

Meridian Planning and Zoning Meeting

November 17, 2022.

Meeting of the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission of November 17, 2022, was called to order at 6:03 p.m. by Chairman Andrew Seal.

Members Present: Chairman Andrew Seal, Commissioner Patrick Grace, Commissioner Maria Lorcher, and Commissioner Mandi Stoddard.

Members Absent: Commissioner Steven Yearsley and Commissioner Nate Wheeler.

Others Present: Joy Hall, Kurt Starman, Bill Parsons, Sonya Alan, Joe Dodson, and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

_____ Nate Wheeler	___X___ Maria Lorcher
__X__ Mandi Stoddard	_____ (Vacant)
_____ Steven Yearsley	___X___ Patrick Grace
_____ Andrew Seal - Chairman	

Seal: All right. Good evening, everybody. Welcome to the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting for November 17th, 2022, and at this time I would like to call the meeting to order. The Commissioners who are present for this evening's meeting are at City Hall and on Zoom. We also have staff -- we also have staff from the city attorney and clerk's offices, as well as the City Planning Department. If you are joining us on Zoom this evening we can see that you are here. You may observe the meeting. However, your ability to be seen on screen and talk will be muted. During the public testimony portion of the meeting you will be unmuted and, then, be able to comment. Please note that we cannot take questions until the public testimony portion. If you have a process question during the meeting, please e-mail cityclerk@meridiacity.org and they will reply as quickly as possible. If you simply want to watch the meeting, we encourage you to watch the streaming on the city's YouTube channel. You can access that at meridiacity.org/live. We are getting a feedback. All right. And away we go again. With that let's begin with the roll call. Madam Clerk.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Seal: Okay. The first item on the agenda is the adoption of the agenda. There are no modifications, so can I get a motion to adopt the agenda as presented?

Lorcher: So moved.

Grace: Second.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded to adopt the agenda. All in favor say aye. Okay. No opposed. Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

1. Approve Minutes from the 11-3-2022 Planning & Zoning Meeting

Seal: Next item on the agenda is the Consent Agenda and we have one item on the Consent Agenda, which is to approve the minutes of the November 3rd, 2022, Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. Can I get a motion to accept the Consent Agenda as presented?

Grace: So moved.

Lorcher: Second.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded to --

Stoddard: Second.

Seal: -- moved and seconded to adopt the Consent Agenda. All in favor say aye. No opposed. Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Seal: At this time I would like to explain the public hearing process. We will open each item individually and begin with the staff report. Staff will report their findings on how the item adheres to our Comprehensive Plan and Unified Development Code. After staff has made their presentation the applicant will come forward to present their case and respond to staff comments. They will have 15 minutes to do so. After the applicant is finished we will open the floor to public testimony. Each person will be called on only once during the public testimony. The Clerk will call the names individually of those who have signed up on our website in advance to testify. They will, then, be unmuted in Zoom or you can come to the microphones in Chambers. Please state your name and address for the record and you will have three minutes to address the Commission. If you have previously sent pictures or a presentation for the meeting, it will be displayed on the screen and you or the Clerk will run the present -- presentation. If you have established that you are speaking on behalf of a larger group, like an HOA, where others from that group will allow you to speak on their behalf, you will have up to ten minutes. After all those who have signed up in advance have spoken we will invite any others who may wish to testify. If you wish to speak on this topic you may come forward in Chambers or if on Zoom press the raise hand button in the Zoom app or if you are listening on a phone, please, press star nine and wait for your name to be called. If you are listening on multiple devices, such as a computer and a phone, please, be sure to mute the extra devices so we do not

experience feedback and we can hear you clearly. When you are finished the Commission -- if the Commission does not have questions for you, you will return to your seat in Chambers or be muted on Zoom and no longer have the ability to speak. And please remember we will not call on you a second time. After all testimony has been heard, the applicant will be given another ten minutes to come back and respond. When the applicant is finished responding to questions and concerns, we will close the public hearing and the Commissioners will have the opportunity to discuss and hopefully be able to make final decisions or recommendations to City Council as needed.

ACTION ITEMS

- 2. Public Hearing for Sessions Parkway (H-2022-0046) by KM Engineering, LLP. located at 2700 N. Eagle Rd.**
 - A. Request: Development Agreement Modification on the existing Development Agreement (Inst.#104129529) to remove the subject property from the agreement in order to enter into a new Development Agreement for the proposed project.
 - B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 5 building lots on 5.32 acres of land in the C-G zoning district with a request for City Council approval of an access via N. Eagle Rd./SH-55.

Seal: So, at this time I would like to open the public hearing for Item No. H-2022-0046, for Sessions Parkway and we will begin with the staff report.

Allen: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission. The first application before you tonight is Sessions Parkway. It's a request for a development agreement modification. This application does not require Commission action. City Council is the decision-making body. And a preliminary plat. The preliminary plat is what's before you tonight. This site consists of 5.32 acres of land. It's zoned C-G and is located at 2700 North Eagle Road. This property was annexed back in 2003 with a development agreement, which was later amended in 2017. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation is mixed-use regional. The applicant is requesting approval of a preliminary plat, consisting of five commercial building lots on 5.32 acres of land in the C-G zoning district with a request for City Council approval of a right-in, right-out driveway access via North Eagle Road and State Highway 55. Approval of the preliminary plan is contingent upon City Council's approval of the concurrent development agreement modification application. One driveway access is proposed at the northern boundary, which will serve as a backage road along Eagle Road and will connect to the property to the south. The jog in the roadway will result in traffic calming and reduced speeds, which is desired, especially if the access via Eagle Road is approved, which will intersect the backage road. Two driveways to the east are proposed for interconnectivity with the future residential development. ITD has issued a letter of acceptance of the revised traffic striping conceptual drawings. Final approval of the proposed access and associated improvements will be determined once all documentation have been provided and the

permit is signed. A 35 foot wide street buffer is proposed along North Eagle Road, State Highway 55, with a ten foot wide multi-use pathway in accord with the Pathways Master Plan. Decorative pedestrian lighting is also required along the pathway. A 25 foot wide buffer is required on the subject property along the eastern boundary adjacent to future residential uses with lot development. Written testimony has been received from the applicant's representative Givens Pursley. They are requesting removal of all four changes to the concept plan recommended by staff in Section 8 of the Staff Report, A-1-A. Staff is recommending approval of the proposed preliminary plat contingent upon compliance with the development agreement provisions and conditions of approval in the staff report. Staff will stand for any questions.

Seal: Thank you, Sonya. Would the applicant like to come forward? Good evening.

Hopkins: Thank you. Good evening, Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission. I have a presentation I think Sonya is going to bring up.

Seal: And we will need your name and address for the record and the floor is all yours.

Hopkins: Stephanie Hopkins with KM Engineering. 5725 North Discovery Way in Boise. I'm here super excited to represent our client and the developer for Sessions Parkway. We have been working on this project for a few years now on various components and we are really excited to be showing you the preliminary plat, as well as discussing the development agreement modification we will be requesting from City Council and an access -- right-in, right-out access to State Highway 55 or Eagle Road. So, just to get you situated -- and, actually, a little bit of history on this project. It was originally annexed into the city in 2003 as part of Red Feather Estates, which is located to the southeast as you can see on the map here. In 2015 additional property was annexed and zoned and a conditional use permit was also approved for multi-family use. That is the DA that's current on the property now and what we are requesting to modify with City Council. We also did a property boundary adjustment for this property in 2020 that created the current configuration that you see here. So, Sessions Parkway is about 5.3 acres and it's outlined in yellow. We are surrounded by existing development, most of which to the east is residential in nature. So, there is some multi-family to -- directly east and that was -- it's currently under development and under this -- the same development company that's working on this project. There is retail and professional service uses to the north. Regency at River Valley, which is a multi-family development to the south. The Village, which has a variety of commercial and non-retail uses. There is some professional offices and other types of uses in -- in the development there. And, then, there is a county land, as well as State Highway 55 or Eagle Road to our west. Kleiner Park is also a large regional draw. Pretty great civic use that has a variety of pathways and playgrounds and places for people to recreate. It's quite large, so -- this is the preliminary plat that we are asking for your approval on this evening, comprised of five lots, range in size from about 36,000 square feet to 63,000 square feet. Cross-access will be granted internally to each of the lots and we are planning on connecting to Copper -- Copper Canary, which is to the south. They recently came through with a development agreement modification sometime last year and we will comply with whatever they decide to do with their backage

road that goes through their property. So, as part of our preliminary plat we will provide 25 feet of landscaping to the adjacent residential use, The Village apartments to our east, and we will be integrating the site with vehicular and pedestrian connectivity as I will show later. So, as part of this application to City Council we will be requesting a right-in, right-out location -- or an access point to Eagle Road, which is shown on our south boundary through that private driveway. This is something we have been coordinating with ITD for the past couple of years. They have approved a conceptual striping plan and recently we were coordinating with them and they said that, you know, this is conceptually approved, we just need to submit the formal permitting once construction plans are finalized and we are kind of further along in the process. So, we have also -- our clients have been coordinating with the Copper Canary property a fair amount on this access point. I know the city's been talking with that property as well as us for a while on consolidating the access points that are currently used to our north and south. So, this is the existing concept plan that's in the development agreement that we will be asking to modify. It shows four different pad sites, which were associated with four lots. We have changed the concept plan to be more consistent with the lots that we are now requesting, which are five, as well as different vision for the property. So, along with our development agreement we are asking for two conceptual plans to be attached. We are -- both concept plans include a convenience store, which is at the northwest corner of the site and the first concept shows a drive-through, which will be at the southwest corner. The first concept shows three building pads of different sizes on three different lots and the second -- this is just a -- a rendering to kind of give you an idea of how it would be landscaped. Pedestrian connectivity would be provided on the north, south, and the ten foot multi-use pathway on the west side adjacent to Eagle Road. There would also be some plaza spaces that are on the south side, kind of along here. If you can see my cursor. And this would provide a -- a nice central area for folks within this entire region to hang out, especially if they are coming over from Kleiner Park to access maybe a convenience store or get to some of the other commercial uses that are in this area. This is our second concept plan, which includes the convenience store, as well as the drive through. This one shows a hotel concept, which would go across the three property lines and if this was the concept that was going to be pursued we would just do a property boundary adjustment to consolidate those lines to make sure it wouldn't be an issue for building code stuff and this also shows the plaza spaces on the south side, as well as pedestrian connectivity throughout. I will show you a couple of exhibits later that kind of highlight the pedestrian connectivity to make it a little bit clearer, too. And, then, a rendering -- so, you can see how nicely landscaped it will be. It will be really consistent with what's in the area as far as the ten foot multi-use pathway and we will provide a nice -- kind of a -- a last puzzle piece for this area, because it's really an in-fill spot that's been undeveloped for quite some time, so -- so, this is the city's future land use map that's associated with the Comprehensive Plan. The area in brown is mixed-use regional and that's the land use that's designated and kind of guides how the property develops in the future. East of Eagle Road between Ustick and Fairview -- so, it's kind of like an L-shape here is about 150 acres. So, our site is about five acres. It's a pretty small percentage of the overall land use for this area, most of which has already been developed with some civic uses or commercial uses, as well as some professional uses in the -- The Village apartment -- or The Village shopping center. And, then, there are grocery and kind of some

professional and retail uses to the north, as well as the multi-family that we kind of talked about earlier. This is a pedestrian connectivity exhibit to show you exactly how much pedestrian connections this development will be providing. So, The Village apartments are located on the east side here. Quite a few pedestrian connections throughout that development and we will be marrying the two projects together by bringing kind of the east-west connections through and, really, it will provide -- if you can -- I look at Kleiner Park -- if you go further west you can take a variety of paths up north and if you wanted to access maybe this drive-through restaurant there would be a few different options to get over there. So, we felt that this would really show kind of how this project will help to bridge that gap and -- and contribute to the overall kind of open space and pedestrian connectivity here. So, this is the proposed access to State Highway 55. As Sonya mentioned, you won't be making a recommendation on this tonight, but it is important I think to this project, because it's going to be an integral part of how the -- the site is accessed. It's also going to help alleviate a lot of issues, I guess, that would -- that already exist on Eagle Road. So, I think we are all familiar with Eagle Road. It's a road that's supposed to be a pretty high traffic volume and fast pace, but there are a lot of access points and so this project would consolidate four of those existing access points, the Copper Canary's property here, this access point was supposed to be temporary. So, with this -- the access point that we are proposing here as a right-in, right-out that would eliminate these four access points and really create a more consolidated place for cars to safely enter and exit. So, we are in agreement with the majority of the staff report and appreciate their analysis and all the coordination that they have helped us on through this project. But there are a few conditions that will be associated with the development agreement that we would like to request modification of. So, we -- our counsel submitted some -- a memo basically outlining these -- these conditions and how we would like to change them and I just want to go through it quickly, so that we can kind of cover that. The first one is the first condition under the development agreement conditions and it's to depict nonretail, commercial, office or civic uses for a minimum of 50 percent of the development area on Exhibit X1.0, which is the first concept plan that showed the three buildings on the east side, unless Commission or Council finds that this isn't applicable, because this property is part of a larger mixed-use regional designated area. This doesn't apply if their property develops with the hotel as proposed in Exhibit 2. So, in order to afford flexibility for our client, we really would like to modify this condition -- or remove this condition, because we do feel that given the size of the property, which is about five acres, in the overall scheme of the mixed-use regional land use it's a pretty small piece and we feel that the intent of the mixed-use regional zone has been fulfilled with all of the other uses that we have kind of talked about. So, the civic that's Kleiner Park, the commercial uses in The Village, as well as to the north and, then, you know, some of the professional service uses that are available to the north, as well as to the south, as well as the multi-family residential properties and, then, a variety of single family residential properties as well within this kind of mixed-use regional zone. And the second one was related to specific details for the integrated plaza slash open space area shall be provided with a first certificate of zoning compliance. The applicant can relocate open space plaza areas depicted on the plan with director approval once specific tenants are known. We request to keep the plaza areas as we have shown on the south part of the site and this is really so that we kind of know what to expect for folks and, additionally, we -- we would prefer

that these not be associated with the first certificate of zoning compliance. It's pretty limiting depending on who comes in first and if it's not contiguous with whichever property comes in first it would be hard to -- to make that happen. So, that's how we are proposing to modify that condition. And the third condition was on concept plan one, labeled as X1.0. Again, that's the first concept with the three buildings on the east side. Some or all of the buildings along the eastern boundary should be rotated and/or relocated in a shared plaza area or green space area added to a more central location within the development for better integration, including a central pathway connection to the open space and front pad sites. We request to keep this building alignment as shown for concept one with the plaza spaces and open spaces on the south. This will really afford more flexibility for future tenants and will allow them to configure the buildings in whatever way they would like to within the building pads, as long as they meet the setbacks and dimensional standards for the C-G zone and would provide a nice buffer for residential uses to the east from the future commercial that will be located there, as well as Eagle Road. We also feel that this building alignment will provide better visibility for commercial users from Eagle Road, which is important for the viability of their businesses and to make sure that they are contributing to the economy here, so -- and the fourth one is -- if the site develops with concept plan two, which is labeled as X2.0, the applicant shall construct a five foot sidewalk on the east boundary and provide a decorative crosswalk across the drive aisle of the multi-family portion of the development to enhance pedestrian connectivity. We request that that sidewalk remain as depicted on the concept plan, which I will bring up. We believe that the additional pathway along the east boundary will be redundant, because there are already several options between and through The Village apartments. We don't think that this pathway would benefit anyone that would be using the hotel or the commercial properties and think that it would just be an unused pathway essentially. So, prefer to keep the pathway directly adjacent to the hotel, so those folks can use it and easily access shopping and other services to the north and south. We do agree, though -- I -- I think staff had written that they wanted a connection right down here to The Village apartments and we agree to do that connection. We think that makes a lot of sense and we will follow code requirements as far as special pavement or differentiating it from the pavement. So, as I mentioned, we are really excited for this project and it's been a long time coming and I think, you know, having two concept plans attached to this development agreement will provide our client the flexibility that's needed to really make it a successful project. It fulfills a lot of the city's goals and I think it will be a wonderful addition to Meridian. So, excited for it and I will stand for questions if you have any. Our development team is here as well. Our client and counsel if you have questions for them they can come up and answer those.

Seal: Okay. Thank you very much.

Hopkins: Thank you.

Seal: Commissioners, do we have any questions for applicant or staff? None? All right. Thank you very much.

Hopkins: Thank you.

Seal: We will get back to you after the public testimony.

Hopkins: Okay.

Seal: Madam Clerk, do we have anybody signed up? Okay.

Hall: We have a Leo Bertz. No? So, don't see anybody else wanting to come up and testify at all? Do we have anybody online?

Starman: Mr. Chairman? Not to testify, but may I just add a piece of clarification --

Seal: Absolutely.

Starman: -- for the Commission in particular. So, this is one of these hybrid applications where we are -- and you saw from the presentation this evening, particular from the applicant, where a lot of discussion relative to the proposed modification to the development agreement and, then, we also have the topic as part of the application is the preliminary plat and so this is one of those odd types of applications in the -- in our Unified Development Code where it talks about the responsibilities of the Commission, vis-a-vis the department director, vis-a-vis the City Council. The Commission is tasked as a recommending body relative to the preliminary plat, but with respect to the proposed modification to the development agreement, the recommending body, so to speak, is the community development director, not the Commission. So, even though you heard a lot of testimony about the proposed modifications to the development agreement, that's really not directly within your purview. So, just I wanted to sort of clarify that piece. But I would also say it may be difficult to talk about one without the other and so I don't want you to feel artificially constrained and if you need to talk about the bigger picture to understand, you know, the preliminary plat better, I think that's all fair game. But I just wanted the Commission to be aware that, really, in terms of -- from the code perspective your recommendation is specific to the preliminary plat. That all make sense? Okay.

Seal: Thank you very much. Appreciate the clarification on that. Nobody else wants to come up and testify? I was going to say would the applicant like to add anything or close with anything? Okay. With them signifying no, can I get a -- a motion to close the public testimony?

Grace: Mr. Chairman, I would move to close the public testimony.

Lorcher: Second.

Seal: It's been moved to close public testimony for File No. H-2022-0046. All in favor say aye. No opposed. Motion carries. The public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Seal: Who would like to go first?

Lorcher: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Lorcher, go ahead.

Lorcher: So, based on City Council in regard to our goal tonight, the way the buildings are situated and the open space and all that, that's the develop -- that's the development agreement; correct? We are really talking about whether or not this is designed for mixed-use regional or -- or retail -- or retail or general commercial; correct? Based on where the buildings are.

Starman: Mr. Chairman and Commissioner Lorcher, like I said, it may be difficult to break those things apart, the preliminary plat, which is within your purview as a recommending body, vis-a-vis proposed change to the development agreement. But, really, the issue before you is a preliminary plat and maybe staff can -- our planning staff can put that back -- that slide up. Do you have a slide that just shows the preliminary plat? Yeah. So, really, this -- this is -- if you wanted to kind of zero in like what precisely is your recommendation, it's relative to the preliminary plat that's on your screen now in the Chambers here. Your recommendation is relative to the preliminary plat before you, but to the extent you need to talk about the bigger picture of the concept plans that you saw and how it might relate to this topic, I think that's fair game.

Lorcher: Okay. Well, with that being said, I mean to put in a mixed-use, I'm a little concerned about convenience store with the high traffic off of Eagle Road. I'm trying to think if there is anything else like that right there, but because of the right-in and right-out, I don't know how much use the convenience store would get because it would be challenging to get in and out of there. Is there a gas station proposed with it as well? So, a gas station as well. And, then, some kind of drive-through, which we have plenty along Eagle Road. I -- I guess, you know, without getting into the weeds, you know, the City Council may -- or the city planners made recommendations as far as how the buildings should be situated for the developmental -- development agreement, which should be followed. But if we are just talking about our recommendation of whether or not this should be a drive-through, a convenience store, and some stores, I guess I would like to hear from you who have had more experience with this and whether this would be in the best interest of the city.

Seal: Well, I will kind of go about it a little different way. I mean looking at the -- at the plat -- I mean, you know, you are looking at a bunch of squares, you know, or -- or odd shapes on a -- on a map, then, basically anything that can go there that would fix -- you know, fit mixed-use residential, so -- or mixed-use basically. So, with that I mean it is difficult not to get into the weeds a little bit on the DA plan, so -- on the DA modification and -- I mean the -- the one thing that I will say is the -- the hotel-motel, that seems to fit a lot better. For me if it fits a lot better mainly because with the residential all being lined up creates that wall effect, which is hideous. So, it's not -- to me that is just a -- it creates a dead space behind the -- the commercial use buildings with the apartments. It's hard to see back there. You know, that -- that in and of itself is -- is a concern for me with that. That also affects, you know, obviously, the layout of the preliminary plat, because if you

do turn the building sideways, then, you know, is this plat well adjusted for that? I don't know the answer to that. Not a -- I'm not that kind of engineer. So, I mean there are -- that's -- that's the biggest concern that I have with it as the preliminary plat and the DA modification kind of come together, so -- I mean the others -- you know, other than that I have no big issues with that. I know there has been a lot of work done with ITD in order to get, you know, the right-in, right-out in order to get the access points created as they are. The property to the south has been, you know, through here before. You know, we have had a lot of conversations about this piece of property. So, in all I'm happy to see it develop. You know, I mean to me this is an in-fill project for sure. That said, you know, I think either the -- the hotel or turn the building sideways has been recommended by staff, would be in your best interest for sure in order to make sure this fits correctly and is, you know, of good use for the community. As far as the -- some of the other things that have been in there -- I mean I -- I understand this is a small piece of a larger piece of mixed-use. That said, I -- I like properties to stand on their own. I -- I always use the example of we have developers that come in and say, well, I -- we don't have -- need to have as much common space, because, well, there is a school next door to us, you know, without making any kind of contribution to the school at all. You really can't rely on your neighbors in order to fill in what you are supposed to be doing. That's the way it has been. That's the way it should be. So, I'm not going to rely on my neighbor to augment my goals. So, I -- you know. And that's just a recommendation as you go to City Council. I'm sure they will -- I can't speak for any of them, but, you know, I watch their meetings every week, so fairly certain that that's going to come up. Does that help, Commissioner Lorcher? I mean it's, essentially, that's, you know, how I'm tying it all together is it is difficult to not tie in everything from the DA mod, but it is -- you know, it's not in our purview in order to recommend approval for that. So, City Council does listen to what we have to say sometimes, so that's the recommendations that I would give is either go with the hotel plan or turn the buildings and, then, you know, reconfigure some of that public space -- or open space that's out there in order to fit in with the recommendation that Sonya has made. We can't tell you how to design your property, we can just tell you what might work and what might not and, then, it's up to you to design it.

Grace: Mr. Chair, I don't -- I don't have a whole lot more to add. I -- other than I really would echo your recommendation that the -- I guess of the two options I really like the idea of the hotel as well, to the extent that that carries any weight with City Council that would be my recommendation. I like some of the things I see. I -- I like the -- the abandonment of some of the -- some of the access points into one. That's a -- I think that's a positive. I did have a question similar to maybe Commissioner Lorcher whereby, yeah, the folks going northbound I guess on Eagle, it's -- it's an easy access. The folks coming south -- southbound -- I guess they would have to go Ustick and, then, around like that other parallel road escapes me at the moment, but -- and, then, come in the other way. Or go in through The Village. So, yeah, the convenience store doesn't bother me per se, other than if it's -- if it's only accessible one way I guess that could be -- you -- you could ask, you know, the value of it, so -- so, not -- not a whole lot to add, but just -- just some comments, hopefully, for consideration for City Council or others.

Seal: Okay. Commissioner Lorcher, go ahead.

Stoddard: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Yes, go right ahead, Commissioner Stoddard.

Stoddard: Yeah. I just wanted to kind of echo the same exact stuff. You know, I'm -- I'm really happy to see the consolidated access points. I'm really glad to see it being developed. I think that's great. Same -- I -- I don't mind the convenience store at all and I definitely agree also that -- that I think a hotel in that space would be nice, especially with the subdivision, you know, behind it. I think it would just kind of be a nice transition there and so -- anyway, I just kind of have the same kind of thoughts and feelings.

Seal: Okay. Thank you. Appreciate that.

Stoddard: Uh-huh.

Lorcher: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Lorcher, go ahead.

Lorcher: Sonya, with -- do we have to add anything into our approval as far as modifications are concerned or is it as is? Do we need to add anything in or --

Seal: I think -- and that question probably stems from the -- the modifications that Sonya has in the staff report really are not related to the preliminary plat.

Lorcher: Oh.

Seal: So, I think that the recommendations that we give are on the preliminary plat, albeit you can include a recommendation in a motion, so --

Lorcher: All right. Mr. Chair?

Seal: Go right ahead.

Lorcher: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to approve to City Council File No. H-2022-0046 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of November 17th, 2022.

Grace: Second.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded to approve Item No. H-2022-0046 with no modifications. All in favor say aye. No opposed? Motion passes. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

3. Public Hearing for Centrepoint Apartments (H-2022-0072) by MGM Meridian, LLC., located at 3100 N. Centrepointe Way, near the southwest corner of N. Eagle and E. Ustick Rds.

- A. Request: Conditional Use Permit for 213 multi-family residential units on approximately 10 acres in the C-G zoning district.

Seal: All right. At this time I would like to open File No. H-2022-0072, Centrepoint Apartments, and we will begin with the staff report.

Dodson: Mr. Chair, just give me one second, so I can pull up the applicant's -- so we are ready for that when we get there.

Seal: Sorry. Time's up. We are continuing it.

Dodson: It's okay to be mean tonight. That's --

Seal: I was going to say, I don't get a lot of opportunity to be mean to you, so I got to take advantage of it.

Dodson: Sounds good.

Seal: Thanks, Joe.

Dodson: All right. Now we are back. Here we go. So, my first item tonight as noted is for Centrepoint Apartments. The application before the Commission tonight is for a conditional use permit for 213 multi-family units on approximately ten acres in the C-G zoning district. The application encompasses one of two parcels that surround the hard corner -- the southwest corner of Eagle and Ustick Roads. These parcels were part of a development agreement modification and CUP in 2019 that removed the subject parcels from existing DA to enter into a new DA to obtain approval for a new athletic club and spa, which code calls an indoor recreation facility, and that was known as Villasport. The CUP approval for that has expired and the property has been sold to the current owner. Earlier this year the applicant did receive a new DA modification. 2022-0035 was approved the end of July, approximately. To enter into a new agreement with a concept plan depicting multi-family residential on the ten acre piece and commercial space on the smaller one acre piece that's directly along Eagle Road that is not part of the CUP. You can see it vaguely here in the bottom right. The subject CUP is the next step in establishing the approved use and concept plan and the submitted site plan elevations are substantially consistent with the concept plan within the DA. Through the recent DA modification staff found that the proposed project and additional multi-family units to be generally consistent with the mixed use regional designation, because this subject area is -- consists of several retail, restaurant, office and residential uses available to the region and the addition of these units would not over-saturate this area with residential. The main points of discussion through that MDA process regarding traffic, parking, and the proposed building heights -- I just lost my place. I'm sorry. There we go. The applicant

did an abbreviated traffic study to obtain updated traffic generation counts. ACHD did not require a full traffic impact study, because the proposed project generates less than 40 percent of the anticipated vehicle trips from the previously approved Villasport site. So, that one anticipated about 3,200 trips. This one anticipates less, about 1,250 trips. This is a significant reduction of vehicle trips for the adjacent local streets and the private street to the southeast, as well as the intersection of Eagle and Ustick. In addition, parking for the units was heavily discussed by the City Council. City Council required that each area of the project to be self parked, so that residents would not have to cross any drive aisle or cross Centrepoint Way to get to their assigned parking space. So, it's kind of broken into three pieces. You have the west side -- west of Centrepoint Way, three here that had to be self parked. The central section had to be self parked. And, then, this area had to be self parked. Through -- sorry. This -- this parking issue coincided with the originally proposed building heights of four stories for the three largest buildings in the center. Through the public hearing process the applicant reduced the building height of those three buildings to three stories and proposed a new two-story building along the west boundary. Following the changes to the building height, which reduced the unit count, the applicant was able to self park each area of the site as directed by City Council. The submitted site planning continues compliance with the DA provisions from the Council. The submitted plan to show compliance with all dimensional and specific use standards, including, but not limited to, building height, setbacks, access and the required parking. Access for this development is proposed via a shared drive aisle connection to Ustick, which is this here. It's an unnamed -- it connects to Cajun Lane, so everybody just keeps calling it Cajun Lane, but technically it's unnamed, just to be specific there. It is also -- access is also via a public street connection to Centrepoint Way. So, Centrepoint Way is here. Both Centrepoint Way and the drive aisle are existing today. Specific to the proposed apartment buildings access is proposed via drive aisle connections to Centrepoint Way and the drive aisle on the east side. So, there is three connections to Centrepoint Way. Through here crossing each other. One here. On the east side you have the access here. And, then, these access points here. The shared drive aisle, like I noted, does connect to North Cajun Lane to the south, which is a private street. It connects from Ustick through Jackson Square to the south and, then, out to Eagle Road. This drive aisle was previously acquired with the previous Villasport approvals and the Wadsworth site that's on the hard corner for cross-access and interconnectivity to and from Ustick. In addition, the Bienville Square plat, which is the plat to the south, requires cross-access that depicts it on the plat over Cajon Lane and out to Eagle Road from this site, which furthers that there was anticipation that traffic -- some form of traffic would flow from this project to the south and out to Eagle Road. North Centrepoint Way is an existing local street that connects the Bienville Square Subdivision, which is known as Jackson Square, to this site and to Ustick Road via that public road. It is signaled at the intersection of Centrepoint and Ustick. Since publication of the staff report ACHD did issue their final staff report and is not requiring any additional road improvements for the proposed project due to the reduction in anticipated vehicle trips from this site. So, the two things that they required previously was, quote, unquote, Cajun Lane to be constructed, a right-hand deceleration lane to be constructed here, which has been constructed already. That was the requirements at the time. This applicant is proposing to widen Centrepoint Way here to help -- and stripe this area for a right-hand turn lane

and a center and through lane here. So, should -- that was discussed at Council, not required, but it was proposed by the applicant and it should help the -- any traffic movements in that area. According to the site plan, the applicant is proposing 449 spaces, with 205 of them to be covered by a carport or located within a garage. Twelve spaces are in attached garages for the buildings D and E and they are tucked under garages. Six on each building. Code would require 380 parking spaces, with 189 covered. Therefore, the applicant is proposing parking well in excess of code. In addition, as noted the DA requires that each section of the site is self-parked and the applicant has complied with that as well. The applicant is proposing to complete the arterial sidewalk along Ustick and proposes multiple micro paths throughout the site for added -- added pedestrian connectivity. Staff supports the proposed sidewalk and pathway network, except for the lack of connectivity at the very southern -- at the southeast corner of the -- where the southern micro path does not connect anywhere. So, this area right around here. There is no internal connection to this micro path from inside the site and it also does not connect to any sidewalk along the shared drive aisle, because there is just not enough room right here to add a sidewalk. So, there is minimal opportunity to access this desirable micro path within the site. Therefore, staff is recommending a loss of one parking space around this planter island. I don't really care which side, just somewhere in there, and, then, add another sidewalk connection to the north, so that it can cross this drive aisle -- cross this drive aisle and connect to the sidewalk there to have another access point from inside the site. The proposed landscaping complies with all UDC requirements. In addition, the applicant is depicting dense vegetation that exceeds code requirements within the south and west buffers, with some of the proposed trees -- trees to be evergreen variety for year-around screening. Specifically the buffer along the south and west boundary is 25 feet wide. Code would only require ten feet, so that the applicant is required -- proposing a much bigger buffer than would be required. In -- prior to the hearing there were two pieces of public testimony, both from neighbors. Mr. Steve Grant. He had questions about the continuation of a brick wall or a CMU wall along the west boundary and also noted traffic concerns with Centrepoint Way. Specifically asked about would it be striped for the right-hand turn lane, et cetera. And, then, Mr. Schofield, who lives to the west and abuts the shared property boundary on that side, had concerns over the two-story building looking into his backyard, as well as the wall along the boundary as well. The applicant is proposing to continue the wall along the west boundary as required with the development agreement. Staff did recommend approval as the project complies with UDC requirements, as well as the DA, with just some conditions of approval regarding some minor things. Other than that staff will stand for any questions.

Seal: Thank you very much. Would the applicant like to come forward? Good evening. Just need your name and address for the record and the floor is yours.

Koeckeritz: Good evening. My name is Elizabeth Koeckeritz. I am with Givens Pursley and I'm here on behalf of the applicant MGM Meridian, LLC. Mike Mafia with MGM will be presenting with me and other representatives of the applicant are here and available to answer questions, including our architect Trevor Schur, who is with BDE, and our civil engineer Brandon McDougald, who is with Kimley Horn are here with me today. And we also really want to thank Joe for all of his help here on this. He has really helped us figure

out and massage this over the months to try to get a plan that's really going to work well for everyone and we also want to say congrats on your last public hearing here. Okay. So, moving on. Okay. We are proposing -- just to give you a little bit more of a background, we are proposing to develop the Centrepoint mixed-use project. It's approximately -- the overall parcel is 11 acres and it's near the intersection of Ustick and Eagle Roads. It is an in-fill site. There has already been approved for a drive-through on the commercial portion. The corner is also developing with a commercial use and, then, south along Eagle is additionally a commercial use. We are only here tonight for the CUP for the multi-family portion of the development. As mentioned, the property is designated mixed-use regional on the FLUM, which calls for the mix of employment, retail and residential uses, with residential densities ranging between six to 40 units per acre. We are proposing just slightly under 20 units per acre. As the staff report notes, adding higher density residential on the site will support the surrounding commercial and employment uses, providing nearby customers and employees that want to be able to walk to work. The staff report also finds that this multi-use development will not over saturate the area with residential. The site is zoned C-G and we are not seeking any rezone. It has C-G zoning to the north, the east across Eagle Road. The little in-fill site partially to the south and, then, there is -- directly the residential to the south is R-8 and R-15. There are two R-2 residences located along the western boundary of the property. With that I will let Mike take over here.

Seal: Good evening. Just start with your name and address -- or sorry. Yeah. Name and address and the floor is yours.

Mafia: Good evening, Commissioners. Mike Mafia and owner of these two parcels on Meridian and Ustick and I am the owner -- sole owner of this property. I'm a private developer. I do select projects. I'm passionate about development and -- and taking a responsibility very seriously. I target projects that are in-fill and have immediate proximity to amenities such as this site. I went back through my notes. My first meeting with Bill and Joe was 14 months ago and came and worked with several local developers and consultants with a blank slate trying to figure out what is the best approach for this site. It's -- it's the second busiest intersection in Idaho, so it's -- it's very dense, it's very busy. The site did have some inherent limitations. You can see the -- kind of odd shape to it, but it also has this Milk Lateral that divides the site with a 30 foot setback and, then, it has the two drive aisles, Centrepoint and the unnamed Cajun Lane, which bifurcates the site and it creates -- created some challenges. Working with staff and various consultants we looked at various uses commercial, multi-family and decided that this was the -- the best use. Even though we are not here for the CUP, there is a retail portion on Eagle, with a strong connection to the multi-family site. As Joe mentioned, we started with our MDA application in front of Council. Just quickly, this was the original site plan. It was 259 units. It was a four story building, elevator served, and we were using the parking field to the west for kind of that central portion of the development to qualify the parking and, again, as Joe mentioned, the feedback from Council was to go back to the drawing board and self park each quadrant between those drive aisles. This is where we came back -- there were also some concerns about the -- the height of the buildings from neighbors and we ultimately reduced this to a three story core -- three buildings in the middle and,

then, the western building is a two-story building and, then, to the east are those, Buildings F, and are also three stories with tuck under garages. But this shows the evolution of the site plan and, then, for our CIP hearing or application we -- and to give you -- to back step a little bit, through this process we had two pre-application meetings, both for the MDA for the CUP, two neighborhood meetings and several meetings with staff. So, the site plans I'm going through was actually 12 months of work of -- of -- of modeling and -- and working with Joe and the -- the change in this -- this CUP application was we increased our open space between the three larger buildings and increased the -- the turf area that was mentioned in the staff report. I will speak to it later, but we did add voluntarily more screening than required, particularly to the west, with a mix of deciduous and evergreen trees. I have met with the neighbors, I understand their concerns for screening and believe we will be able to mitigate it. That two-story building to the west, you know the first floor is ten feet at the finished floor and, you know, we are confident we can get evergreens to -- you know, to that elevation fairly quickly. Here is an updated rendering. You know, as I spoke earlier, I have toured this market -- I have been working in Boise for a long time with developers going back 20 years and, you know, I really try to focus on which projects are successful, borrow from those successes and, then, avoid the failures and this vernacular is -- I would say a somewhat contemporary approach on -- on a -- on a Craftsman style home. I think we will complement the area and blend with it and make that transition from a very, you know -- you know, high traffic commercial area to -- to the residential transition, especially with the three story and kind of the breaks in the elevations. On our vertical elements we have board and batten and, then, on the horizontal we have a ship lap and, then, the -- you know, the decks are -- are enclosed with one side open. There was a comment in the staff report to incorporate to meet the design standard and we will include brick or masonry to -- to reflect that comment. We have interior walk-ups and -- and you can't see it in this plan, but I do focus a lot on our landscape plan and creating spaces that are approachable, promote gathering. Too many projects, in my opinion, are overdone with, you know, dry rock beds and pavement and we are really trying to promote a landscape that emulates the natural environment, the high desert. People come to this area for -- for that connection to the outdoor spaces and we -- we intend to borrow from it and something I -- I pay a lot of attention to. These are just some select elevations. I think -- I think that's all I have for now. Turn it back over to Elizabeth.

Koeckeritz: All right. Thank you. I just want to point -- we are just going to focus a little bit on some of the cross-sections, because we do know some of the neighbors continue to be concerned about having any sort of residential development here. They were also -- I don't know how many of you were here for the Villasport. They were also very concerned about that and we actually believe this is a much better fit for the neighborhood than the Villasport. As you can see on this cross-section, this is a three story building and it is -- the Villasport was only ten feet from the property boundary, which made it 65 feet from the nearest home. Here we are a hundred feet from the property boundary and we are 155 feet from the nearest home behind us. Villasport had also received a variance to be able to have speakers within 25 feet of the property line. That has been eliminated and, instead, there will be trees and a pathway through that area. Here is a cross-section. The two homes to the direct west are understandably somewhat concerned about this

development coming to their neighborhood. In this case the -- we are 25 feet from the property boundary. Then the house is an additional 95 feet away, which creates 115 feet total. There are going to be -- on the upper floor of this building there will be six balconies. The balconies are the private open space required by code and so we anticipate that being, as Mike mentioned, about 16 feet if you were standing on the second floor and you were a tall person looking out and so we do -- we are trying to do a heavy mix of deciduous and evergreens to really help screen that property. In addition, the neighbors had asked for the masonry wall and we have agreed to do that along this boundary as well to really help continue to alleviate any noise and sound concerns there. We do meet all of the CUP criteria. I will go through really briefly. We accommodate the use. We meet all the city code. As Joe mentioned, it is harmonious with the Comprehensive Plan. We are compatible. We are not adversely affecting other property. We are right in the middle of the city. There is -- all the public utilities are there. This is not excessive traffic. It's reduced traffic. Noise, smoke, fumes, glare, odors, none of those sort of things. And there is no historic features on this site. Also for multi-family, as I will discuss here briefly, there is ample open space, lots of amenities. It's quality buildings and designs and really try to integrate into the surrounding community. Just touching briefly on the comp plan, I have two slides on this. I could have had many many more. It hits at least 14 goals of the Comprehensive Plan, including its in-fill development and a growth area. It's in the center of the city. It's a place where residents can live, shop, dine and play all in close proximity. There are diverse housing options. It's a mix from studios to three bedrooms. There is great pedestrian access and public services are available. We don't have to go through all of them. Traffic is always a concern. As mentioned there are 1,600 fewer daily trips than the Villasport. That doesn't mean there is no cars, but there is definitely less and that results in 80 fewer weekday morning trips and 166 fewer weekday p.m. trips. One of the things that the neighbors to the south have raised is the concern about the cars cutting through their development and getting out to the road -- out to Eagle Road where their development has a right-in, right-out access on Bourbon Street and what they found -- what the traffic engineers found is that cars will be going around the edges of that development, but not through it on the private interior streets and they estimate that there will be 30 outbound trips in the a.m. peak hour added to that intersection where cars are trying to make the right-hand turn to get onto Eagle to get to the Interstate. Because of the right-in, right-out there is hardly any inbound and, then, at night there will be 15 outbound trips in the p.m. hour. As far as open space, the code requires approximately 2.23 acres. We are providing 2.53 acres and possibly more, depending on how you want to interpret different portions of the code. In any event it's over -- there is excess open space here that does not include the arterial street buffer. As we have talked about there is enhanced landscaping on the west. The masonry wall on the west. There is the pathway along the southern boundary and, then, there is also micro paths throughout. I will show on our last slide we have already incorporated the micro path that Joe just asked for. That's already been added, because the connectivity and the ability to get in and around this is really important. The amenities include a clubhouse with a business lounge, multiple plaza areas, swimming pool, fitness facility, outdoor kitchen, a dog run, the micro path system through this area and a bicycle repair room. I knew I was running out of time. And here is the revised site plan where we did eliminate the parking space. We have widened that road. One of the neighbors were concerned about Centrepont. ACHD

is recommending that it be widened. We are absolutely agreeing to widen it. And, then, we have also straightened the sidewalk along Ustick. And with that we will stand for any questions.

Seal: Thank you very much. Commissioners? Go right ahead.

Grace: Mr. Chairman. Just one quick question. Ms. Koeckeritz, does that Cajun Lane -- does that -- is that an out -- an outlet to Ustick?

Koeckeritz: It is. It's a right-in, right-out onto Ustick.

Grace: Okay. So, Centrepont is, obviously, a light and a pretty big intersection.

Koeckeritz: Yes.

Grace: So, there won't be a light there, it will just be a right-in, right-out?

Koeckeritz: Yes.

Grace: And can you -- can you attempt to get into that left lane to go north on Eagle Road from there? Because that's a little further closer to the intersection; right?

Koeckeritz: Because of how close it is to the intersection I think that would be pretty difficult, depending on the time of day, of course, but it would be -- I would think fairly difficult to go across those lanes of traffic to get onto Ustick to go north.

Grace: Yeah. Okay. And, then, just a separate question, but a -- but another one. The -- there is just two lots to the west of that two-story.

Koeckeritz: Yes.

Grace: There is just two homeowner lots there.

Koeckeritz: Yes.

Grace: Okay. Thank you.

Seal: Commissioner Lorcher, anything? Commissioner Stoddard, do you have anything?

Stoddard: No. I'm good.

Seal: Okay. Do we have anybody signed up to testify?

Hall: We have. Jared Schofield.

Seal: Thank you. Good evening, sir. Name and address for the record, please.

Schofield: Jared Schofield. 1566 North Leslie Way. I have one of the properties immediately -- immediately on the west side of this property. First I would like to say I -- I have had the chance to meet Mike and he is -- he is a good guy. I don't mind him at all. It's just my biggest concern with this -- well, I have several concerns. My biggest one is the safety and security of my family. When this was originally -- when I purchased my property 12 years ago this was -- we were told it was going to be non-retail commercial. So, anticipating, you know, whatever it be -- doctor's offices, dance studio, whatever it may be. Something that's going to have set hours. It's going to be -- not going to be a large structure. It's two-story. It's not going to have people there all night. You know, very limited. The block wall that's actually there already was also going to stay -- was going to be built and along the same alignment that it currently exists, which was also shown in Villasport's plan and every other plan that has been submitted before that. So, we would still like to see that wall on that same alignment and we would like to see -- or not have people looking into our backyard. I have small children and any of you as parents probably have similar concerns of -- with small kids of people staring directly into your backyard as they are playing and spending their time out there with their friends and I, as a parent, am deathly terrified. I have three girls. I'm -- in this day and age security and safety of my family is my first and utmost priority. But I do appreciate Mike wanting to add additional full -- or additional trees to be able to create a landscape buffer there. That is very much appreciated. The only problem I have with that is that if this is not an immediate buffer. This is something that will not occur -- those trees will not reach a height of any kind of cover for four to five years at the soonest. That's just reality. I wish it was the -- I wish it wasn't that way, but, unfortunately, it is. I have nothing against Mike and the development. I -- you know, I like what he's done with the main structures. They look -- I mean they will look nice. I -- I believe personally I think the number of people this will bring in is going to do -- it will and truly create a headache on traffic. We already have people -- and Mike has seen it, too. He's seen it today. People that cut down Centrepont at a high rate of speed, cut through the neighborhood to be able to get out by Jimmy John's onto Eagle. They also do the same thing when traffic starts to get backed up -- backed up every morning, they cut down Leslie Way and do the same thing traveling down that road at 40 to 50 miles an hour when kids are getting out of school to be able to access onto Eagle. People have found the shortcuts. That's the nature of people. People are lazy. They want to go faster. But this is only going to increase that. It's going to increase the safety risk to the kids that are walking down Leslie Way or down Centrepont to get to River Valley Elementary. That -- this whole community needs it to be safe and, again, not opposed to it, but we would like to -- we would like to see something safe for our kids and our families. Thank you for your time. Do you have any questions?

Seal: Thank you very much. Appreciate that.

Hall: There is no one else signed up, Mr. Chairman.

Seal: No one signed up? Anybody in Chambers that would like to -- ma'am, come on up. Oh. Wait until you get up to the microphones there.

Bailey: Good evening. Thank you for letting me speak. I wasn't going to say anything tonight, because every time that --

Seal: Oh. We need your name and address for the record.

Bailey: Janet Bailey. 2925 North Centrepont. I know they are going in. I have been adamantly opposed to this whole thing since it started, because I live on Centrepont. I am the neighborhood watch chair. I started it. I walked every neighbor in that place, so I know what is happening in that neighborhood. Traffic is speeding down Centrepont. I don't know if you have current records, but we had a crime come through our neighborhood and now I know this is not related, but it's an increase. My husband's tires were slashed and four others on the street were. Then we had another accident -- a huge accident at the entrance of Ustick and Centrepont just a couple weeks ago. So, these -- these kinds of things are increasing and with putting all of those apartments stacked in there and the -- the top layer they took off, they shoved it over in the corn -- the corner where the -- the narrow Centrepont -- I -- granted if he's going to, you know, expand it, yea. But the traffic coming around that corner -- somebody's going to have a problem. Somebody's going to look for somebody to sue, because they -- the traffic is just sitting there. I tell my kids don't go out. Lag back. The traffic -- everybody runs it -- in the morning you -- it's several light changes to get through. In the afternoon Eagle and Ustick is backed up so far that you can't get out there and adding all of this extra parking is going to add extra traffic in the neighborhood. I have seen it. I watch it. I live it. I don't know what the studies are. They don't live there. They don't know. But the people that do live there -- I mean that was our retirement there and it's to the point where that whole neighborhood -- it's so stressful now thinking about what's coming and how it's changing, it -- it -- I feel like, oh, my God, how do I get out of here? There is a lot of retired people in there. A lot of older people and these -- this added traffic, it's going to make it worse. And I don't care what he says about building the corner, I -- I disagree and I know there is a lot of people in there that disagree and we have even requested a gate, because people will turn down Centrepont, flip a u-ey and go back. The lady on the corner that's at the beginning of the subdivision, she counted cars. She counted like 40 cars within 30 minutes that flipped it and went back out. So, like Jared said, there are -- they have learned the shortcuts and they are zooming down Centrepont -- maybe they don't cut Cajun, but they can get out going down the end of Centrepont and following it around, you come out by Discount Tire. So -- sorry, I -- I wasn't going to say anything, but I just think that this needs to be heard over and over again. So, thank you.

Seal: Thank you very much. Anybody else in Chambers like to testify? All right. I don't think we have anybody online that is -- oh, looks like we got one person online raising their hand.

Hall: You can speak if you unmute yourself.

Grant: My name is Steve Grant. I live at 1534 North Leslie Way. Can you hear me?

Seal: Yep. We can hear you. Go ahead, please. Thank you.

Grant: A couple of concerns. Number one, the alignment of the wall that J.R. spoke of, just so you are aware the -- the -- the -- the alignment of the wall sits five feet -- approximately five feet to the east of the property line and I'm not sure what Mike has in mind in terms of continuing that wall along the same alignment, but I would hate to see it jog five feet going -- bump beyond the property line to where the -- it's a masonry wall that's going to require footings and -- and to maintain the same alignment is I think the appropriate thing to do for aesthetics. The second comment I have is the traffic justification for Villasport was based on that being a commercial property. This is all residential. So, I think the peak hour impact on -- on Centrepoint with people coming off the west -- those two-story apartments trying to turn left onto -- to -- to exit -- or exit that facility is going to be a problem and I just think that the road is not wide enough, even if they widen -- so there is a right-turn lane on -- onto Ustick from Centrepoint, that's -- that helps, but I think traffic is going to stack and create all kinds of problems that I'm not sure a traffic study is taking them into account. Thank you.

Seal: Thank you, Steve. Appreciate it. Okay. Would anybody else like to testify? All right.

Dodson: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Going once. Going twice. You can't testify, Joe.

Dodson: No, I can't testify. No.

Seal: Go ahead.

Dodson: Since it's come up twice I did want to discuss the wall placement. That's something that staff and the applicant had discussed with the Police Department and they don't want to create this five foot dead zone between a wall and a fence, which typically is where crime does occur in those dark areas that nobody can get to very well and police can't see. So, we had decided to shift the wall back towards the property line, because of the existing structures, as well as the required footings for a wall it's not going to be exactly on the property line. I don't know where engineering wise, but probably at least a foot away and, then, continue it down and up to Ustick. So, there was a thought behind that. It's not that we are trying to change the -- what's already there, it's just they -- they don't want to create a dead zone in there, you know, because of the CPTED things.

Seal: Okay. Thanks. Appreciate the feedback on that.

Dodson: Yes.

Seal: Go ahead.

Grace: Mr. Chairman, just a follow-up question on that, Joe. Is -- so, if there is like a -- a little bit of a foot strip or -- or so, will that be closed off on the cap at the ends or could someone --

Dodson: I'm assuming it will be capped to some degree, but if not I mean you would be standing on rock or brick or something that's going to be sloped that will go into the bottom of the adjacent fence. So, it's not going to be a place you can really get to much.

Grace: Yeah. Okay.

Dodson: So, it will be a lot harder than five.

Seal: Okay. All right. Would the applicant like to come back up?

Koeckeritz: Elizabeth Koeckeritz at 601 Bannock. Just in response to a couple of things that were just raised, the alignment of the wall has been discussed and it is something where -- it just makes sense to put it as close to the property boundary as possible. There is also, just from a liability standpoint, of being an owner and having this extra dead space on the backside of your wall where you don't know what's going on, you can't see it, becomes difficult to maintain and so he is looking at placing the wall as close to the edge of the property boundary as possible. As far as the traffic goes through the subdivisions to the south, there is an easement -- a cross-access easement and there has been since 2006 back when this was called the Sadie Creek Development and it was Sadie Commons below. Could you bring up our presentation again? Where the neighborhood to the south did grant a perpetual nonexclusive easement for cross-access by vehicular and pedestrian traffic, but not parking upon and over roadways that may exist from time to time. They will design and build the roadways in such a fashion as to permit reasonable access through and across parcel B, which is the one owned by our clients and their -- their parcel B and provide parcel A, which is what's currently before you tonight and parcel C, which is the corner lot, access to Eagle Road. And so that has been in place. The development was built with this cross-access agreement in place. Their traffic comes through Centrepont through this development and vice-versa. It's been there for quite some time. Additionally this is still, we have to remember, 40 percent less traffic than the last approved use here. Any development always is going to bring traffic, but this is significantly less than what's been there before. Additionally, although there was the addition of the smaller two-story building, there was still a net loss between the original proposed plans and what's before you today. We reduced the number from 259 units to 213 units. One of the other things that has come up is the question about traffic speeding on Centrepont Way and it's kind of hard -- I don't know if I have a good depiction of it, but we have -- do you have approval where the road will start at 40 feet wide up by the intersection to Ustick, so that you have got space for the turn lanes and, then, at the intersections where the drive aisles are it is going to narrow down and taper to 33 feet and, then, it will widen out again. But that's really sort of a built-in traffic calming along that road and, in fact, the applicant is working with ACHD and ultimately, if possible, would like that to be even more of a constriction, it's just that right now that's where ACHD is on it and so it is somewhat of a traffic calming device there. And, then, just, finally, we absolutely understand the neighbors concerns. I know the applicant is -- to the west the applicant is looking at faster growing trees, making sure that some of the trees are evergreen. They don't plant immediately -- they don't grow immediately. It does take some time. There was some discussion with City Council about -- could you bring in

bigger trees, like bigger caliper trees, and what it came down to after talking about that and meeting with the forester, as those trees don't do as well long term and they grow slower and they don't stabilize as well and you are actually much better off putting in the younger smaller caliper trees and, then, overtime they will grow to that bigger one and you won't be replacing them, spending the money and the effort of replacing trees that die and that they are not -- just aren't thriving the way that you would want them to. So, with that I think I will stand for anymore questions.

Seal: Okay. Thank you. And I -- I have a couple. Mike had indicated that there was talk about possibly eliminating where that -- where the road squeezes there on Centrepoint. So, is what you are saying is you are going to have it squeeze, it's just a matter of how much ACHD allows you to?

Koeckeritz: Yes.

Seal: Okay. That's good, because I -- that part of this is very attractive to me as far as being able to kind of mitigate traffic in that area. So, the other part of that, too, is I turn on Centrepoint Way to go over to Fast Eddy's, so that's where I buy my fuel from. But I do see people turn into there and not understand where they are going. So, hopefully, having this in there will mitigate that as well, so -- I think they get confused as to how they get down to the -- some of the parcels that are there to the east of you. So, it's -- I think that that will be helpful in that. As far as the block wall alignment, I kind of understand how that -- why that is not going to align, so I won't go into that very much, but -- that's everything I got. Anybody else have any questions, comments? Go right ahead.

Grace: Mr. Chair. Thank you for addressing the size of the trees. I was going to ask that very question. Could you get some older growth trees that are already bigger in there. But it sounds like you have already considered that. What about the -- the five foot wall there on that west side? Is there any ability to go higher to provide -- I'm sympathetic to -- to this homeowner, the gentleman's concerns about, you know, you can look directly down into their backyard and he has got children. I'm -- I am sympathetic. I -- I -- so, I just wanted to ask that question.

Koeckeritz: Well -- and I think -- was it six feet? It's a little -- so, first, it is already a little bit higher than six feet and there will be the trees -- when you really look, there isn't a line going across here. I mean -- but once those trees are there it will really help block this. These are also -- these patios they are not extruding off the back even further. If you look at -- it's not the ideal picture, because it shows an end unit, but they really are sort of inside. They -- they don't extrude, they are covered on three sides and they really only have that one wall. I understand the concern, but it really is trying to keep them stepped back, still meet the code and really work with the neighbors as much as possible with the design.

Dodson: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Go ahead.

Dodson: I did want to hit on a couple of those points as well. Mr. Schofield, that -- of the two properties adjacent, only one has a fence and that's his and it's a chain link, so some of that dead zone piece is gone. However, they could always input a fence and we would still have that issue. I want to verify -- I can't remember in code. I think C-G only allows six foot fence, but it might also be eight feet. Now that I'm thinking about it, I think it's eight feet. So, I believe they can go up to eight foot if you guys required that, but we would -- if you make any kind of condition with that I would recommend just making it broad and work with staff, so that we can verify. But I think that that could help quell some of the issues that you are having there. But, again, eight feet is only eight feet versus the second story, which is the main concern here. Staff -- at the Council hearing we did talk about the growth of the trees and the higher caliper and our parks director specifically had stated that they do not like when applicants put in the larger caliper trees at the beginning, because they typically will just -- they will die. Transporting them from where they are to the new place just usually doesn't work very well. Secondly, we already have conditions in there that those buffers are to be constructed with phase one. So, they need to be part of the beginning of the development to help get them established prior to occupancy, prior to the buildings being constructed, honestly. I don't know if they are going to do this two-story one first, but I presume they would do the stuff in the center with the clubhouse and everything first and, then, get to the west of the boundary. Buffer should still be constructed with those first buildings. So, staff did think about some of this with the timing of it, but I know that Mike would gladly work with the timing portion of that as well.

Seal: The only question I had on the trees -- I mean we say, you know, larger caliper, smaller caliper trees, when to me it's height. I don't care how big -- you know, I don't care how big around it is. If it's 20 feet tall and it's a small, you know, junior tree, then, that's still better than having a, you know, six foot tree planted there that's going to take 20 years in order to reach, you know, 15 feet. So, I mean is there something -- some stipulation we can put in there that the least we provide, you know -- that the applicant provide something in there that's going to be of some substance and -- and I know this is a small detail, but at the same time it's -- you know, it's been talked about and it's -- it's something that, you know, obviously, there is a concern about. So, I mean as far as the fence height, you know, and the jog in the fence and all that stuff, I think you have to do what you have to do for that, you know, in order to make it fit. I don't see having the fence at a certain height and, then, continue it on at a different height as being appealing or -- you know, that just doesn't seem like something that would be necessary knowing that there are going to be things that are going to be in there in the future.

Dodson: Well, Mr. Chair, I'm not an arborist, so I can't speak too much on this landscaping, but I know that Mike has talked about it before. They can find fast growing, quote, unquote, deciduous trees and, then, ever -- evergreens, again, are going to probably be the best when it comes to long-term screening. They are year around, but I will leave that to the applicant.

Seal: Okay.

Koeckeritz: The site plan does show the mix of trees that are currently being proposed, but I didn't write them down and I can't read that small of print. But he can speak to what the mix will be.

Mafia: I mean there is an exhausting amount of trees on there, but it is a mix. I mean there is spruces and there -- there is some furs and some of them grow 15 inches a year, some of them grow 25 to 30 inches a year. I have been in this situation before. I just did a project -- one retail project of the year, because of some of the landscape features, I -- I am very involved. I'm not a -- or a large institutional investor. I talk with the landscape crews. I make sure they are planted correctly. I mean if a lot of trees fail not just because of the health of the tree, but they are planted too shallow or too high, they are not irrigated properly and as a long-term investor, I mean, you know, the -- the year warranty you usually get on a tree is -- is -- is not sufficient. You are controlling the process from -- from the time you get your order and, you know, historically we are rejecting, you know, five to ten percent of the specimens, because they are not acceptable. So, I mean I am -- I am very involved in that process and I don't know -- it's never been conditioned. It's a tough one, you know, to condition and -- and qualify it. But, you know, I -- I met J.R. on site today and I spoke to him, you know, specifically about that and my commitment to getting healthy trees, because you could have the same seven foot or ten foot spruce and depending on what nurseries it's coming out of, one could be a lot healthier than the other and that's -- that's the -- that's the importance of long-term growth is, you know, healthy specimens, so --

Seal: Okay. Yeah. And that's -- I mean my point is just it's hard to condition something on. No, you have to put in a 12 foot tree. Well, what does that mean, you know, and a matter of code or any of that stuff. So, it -- it's a concern. It sounds like it's -- you know, I mean you are working through that. You are going to try and put in the best trees to provide the best coverage in the best amount of time, so I think that satisfies that for me for sure. Any other questions, Commissioners? Guys are all done? All right. Thank you very much. Can I get a motion, please, to close the public hearing for File No. H-2022-0072?

Grace: So moved, Mr. Chairman.

Lorcher: Second.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing for File No. H-2022-0072 for Centrepoint Apartments. All in favor, please, say aye. No opposed. Public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Seal: So, if somebody would like to go first or -- if we have hashed everything out a motion or --

Grace: Mr. Chairman, I -- I feel like I -- I got the answers I was looking for. I appreciate a lot of the efforts that were done from the applicant to -- not only with the new use, obviously, but with reductions seems like in a lot of things. So, I think there is a good faith effort there. I am sympathetic to some of the comments that were made. You know, we get -- we get comments about these apartments a lot and -- and -- when they come in. There is no great place to put them it seems like. So, it is where it is. I'm -- I'm comfortable with the information I got tonight. So, that would be my comment.

Seal: Okay. Any other comments?

Lorcher: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Lorcher, go ahead.

Lorcher: After considering all staff and public testimony, I move to approve file number H-2022-0072 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of November 17th, 2022, with the following modification: Applicant work with staff to provide safety and privacy of the homes surrounding the development.

Grace: Mr. Chairman, I would second that.

Seal: Okay. It's been moved and seconded to approve File No. H-2022-0072 with the aforementioned modifications. All in favor say -- please say aye. No opposed. Motion carries. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Dodson: Sorry, Mr. Chair. Playing musical presentations.

4. Public Hearing for Knighthill Center Childcare Facility (H-2022-0070) by Ethan Mansfield, Hawkins Company, located at 6241 N. Linder Rd. near the southwest corner of Chinden and Linder Rds.

- A. Request: Conditional Use Permit for a Daycare Facility (more than 12 children) located on approximately 1 acre of land in the C-G zoning district.

Seal: Okay. At this time I would like to con -- or open the public hearing for item number H-2022-0070 for Knighthill Center Childcare Facility. We will begin with the staff report.

Dodson: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. So, my last one for my public serving career for now -- I will probably be back someday. As noted, this is for Knighthill Center Childcare. It is a conditional use permit for a daycare center located on approximately one acre of land within the C-G zoning district. Because it is more than 12 children it is classified as a daycare center within the UDC, which requires a conditional use permit. The proposed use is a community serving commercial use that is consistent with the

future land use designation of mixed-use community. It's proposed location is within the center of a relatively small commercial development, but very nearby existing residential -- established residential to the south and southwest. Staff finds that the proposed use will provide a needed use for the nearby community and offer employment opportunities beyond just typical retail jobs, like the Dollar General to the left -- to the west. The subject site is part of an approved short plat that has subdivided the existing lot into two commercial building lots. This is on the north lot. A salon is administratively approved on the building lot to the south, but has not yet received final building permit approval. The proposed use is subject to specific use standards, 11-4-3-9 to be specific. Staff finds that the project complies or exceeds all required specific use standards, as well as the UDC dimensional standards, except for one, which is a requirement for parking lot landscaping. Parking lot landscaping requires at least five feet of landscaping along vehicle use areas, which does include drive aisles, which would be along the east boundary where there is no landscaping shown between the sidewalk and the proposed play areas. The applicant is proposing the required five foot sidewalk, but no landscaping as noted. Instead, the applicant is proposing multiple bollards behind the sidewalk for added safety for the proposed play areas, which staff definitely appreciates. The bollards should help increase the safety and staff finds that a full five feet of landscaping may not be necessary, but some landscaping should be provided to increase the buffer between the drive aisle and the play areas. After discussing this with the applicant, staff has included a condition of approval to provide this landscaping or request alternative compliance to reduce that buffer area and include dense and decorative landscaping elements between the sidewalk and the play area. So, again, could be five feet, could be three, two and a half, that could be done through administrative process after this conditional use permit. Staff just wants to increase that buffer between. Specific to the site. Shared drive aisles are located along the west, north, and east property boundaries. Those are existing. All of these around the edge here are existing. There is an existing cross-access easement on each of the drive aisles and throughout this commercial subdivision, as well as for the recently approved short plat. Because there is no direct lot access to public roadways and each roadway is constructed to its full anticipated widths, which would be Chinden to the north and Linder to the east, ACHD did not require any kind of traffic impact study, nor any road improvements with this application. The proposed daycare building is shown as approximately 10,000 square feet, requiring minimum 20 parking spaces per code for residential -- for non-residential use, which is one space per 500 square feet. The applicant is proposing 46 parking spaces, which is more than twice the minimum. The submitted site plan shows a new two way 25 foot wide drive aisle on the north side of the building, with two rows of parking, as well as parking on the west side of the building. The site plan does not show any dedicated pick-up or drop-off location, which is intentional by the applicant, because through the narrative the applicant does describe that this -- their policy for the actual operation of the daycare is for parents to park to drop off and pick up their kids. They don't just toss them out the door as they go, you know. Staff finds that the excess parking and the proposed operation for the parking and the child pick-up and drop-off is sufficient. As of 1:30 p.m. today -- I should have looked again later, but I presume it's the same. There was no written testimony for this -- this request and with that staff did recommend approval, because it

complies with code, minus the parking lot landscaping, and there is an avenue to correct that. So, staff will stand for any questions.

Seal: Thank you, sir. Applicant would like to come up and -- good evening, sir. Need your name and address for the record and the floor is yours.

Mansfield: Thanks, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners. Good evening. My name is Ethan Mansfield with Hawkins Companies and we are the developers on this project. Our address is 855 West Broad Street, Boise, Idaho. 83702. I will let Joe pull up my very brief report -- or my very brief presentation. We are seeking a conditional use permit tonight for a childcare center on one acre of land, located in the northwest corner of Chinden Boulevard and Linder Road in a -- or, sorry, that's southwest corner of Chinden Boulevard and Linder Road in a service commercial zone. Joe did a great job outlining the project, the conditions and his recommendation of approval. I won't add much to say -- except to say that we agree with the terms and conditions outlined in the staff report. We are going to go ahead and, you know, work with staff through alternative compliance to address the landscaping. We are certainly amenable to providing some landscaping along that -- that part of the -- of the site. We will continue to work with staff and -- to ensure that our zoning certificate, our design review application and alternative compliance application comply with the UDC, the architectural standards and all other applicable ordinances. And, again, I would really like to thank Joe for his time on this application and his time at the city as a whole. He's been a great planner. It's been really nice to work with him and I would like to thank you for considering this item tonight and I would be happy to answer any questions that you have this evening.

Seal: Mr. Grace, go ahead.

Grace: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, just because I had the experience very close by in Kids Choice down the road, I ask do you have outdoor space -- sufficient outdoor space for these kids to play in? I see the 10,000 square foot building and the parking and just -- if you could clarify -- okay.

Mansfield: Yes. We -- Mr. Chairman, Commissioner, we do have about 5,000 square feet of outdoor space. So, half the area of our -- of our building is out -- outdoor space. So, yeah, five out of 15,000 square feet will be outdoors. There will be an infant playground and a playground for the older children, split roughly equally.

Grace: And I see that's on the east side of the building, which is smart.

Mansfield: Thank you, Commissioner.

Lorcher: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Lorcher, go ahead.

Lorcher: Ethan, what are the bollards?

Mansfield: A bollard is design -- is a -- I have not looked up the definition recently, but in this case it will be a -- like vertical -- kind of vehicle deterrent that -- that, essentially, if anything were to hit that it would stop whatever is hitting it. We have it detailed in our landscape plan, which I believe is included in the materials submitted. I don't have it printed tonight, but -- okay We don't have it available, but I would be more than happy to provide that -- a cross-section of the bollard if that's of interest. Essentially, the bollards in this case -- about three feet tall, four feet tall, designed to stop any vehicular momentum from affecting the fence that surrounds the play area.

Lorcher: Is it like a Jersey barrier? Like a big concrete barrier?

Mansfield: No. No. No. These are decorative bollards. They are typically used when pathways. Well --

Dodson: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Go right ahead, Joe.

Dodson: It -- like they usually have them at banks, the big concrete posts that are sticking out of the ground to protect tellers. Anything like that. About three to four feet high. Usually made -- they are made out of concrete or they are metal with a plastic thing over the top to make them look prettier. But it's just -- yeah, they are definitely meant to stop vehicles from running over anything that it is behind them. You can kind of see it. There is quite a few -- one, two, three, four, five, six, seven -- you know, 11 or 12 along the east boundary spaced in such a way that a car can't fit between them either, which would be the point of keeping vehicles from getting anywhere near the play area.

Lorcher: Okay. So, you are also propose -- you are proposing these -- am I saying it right -- bollard?

Dodson: Yes. Yes, ma'am.

Lorcher: A bollard and landscaping; is that correct? Or is it one or the other?

Mansfield: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Lorcher, we originally proposed the bollards and staff asked us to include some landscaping, which we agreed to do in addition to the bollards.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you.

Seal: Yeah. And I will -- I will go out on a limb here and, Joe, this might be a question for you, but -- and the reason I ask that is because my son used to go to school at Compass, so we have been through here a lot and people zip up and down this street where the bollards are going to be at, so it -- is it possible to shift the building over and put the parking on the other side or is that just -- is that a nonstart -- well, I mean just from a code perspective is that something that would even be allowed? Because I -- I mean it

looks like the parking on the other side is accessed directly from the street, where that -- that would not be possible on the other side on -- if they were to put that on the east side; correct?

Dodson: Mr. Chair, I would -- code wise there is nothing that would prohibit the site for -- this area being flipped basically.

Seal: Okay.

Dodson: It -- I don't necessarily see a physical issue with that, except that the drive aisle on the east side is probably more used and we don't typically like backup parking into those more frequented drive aisles, because you can create a lot of vehicular conflicts there. I would presume that -- was it Mr. Wiley who owns the overall subdivision would not like that at all. I think that would probably be the biggest hurdle, which is the drive aisle on the west is a lot less used, because it's closer to the -- it's -- this area would basically be adjacent to a portion of the parking for Dollar General and I think even the southwest corner of it is actually just adjacent to the building really. So -- yeah.

Seal: Okay.

Dodson: So, it will be -- should be less frequented. I see your point though. I do get that. I'm sure the applicant does as well, but because that east side one is used so much more, I do have questions and qualms with that backup parking there. I just feel like it's going to create a lot of issues.

Seal: Yeah. And I understand that as well. So, just -- I mean my concern is just having kids in there. I understand the bollards and that should mitigate that. But should and does are two different words, so, you know, that's about the only concern I have with it at this point is just how to better protect that side of it. I mean, obviously, you are putting bollards in there, so there is a concern. So, just anything we can do to kind of mitigate that further would be good, but I don't know what -- what, if any, choices there are to do that. Yeah. Not sure.

Dodson: I'm not sure either, Mr. Chair. I -- the only thing that could come to mind is just putting the play area adjacent to the parking spaces and pull the building to the east, but, frankly, I have jumped the curb in a car before and if there were bollards on the other side I probably would have landed on top of them, rather than hit them. Granted. I was in a '58 -- they aren't very heavy, but -- so I feel like the same concern would probably exist. It's just unfortunate with just the size of the site and you have so many drive aisles, I -- I don't think it's avoidable, honestly.

Seal: Okay.

Dodson: The bollards is great. I had not thought of that and I'm glad that the applicant and the team did. Now, I think, again, at least a couple feet of landscaping will make that even safer. I think that that's going to be much preferred.

Seal: Yes. Go ahead.

Grace: And where I was going with indicating that I thought it was smart was that, obviously, that afternoon sun --

Seal: Yeah.

Grace: -- presents a better place for the playhouse -- playground. It could be awful with the kids playing in the direct west side --

Lorcher: Taking the kids in sun -- sunshine. Okay. Got you.

Grace: Thank you.

Seal: Any other questions? Do we have -- I'm sure we don't have anybody signed up to testify.

Hall: No one signed up.

Seal: Sir, would you like to testify at all? You sure? All right. Does the applicant have anything else to add?

Mansfield: I think I'm good. Thank you.

Seal: All right. Thank you very much. With that, can I get a motion to close the public -- or public testimony portion of File No. H-2022-0070?

Grace: So moved.

Lorcher: Second.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing for File No. H-2022-0070. All in favor, please, say aye. No opposed. Public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Seal: Okay. And with that I will take any discussion, a motion --

Lorcher: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Lorcher, go right ahead.

Lorcher: We need daycare, so -- and this is a -- seems like a good location, because it's -- it's Linder and -- and Chinden; right?

Seal: Uh-huh.

Lorcher: So, there is lots of families around there. So, it looks good.

Grace: Yep. And it's a good -- it's a good artery for people to drop people off on their way to work, so --

Lorcher: Right.

Grace: -- I would be ready for a motion, Mr. Chairman.

Seal: Feel free. Feel free.

Grace: After considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to approve File No. H-2022-0070 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of November 17th, 2022, with no modifications.

Lorcher: Second.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded to approve File No. H-2022-0070 with no modifications. All in favor please say aye. No opposed, so motion carries. Thank you.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Starman: Mr. Chairman, before your quick -- your colleagues are quick to make a motion to adjourn, can I take care of a little housekeeping for like 60 seconds?

Seal: Possibly.

Starman: Possibly.

Seal: Go right ahead.

Starman: Mr. Parsons asked me -- he had to step -- step away this evening, but you may recall -- Commissioners, you may recall we made a commitment to provide some training to the Commission periodically from time to time as -- as the calendar allowed. So, I think that Mr. Parsons and our planning manager Caleb Hood and I may -- may collaborator as well, but we are looking to provide some training to the Commission on your -- at your December 15th meeting. So, if you want to just sort of kind of make a note of that, we will follow up in writing. If that's a problem for a majority of the Council -- or for a majority of the Commissioners we can look for an alternate date. But right now we are thinking December 15th and in terms of topics we spoke a little bit with Commission -- with the Chairman Seal earlier this evening and we are thinking about when each of you became a Commissioner we provided some one-on-one training, somewhere like 90 to -- 90 minutes to two hours worth of training and we are thinking about doing kind of a summary of that or a condensed version of that, kind of a -- a refresher course so to speak and kind of just sort of -- now that you have had some time in the seat and you have had some experience doing what you are doing, to kind of go back over that might be more

meaningful to you now that you have actually, you know, had some time to make decisions. So, I just want to mention those two things for you that we are looking at December 15th. We may start like at 5:15 before the usual 6:00 p.m. starting time and, then, we will try to, you know, keep -- keep to a condensed schedule. So, we will likely survey the group -- maybe I would ask the city clerk's office to survey the group to confirm attendance, that we have enough Commissioners that can attend and, then, if you have any -- if individual Council -- Commissioners have any particular topics or issues that you would like us to address, feel free to drop a note or an e-mail or phone call to Bill Parsons and we would be happy to try to accommodate that as well. Thank you for letting me do that, Mr. Chairman. Appreciate it.

Seal: No problem. Thank you. Appreciate it.

Lorcher: I was hoping he was going to do a 60 second training.

Dodson: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Yes, sir.

Dodson: Before we adjourn I just wanted to say thank you all for your time and I mean professionally thank you for making the commitment to be volunteer for this and I appreciate working with all of you and those that are not here tonight. Again, on to my next adventure, but I'm sure I will be in front of you again in my next role.

Seal: That -- we wish you the best for sure and it has been a pleasure to work with you and we will -- I look forward to giving you a bad time when you are in Chambers.

Dodson: Yes.

Seal: We have -- we have already been told that anything submitted by your firm will be heard last --

Dodson: Oh, that's --

Seal: -- forever.

Dodson: My wife will love that, so --

Lorcher: Good luck.

Seal: Thank you very much, Joe.

Dodson: You're welcome. Have a good night.

Seal: You, too. Thank you.

Lorcher: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Lorcher, go right ahead.

Lorcher: I motion we adjourn.

Grace: Second.

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

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:50 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS.)

APPROVED

ANDREW SEAL - CHAIRMAN

____|____|____
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK