

Grove: In that case I second.

McCarvel: Okay. It has been moved and seconded to approve H-2020-0124 and I believe we will take a roll call vote.

Roll call: McCarvel, yea; Holland, absent; Cassinelli, abstain; Seal, nay; Grove, yea; Yearsley, yea; Lorcher, nay.

McCarvel: Okay. Well, motion passes and I believe City Council will have all of our notes and we will move on from there.

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

6. Public Hearing for Compass Pointe Subdivision (H-2020-0100) by A-Team Land Consultants, Located at the Southwest Corner of E. Victory Rd. and S. Locust Grove Rd.

- A. Request: Annexation and Zoning of 7.69 acres of land with a request for the R-15 zoning district.
- B. Request: A Preliminary Plat consisting of 48 residential building lots and 9 common lots on approximately 4.69 acres of land in the R-15 zoning district.
- C. Request: A Planned Unit Development for the purpose of reducing the rear setback of the R-15 zoning district for a portion of the development due to site constraints.

McCarvel: In that case we will move on to the public hearing for H-2020-0100, Compass Pointe Subdivision and we will begin with the staff report.

Dodson: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. As noted the next one is Compass Pointe Subdivision. It is located in the southwest corner -- right. Yes. Southwest. Southwest corner of Locust Grove and Victory Road. The site consists of 7.69 acres of land and the project was first heard by Planning and Zoning Commission in December 3rd of last year. The Commission recommended denial of the project at that time. Following this recommendation the applicant made a request to the Council to be remanded back to P&Z with a revised plat and open space pursuant to the comments made within the staff report, as well as by the Commissioners. The City Council agreed with this request and remanded the project back. That's why we are here tonight. The main changes made by the applicant following that recommendation of denial related to the number of units, the road layout, the amount of usable open space and the applicant is also no longer requesting a planned unit development. Therefore, the applicant is requesting annexation and zoning of 7.69 acres of land with a request for R-15 zoning, a preliminary plat consisting of 38 lots -- building lots and ten common lots on approximately 4.69 acres and, then, private streets for the road access for the development. That also

requires an alternative compliance request, because the private streets will connect directly to an arterial street. The proposed uses are all single family residential, but in multiple forms. Attached townhomes, which are triplexes, attached duplexes, and four single family detached homes as well. The project is proposed with a density of 4.94 dwelling units per acre and a net density of 9.8 dwelling units per acre, which is lower than the previous submittal. The applicant is proposing to construct private streets within the development of 24 feet wide, with five foot attached sidewalk on at least one side of the street throughout the project. As seen the main thoroughfare through this site has sidewalk on both sides of the street, which is not required with private streets. At the north end of the main street within the development, which is Compass Lane, the applicant is proposing an emergency only access out to Victory Road. This access is required if more than 30 homes are to be constructed. The proposed access for this development is to Locust Grove and lines up with East Coastline Street on the east side of Locust Grove, which was the access into the Trade Winds Subdivision and a future subdivision further east of that. Yes, the access point into the development does not meet ACHD's district policy, but they are modifying their policy to accommodate the access, as this is the only place that they can take access to the -- I should say if they took access off Victory it would be even less compliant with ACHD policy as to the acute triangle we have here. Therefore, again, ACHD is modifying their policies to allow this access as that is the most logical and safest place for an access to Locust Grove. There are no other public street stubs to this property from anywhere, mostly because the abutting site constraints, which are the two arterial streets and the Ten Mile Creek, which there is no bridge or even a pedestrian bridge over the creek. The site, as I noted, is a triangle shape, bordered on two sides by the arterial streets and the Ten Mile Creek. As noted, again, there is no opportunity for future road connectivity and that's why ACHD and the city find it applicable for private streets to be used within the development. City code requires that private streets are going to be used in either a MEW or gated community. The applicant has proposed a gate, which can be seen here, sort of, that meets code requirements and exceeds the distance away from the right of way as required. Code requires minimum 50 feet and this is well within that -- well beyond. There is a gray area here. Staff did recommend changing this to a turnaround, instead of the parking. So, basically, remove the parking and allow this area to be a turnaround area in case people accidentally pull into the subdivision, pull into this access and cannot turn around adequately on the private street and they can't get through the gate, because they are not part of the community. The applicant did submit revised plans showing this, which staff does appreciate. The proposed private streets are not wide enough to accommodate any on-street parking, as they are only 24 feet wide. However, the applicant is proposing to construct additional off-street parking along the main street as seen on the plat. There are no multi-use pathways proposed or required with the development. However, the applicant is proposing a five foot wide pathway on this side of the creek and behind the proposed homes. This pathway connects to the private streets at the southern end of the project and to the common open space a lot in the center of the development, as well as north closer to Victory. Staff recommended an additional pedestrian connection to the sidewalks, the arterial sidewalks, specifically that on Locust Grove, be constructed from this -- the revised layout, which is here, this new loop. Connect those sidewalks there. Which as seen the applicant has done that with their revised plans. There is no existing

sidewalk along Victory or Locust Grove. Both arterial streets are scheduled to be widened as part of -- sorry. As a part of the roundabout project at this intersection beginning this year. According to ACHD with the roundabout project the applicant is required to dedicate additional right of way for the intersection and future widening of both roads. ACHD is requiring the applicant to enter into a road trust for the sidewalk improvements -- the arterial sidewalk improvements that are adjacent to the site, since they will be constructed with the widening project and with -- if they were constructed with this project they would end up being torn out and, then, we would be spending duplicate money. I wanted to show you this map here, which I usually don't show for Commission, but just to show when the timeline is for all this. It has also come to my attention that the intersection project for the roundabout at Victory and Locust Grove does extend all the way south to the bridge, which abuts -- the bridge over the Ten Mile Creek, which abuts the property directly to the south and that bridge will also be widened, which should help with a lot of different pedestrian safety issues along the bridge there. That gets very skinny. A minimum of ten percent qualified open space meeting UDC standards is required. According to the property size, the applicant should supply at least .77 acres of qualified open space or approximately 33,500 square feet. The applicant is proposing 3.9 acres of open space, of which 3.4 is shown as qualifying on their submitted open space exhibit, which is, obviously, vastly more than the minimum requirement. However, some of the areas listed on the open space exhibit by the applicant as qualifying does not meet UDC standards due to their not being the -- those areas not being at least 5,000 square feet or not being anywhere near the 50 by 100 dimension. So, staff does have some discretion as to whether we need every single qualified open space to be exactly 50 by 100 at least or if there are some odd shapes allowing those to be qualified if they are greater than 5,000 square feet. For example, the open space lot surrounding this is not very usable, because it abuts an arterial and has parking and homes. So, staff finds that that area is not qualifying, but this area is, because it is over 5,000 square feet and is more usable and a safer area for residents. Once the areas are removed from the qualified open space exhibit that are not qualifying -- the qualified open space is approximately 2.97 acres. More importantly, the open space for this development is largely made up of the Ten Mile Creek, which is over two acres in size, and the arterial street buffers, which are 19,000 square feet of qualifying area. All of this area is qualifying, but the Ten Mile Creek will be left natural and will be a buffer and more of a visual amenity than usable open space. Abutting the creek and generally mid block with a micro path through it, the applicant is proposing an open space lot that is approximately 5,700 square feet. It contains one set of the amenities and the micro path as noted and connects to the private street -- well, the sidewalks, as well as to the open space lot directly east of it as noted before here. The 3,700 square foot open space lot is the most active and usable open space lot within the development. In general the applicant has increased the usable open space areas throughout the -- throughout the site following the Commission's recommendation of denial. With the reduction in unit count and additional centralized open space, staff finds the proposed open space not only in excess of code, but also as an improvement from -- from previous layouts. Applicant submitted conceptual elevations for the proposed attached single family homes for both the duplexes and the triplexes. They are not required for the detached single family homes. They do not require design review. The submitted elevations show all two story attached structures with two car garages and

finishing materials of wood and stone, as well as stucco. In addition, the elevations show modern architecture with shed roofs, secondary -- second story patios with glass railings and stone accents that go from grade all the way to the roofline, which is actually pretty uncommon. Attached single family homes do require design review prior to obtaining building permits. Therefore, staff will ensure compliance with the architectural standards manual when those applications are submitted. Since the previous meeting the applicant has provided conceptual elevations of the proposed units offering different designs and color combinations than previously seen. There were 41 pieces of written testimony submitted for the project the first time this came through and the general concerns were regarding the proposed density, the amount of open space, school overcrowding, and traffic issues with additional homes in this area. The neighborhood also had issues with the proposed access to Locust Grove and there only being one access for the development, which I hope I answered sufficiently due to there not being any other place to access this. After I sent the outline there were a few pieces of public testimony that outlined some of the same issues as well from neighbors. With all these comments and notes, staff does recommend approval of the subject applications with the conditions listed and with the inclusion -- the requirement I should say of a DA and those provisions within the staff report. And I will stand for questions.

McCarvel: Any questions for staff?

Grove: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Grove.

Grove: Joe, with the revised plan -- I hadn't seen that until just now. Did that significantly change anything in your report? It does look like, you know, a bit different with the -- that central Island and, then, some of the open space that they have used.

Dodson: Commissioner Grove, as far as numbers and data, no. Nothing that's going to make them noncompliant that's for sure. All of the proposed lot sizes still meet the minimum dimensional standards and it did reorient the lots in the center, which, frankly, I think is an improvement and kind of breaks up the monotony of all of that. They are not all going the same direction now. It did reduce that central open space lot here just slightly, but I didn't touch on this enough the first time through, but there are no fences between any of these homes, so it will look and function a lot more like a multi-family project in the sense that there is -- none of this area -- I can't find my pointer. None of this area will be fenced off. They will just have the open patios. So, all of this area will still technically be out there and open with landscaping. But I guess -- sorry, I'm rambling. In short, no, it shouldn't affect anything and they actually responded to all of my conditions of approval.

McCarvel: Any other questions?

Cassinelli: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Cassinelli.

Cassinelli: Joe, does the -- does the density fit with a -- with the current R-8 in there? Is this -- or does it fit with R-15?

Dodson: Commissioner Cassinelli, the density is tied to the future land use, not the zoning, and it is three to eight dwelling units per acre and it's actually on the lower half of that now with the reduced lot sizes at least in gross. Again, that's what our densities are based off of. The net density once you take out the creek and you take out the roads and the arterial buffers, it does bump it up to 9.8 or so I think I said, which is still significantly less than what it was, which is in response to a lot of the comments received the first time through.

Cassinelli: Okay. But the gross density is what that's -- it's tied to the gross, not the net?

Dodson: Yes, sir.

Cassinelli: Okay. And, then, I also had another question. You were mentioning on the private -- with the private streets, the MEWs. Can you -- can you reiterate those comments and how those tie together?

Dodson: Yes, sir. Commissioner Cassinelli, Members of the Commission, so when you have a private street application, they -- the code requires that the development be either a MEW development or a gated community. This applicant chose to go with the gated community as a private street development. So, they meet the code and at the director level are approved for the private streets. The MEWs, for those who do not know, are like paseos or vistas through units. Theoretically you could say they have a MEW here, but usually there is -- they are wider and more active than this. But other than that they don't have MEWs and that's okay, because they have the gate and that makes them compliant with code.

Cassinelli: Okay. Thank you.

Dodson: You are welcome.

McCarvel: Okay. Would the applicant like to speak?

Arnold: Yes. Can you hear me?

McCarvel: Yes. Please state your name and address for the record.

Arnold: Yeah. I'm going to share my screen real quick if I may. It says I can't start screen share.

McCarvel: Madam Clerk, do we need to give him extra permission for that?

Weatherly: We just stopped screen sharing on our end. It should update now.

McCarvel: Okay. Okay. Thank you. Go ahead and try again.

Arnold: Can you see my screen now?

McCarvel: Yes.

Arnold: Okay. My name is Steve Arnold. I'm with A Team Land Consultants. Business address is 1785 Whisper Cove, Boise. 83709. I would kind of like to -- I will go into some of the larger elements of our redesign and, then, I will get into a lot of the specifics of what we did change up. It was stated that we are asking for 38 lots, but when we made this change here -- I'm assuming you can see my arrow.

McCarvel: Yes.

Arnold: Once we did this -- this was a staff recommendation to get rid of the two dead-end streets here. So, as soon as we did that it -- it caused us to lose a lot. So, what you have before you tonight is 37 lots. So, this was probably -- this was the main change after we submitted to the city and we agreed with staff to do that, along with turnarounds, the gate, and, you know, all the additional sidewalk changes. That was probably the most significant, along with dropping down from 48 to 37 lots. Again, this was the original that the Planning and Zoning Commission denied, and, again, we went to City Council and asked to be remanded back to staff. This -- I know one of the concerns was that we -- we were going to get a lot of massing of buildings along the front. So, one of the things we did is basically wiggle or make S curves in the road and that really changed the -- the -- the massing of the buildings and, again, you know, as -- as Joe stated, this project will come back before the Commission -- excuse me -- the Council has a design review -- or I believe that might even be staff level. So, this is at the entrance off Locust Grove looking north. To give you an idea of the -- the way it's going to look with the -- the massing and notice we got rid of the ugly orange. So, that's not the proposed -- actually, that was a mistake that we had submitted. All of the earth tones will be used in here. This is an image from the northern side looking south and this also gives you another representation of how our building orientation is going to look and you can see that one of the things that staff was looking for was -- is our crosswalks and that there is a condition in there that Joe and I spoke about earlier that we are looking to get modified. This is a view just kind of looking north kind of in the center of the project. Give you an idea of the park and how it is going to orient. But, again, it also gives you some feel of how the buildings are and how the massing is going to change with the different meandering of the road. Here is in the park looking east towards the -- the opposite side of the park. Again, you can see the -- the raised crosswalks that we will have and, then, the -- the -- the different massing of the buildings. Excuse me. We have read through all the conditions of approval and we have concurred with staff and, actually, the revised map that got sent to staff today has incorporated all the requested changes. One change to the -- a couple conditions and it's -- we are not asking that they be deleted, but I think they were -- after talking with staff these were the changes that we have kind of agreed to. The top condition states, you

know, all sidewalks and -- and -- well, I think was a mistake or maybe not intended that -- so, in speaking with staff we are requesting that it be all pedestrian crossings within the subdivision be constructed with either pavers, stamped concrete, or raised striped asphalt or similar to clearly delineate. So, it's, essentially, we are going to do normal sidewalk and, then, at the crossings we will have something that delineates them and, then, it's also stated in this other condition. So, again, we are just asking that it be associated just with the crossings. Basically all the modifications to the map from the last time that you guys reviewed this -- our building lots went from 48 to 37 lots. The density -- again that's the gross density -- went from 6.24 to 4.8 and in doing so we eliminated the need for a PUD. We also increased the housing variety, so when we wiggled the road around we got rid of the majority of the triplexes on the east side of Compass Lane. So, we increased with some single families and some towns throughout the -- the entire project and actually there is a place where I think we can actually include, without losing anything, two more single families. So, we are going to probably end up breaking up one of the duplexes. And one of the things that was brought up at our original meeting it looked like a couple of our lots were an afterthought or I guess the buildings were an afterthought. So, we got rid of those odd shaped housing units. If you don't mind I will scroll up real quick. So, these -- these areas here and right here we eliminated. So, we got rid of those types. We increased our open spaces, like Joe said, and it went from 35 to .68 percent with nearly three acres of qualified and which is 44 -- we went from 35 to 44 percent. With the increased open space we did add the dog park to the north and an additional central park as noted by staff. Roadways. We will eliminated the two ends and created a lollipop or what is also known as a loop roadway design and, then, again, we added the S turns in the -- the north-south road and breaking up the massing. Sidewalk, which was -- we went from 2,094 feet to 3,205 -- point five feet, which I have stated before in front of several commissions sidewalk is your most used amenity in any subdivision. So, we really focused on our connectivity. The sidewalk along the Ten Mile Creek, which, by the way, you know, is -- we had concerns -- or neighborhood concern about the safety of children. Well, as you can see we are going to put four foot open vision fencing on the west side of that pathway to decrease those concerns. Then, again, as noted we added the gated entry and added a turnaround at the gate as requested and added pedestrian crossings, so that we can get clear pedestrian circulation throughout the development. So, basically, all the requested changes from staff in the staff report we have met. There are maps that were sent out today. I guess in conclusion you guys have seen this project once before. We believe it conforms to the city code and the comp plan and we basically made all the staff recommended changes. We have taken in the neighborhood concerns about the density and greatly reduced it from 50 to 48, now down to 37. Something to keep in mind -- and I know Joe's touched basically -- a little bit on it -- that the zoning request is not for the density. We are kind of at the low end of the R-8 zoning designation density, but the zoning is mainly so that we can create smaller lots and still have an open field with the adjacent landscaping, but go down to those reduced dimensional setbacks, so that we can get this product type that we are putting there. There has been I know -- and the neighbors at our last meeting there was a lot of discussion about multi-family housing. Well, the whole idea of why we are doing this -- the way we are doing it on their own -- their own lots -- so each home will be on their own lot and have the ability to be sold off. So, these aren't multi-family. These are for sale. We believe it to be compatible,

especially with the Ten Mile Creek being a divider and all of the adjacent roadways around us. We have -- I believe we got most of your concerns from our previous meeting and made the changes -- the maps accordingly. One of the big one was open space. That was a concern back in December and we have -- as stated by staff, it's been very greatly increased. And something to keep in mind, you know, the -- the developer here is the builder and will be building the units for sale. So, it behooves them to build a quality product, because they are in this until the unit sells. So, I -- we plan on putting a nice quality home. As you have seen by some of the images, minus the color, but our plan is to build nice quality. The square foot of the homes will actually be very compatible with what is in the surrounding area. The only thing that is different is, again, we are putting it on a smaller lot and that smaller lot will be owned and maintained by the HOA. So, we will have conformity of landscape maintenance, et cetera. This is -- you know, again, we are providing a mix of housing type, which is consistent with Comprehensive Plan policies. We got single family, town -- townhomes and triplexes, which we believe is in huge demand. Our housing market right now -- we also work in the field of real estate, but our housing market -- the real estate and the demand that's occurring right now is -- is kind of scary, because we are actually pricing all of our local people out and it's because there isn't a demand. So, we believe that this product type is in a huge demand and the area needs it. We are dealing, as staff has stated, with a very difficult site. It's got a lot of constraints with the roundabout, the Ten Mile Creek, and -- and the -- the other arterial road. We believe we have hit the highest and best use for it. We have tried to meet all of staff's recommendations and we have tried to meet all the -- the Commission's concerns in our modification. In that we will ask for approval and I will stand for questions.

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

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: Can we see the -- the amendments that you wanted to make to the staff report? I would like to see that slide one more time. Yep. If you would just leave that up that would be perfect. Thank you.

McCarvel: Okay. Any other questions for the applicant?

Cassinelli: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Yeah. Commissioner Cassinelli.

Cassinelli: I know -- I want to see those. Hopefully every -- everybody has had a chance to see that slide. I wonder if, Steve, if you could put a plat map up or if you don't have it, staff, do you have that?

Arnold: I can pull this -- this up.

Cassinelli: Okay. Was there -- the Fire Department was okay with turnaround access. I'm looking at that -- at the -- at the dead end there to the upper right. What about -- what about trash access there? Is there a central trash or is it individual cans?

Arnold: They are going to be individual cans.

Cassinelli: Is that -- is there going to be a -- that's not a turnaround, that's parking up there; is that correct? That little -- that little cut out?

Arnold: Yes. That is proposed as parking.

Cassinelli: So, trash, will they have -- will they be able to maneuver up in there?

Arnold: They will back up a maximum of 150 feet, which is the same with Fire, and that's what we have got here. We also could require these homeowners to bring their garbage out over -- over on this side, if it's the Commission's direction, to lessen the distance that they back.

Cassinelli: And, then, finally, if I could, how much -- the -- those parking cut outs, it looks like there is two of them. How many spots total do you have set up for that remote parking?

Arnold: Boy, it's on my plat. Let me --

Dodson: Commissioner Cassinelli, it should be nine with the removal of the ones outside of the gate.

Arnold: Correct.

Cassinelli: Nine -- nine spots interior? Okay. Thanks.

Arnold: Madam Chairman, just -- but there is -- was a staff requirement and I -- I apologize, I think we missed one of your requirements, Joe, that -- I believe you asked for additional parking in here.

Dodson: That is correct. We are at the one further south. I said you had room to add more along that. The one that has the six, you can add at least two more.

Arnold: And we will comply with that.

McCarvel: Any other questions for the applicant?

Lorcher: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Lorcher.

Lorcher: Mr. Arnold, along the Ten Mile Creek, just so I'm seeing this right, so are those backyards with a fence going across it or is that the front of the house with landscaping and that -- so, the -- are the driveways in front?

Arnold: Madam Chair, Commissioner, yes, the driveways are in front. Our thought here initially would be just to have a fence on the west side of this pathway and it would be an open field and a backyard.

Lorcher: And would it be a solid fence or what -- I think you said it was going to be like a wrought iron fence, so they can see through or not see through?

Arnold: See through.

Lorcher: Okay. So, they will be able to see through to whatever this space is that the irrigation company maintains in Ten Mile Creek; is that right?

Arnold: That's correct.

Lorcher: And, then, just out of curiosity what's on the other side? Are those -- are those existing homes?

Arnold: These are existing homes. That's correct.

Lorcher: And do they -- what kind of -- do you know what kind of fencing they have? Is that solid or is it --

Arnold: It's a wooden fence here and a chain link fence here.

Lorcher: Okay.

Arnold: And it's -- this is six foot here and I believe this is about a five foot chain link.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Dodson: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Yes, Joe.

Dodson: Sorry. Thank you. Commissioner Lorcher, just to give you a little more background on that, too. There is a -- the code requires that the fencing along the creek be open vision, so that there is added safety to -- you know, if somebody falls in or anything like that that you can see, as well as the -- it's what the irrigation district wants as well. They don't want any kind of six foot fence abutting their easement. So, they -- that's why our requirement is four foot wrought iron or open vision --

Lorcher: Thank you.

Dodson: -- whatever that might be. Material that --

Lorcher: Okay.

McCarvel: Any other questions for the applicant? Okay. Madam Clerk, do we have anybody signed up to testify on this application?

Weatherly: Madam Chair, we do. In house we have Rhonda Unruh.

McCarvel: Okay. Please come forward and state your name and address for the record.

Unruh: Thank you. My name is Rhonda Unruh and I'm at 3246 South Murlo Way.

McCarvel: Okay.

Unruh: Wrong one. Sorry.

McCarvel: The floor is yours.

Unruh: Rhonda Unruh at 3246 South Murlo Way.

McCarvel: Okay. Thank you.

Unruh: Yeah. Thank you, Madam Chairman and the rest of the Council Members. I did not see the new plat map that came out. I have printed out a previous aerial -- aerial map before they changed and I was going to make the point, but that's been changed a little bit that when you look at this aerial map and the old -- the previous plat map, it looks as if this is the last piece of property in Meridian and we are trying to cram as much as we can, so that we can accommodate the growth of Meridian and by doing that I don't know if any of you have ever driven that -- through that intersection in the morning or in the afternoon, but that is a very high traffic area. It's backed up on all four roads and the thought of putting this many more cars on one exit and entryway trying to get into traffic that's sitting there already doesn't make sense to me and that's not even mentioning the northwest corner that has a proposed development there. That one I don't have a problem with, because for the acreage that's there and the proposed amount of residential units that are being built there, it makes sense and it works with the future planning of a circle. But by jamming all of these here in an area and as the developer was mentioning himself, now what do you do with trash? What do you do with the fire trucks if there is an emergency? Well, they have to go in and they got to backup. I don't see the safety being addressed here. And several points -- I have many others, but no time. With this new proposal he's just showed tonight I do have a question. Does this bring this down from an R-15 high density to what we are calling a medium high density? If it's still considered high density, I went onto the City of Meridian -- their premier community -- the website that describes what a premier community -- community is and what we would like for the City of Meridian and, yes, we do want diversity in our neighborhoods, but it does state immediately after that description -- and I quote: High density housing must be

strategically located to public transportation, community services and employment areas. End quote. If this is still considered a high density housing, when you look at the map of this area we don't have any of that in this vicinity. So, to me this says an R-15 doesn't fit here according to what is written in your own premier community site. Thank you.

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

Weatherly: Madam Chair, next is Stan Unruh.

McCarvel: Okay. Thank you.

S.Unruh: I'm Stan Unruh. Address is 3246 South Murlo Way in Meridian. You might have guessed I'm related to the previous person. I just wanted to touch on a point that she made about the traffic and I wondered if you can -- if it's possible to put the plat back up there. And I just wanted to -- to revisit the concern. There it is. Yes. ACHD has already acknowledged the difficulty of this location and I want to just touch on that a little bit more and ask the Planning Commission to query them further about the difficulty of traffic entering in and out here, because we have potentially two car -- probably, you know, in the neighborhood of 70 vehicles being parked in this development and with only one exit it will come out right where the road narrows down -- after the roads are widened -- after Locust Grove is widened it will -- the exit will come right out where it narrows down. This is already a high density, high traffic area. The traffic is already backed up in the mornings probably to where that exit is. Our house looks toward that circle -- our back -- our backyard faces that circle and we can see the traffic backed up there every morning and so what I believe likely will happen is that residents coming out of this development will find it very very difficult to cross and head north on Locust Grove and so naturally what I would do if I were them would instead turn right and, then, do an additional right turn and come down Murlo Way and so I believe likely what will happen is by approving this development what we are doing is -- is creating a situation where it will be most natural and easiest for the traffic to flow through our neighborhood, where we have kids on the corner of Ascaino and Victory waiting to get on buses. So, there is kids all over that neighborhood. The neighbor -- it's a quiet neighborhood now and I believe what we are actually approving is to have traffic just blazing through our neighborhood and so my -- my request is just that the Planning Commission revisit this with ACHD and have a look at that and make a -- try to understand that intersection a little bit better, because I believe we are going to create an unsafe situation in that neighborhood. Secondly, I would just point out that through this whole process there has been a lot of resistance to this development from the neighborhood. It is not anti-development, it is just asking for a reasonable zoning for the -- for the development and with the changes it appears that they have reduced the density down to what the neighbors have asked, but I think -- if I understand right really what is going on is that this developer owns the canal area, which is -- increases the size of property, so by math it appears to be a lower density than what it really is. The fact of the matter is this is very high density housing that does not fit any -- the neighborhoods in any direction from there. However, because of the property that's owned with the canal -- it appears to be low density and I appreciate your listening. Thanks.

McCarvel: Thank you.

Weatherly: Madam Chair, next is John Buckner.

McCarvel: Thank you.

Buckner: Good evening. Thank you, Madam Chairman, and thank you for having me here, Planning and Zoning Commission. I just want to restate -- well, I'm sorry.

McCarvel: Mr. Buckner, could -- yeah. State your name and address, please.

