay.

Lorcher: So, we have a three to two, so the motion passes. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: THREE AYES. TWO NAYS. TWO ABSENT.

Lorcher: That application is done, so you may stay if you would like or if you don't have anything else you may go.

DEPARTMENT REPORTS [Action Item]

5. Adoption of Proposed Bylaws for the Planning and Zoning Commission

Lorcher: We do have Kurt to discuss some bylaws for the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission.

Starman: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. The City Council recently in the last -- earlier this calendar year made some -- some amendments to the Meridian City Code as it pertains to commissions and to committees. One of those

changes now requires each commission and committee to adopt bylaws. Up to this point the Planning and Zoning Commission has not adopted bylaws. So, that's the topic before you today. I will pause for a second.

Lorcher: Thank you for coming. Can you go outside, so we can finish our meeting? Thank you.

Starman: So, that's the purpose of our discussion this evening is that we now have an ordinance that requires the Commission to adopt bylaws. To help to try to facilitate that the city attorney's office sort of crafted some -- sort of a template that most commissions and commission -- committees could use and, then, we have kind of modified that a bit to satisfy specific needs. The purpose of the bylaws really is to supplement what's in the code. So, just as a reminder in the Meridian City Code there is already some detail in there in terms of the Planning and Zoning Commission. Qualifications to commissioners. How you are appointed. How vacancies are filled. Your duties. Your purpose. All that. And when you -- when do you meet? All that is in the existing Meridian City Code. The purpose of the bylaws would be to supplement that information and, really, if you had an opportunity to -- to scroll through the material it's fairly kind of some -- some basic -- information to basically run your meeting efficiently and to provide some kind of rules and parameters. I will just kind of summarize those very quickly. I know you had to -- you had them in your packet and I won't go into great -- I'm not going to read them and won't go into great detail, but, you know, essentially, talks about that the Commission will have officers, meaning the chair and vice-chair, as you do today and you have for many years. It talks about the -- the election of a chairperson and vice-chair each year. That's been your practice and also in the Meridian City Code for some time. So, that's not a deviation from what you have done historically and, then, it talks about whether there are vacancies for the officers. That's not a vacancy of a commissioner. So, when a commissioner vacancy occurs the Mayor makes an appointment subject to confirmation by the City Council. This is referring to when you -- when your officer positions become vacant. A chair position or vice-chair position. Article 3 talks about your meetings. How notices are provided. That really just codifies what you do today and what staff does today relative to noticing for meetings. What constitutes a quorum. That essentially codifies what you do today and what a quorum -- how a quorum is defined today. There is no deviation from your historical practices. How meetings are conducted and how agendas are structured, again, follows very closely what you have done historically as well. It talks about when -- this is kind of a rare thing, but every now and again we will have a request or maybe there is a request on the part of a commissioner or the Commission as a whole to have a special presentation or someone wants to make a presentation to the committee or Commission. Last one I recall was maybe within the past six months or so a member -- I think of our Arts Commission wanted to make a presentation. That would be an example. This basically says that's at the chair's discretion you can set some rules and parameters for timing to run an efficient meeting, but really nothing -- nothing really out of the normal from what you have done historically, although that's kind of a rare situation. It talks about minutes, which really, again, just codifies current practice where the clerk's office prepares minutes. They are provided to you timely. They are, you

know, reviewed and approved by you as they are today. It talks about Commissioners are entitled to one vote and clarifies as we have had this discussion with Commissioner Lorcher and others overtime about whether the chair -- I think there is some confusion sometimes about this whether the chair can make a motion or whether the chair can vote. I think that confusion kind of stems from -- in the case of the Mayor and the City Council, that's a little different situation where the Mayor is not a member of the City Council. The Mayor is directly elected. The Council is the City Council. So, the Mayor chairs the meeting, but the Mayor is not a member of the Council and only cast a vote when there is a tie. That differs from the Planning and Zoning Commission where you all are members of the Commission, including Chairperson Lorcher and you are entitled to vote and you are entitled to make motions and, you know, fully participate as any other commissioner would participate. That just simply codifies that and makes that more clear on a going forward basis. So, there is nothing quite really earth shaking here, but the idea we have to comply now with the revised Meridian City Code. I think this is pretty straightforward. If the Commission is inclined to adopt the bylaws tonight or on a going forward basis ultimately they are subject to City Council review and approval before they become final, but I'm happy to answer any questions you might have about the bylaws. If there are no questions or if you feel comfortable with them, my request would be that you -- I would ask for a motion and a vote to approve the bylaws. If you feel like you need some more time there is no time sensitivity to it. If you want to think about it for a few weeks or you have some questions you want me to come back later that's okay, too. But if you think it makes sense I would recommend that you act on them tonight and approve the bylaws. Happy to answer any questions you might have.

Lorcher: Commissioners, everybody had a chance to review the document -- the bylaws? Can I get a yes or no? Commissioner Sandoval? Commissioner Sandoval, you have not had a chance to look at them?

Sandoval: I have not. Could we table this until the next scheduled meeting?

Lorcher: Commissioner Stoll, you said you did look at them?

Stoll: I -- I did look at them. I had one question.

Lorcher: Okay. Hold on to that for a second. Commissioner Garrett, did you have a chance to review them?

Garrett: Yes.

Lorcher: All right. And how about Commissioner Smith?

Smith: Yes, I have.

Lorcher: Commissioner Stoll, would you like to give your question?

Stoll: Madam Chair, Kurt, I would just like to say, number one, well written and the only question I had was is it in city code somewhere about the annual -- there's a reference to the annual meeting where we have the election of the chair and the vice-chair. Is that in city code that the annual meeting will occur on this date or --

Starman: Thank you, Madam Chair. Commissioner Stoll, my recollection -- I might be able to find it if I take a moment. My recollection it does talk about a reorganization at the beginning of the calendar year. It doesn't specify a particular date, like January 1st, but it does talk about your first meeting in January, if my memory serves me correctly.

Stoll: In the city code?

Starman: Yes.

Stoll: Okay. And let me -- as you ponder whether you want to continue the item for a little bit, I will -- I will see if I can make -- I will see if I can confirm that real quick for you.

Stoll: That's the only issue I had as far as -- that needed to be clarified or not. Otherwise I'm fine with the --

Starman: I think I will just add just for clarity is that we -- and we have had this situation before, so just because you reorganize and select a chair and vice-chair each year doesn't mean you have to make a change. You can have the same chair go for two years or three years or longer for that matter. Same for vice-chair. So, there is no requirement that you -- you or any other commission or committee make a change. It says that you -- you sort of have to ask that question again each year and make a decision.

Lorcher: I don't remember doing that after the first of the year, but it doesn't mean it didn't happen. I mean, you know, I -- I'm sure I said, yes, I'm in for another year, but -- and I'm sure Jared said the same thing, so -- but, Jared, do you remember that happening?

Smith: Not entirely, Madam Chair, but I think -- I think it might have been -- I'm trying to remember when Andy left and if that might have had something to do at the time.

Lorcher: That's possible as well, because he -- he -- I don't -- was it -- was it 2025 or 2024? I guess he left in the spring of '25. I don't know.

Starman: Madam Chair, I will say that I don't recall off the top of my head, but if it's of interest to the Commission we could go back to the minutes and confirm or not, but I will -- I will say I did find that the code sections I will just read that very quickly. So, whether we did or not is a different story, but I will confirm that the code requires us to do so. So, if we didn't shame on us, but the -- the -- the current language basically says at the first meeting of each calendar year each statutory commission, which includes Planning and Zoning, shall elect a chair and vice-chair.

Lorcher: I will say that Commissioner Seal stepped down in 2024, because he knew he was moving. So, I have been chair longer than just January of '25. Does that makes sense? So, he was a commissioner and he left in the spring, because he moved to Eagle. But he stepped down as commissioner last spring -- last summer -- last fall, something like that. So, I have been -- that was his choice, so -- the only reason I'm hesitant to vote on it tonight is Commissioner Perreault and Commissioner Rust are not here and they have not indicated one way or another if they had any questions or concerns and the fact that Commissioner Sandoval did not have a chance to review it. So, I think when we meet for the next time to vote on it at the next meeting and when Tina sends out the notes for the meeting to request that everybody be ready to vote on the bylaw minutes and that way nobody -- none of the Commissioners feel like they are excluded. Does that make sense?

Starman: It does, Madam -- Madam Chair. It makes sense and, like I said, there is no particular time sensitivity, so that's perfectly fine to put on the agenda again in two weeks for -- potentially for final action. That's perfectly fine.

Lorcher: Yes. So, when we send out the applications for the August 21st meeting, Tina, if you can add an extra line saying that we will be voting on the bylaws and that if they are not in attendance they -- they either choose to defer their vote because they are not in attendance or if they have any other questions that maybe they can e-mail you directly. Is that fair?

Starman: Madam Chair, that would be fine. If any of the Commissioners, including those in attendance tonight, have questions, you know, individual, I'm happy to -- to answer any questions that may come up in the interim. So that sounds fine.

Lorcher: Okay. And, Commissioner Sandoval, you can find the document at the bottom of the agenda that was sent to you in your e-mail. It's -- at bottom it has a hyperlink that you can look at.

Sandoval: Thank you, Madam Chair. I must have missed it.

Lorcher: Yeah. Yeah. It's kind of hidden at the bottom. Okay. Thank you very much. Before we adjourn -- or ask for the one more motion, for the next meeting Jared will be chairing. I will be a commissioner online. I can't make it in person, but it's too complicated to chair when I'm not physically in the building. So, Commissioner Smith, you are good to take care of this by law portion of it; correct?

Smith: Madam Chair, yes. And, then, for the August 4th, 5th meeting -- the first meeting in August I most likely also -- September. Gosh. I did that twice. Okay. The first meeting in September I will also most likely not be here. I haven't finalized my plan, but that's a travel day for me, but I will know by the next meeting for sure and Jared will manage that one as well. With that in mind can I get one more motion, please.

Stoll: Move to adjourn.

Garrett: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to adjourn. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much. See you in two.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:20 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS.)

APPROVED

MARIA LORCHER - CHAIRMAN

_____|_____|_____
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK