

6. Public Hearing continued from February 01, 2024 for Farmstone Crossing Subdivision (H-2023-0045) by Bailey Engineering, located at 820 S. Black Cat Rd.

- A. Request: Annexation of 33.893 acres of land from RUT to the M-E (Mixed Employment) zoning district.
- B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 6 buildable lots on 27.59 acres of land in the proposed M-E (Mixed Employment) zoning district

Seal: All right. With that -- thank you very much. I would like to open File No. H-2023-0045 for Farmstone Crossing Subdivision and we will begin with the staff report. Or should I say we will finally begin with the staff report.

Hersh: Mr. Chair, Commissioners, the applicant has submitted applications for annexation and preliminary plat for Farmstone Crossing Subdivision. The site consists of 33.89 acres of land currently zoned RUT in Ada county, located at 820 Black Cat Road. There is currently no history on the property. The Comprehensive Plan FLUM designation is mixed employment. The applicant is requesting annexation of 33.89 acres. Again, from RUT to ME zoning. The development abuts mixed use employment designated to the east and borders I-84 to the south. The development is proposed to have access to a collector street as desired and medium high density residential uses are proposed to the north and light industrial to the west. Allowed uses in the ME district consists of offices, medical centers, research and development facilities and light industrial and ancillary support services. The areas intended to develop with approximately 378,360 square feet encompassing various potential uses like office, light industrial operations, flex space and research and development components, such as distribution and light manufacturing. The inclusion of loading docks on the elevations for the proposed flex buildings implies that all the intended uses are primarily related to distribution and warehousing, which requires a conditional use permit in the ME zoning district. The proposed preliminary plat consists of six building lots and one common lot on 27.59 acres of land in the ME zoning district for Farmstone Crossing Subdivision. The subdivision is proposed to develop in two phases as shown on the preliminary plat. Staff recommends that the collector street, which will be Vanguard Way, be constructed prior to development commencing on the property. Additionally, the first phase of develop -- development should encompass the construction of both the ten foot detached sidewalks along South Black Cat Road and Vanguard Way, including the entire street buffers. The second phase of development should encompass the completion of the remaining ten foot pathway along the I-84 interstate. According to the GIS imagery, there is an existing home and other historic outbuildings adjacent to Black Cat Road that will be removed upon development of this subdivision. Staff recommends that the applicant preserve some elements of the historic buildings. The applicant presented their proposed plan for the existing silos to the Historic Preservation Commission on January 25th with the following options: Option one involves careful disassembling and storage of the structure with the intention to find an interested agency that may preserve the silo on another site. An

agency would need to be identified before disassembly or prior to the commencement of the road. Alternatively, if no interest -- interested agency is identified prior to the commencement of the road construction, then, option two entails utilizing some materials from the silo in the construction of the monument. The meeting conducted with the Historic Preservation Commission expressing preference to recommending to the Planning and Zoning Commission that both existing silos be disassembled and reassembled at yet to be determined future location. It was emphasized that the specifics of the location be clarified prior to disassembly and the new site would need to be determined within a reasonable period of time. As an alternative proposal the Commission advocates for the creation of a scale replica of the facilities on the current site. The Historic Preservation Commission wishes to review the details of the proposed monument with the initial certificate of zoning compliance submittal for the site. Additionally, the Historic Preservation Commission wishes to retain the ability to provide comments on the final proposed monument presented by the applicant. As part of the first phase of the development all existing structures that do not conform to the district setbacks must be removed, except for those agreed upon for the historic preservation. The proposed preliminary plat appears to comply with the dimensional standards of the district. Access is proposed -- proposed to be provided from the northern boundary of the site from the extension of Vanguard Way to Black Cat Road to the west. Vanguard Way is designed as a collector street in accordance with the master street map and the transportation system in the Ten Mile area plan. A driveway is proposed adjacent to the property to the east for future extension. Vanguard Way should be constructed in accordance with Street Section C, which is in the Ten Mile area plan, which requires two 11 foot travel lanes, six foot bike lanes, eight foot parkways, with streetlights at pedestrian scale and a minimum of six foot wide detached sidewalks. The applicant proposes a modification of the street section to include a ten foot wide detached sidewalk, pathways in lieu of on-street bike lanes, which is required by ACHD as set forth in the master pathways plan. Prior to submitting the final plat the applicant shall coordinate with the property owner to the north and the east to construct Vanguard Way and deed the right of way to ACHD. The applicant should ensure that the intersection of Vanguard Way and South Black Cat Road aligns with the entrance of the Black Cat industrial project on the west side of South Black Cat Road. The applicant is proposing two curb cuts off a Vanguard Way, the planned collector street in the Ten Mile area. In accordance with the UDC multiple accesses off of arterial or collector roadways shall be restricted. The applicant has chosen to eliminate the curb cut aligned with the proposed subdivision to the north and has, instead, opted for the one closest to the intersection of Black Cat Road. Typically staff recommends that the curb cuts align directly across roadways. However, staff supports the offset change given that the entrance effectively highlights the features of the proposed plaza provided it adheres to ACHD's requirements. Additionally the applicant has proposed establishing a shared access on the east side of the site in collaboration with the property owner to the east intended for the future access. Ten foot multi-use pathways are proposed on the site in accordance with the pathways master plan. One segment follows Vanguard Way across the northern portion of the site. One segment runs along the southern boundary within the street buffer along I-84 and the other segment runs along the west side of the site adjacent to South Black Cat Road to the plaza on the north. The proposed pathway is intended to cross the drive aisle between

buildings one and two that are proposed. Staff recommends removing the loading docks for the rear of buildings one and two to mitigate potential conflicts between pedestrians using the pathway and delivery trucks accessing that area. All proposed sidewalks and pedestrian walkways look to meet the UDC code requirements within this proposed development. A minimum of 25 foot wide street buffers are required along arterial streets, which would be South Black Cat Road and commercial districts and a 20 foot wide street buffer is required on all collector streets, which would be the Vanguard Way. The buffer may be placed in an easement rather than in common lot according to the UDC. A minimum of a 50 wide street buffer is required along I-84 landscaped per the standards in the UDC, which requires a variety of trees, shrubs, lawn and other vegetative ground cover. The proposed dimensions appear to meet the requirements of the UDC. However, there is a lack of combination of planters, which would be shrubs and rock mulch with the buffer along Vanguard. The applicant has provided 52 trees and only 34 are required along Vanguard. Staff does recommend the applicant enhance the street buffer by removing some of the trees and incorporating additional planters instead. Landscape buffers along Black Cat Road adjacent to the open drainage swale lacks vegetation in front of the ten foot pathway not meeting the UDC requirements. The applicant -- the applicant is proposing a plaza area between buildings one and buildings two featuring benches, a pergola, landscaping and potential historic monument of the existing silo on that site. The applicant should revise the landscape plan to reflect landscaping within the buffers along Black Cat Road and the drainage swale in front of the ten foot pathway in accordance with the UDC. To improve the integration of this property with the neighboring ME zoned property to the east staff encourages the applicant to consider removing the entire landscape buffer along the east side and coordinate alignment of parking with the adjacent property owner. This would facilitate shared access to the east and improve integration with the property -- eastern property. All fencing that is proposed for this site meets UDC code. Off-street vehicle parking is required for the proposed commercial subdivision as set forth in the UDC. Based on approximately 378,360 square feet of proposed floor space a minimum of 757 off-street parking spaces are required. A total of 764 off-street parking spaces are proposed, so seven additional than what's required. Based on the 764 spaces a minimum of 31 bicycle spaces are required to be provided. None are proposed. Bicycle facilities should comply with the standards in the UDC. Bike racks should be provided as close as possible to each building entrance totaling 31 spaces or in a designated area within the plaza. Staff is recommending the removal of the loading docks at the rear of buildings one and two, which would create additional parking. Staff recommends the applicant submit revised plans incorporating the aforementioned with the CZC application. The applicant has submitted conceptual building elevations for the proposed flexible buildings and light industrial. Building materials consist of horizontal metal Hardie board plank siding and white wood color stucco in dark and light gray colors. Metal awnings. Gray wrapped cornice molding. The proposed conceptual plans are not approved. Final design must comply with the design standards in the architectural standards manual and the design -- design guidelines in the Ten Mile area plan for the commercial designation. A certificate of zoning compliance and design review application is required to be submitted for the approval of a site building design prior to submittal of building permit applications. There are no written testimony for this property -- or this project and staff does recommend approval of the annexation

and preliminary plat per the conditions of the staff report and the findings and that concludes staff's presentation and will stand for any questions.

Seal: Thank you very much. Would the applicant like to come forward? Good evening.

Bailey: Good evening. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners. My name is David Bailey with Bailey Engineering. My office address is 1119 East State Street in Eagle, representing Trilogy Development for this development Farmstone Crossing. Thanks, Stacy, for a very complete report and as we all know we have diverged a few times, because we have got some serious history here. We have actually been working on this for about -- almost three years now to get it to this point to deal with the pieces we are looking at. So can I get my presentation? Okay. So, Farmstone Crossing Subdivision - - and as Stacy said, the project is located north and west a Black Cat Road and I-84. There is an out parcel in the -- in the southwest corner there and that's an ITD storm drainage pond. It will stay there, so it's not to be developed -- it won't be developed in the future. To the north of us is the proposed Avani Subdivision, which I think was before the Commission here just a week or so ago or two weeks, then, is headed for the City Council I would assume. To the east of us is the Vanguard Subdivision and that property is owned by Adler and they are actually working on the development plans for that and bringing sewer down there now from the north from Baraya and working on the design plans for the Vanguard Street to our eastern boundary and I will talk a little bit more about that later. To the west is that the -- Black Cat is an industrial subdivision that was approved over there. I believe there is one of the hospitals -- I think it's St. Al's sundries center is going to be a pretty significant operation they got and, then, they have got a variety of uses to the west here that all fit within the same zone, although they are not in the Ten Mile plan area. They were very consistent and they are well underway on construction. So, they are zoned ME to the west. We are proposing a mixed employment zone. Same to the east. To the north is medium high residential and to the northwest as that light industrial from the -- from your future land use map. The zoning we are proposing is ME within the -- within the area there and applies to the Ten Mile plan. A lot of discussion on the silo and, actually, that's been a lot of the pieces that we have worked on as we have gone along there. So, we have been aware, you know, from the time we have made the application and prior to that that there is -- this historic silo is on the site and -- I think we have got a good picture of it here to start with. Yep. So, there are actually -- this silo and, then, there is a tall -- much taller one that's on the site. They were documented by the -- by the -- I think it's by the city's or by the County Historical Preservation Society. It is eligible for registry on the national register, but is not registered in any areas. I don't have an official, you know, historic designation from that case, but we understand the importance of it and I understand it was as a granary and I'm not the expert on it, although we have got a lot of experts we have talked to about it. It was a granary that stored the grain in the sides and, then, provided a beating area within it. So, there is an enclosed building there. Those silos on the side are made from these blocks that were built in the early 1900s that have kind of an S shape at the bottom and top, so they are kind of keystone shaped and they were stacked and, then, wrapped with steel rods to hold those things in place together and they are poured on top of a concrete foundation. I'm an engineer, so I got to talk about the structural, you know, side of things as we go along.

There was a poured concrete foundation underneath this that's there and they were stacked and put on top of that, but there is no -- the structural is just by them being held together by those bands and, then, that's a wooden roof that's built on cross -- on top of there and across and a wooden building in between. I don't think I have a picture with me, but it does stick out the back side of this a little bit. I guess I'm assuming this is the front and, again, I'm an engineer, so I do dirt, so I'm not really that great with buildings, but that's my understanding that this is the front and the look of this. So, it has some distinct features to it. Apparently these were somewhat common in the midwest in the early 1900s and that some of them were brought over this direction or constructed additionally in this direction. We have met several times on the site with -- with Blaine Johnston who is here. I'm sure he has some comments for you tonight. And engaged TAG Historical and as Barbara Bower and she brought in Fred Critchfield, who does artistic renderings of -- of this type of stuff and, then, we intend -- we intended to have them do the documentation of the historical piece here and -- from the very beginning and to create a monument sign of some sort that we had had Critchfield work on it and we built. I will go into a little bit of that further later on, you know, as we show you what we are proposing on here. So, as of -- and prior to that we had gone through and -- and looked at the location of it. We have tried to move the street around some with this thing and incorporate it into the site on here and as we have gone along ACHD approved the project to the left, Vanguard is where it is, and this -- the silo ends up being really dead in the right of way for Vanguard Street. So, the -- the location across to the west was approved with the subdivision there. The location of Vanguard to the east is here. We have met -- reached out to the highway district again and said could we move that to the north? We have talked to the neighbor -- to Conger Development to the north of Avani and they were somewhat agreeable to moving in this stub. They wanted to talk about it. And, in fact, right now the -- in accordance with the conditions there that -- that this developer and Conger and the developer to the east do have a -- I think they call it a letter of intent or -- or -- or a memorandum of agreement of some sort to actually build Vanguard and the design of Vanguard is underway by -- not my engineering firm, but I think that Ardurra is actually doing the design on that -- on that road there and they are in design work on this and they are intended to get this built. It needs to be built for Vanguard to continue from the east and continue out to Black Cat and to provide access to the property on the west side here and so, you know, it's well underway heading that direction and so the condition to build Vanguard before we develop our property is certainly consistent with what we want to do and -- and -- and that's going to get built. Unfortunately, that's right in the middle of the road and so our take is that it has to come down, right, and it has to be moved, of course. We engaged Pacific Movers back very early in the beginning, asked them can we move this, right, and they -- they declined to provide us a bid to do that. They said it couldn't be moved without damaging the structure and coming apart. We had a structural engineer evaluate it and the structural engineer, Sage Engineering, has a letter on the file that says we could -- if it were to remain in the same spot we could fortify the inside of that -- that silo and probably have it be a safe structure to remain in the same spot, but in order to move it they thought that it would have to be disassembled in order to move the structure and pour a new foundation for it to move the structure from the site. When we went to Historical Commission -- I don't want to run out of time here, because I do want to talk about the project, too. We got a recommendation from a

member of the -- from Ken Freeze on your Historical Commission to engage Kelly Moving also and they have been out there once. Not sure what they could do. They have been out there again for another evaluation to see if they could possibly move it. But, you know, when you move a house you jack up the house and, then, you pour a foundation you put it back down on that this. Can't be moved that way. They would have to jack up the entire foundation and, then, they would have to figure out how to put it back down and keep it safe in the meantime moving it that way. We don't know the exact final answer, but I suspected it can't be -- it can't be moved in that way. So, we propose that we take it apart there. We have not proposed -- and we are not proposing at any point along the way that we -- that we preserve or move the taller silo that's to the east of this. It's not a significant -- it's not of the same historical significance as the double silo and it's not practical to move and so that's not part of our discussion on that, although I think it was involved partially in the recommendation from your Historical Commission on that piece of it. So, our take now is we would like to take it down and -- and move it if we have somewhere to be identified where it's going to go to. We don't want to destroy anything in the process of that. So, our site -- we don't think it's really appropriate on our site to rebuild it there on our site and we would prefer to provide a pretty substantial monument using some of the site materials, using some of the materials there, so to preserve that history, it would preserve a board on that and build that piece of it. So, I will kind of jump -- jump ahead there. So, this is probably round three and there is probably seven rounds of -- of design on this monument before we get there. But the idea is to keep the look of that, some structural size. The monument in the center would be professionally produced and we had photos of this and all the entire history. We have documented a monument for the site. There would be a plaza around it. It would be in our central gathering area there and the size and the materials and that we fully expect that we will go through your Historical Commission and do that at the CZC point that we would have that approved by the city before we would build that monument. On the project the preliminary plat, as Stacy said -- I don't want to jump on that a whole lot more. I will bring out here that I think there is some confusion. We don't have any loading docks proposed on any of the buildings except for building six, the distribution and manufacturing potential building. Those things that are drawn on there are actually parking spots with landscaping next to them. So, we don't object to any of the conditions, you know, about removing the loading docks. We didn't have those intended there. Those are intended to be flex spaces. They are used by a plumbing supplier or a contractor. They have offices in the front. They have a warehouse in the back. The little -- little squares that are shown there are just a single overhead door for the back of those. So, they be light industrial, you know, supply contractor type spaces and they work out pretty well in that area. So, they look really nice to be on that. They would be fairly tall as you saw on the renderings and they could have upstairs office space as well associated with that. Essential gathering plaza we have here and we have moved this around a couple times and this here allows us to keep this next to this pathway. This connects the pathway from I-84 all the way along and connects back to Vanguard and, then, this path continues to the west. As Stacy stated, we -- we would like to have that ten foot multi-use pathway along the south side of that. You know, we are going with what ACHD said for the road section and what they are building to the east. We are fine with whatever road section is appropriate for that. We do have all these turn lanes and everything we have to build at that intersection there as well associated --

not -- no problem with that. The access here -- and we have worked with the neighbor next door and they have this plan in their design thing there to do the two accesses to the site and they do meet the offsets of -- of the -- of the highway district on that. So, we are fine with all the ACHD conditions on this. We are fine with all the city's conditions on this -- you know, everything in there. I understand there is some tweaks to the landscape plan and we will bring those in with the -- with the final plat, you know, and meet the city's requirements associated with those. So, a few changes as we have gone along, but we really think this meets the requirements and we think that there is a -- there is a possible solution for the silo, but we really can't get anywhere until we move this thing forward and get it -- get around to designing it and seeing what we can really do on that. So, we are requesting your approval of it. So, the pathways I already talked about. And, then, we showed the renderings of the buildings on here. We agree to all the conditions of approval and we are requesting your approval of this, so we can move this forward and get this thing taken care of. I would be glad to stand for any questions.

Seal: Thank you, David. Commissioners, do you have any questions?

Bailey: Am I close?

Seal: Oh, you are well -- you are well within. You can ramble for a couple more minutes.

Bailey: No. I'm good.

Seal: Any questions?

Lorcher: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Lorcher, go ahead.

Lorcher: So, in the staff report there were two very vague comments and so I just want to kind of get an idea. So, the next steps after Planning and Zoning is, obviously, go to City Council, but to move the silos would be a commencement of road construction. So, if you get approval within the next, you know, 90 days from City Council what -- what's your -- what's your tentative time plan as far as commencement of road construction for Vanguard? Do you see it in 2024? Are you looking more at 2025?

Bailey: So, this developer wouldn't be able to move forward fast enough to develop that and doesn't have, you know, the use for the build out of this. So, the construction of Vanguard is going to happen as a group effort of the Vanguard development, the Avani and this development here --

Lorcher: Okay.

Bailey: -- and move together with those. Like I said, someone else is doing that design. As far as I know both the city and everybody at Ten Mile and your new vertical BVA joint

venture that's going into the east of this and everybody to the west wants this thing built yesterday.

Lorcher: Okay.

Bailey: Right? So, probably this developer is the least anxious to build Vanguard. That said, you know, I think it's probably going to -- probably going to be under construction and open next year. I would say in 2025. That's my guess.

Lorcher: Okay.

Bailey: They want it.

Lorcher: They want it done.

Bailey: Uh-huh.

Lorcher: And I guess the next question is that the comment of a new site would be determined within a reasonable amount of time. So, we are talking about the same thing, right, because it's in the middle of the road, so the road can't be -- can't be created until that's done. Have you -- have you even reached out to people who are interested in this historical silo?

Bailey: So, if we could identify somebody, you know -- again, been with the Historical Commission and we are not the people who are going to reach out to somebody, but we have agreed that we will -- the road group -- if -- if we get approved now you have got a condition that makes us disassemble that and hold it for somebody for a reasonable amount of time. Right? And so when that time is I don't know how we fix that. But I do know we can catch us right -- right here and get a condition on there that it will get disassembled, right, at a minimum, right, before that road gets built and I'm sure that you could probably also go through, you know, ACHD or whatever or the Historical Commission and say even if this developer gets denied we still want to save that thing, right, and -- and they are still going to build that road, so we are kind of on the side a little bit, except for the idea that if -- if you put a condition on us, now you have -- now you have got that in place, right, to get that disassembled. When that will happen, what's a reasonable amount of time -- what we propose is that this all has to be resolved by the time we get to CZC, because we are going to propose at CZC that we build this monument in place of what's going on there and it's my impression that regardless of the -- of the -- I don't get to tell everything that gets done, but I have here of some people who do things; right? It's my impression that regardless of whether someone else takes that silo or not, we are still building a monument in our thing that will include this sign in the center; right? And so I will probably get in trouble for saying that, but if that's a condition of it that we build -- we build our monument, you know, in there regardless of that and get that approved at CZC, I wouldn't object to that; right? And that makes it -- and we really think it's appropriate. This is an industrial area; right? And so we are not -- or, you know, heavy commercial area. We are not seeing a whole lot of foot traffic here. This is not going to be open for people to look at, you know, or see a lot, but we can get it an area here and

if we had a -- a board in there that's preserved that history, you know, in a professional manner, you know, I think SHPO has been out there as well, too, you know, but we would have a professional do that documentation and preserve that, you know, on -- on a monument sign there that I think we might do better on or to the -- to the silo than just the silo sitting out there and where if we built the road around it or something, you know, in that case, so --

Lorcher: Well, I guess the truest thing I have ever heard and the saddest thing I have ever heard is that it doesn't matter what was there before, nobody will remember anyway, and so a negotiator for the impact area of Highway 16 said it doesn't matter what was there, nobody's going to remember and that's the sad part of our development in Meridian is that we are taking away what made Meridian to begin with and I completely understand that this entire area if -- all that is going to be to the east of you. We have got that new transportation -- or excuse me -- industrial to the west of you, plus Highway 16, development needs to come, but being able to kind of hold onto those small little nuggets of history is going to be important for our community. Otherwise, we are just anywhere USA; right? So, you know, I wish you could move it to my farm down the street, but I don't know how to be able to do that. But it's -- I'm glad that you have taken the time to be respectful of the silos, regardless of whether they stay or if the monument is made and, you know, to be able to be aggressive, to be able to get it out in the media for some developer to be able to move it to there, so that it can stay within at least in the Treasure Valley, if not Meridian. So -- so, thank you for being conscious of that and, hopefully, we can kind of -- you know, to assume that ACHD won't kind of work with you to kind of make a little bit of a curve to be able to keep them there, but hopefully we can take these vague time frames that are within the staff report and find a good candidate for the siloes.

Seal: I had to jot down a note, trying to keep up with what I'm supposed to be doing here. Just -- I have questions on it, too, but the timing of option one, which is basically take it down, move it somewhere else, what -- what kind of a timeline would you like? Because you can't store it forever, obviously. So, I mean what kind of timing would you guys think is appropriate for that or --

Bailey: When -- when we come in with the CZC for the site -- for the site construction. So, at that time, you know, we are going to build the site. We are going to store it on site until then, if we take that down, and so at that time when we go to construct the site, either someone's going to take it or it's going to go away at that point --

Seal: Okay.

Bailey: -- because we are going to -- we are going to build the monument. It would -- would be what we are proposing as the -- and that's a definite time frame. We know that prior to disposing it we are going to have a solution to document it, preserve it in a different form.

Seal: Okay.

Lorcher: Mr. Chair, one more.

Seal: Go ahead.

Lorcher: Did -- did you talk to the Agros family at all about the silos? Did they have any comments about it?

Bailey: I did not personally myself, but -- and I don't -- I don't know who has, you know, within this. So, they have talked to the -- you know, the people who did the documentation on it and it would be part of the discussion for TAG Historical to have that discussion with them to make sure that their -- their history on it is preserved on the sign as well.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you.

Seal: Okay. I can get to some of the -- some of the other stuff later, because we have got public comment and things. Commissioners, any other questions? Commissioner Smith, you look like you are ready to ask a question to me.

Smith: Mr. Chair, it's more of a -- kind of just I'm mulling it over and I'm kind of have a similar opinion. It seems as the rest of this is I wish the situation were different around this, but, then, again, I echo Commissioner Lorcher's appreciation of trying to respect the history and I think at the very least, you know, a monument and, you know, working to try to find somewhere for this to go, ideally nearby, would be -- would be awesome. But there are realities of, you know, how ACHD has kind of set things up here and how this development is going as a whole that are kind of outside of the applicant's control in a lot of ways and so I don't really have a question there, it's just -- just some -- some thoughts and some pensiveness if you will.

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

Lomeli: Thank you, Mr. Chair. We have Blaine Johnston.

Seal: Thank you. Good evening, sir. We will need your name and address for the record, please.

Johnston: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, my name is Blaine Johnston. My address is 6138 North Demille, Meridian. I am president of the Meridian Historic Preservation Commission. So, I appreciate the opportunity to come to speak before you. I appreciate Commissioner Lorcher's comments on the history of Meridian and it's slowly disappearing as this development goes on and on. Our goal as a commission is to preserve and protect as much as we can the history of Meridian and our main goal for this development -- is it possible just to retain that -- those double silos on site. That's the last existing dual silo -- silo granary in Ada county. That's why we are intent on, if possible, keeping it there. With that said, with the roadway -- I don't know if it's possible, but I appreciate the applicant's consideration, his sign he put in for it. Staff report on the history and what it means to us. I think the only thing I have to say is to add, after listening to

the applicant's testimony -- I don't know if it's possible to have a condition on this is to get a final answer for that second moving company for approval before it moves to City Council or before City Council's approval of it. So, if it can be moved or not. I think that's the big thing right now. If it can't be moved I think it would be great to keep it on site -- slash work for everybody else and it retains part of the historical integrity of that building. So, with that I'm open to any questions.

Seal: I have got a question on this. I have about a billion ideas floating around in my head, because --

Johnston: So have I.

Seal: Yeah. To be honest, this is the first time -- I have been doing this for about six years. This is the first time that something of a historical existence has come through that we are -- that we are talking about, so --

Johnston: I have been on the commission for 11 years and this is the first time we have ever had an applicant come before us and the first time I have ever come for P&Z to testify. So, I hear you.

Seal: Yeah. So, it's -- to me it's important, because we have had a lot of feedback from -- from the residents of -- of Meridian about, you know, losing our history, as, you know, we -- we progress with -- with building the city out in the future, so -- I mean something in the back of my mind with this is if -- if we can move this -- I mean, obviously, where it's at -- it's going to have to be disassembled and moved, so -- and what the applicant is saying that they would like to -- regardless of if it goes somewhere else or not, they are going to do some kind of historical preservation on site to mark the -- to mark the area, which I think is a good -- you know, an important consideration of this to mark the site and have areas like that available within Meridian, but -- I mean would the -- you know, what the Historical Commission be -- in the back of my mind I have always wondered what they are going to do with the northeast corner of Ten Mile and Franklin, something along those lines, or in the middle of a roundabout one of the big ones or something along those lines. Like is that something that -- from the Historical Commission perspective is that something that would kind of ring true for this piece of --

Johnston: I think if the roundabout is big enough I don't see a problem. I think that would be a great use for this structure is to be in the middle of a roundabout. People would see it. They couldn't stop and look at it, but they could at least say, okay, yeah, that's -- that's part of our history. That's -- that's -- the history of Meridian is agriculture and all that. Yes, I think that would be a fantastic use if it's possible.

Seal: Okay. Just wanted to kind of check on that.

Johnston: Yes.

Seal: Like you say, I mean it's -- it's -- speaking about it, I just want to make sure it doesn't take over the whole application, but at the same time it's something that we are going to talk a lot about, so I would imagine -- so, appreciate you coming in and talking to us. Commissioners, do we have any other questions? Any comments? No?

Lorcher: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Lorcher, go ahead.

Lorcher: So, it would be up to City Council's determination whether or not they have a budget to be able to retain it as a city monument; correct?

Johnston: Correct.

Lorcher: You don't have any funds to be --

Johnston: No, HPC doesn't have any funds to do anything like that. So, it would be up to City Council if -- to move it on city property, yeah, it would be up to City Council to appropriate the funds for it. I have talked to a couple of developers that may be interested, but they don't know yet. So, a lot depends on what the outcome of this Commission says. Lorcher: I guess my only other comment is -- is when I first started with this Commission for Planning and Zoning and talking to the Mayor -- and this is my -- starting my fourth year, so I have been around for a little while. It's been challenging to get Meridian City Council to be interested in our history and to preserve things. It's about growth. It's about smart growth. And I appreciate that. But, again, if we lose who we are, then, we are just Anytown USA; right? So, I don't know if we can put that as a condition in our motion to City Council to look at the opportunity to retain it as a city monument somehow. Is that - - I'm not sure if we can even do that, but, you know, that would be the most important thing to even -- so, it doesn't leave Meridian.

Johnston: Correct.

Lorcher: Because it was suggested in one of the reports that it goes someplace else in the Treasure Valley. Well, if it ends up in Harris Ranch or, you know, in Mountain Home or someplace else, it -- it loses its designation -- or the distinguished part of being part of Meridian.

Johnston: I agree with you totally.

Lorcher: Yeah. So -- okay. That's all I --

Seal: Thank you.

Hersh: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Lorcher?

Seal: Yes.

Hersh: So, Commission can recommend that -- that -- to City Council that you would like them to preserve it somewhere as a recommendation.

Seal: Anybody else? Thank you, sir. Appreciate your time.

Johnston: Thank you.

Seal: Anybody else signed up?

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

Seal: Anybody in the audience want to come up and testify on this? No? All right. Would the applicant like to come back up?

Bailey: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners. And thanks, Blaine, for -- for coming in here and talking about that stuff, too. And I think we do appreciate -- but I want to reiterate that -- you know, that we have taken this seriously as we have gone along and we would like to see a solution for it, too, you know. We are not -- we are not in that range of -- of trying to get rid of any history in Meridian. But we are stuck with, you know, where we are and with -- with certain constraints on that. You know, basically we are kind of open to -- if you have suggestions that go there -- we are trying to set this so you can move us forward here and I think that's important for a couple reasons is, one, that, then, we can plan for what we are going to do and, two, if we don't move forward, then -- then we are out of the decision making process on -- on it anyways. So, with that said, if -- we would rather move forward tonight with -- you know, with your condition than be deferred, because we don't think we are going to find out anything from now -- or for some period of time; right? And, like I said earlier, while Kelly Moving is still looking at that, they have been out there twice so far and I haven't seen a proposal for them and I have talked to them and I do know from a structural perspective that -- that this is going to be a really hard thing for someone to take on to pick up the entire foundation, stabilize that building, move it and, then, give us a building permit at the other end. That said, he is going to have a tough time, you know, giving us a building permit. Structural engineer is going to have a tough time with that. So, I just don't feel it's possible and we will continue to investigate and if they say, yep, we can do it and we are going to do it for this price and it can get there, I will probably try to talk to the developer into doing that; right? But once it's up and moving it could also go to the intersection, too; right? You know. Or to -- to another site as well. So, now we have a lot of options and we have a backup option here with our proposal that at a minimum really maintains a good historical preservation of the idea of the monument itself and that's not the real thing, but -- but it's, you know, held to be close to that, you know, with the historical stuff. So, I guess I take it at that. And, then, we do agree with all the -- all the conditions of approval otherwise and -- and we would like to move forward with the approval of the project tonight.

Seal: Okay. Any other questions, Commissioners? All right. Thank you very much. Appreciate your time tonight. With that I will take a motion to close the public hearing for File No. H-2023-0045 for Farmstone Crossing Subdivision.

Smith: So moved.

Lorcher: Second.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded to close public hearing for File No. H-2023-0045. All in favor, please, say aye. Opposed nay? The public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Seal: I will jump in on this one first, just to talk about the project itself. So, I actually like -- I like the layout. I like the -- kind of the form and function of it. So, I -- you know, I'm happy with those pieces of it. I mean it's -- it seems to be appropriate for the area. It's going to help Vanguard extension go in. I did have a question for staff on Vanguard. Do you have any estimation on when that might be complete all the way through to Ten Mile? To mile high.

Parson: Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission, I don't, but I can tell you that I have been at all of the meetings where those discussions are occurring and if -- what's being planned for that area it does occur it will need to happen sooner rather than later, just because of the access issues out there. So, the applicant was correct in stating that it will happen fairly quickly and met with the applicant or the design firm that is putting that together. It has not been officially submitted to the city or ACHD for review yet, but it is imminent.

Seal: Okay. Thank you. Yeah. I mean Black Cat is a -- it's -- it's kind of sticking to me, so I don't -- I have -- I struggle with its ability to properly provide for the amount of traffic that's going in out there, but I also understand that it's -- you know, it's something that ACHD and the city are trying to bump the priority on and get that taken care of, so happy to see some of the stuff going and be developed. On the -- just on the historical portion of it, you know, as -- as some type of monument is developed for this my -- my hope is it's something that can kind of be seen from the freeway. I don't know if that's even a possibility, but something that kind of marks that that is there, so that, you know, when you are driving by on the freeway you say I'm by the -- you know, whatever monument it is. It's something that's recognizable. It's something that people can see as they drive in and out. And, then, as far as the -- you know, the dual silo itself, it's small enough -- the hope is that maybe they can move it somewhere that it is something that at least can be viewed. So, I don't know if they are going to be able to move it in its current iteration foundation at all, but, hopefully, move at least enough of it to preserve it in a way that people can visit it and it's -- you know, it's a historic marker for Meridian -- Meridian and its placement is such that, you know, it will be enjoyed by hundreds, if not thousands of people a day as they drive by it somewhere. So, we do have a lot of places that I think could accommodate that that are little slices that are really really hard to even

conceptualize putting something in there. So, hopefully, that happens down the road. I mean I would love to see, you know, Parks Department, art commission, you know, kind of throw collectively some heads together and see what can be done with this. So, you know, I don't know if there is any budget for it or not, but hopefully the city can take on a large role in trying to preserve that piece of history. Anybody else? Commissioner Smith, go ahead.

Smith: Mr. Chair, thank you. Yeah. I echo what you are saying. I would also -- kind of extending that line of thinking -- of putting heads together. Also considering, you know, if this doesn't get relocated somewhere else, I mean the worst -- the worst outcome is that that wood or those materials become just scrap and so if something could at least be salvaged from that if we can't relocate the silo as a whole or in significant part, I would like to see, you know, some discussion of that as well. I think at the very least this -- you know, the monument -- I appreciate that, but there is -- there is probably more we can do and I don't know that this is -- the developer needs to do, but that we as a city can do to try to figure out how to continue the legacy of Meridian in the past as we kind of keep building the Meridian of the future.

Seal: Thank you.

Lorcher: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Lorcher, go ahead.

Lorcher: I think about -- if you go down to downtown Boise -- and I'm going to get my streets wrong, but I think it's 5th and Grove or maybe 6th and Grove, there is a waterwheel there that kind of shows an open canal of where the water used to come through in open canals through the city of Boise and if -- they were able to kind of preserve just a little bit of -- a tidbit with a little park around it that kind of talks about, you know, what was here type of thing and we see that more, obviously, in Boise than we do in Meridian. We do have our historic walk down here with our homes, but not necessarily our farms, because they are further out. As an advocate of history I live and own Mr. McDermott's house at Ustick and McDermott. We have fought with ITD, because we are in the impact area of Highway 16. We have been able to save that house. It's a 1920s farmhouse. Most people -- I think the -- the bean counter said that it had no economic value and -- and that may be true on paper, but it's not necessarily true for our community and so being able to preserve these silos within the city, if we can actually -- what I have been trying to write to possibly suggest to City Council is that the -- the city considers retaining it as a historical monument before it's sold or given to another part of our community and the developer build some sort a monument to acknowledge that that space was there, because there is enough history wonks in our community that will want to remember that and then -- and try to find a likely candidate for the -- if the city is not interested in being able to retain it and our -- like you suggest, our park systems or a roundabout or somewhere in our city, that, you know, we can find a developer that can incorporate it. Those are my only comments. But I guess for the development part of it, based on what's happening on the

manufacturing side on the west side and your development here was with Adler going onto the east, everything that you are doing for that site is appropriate.

Seal: Any other statements, questions, concerns? No? Absolutely. I will --

Lorcher: All right. I'm going to give this a go. As you can see I'm a little passionate about our history here in Meridian.

Seal: That's good.

Lorcher: Okay. After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to City Council of File No. H-2023-0045 as presented in the staff report -- I don't know if they are modifications, but I'm going to say including a proposal to the Meridian City Council to retain the dual silos as a historical monument within our city and not to be given or sold to another part of the Treasure Valley and the developer to build a monument on site to commemorate the dual silos for the hearing date of February 15th of 2024.

Smith: Kurt, does that sound okay to you from a legal perspective?

Starman: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, I think it's a bit beyond your purview, but I think it -- as Stacy mentioned, I think you have the ability to make recommendations to Council. My -- my thinking is you have a concrete application before you and you have criteria in the UDC and the Local Land Use Planning Act, state law. That's your foundation and, really, your -- your motions and your recommendations should stem from that. I think that the way Commissioner Lorcher made the motion -- I think made it clear that you are recommending approval of the project as presented in the staff report and you have a supplemental thought that you are recommending to the City Council that's related, but it's supplemental thought. So, I think in that context that's appropriate. But, in fairness, I would say that's a bit beyond the scope of the Planning and Zoning Commission in terms of budget considerations and, you know, Council allocation of resources. That's really not really your purview, but I think the way the motion was crafted is sufficient and I think the Council can react as they decide -- they choose to do so.

Seal: Okay. Thank you.

Lorcher: I stand with my motion then.

Seal: Second still stand?

Smith: Second stands.

Seal: All right. Thank you very much. With that it's been moved and seconded to recommend approval of File No. H-2023-0045 for Farmstone Crossing Subdivision. All in favor please say aye. Opposed nay? Approved. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.