Buckner: John Buckner. I'm at 3877 South Picasso and I am not related to the two previous speakers. Just to reiterate, I am pro-development. I'm not anti-development. I am just for pro-development that makes sense. As has already been reiterated many times, sticking up for R-15 zoning density right in the middle of R-4s and R-8s and low to medium density zoning just does not make any sense. I would like to see the application changed for rezoning to no more than R-8 and a redesign of the apartment style townhomes that doesn't fit in with the rest of the character of the community. I want to thank the support of the Planning and Zoning Commission during December for just your words. This includes especially Steven Yearsley, who said the developers do their work and, then, leave the community to pick up the pieces. Also Bill Parsons, who acknowledged the 45 e-mails sent by members of the community, as well as you, Mr. Seal, and Lisa Holland and as well Mr. Grove, who said that he wants to like it, but it's isolated from the neighborhood. The members of the P&Z Commission unanimously and with -- with agreement of the 2019 Comprehensive Plan, that while the designs look nice they do not fit the character of the neighborhood. This conflicts with Action Item 5.01.02E that to support and protect the identity of the existing residential neighborhoods. The apartment as conjoined units differ drastically from the surrounding neighborhoods. This also conflicts with 3.07.00, which says to encourage compatible use and site design to minimize conflicts and maximize use of land and as stated by the P&Z staff, quote: The proposed development is not like any of the detached single family homes adjacent to the subject site. Like Commissioner Grove said, it's not like the configuration of the surrounding density. The design does not allow for safe and efficient access by public services as commented by Mr. Seal. It conflicts with 3.08.01A that states -- or that says to require the development projects have planned for the efficient provision of all public services as was recently just being discussed, the concerns about vehicles being able to navigate properly throughout the private streets. The applicant has also failed to meet the requirement for off-site parking. This conflicts with UDC 11-3C-6, which requires off-street parking required and according to the application this was not met and I have not seen any evidence to date to show that they have satisfied this requirement. Related to this is also the fact that the conceptual designs look nice, but the parking garages, if you look carefully, they only allow for two cars and the character and general combinations of the diverse homes that are already in our community allow at least four trucks and SUVs. This development will not. This also further compounds the issues brought up previously by the Planning and Zoning Commission that if people use their garages for storage that will compound the issues of mass and traffic. Again I want to state that I'm pro-

development that is reasonable and that makes sense and I would like to address you, Mr. Arnold. You said earlier in January that we are in it for the long haul. I respectfully would like to say, Mr. Arnold, no, you and Butler Realty are in it for the short term. We are in it for the long haul, because we will be stuck with the consequences. Please work with us and let's do this together. Thank you.

Weatherly: Madam Chair, next we have Julie Edwards online. Julie, one moment, please.

Edwards: Hi, can you hear me?

McCarvel: Yes. Thank you.

Edwards: Can I go ahead and start?

McCarvel: Yeah. Please state your name and address for the record.

Edwards: Okay. My name is Julie Edwards and I live at 1310 East Mary Lane, about a mile and a quarter south of this location, and I -- some of the things have been addressed with what the developer spoke about, but I just wanted -- I had written this up a little before, so I just wanted to address everything. According to the city's future land use map Compass Pointe Subdivision falls within a zone of medium density, yet they are requesting R-15 zoning. I'm confused by this request, despite the time and effort put into creating and designing a future land use map by P&Z and a number of public meetings and others involved, why so often do the developers push the limits of what has been planned zoning wise for a particular area and, then, they seem to be approved most of the time. What's the point of the master plan if it's not followed? If it were an old plan I would understand, but this plan is just a few years old. Also in the adopted Comprehensive Plan there is a table in there, Table 2.1, regarding housing goals, objectives, and action items and one of the items 2.01.01H says locate higher density housing near corridors with existing or planned transit, downtown, and in proximity to employment areas. None of which are in this vicinity. I also understand that this development -- at that time it was 13 units per acre. I see that that has been reduced. I'm also curious about what the distances are between the duplexes or between the triplexes, just because some of the window designs on the homes, if you are standing in your living room -- living room it looks like the windows are floor to ceiling and you may be standing right next to your neighbor in their living room looking right at them. Also not sure if this would pertain to you, but as far as impact fees, are duplexes and triplexes -- this is just a question I have -- counted as a single dwelling or are those two and three dwellings. He did partially answer the question about the fence along the canal and he had mentioned that it was going to run along the length of the pathway. I'm wondering should it be extended or will it be extended the entire length of the canal, so that, you know, it's not just a fence along a path with an open space at either end where it meets the roadway. Also pertaining to -- let's see. It's unfortunate, I think, that the usable land is taken into consideration in the gross density for zoning. So, therefore, I think this is the way that it is right now, even though it reduced to 37 lots, it still is quite dense for the area,

especially with R-2 across the street and -- and, then, the other surrounding, homes what they are zoned. Also has future widening of the road. I know that Victory is going to be widened. Locust Grove -- Grove to the south I'm sure will be widened, since it's going to be widened down at Lake Hazel and Locust Grove and, then, already from Overland to Victory on Locust Grove, five lanes up, three lanes to the south, so is this showing -- it seems at the entrance to the subdivision, is that eventually going to get eaten up a little bit more once that road is widened? And in that respect as far as landscaping and those kinds of buffers along those main roads, is that something that, you know, they will put in trees, they will do all this stuff and, then, you know, three years down the road the road gets widened -- is widened and, then, all of those trees are wasted, all of the concrete sidewalks are wasted and --

McCarvel: Julie, could you wrap up your comments, please.

Edwards: Yep.

McCarvel: You have had your three minutes.

Edwards: Okay. I'm good. I'm done.

McCarvel: Okay. Thank you.

Weatherly: Madam Chair, that's all I know of indicating a wish to testify.

McCarvel: Okay. Is there anyone in the audience that did not sign up that wishes to testify, either in person -- in chambers or on Zoom, please, press the raise your hand.

Seal: Madam Chair, we have a gentleman that wants to testify --

McCarvel: Okay.

Seal: -- in chamber.

McCarvel: Okay. Please come forward.

Mooso: My name is Galen Mooso. I live at 687 East Forest Ridge Drive, which is to the west and slightly north of this proposed development. This -- and we have lived there for 13 years. This development does not fit the character of the neighborhood, of the surrounding area. There is no public transit as has been mentioned. I travel through this intersection on a daily basis. It is always busy. I cannot imagine the thought of putting in such dense housing. This is a little little triangle -- triangular lot and I just cannot imagine 37 units on this little triangle. And, frankly, the Ten Mile Creek is ugly. I mean I don't know who owns it, but it is ugly and it needs to be cleaned up. It's not aesthetically pleasing and I just see this as a disaster. Thank you.

McCarvel: Thank you. Okay. If we have no one else wishing to testify, would the

applicant like to come back?

Dodson: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Yes, Joe.

Dodson: Sorry. I would like to address a few of the comments before, since they probably are more related to some city stuff, rather than the applicant.

McCarvel: I was thinking the same thing.

Dodson: No worries.

McCarvel: Go ahead.

Dodson: First of all, I mean if you want to come and write my staff reports -- that other guy -- that would be -- you can come do that anytime. You were very good and I appreciate that. I -- I understand that there are -- there are many conflicting Comprehensive Plan policies. There are. I want to note that the density -- there is some confusion. I need to start an education series with this about the zoning and, then, the future land use map. The zoning has nothing to do with density in the City of Meridian. Not anymore. The new Comprehensive Plan is what dictates the zoning. So, this site is zoned -- or is noted as medium density residential, which allows densities at three to eight dwelling units per acre. You could do R-40 here. It doesn't matter. That zoning is for the dimensional standards. So, the lot sizes, setbacks, height, that stuff, not for the density. So, R-15 is noted as I believe medium high density residential is the word that we use for it, but it's still for the dimensional standards. R-8 is medium density residential. As noted, the gross density for this, including the creek, is 4.8 or so, which is in the low end of the medium density. If you even remove the creek it still does meet the medium density. It's about 6.6. Even if you remove that area it's still in the medium density residential. So, the project is not a high density development. High density would be over 15 dwelling units per acre for our Comprehensive Plan and this is not even medium high, which would be eight to 12. So, I just want to -- again, this is something that comes up a lot in subdivisions and between the difference of our Comprehensive Plan and our zoning this happens quite a lot and there is a lot of confusion. But, again, the density is going to be tied to the zoning and -- or tied to the Comprehensive Plan and not the zoning. I apologize. The points regarding access, again, it -- if you -- this is the furthest away you can get from the intersection on this property. So, that's why ACHD is allowing it and that's also why they don't want a public street, because there is not going to be any future road connectivity. No one's going to give up a building lot in your subdivision in order to have a bridge across, which would be, obviously, beneficial probably more for the whole community, but no one's going to do that. It's unfortunate, but that's just the way this goes. Building bridges over creeks is not cheap. I understand your comment, sir, about the Ten Mile Creek being not aesthetically pleasing. City again -- this -- this is a -- one of the creeks that is specifically noted in our code to leave natural and natural is natural, ugly or not ugly. That's just one of those things noted in there and the irrigation district

maintains that, not the city. The road widening and the roundabout project is slated to begin this year. Locust Grove north of the intersection should be at five lanes all the way up to -- whatever is north of Victory. Overland. That's right. And, then, south of it it will be -- it will remain the two lanes or three that it is, except for outside of the -- within the sphere of influence of the intersection, which the roundabout project will widen that, as I said, and widen the bridge as well, which is good for pedestrian safety. The -- I do also believe Victory is slated to be widened again at some point. It's not in their CIP that I know of right now, which means that it probably won't be for the next five years or so. But all of that should help and that's the point is to fix the traffic problems here. So, the city and ACHD have worked diligently on that to try to address that for now and well into the future. So, I just wanted to address those comments from the city's perspective, especially the density stuff, because that's a big misconception and a lot of the comp plan policies regarding high density do not apply here, because this is not a high density development. Not by our standards and not by our definitions.

McCarvel: Thank you, Joe. I had made those -- those exact same notes almost word for word from him. So, would the applicant like to come back.

Arnold: Yes, Madam Chair. If I can share my screen again if I might.

McCarvel: Sure.

Dodson: You should be good now, Steve.

Arnold: There we go. So, I was taking some notes, because -- there we go. So, I think what I would like to do is just kind of go through one by one. I think I can hit them pretty quickly based on some of the comments that I heard tonight. So, traffic -- I used to work at ACHD and it has always been kind of the main concern with most developments and typically, you know, it's -- you are building a -- a subdivision and, then, they will come. They do an ACHD and they widen the roads. Well, in this case we are actually working with ACHD ahead of time on winding the road before the development is actually approved. So, the concern with traffic -- you are going to have some -- you know, a five lane arterial to the north with Locust Grove, you know, and -- and south and east -- excuse me -- west will be a three lane minor arterial. So, we have got -- and it will be improved with the roundabout. So, the backing that the -- the neighbors are seeing -- they are correct, I have been out there at 5:00 o'clock and it backs up quite a bit, so -- but that will all go away by the time we finish our project -- before we get it built, so -- and, then, density just -- again, I think Joe did an excellent job explaining that. The whole reason we are coming in with that zoning is not so that we can get high density, it's just so that we can meet dimensional standards for the product type that we are using. If I met the R-8 dimensional standards that wouldn't meet what our intent is on the product type. So, it's only to fit our product type in there. It's been said several times -- they are concerned about apartments. I have done a lot of apartments and these are not apartments. I don't put apartments on their own lot. These are, again, for sale, which we are hoping to market for the developer. So, again, I'm here to reiterate to the Commission it's for sale, they are not apartments isolated from a neighborhood was another thing that brought up that we

are -- somehow we are not a part of the neighbors or the neighborhood. Well, there is no way we could ever be a part. We have got arterials and a hundred foot canal right of way separating us from -- so, there is really no way that we can integrate physically and I think from a product type we have -- we have got a very nice product that we are proposing. I didn't really touch much on it, but in our previous discussion -- let me go to the site layout. It was stated are we providing enough parking. Well, we have got additional parking here that we are doing and we are going to add some as staff recommended. Plus we got two parking stalls in front of each unit with a two car garage. So, essentially, both -- all of the units will have four -- four car parking ability, if you will. So, I think we are well adequate in the parking arena. I tried to not take this too personal, because it was stated that, you know, I'm not in it for the long haul and I -- you know, I'm going to -- as soon as we are done here we are on to -- we are out of here. Well, I have been doing this for 25 years. We have done a lot of nice projects in Meridian, few to state are the Tuscany Subdivision, Bear Creek, Scentsy Campus, Lochsa Falls, just to name a few, and I have probably done another 15 to 20 more. Unfortunately, city, I'm -- I'm here, I'm stuck, my family's here. I'm not -- not in it for the short haul. Something came up about window designs and I don't know why it was important with the neighbors, but -- unless they are planning to move there, but the -- for the Commission standpoint what we typically do is we stagger the windows, so that, one, you are not looking right into the next one and -- and so the windows will be staggered, but the other part of that is the Commission should know that they are all fire rated because of our setbacks. Impact fees was brought up. Just for the record, again, I worked at ACHD and I worked on the impact fee ordinance, but those -- those are the same as single family towns. For that matter, a four-plex which is multi-family, typically pays four times the rate of a single family. So, the impact fees will be the same. Question came up about the fence at the back of the walk. Yeah. Our plan would be to extend it and connect it into our fence that we are going to have along Victory Road. Landscaping. It was brought up about our stuff getting ripped out along ACHD. We are not going to do that. We are not going to put anything in in their construction easement. We will likely bond for that and, then, install it after the roundabout is done. That is correct, there is no public transit adjacent to the site. We anticipate as growth occurs that we will get a transit out there. So, a mile north of us we do have transit along Overland Road, but, you know, it's a -- transit is a Catch 22. If you want it you got to get density. Now, again, we are at 4.8 units per acre. We are not dense. So, this development alone won't drive the need for density, but that is correct, there wasn't any transit. Ten Mile Creek does get a little bit ugly and that was stated, especially in the wintertime. But in the -- in the spring and summertime when the water is flowing you have got ducks, you have got all sorts of wildlife that goes in there and, you know, I guess pretty is -- pretty is in the eye of the beholder, but it's a -- I think a great natural area that will be a great amenity to this site. Just to sum up to the Commission, you know, we -- we heard your -- your concerns back in December. We are trying. With that I will end my rebuttal.

McCarvel: Thank you, Mr. Arnold. Any questions -- any further questions for the applicant? Are we ready to close the public hearing?

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: Just a quick -- on the no public transit there for the busy intersection and all that stuff, considering the uniqueness of the layout of the sub there is -- have you worked with anybody to put in possibly a bus stop or a park and ride or anything along those lines?

Arnold: Madam Chair, Commissioner, no, we have not, but I have in other projects we have -- behind the sidewalk is put little, you know, shelter areas or a pad or a shelter area that can come. That is something we can do on this site.

Seal: And that might just alleviate some of the public transit piece of this. I mean any opportunity that there is to have that I think should be taken advantage of and I think the uniqueness of the -- of the layout there provides for that to possibly happen. So, without getting too crazy about it, especially with the road construction that's coming your way very very soon.

Arnold: What I might suggest on that, so that -- if we poured concrete it might deteriorate, you know, because it could be several years, maybe what we do is we provide an easement for it in the future.

McCarvel: Okay.

Seal: A follow up to that. Who would you provide the easement to?

Arnold: It could be an easement stated on the plat that it's for a future bus stop and not necessarily call out specifically, because there is a good chance there may be another public transit that comes in.

Seal: Okay. Thank you.

McCarvel: Any other questions for the applicant? If not, can I get a motion to close the public hearing on H-2020-0100?

Seal: So moved.

Grove: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded to close the public hearing on H-2020-0100. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

McCarvel: Who wants to jump off?

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Go ahead, Commissioner Seal.

Seal: Just looking at the improvements that they have made -- well, I will start before then and I have said it before, it would be nice if this was going to be, you know, a small area with some shops and stuff like that in it. That said it's not zoned that way and that's not the way that it's being presented here. So, everything that's being presented within the confines -- it works within the rule set of the Comprehensive Plan, as well as -- as code -- city code. So, we kind of got to work with what's in front of us. With that said I think that the applicant has worked to provide everything that they can in order to work within this -- this spot. So, the density seems to be the real -- the rub with a lot of folks here, so with the product type that's there and ownership part of it. I think it's going to be a more welcome addition where people are going to come in -- it's probably going to be their starter home, more like a condo type, you know, piece of property that they can own and, you know, eventually move into a bigger -- bigger piece of property. So, that tends to mean that people are going to try and take care of it, because they know that's not their forever home that might, you know, fall down around them. I do like the changes that they have made where they put the loop in. I'm happy to see that they are willing to put more parking in without taking away too much usable open space. The emergency access I think takes care of any kind of safety issues as far as a firetruck being able to get in there. Instead of them having to back in they will be able to use the emergency access. Unfortunately, that won't work for the trash service and things like that. So, hopefully, they can work to make that easier for the trash service -- you know, recycling service to be able to pick up the receptacles as they take them out. You know, kind of like when we have common driveways we have the same kind of issues in some of the bigger subdivisions. So, I don't see that as a huge issue, just something that they need to be aware of and hopefully work to improve upon that. Other than that I think it's -- it's unique and I -- I personally have a son that's looking for something like this in this area, especially something that's very low maintenance as they said, where, you know, essentially, you are going to live there, you are not going to have to mow the lawn or own yard equipment or anything along those lines. So, I think it's a good product for Meridian. I wish it fit a little bit better into the piece of property that it's in, but I think they have done a good job on trying to work it in there.

McCarvel: Okay. Commissioner Grove, you came off mute.

Grove: Yeah. I would echo a lot of what Commissioner Seal said. I appreciate the work that they have done to reconfigure and rework this site and working to incorporate the staff recommendations, especially with this revised plat that they have shown tonight. The loop does improve the flow within this development and I really like the S curve, so that we don't end up with a wall of homes. It -- it gives a lot more character to this general layout and the -- that central section with the MEW in the middle, it -- it hits some of the things that I had problems with the site when we first saw in December where it didn't have a sense of community, it just felt very blah, for lack of better description, but I like what they have done with this. I know the architectural elements of it are not necessarily for everybody, but I happen -- I think it -- I like it. It adds a different character to this corner and, you know, will create a new identity for this area that, you know, will help -- help it --

help the entire area to kind of stand out and have a different sense of identity, as somebody put it, but probably flipped on what they were intending. Looking at the surrounding area, the number of homes in here dropping down to 37 is almost identical to the street directly to the west of this with the number of houses, so I'm not concerned with the density as presented and I appreciate the changes that they have made and I think that this works for me going forward.

McCarvel: Okay. Thank you. Any other Commissioner comments? Commissioner Cassinelli --

Cassinelli: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: -- you have come off mute.

Cassinelli: I have come off mute. I wasn't here in December for -- for the first go around on it. I do like the -- my comments here would be I like the loop. Just to address the design, that's a tough one. It definitely doesn't fit. I mean everything nearby seems to be craftsman style and this is definitely modern, so it would definitely stick out. However, you know, that's one side and the other side says it's -- you know, to have everything looking the same gets boring. So, it's a -- that's a tough one. What -- what bothers me on this one -- and I have already brought it up once tonight -- is that transition and not necessarily from a -- not on this for a density standpoint, but the transition with all the homes that line up against the -- against Ten Mile Creek there were essentially two to one from what I counted. Nineteen to ten from one end to the other there going up to the -- to the homes on the other side of the creek. I would prefer maybe cutting that down a little bit, just to spread that out, if they could do that somehow. And my other thing is I -- I do not -- I do not think that there is enough parking off -- off-street parking, if you will, the nine spaces for 31 -- it's for 36 homes or whatever it is. It's -- it is -- it's not nearly enough. I think that's going to be a big issue. You get -- you are going to get some visitors, you know, you drive in any subdivision and probably every other home has a car on the street. People use their garages for storage. Park the cars on the lot. They want to pull the car out to -- you know for kids to play in the driveway or whatever it is, it's -- I don't -- I'm really concerned about the parking. Some of these neighborhoods like that it's always an issue. Parking is always an issue. That said, an in-fill project like this, tough to do anything. It -- most -- most -- I like most of it in there. I'm not crazy about the design, but it is nice to have something different, but my issue is parking and the transition along the creek. I just -- I can't get behind it yet with those two issues. But as far as trying to get something in that corner where most things won't fit, I -- I would commend the applicant on what they have done here. They have -- I don't know what else you can do in there and -- and, you know, if I saw more parking and cut maybe two lots out of that backside to bring the -- the transition down a little bit, I might be -- I could probably get behind it, but as it stands right now those -- those -- those things I just can't get behind it.

McCarvel: Okay.

Dodson: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Yearsley.

Yearsley: Madam Chair, thank you. I have to commend the applicant for coming back, making the changes that we have requested. I -- it looks -- I know I'm going to get heat for this, but it looks amazingly different to me with the more open space and this space. I do agree with Bill Cassinelli that -- Commissioner Cassinelli, it would be kind of nice to maybe spread out -- I don't know if I have problems with the -- the triplexes, the duplexes, but having maybe a little bit more space in between the different units might be a little bit more nice to try to break up that -- that plain a little bit. With regards to the density, Tuscany, which is across the street, has a section of homes very similar to this within our subdivision and -- and -- and next to the school. There is townhomes would be -- or attached products as well. So, it's not unfamiliar with the area that we -- that's there. I know it's a challenging site with the limited access to it and how small it is. I think they have done the best that they can. So, like I said, I prefer to see a little bit more spacing along that frontage against the canal. But other than that I think it looks amazingly better.

Dodson: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Is that Joe?

Dodson: Yes. Sorry.

McCarvel: Okay. Go ahead, Joe.

Dodson: I just wanted note on the -- the parking, a lot of these units -- I don't know the ratio. Steve, obviously, you know that better than me, but I would -- at least a portion of them are two bedroom, so the parking pad in front is not required. So, that all is extra parking according to the parking counts. I just wanted to note that for everybody.

McCarvel: Okay. Thank you.

Cassinelli: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Cassinelli.

Cassinelli: One other thing I wanted to address that I didn't was the applicant was -- was looking for a couple of exceptions there on a couple of the conditions and I am -- I'm behind staff's recommendations on -- on those that have to do with the sidewalks and -- and the crosswalks and such. I would like to see the pavers that staff is -- is requesting. I think that would give it a nice touch. So, I wanted to add that in. Thank you.

Dodson: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Joe. Yeah. Joe.

Dodson: I should have touched on that earlier. I apologize. The recommendation I have

in my staff report regarding that was more of a precaution, because some of these private street developments when they have sidewalks they claim it's sidewalk, but it's just like an extension of the asphalt street and we didn't want that, so that's why I made that comment, knowing that he is going to construct them as concrete I would not have written my condition that way. I should have asked the applicant to be specific, but I'm okay with the sidewalks just being general concrete and the crossings being the way that the applicant has proposed them as raised -- I guess they are known as tabletop crosswalks. We will verify with Fire that they are okay with that, but it is my understanding that they usually are. But in general the crossings will be delineated. If Commission still preferred my condition that's also in your purview to keep it as is.

McCarvel: But your original condition was there, because you didn't realize he was going to do curb and concrete sidewalk, you thought it was going to be asphalt; right?

Dodson: Yes, ma'am. That's correct.

McCarvel: But that's -- okay. So, you are okay with it being stripped the way the applicant has written -- has requested?

Dodson: Yes, ma'am.

McCarvel: Okay. Thank you. Yeah. I would say -- this is night -- I think it's drastically different from what we saw last time, especially the revised one that showed up today with the loop. I think that takes away a lot of that just, you know, driving in and the feeling that you can't get out and I think the odd shape it just calls for -- calls for some creative thinking and I think they have done that. I don't think it seems near as crammed in and -- let's see. Oh, yeah. I really liked the rock features going all the way up. You know, you usually see that just a few feet. The decks and everything look really nice. I think for the product that this is it's got some kind of nice features and I think, you know, they -- I think they have done just exactly what we asked from the last time we saw this right down to I think Commissioner Yearsley asked them to reduce it by at least ten, which I think it looks like it's come down 11 units and, yeah, the density it -- I know it's sometimes hard to understand -- we call it -- it's R-15, that doesn't mean we will take 15 units, it -- it's really in that medium density range and at the lower end of it. It's just with the attached units we need the setbacks that are described in an R-15. So, I would be in support of it. Commissioner Lorcher, did you want to add any comments or are you good to --

Lorcher: Madam Chair, I -- I actually like the product that they have. I wasn't here for the December meeting. Because it's behind a gated community it doesn't seem -- I know that's a busy corner. I drive it all the time from Cole and turn down Locust Grove to get over to southwest Meridian on a regular basis, especially during Snowmageddon when Overland and the freeway where -- were compromised. It's a very challenging corner. I think with the roundabout going in that's going to change the whole dimension of that corner as far as traffic is concerned and the way traffic is going to flow, which is the concern for the residents in the area it is going to be a hundred percent different and roundabouts are a blessing and a curse all at the same time. It takes us a while to get

used to them. First, the design that the -- the developer is suggesting is -- if somebody didn't say it before, it's in the eyes of the beholder. If everything is exactly the same, then, we are all the same color beige. But to be able to invite young families or professionals to live in a small starter house in a neighborhood that they couldn't usually afford, now this builder is offering that product. The Ten Mile Creek behind it -- I live behind Ten Mile Creek as well and there is parts of it that are super nice and in the winter, of course, it's kind of barren and so it is what it is because the city doesn't have any control over that. So, I'm -- and they have -- and the builder has done everything that -- from the conversation I have heard, everything that you have asked them to do --

McCarvel: Okay. Any other comments?

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal. Commissioner Yearsley, could you mute. Thank you.

Seal: Touched on it a little bit earlier, but the -- one of the major problems that I had with it was just the entrance and access and it didn't seem like the road -- basically the planning and the -- and the rebuild of the road was going to happen for -- it sounded like five years, if I remember right from the December meeting that we had, but it's actually starting in this year will be finished by the end of next year, which coincides with when, you know, they will break ground and start to have people take residents in here. So, with that out of the way, you know, we are kind of -- again, we are stuck with what's in front of us and does it -- does it fit, does it work. The other comment I will make is I would really like to thank the gentleman that very very concisely quoted all of us. A lot of times I go home from here scratching my head wondering if anybody ever listens to anything that we say at all. So, I want to thank that person and hopefully anybody else that's listening, bring that with you, because it does actually help when we make our decisions, especially if we know that we got to pay attention to what we are saying and stick with our guns. So, thank you. If there is nothing else I can take a stab at a motion.

McCarvel: Please do.

Seal: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council of file number H-2020-0100 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of February 18th, 2021, with the following modifications: That A-1-E and A-3-F be modified to strike sidewalk and replace with pedestrian crossings and to include raised paved pathways. That the applicant work to provide an easement for a mass transit stop and that they provide more parking along the existing common areas.

Grove: Second.

McCarvel: It has been moved and seconded -- seconded to recommend approval of H-2020-0100 with modifications. All those in favor say aye. Opposed nay.

Cassinelli: Nay.

McCarvel: Okay. Motion carries. And, Madam Clerk, did you need roll call on that or did you get them?

Weatherly: Commissioner Cassinelli, I heard you as a nay.

Cassinelli: That is correct.

McCarvel: Okay. I think all others were yea. Okay. With that I will take one more motion.

Seal: Madam Chair?

McCarvel: Commissioner Seal.

Seal: I move we adjourn.

Grove: Second.

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

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:50 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS.)

APPROVED

RHONDA McCARVEL - CHAIRMAN

_____|_____|_____
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK