

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:01 p.m. Tuesday, May 6, 2025, by Mayor Robert Simison.

Members Present: Robert Simison, Luke Cavener, Liz Strader, John Overton, Doug Taylor and Anne Little Roberts.

Members Absent: Brian Whitlock.

Other Present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Sonya Allen, Nick Napoli, Linda Ritter, Kyle Ludwig, Steve Taulbee and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Liz Strader	<input type="checkbox"/> Brian Whitlock
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anne Little Roberts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John Overton
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Doug Taylor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Luke Cavener
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mayor Robert E. Simison	

Simison: Council, we will call this meeting to order. For the record it is May 6, 2025. It's 6:01 p.m. We will begin tonight's regular City Council meeting with roll call attendance.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Simison: Next item is the Pledge of Allegiance. If you would all, please, rise and join us in the pledge.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

COMMUNITY INVOCATION

Simison: Next up is our community invocation, which tonight will be given by Nick Armstrong. If you would all, please, join us in the community invocation or take this as a moment of silence and reflection. Nick, thanks for being here.

Armstrong: Father, thank you for making this a great place for us to live. We thank you for Council Members, the Mayor, that deliberate matters that affect our quality of life and making this a great place to live. I pray for the departments that keep our city a clean place and a safe place to live and oftentimes putting their lives at risk for our own benefit. And, Father, as we contemplate the good things you have placed in this city for us that we would be generous with our visitors, new residents and just guests that are here in this community. Just thank you for your goodness and for your son, in Jesus' name, amen.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Simison: Thank you. Okay. Up next is adoption of the agenda.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, no changes to tonight's May regular City Council agenda, so I move we adopt the agenda as presented.

Strader: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to adopt the agenda. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the agenda is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

PUBLIC FORUM – Future Meeting Topics

Simison: Mr. Clerk, anyone signed up under public forum?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, nobody signed up.

RESOLUTIONS [Action Item]

- 1. Resolution No. 25-2517: A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Meridian Appointing Matthew Stoll to Seat 6 of the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission; and Providing an Effective Date**

Simison: Okay. Then with that we will move on to Item 1. Council, Item 1 is a resolution appointing Matt Stoll to Seat 6 of the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission. You may recall that we recently just had another appointment and so we had a lot of applicants and once we finalized that appointment another member stepped down. So, I took all those former applicants that weren't selected into reconsideration and we did have a few people that also applied for the second time and -- and Matt was one of those. Matt is not a stranger to this community. He has been a volunteer on our Parks and Rec Commission in the past and he has also been leading the Community Planning Association here in -- located in downtown Meridian, but really serving the Treasure Valley and sometimes beyond in terms of helping land use and transportation integration on a macro scale. Well, it's my pleasure to bring him forward for consideration and so he will take his macro and get to go a little bit micro on a project-by-project basis, see how the real work gets done in that context. But I'm excited. I know that he is committed to the service to our community and will be a great addition

to our Planning and Zoning. So, with that I would be happy to answer any questions that you may have or open for motions.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Not a question, just a comment. I just think Matt is a phenomenal nomination for this position and I'm really excited to see kind of how you can intersect all of the learning and -- and everything that's happened at COMPASS with, you know, real world decision making on individual land use applications. I think that's really exciting. So, I just really am supportive of this and think he will do a great job. Thanks.

Simison: Thank you.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Again just a comment. I had the opportunity to work with Matt in his previous job as director of COMPASS. Phenomenal human being. I mean he knows more about overall countywide, statewide planning for traffic issues than anyone else in this room. He lived it, he breathed it for an entire career and the fact that he is willing to retire and, then, stand in front of us and become part of our Planning and Zoning just shows how much commitment he has for our community and I -- I salute him. He is a tremendous human being. I appreciate him very much and I can't wait to have him be part of our city.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I want to say all sorts of terrible things about Matt, but I can't come up with a single item. This is an exceptional nomination, Mr. Mayor. I echo what my two colleagues have said. Our -- our community, certainly our Planning and Zoning Commission, is leveling up with Matt's addition and really looking forward to your analysis and feedback as we read the minutes and we get ready for our City Council meetings. I know you will do a great job.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Well, I echo what my colleagues have said. I had the privilege of working with Matt a couple of different times and just really appreciate the fact that he is willing to spend part of his retirement time back with us. So, if no one else has anything

else to say, I would be honored to make the motion that we approve Resolution 25-2517 that appoints Matt Stoll to Seat 6 of the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission.

Overton: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve Resolution No. 25-2517. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it. The resolution is agreed to and Matt can start work.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Simison: But, Matt, invite you up to come say any words that you would like to make for Council and the community that's here today. Probably for land use applications.

Stoll: Mr. Mayor, Council Members, thank you for the kind words. Greatly appreciate that. I appreciate the nomination and the appointment to Planning and Zoning Commission. I look forward to working with -- for the community again and the residents again in this as a commissioner. I enjoyed my term as a Parks and Rec Commissioner and I look forward to using my knowledge that I gained over my career to consider applications that have been submitted to the city, but also learning from the staff and also the residents on how the region -- how the city should grow and the projects that are being proposed. So, thank you again. I look forward to it.

ACTION ITEMS

2. Public Hearing for Core & Main (H-2024-0066) by K2 Construction, Located at 299 S. Black Cat Rd.

- A. Request: CPAM (Comprehensive Plan Amendment) to change the future land use designation on approximately five (5) acres of land from the Low-Density Employment to Mixed-Employment.
- B. Request: Annexation of five (5) acres of land from RUT in Ada County to the Light Industrial (I-L) zoning district.

Simison: Thank you very much, Matt. Appreciate it. With that we will move on to Item 2 tonight, which is public hearing H-2024-0066. We will open this public hearing with staff comments from Nick.

Napoli: Good evening, Mayor and Members of the Council. Next item on the agenda is the annexation, Comprehensive Plan map amendment for Core & Main. The applicant is requesting Comprehensive Plan map amendment to change the future land use designation on five acres of land from low density employment to mixed employment and annexation of five acres of land from RUT in Ada county to the Light Industrial Zoning District. The site is located at 299 South Black Cat Road and as shown on the screen the existing zoning is RUT in Ada county and the FLUM designation is low density employment, but the applicant is proposing to change it to mixed employment.

So, although this property has no prior development history, the adjacent property to the south does provide relevant context for its redevelopment. In 2021 the City Council approved the annexation of approximately 129.2 acres under the Black Cat Industrial Project designating the area as mixed employment and low density employment with the future land use and -- and has the zoning of I-L. The City Council determined that the industrial center aligned with the goals of the Ten Mile Interchange Specific Area Plan. However, that the approval covered a significantly larger area compared to this five acre request and this would be that subject 129 acres that was annexed with the I-L. So, currently the low density employment designation does not permit light industrial uses -- uses such as the one proposed. However, a change to the mixed employment designation would allow the development -- development under the I-L zone. While the preferred zoning in the mixed employment designation is the ME zoning district, alternative zones may be considered when they align with the plans' vision and integrate with surrounding properties. The applicant asserts that the I-L zone is compatible with the adjacent properties to the south. Staff concurs with this, knowing that the proposed use aligns with the prior approvals in the area and would contribute to the expansion of light industrial space along the Black Cat corridor. Additionally, while the proposed use does not provide a large amount of employment, it is providing some employment in a relatively low impact use in the area. However, it is important to note that mixed employment and low density employment designations are limited along the Black Cat and Franklin corridors. Currently the I-L zone comprises of 40.01 percent of the low density employment FLUM designation and 55.24 percent of the mixed employment FLUM designation. These designations are intended to support a mix of employment uses, service and services providing a transition between the residential uses east of Black Cat and industrial areas further west and that's what's shown on this. This is the current zoning map on the left and, then, on the right is the FLUM designation and you can see where I-L is taking up some of that mixed employment and light -- low density employment. So, staff is concerned that the continued expansion of I-L zoning with these FLUM designations may reduce employment diversity, create additional truck traffic and disrupt intended transition. While this specific five acre request may have minimal impact, further expansion of I-L into these areas should be carefully evaluated by the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council. So, the concept plan proposes a 19,000 square foot building with 14,492 square feet designated as warehouse space and 4,508 square feet designated as office. The remaining site would be used as a contractor's yard and outdoor storage. In addition, the applicant has indicated that the number of employees at the site is approximately 18, with ten trucks entering the site on any given day and this would be Core & Main's second location in Meridian as their business continues to grow. So, access to the site is proposed from a future collector street along the northern portion of the property. The applicant is responsible for extending this collector road as outlined in ACHD's master street map. ACHD found that the proposed development meets all of ACHD's policies. However, to align with the UDC, which seeks to limit access points to collector and arterial roadways, staff recommends restricting the western access off the future collector street to truck traffic only and the applicant is okay with that. Additionally, a traffic impact study was not required as the size of the development is relatively small and is not anticipated to account for significant traffic counts in the area. On the screen

are the existing entitlements and planned road improvements along this section of Black Cat and this is also in the hearing outline for you guys to look at, so I will leave it up there for a little bit. There is a lot of information. For the building elevations the applicant is proposing a large one story industrial building designed with higher ceilings and upper windows to create the appearance of a two story structure. The exterior materials include granite stone, optimal metal panels, sand stone veneer, with moderate to large setbacks from the street. The applicant has been highly receptive to staff feedback and has worked to refine the building elevations, site and landscape plans to better align with the architectural standards and UDC. In response the applicant has adjusted the building's orientation and incorporated addition -- additional materials, fenestration and modulation. At the Commission hearing Cheryl Whiting Stores, Greg Stores, Keith Whiting and Colton Stores testified in opposition of the project. Their concerns include buffering the adjacent residential to the north, not having adequate transition as the plan had originally -- originally envisioned and noise pollution. Since the Commission hearing the applicant has provided a sound study from their current location to help address the concerns of the neighbors and they will discuss this in their presentation. Staff and the Commission are recommending approval of this project and have not received any written testimony since the Commission hearing. And I will stand for questions at this time.

Simison: Thank you, Nick. Council, questions for staff? Okay. Would the applicant like to come forward? Good evening. State your name and address for the record.

Walker: Glenn Walker. Excuse me. Glenn Walker. ADP Architects, 1831 East Overland Road. That's in Meridian. Nick, do we have the presentation by chance? Oh, it is. How do we go through this here? Just pushing the arrows? Is that how it works? Oh. And they -- oh, yeah. There we go. Good evening, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. I'm here on behalf of Core & Main to discuss our proposal for the five acre site at 299 South Black Cat Road. We appreciate the opportunity to present this project and the collaboration guidance provided by the city staff throughout this process. Project overview. This application includes a comprehensive plan map amendment from low density employment to mixed employment and annexation from Ada county RUT zoning to the City of Meridian's light industrial district. Core & Main proposes to develop a light industrial facility on the site, consistent with the city's Ten Mile Interchange Specific Area Plan or the TMISAP and adjacent uses to the south. The five acre site is currently vacant. Proposed uses, light industrial facility, supporting employment and economic development. The design incorporates enhancements based on city staff feedback, including architectural refinement, pathways and screening. Alignment with city goals. This proposal directly supports city broader economic development and land use goals. Supports of the TMISAP, which is light industrial, is an allowed used within the mixed employment designation. It provides a transition. The project offers compatible land use buffering between residential to the east and heavier industrial west of Black Cat. It encourages investment. The development will drive additional growth on nearby vacant parcels and create jobs. Core & Main will generate quality employment at wages that support local households here in the City of Meridian and also in the valley. Design and site enhancements. We worked closely with the staff to ensure that the site is well

designed, visually compatible with the area and consistent with the city standards. Core & Main is providing an eight foot closed vision fencing all around the four sides of this property. Ten multi -- ten foot multi-use pathway along the future collector and south -- along South Black Cat Road, which aligns with the pathway master plan. Site design minimizes the impacts. Estimated average of ten trucks per day. Significantly less intense than other industrial uses especially in this area. Architectural elevations enhanced per staff directions to meet Meridian's expectations for employment centers. Also the site will feature thoughtfully designed landscaping that complements and enhances the architectural character of the building. The landscape plan will follow best practices and incorporate a diverse selection of plant materials. In addition it will include a mix of soft and hardscape elements that harmonize with those found in the surrounding developments. Addressing concerns. We understand staff's caution regarding the expansion of I-L zoning. However, this project represents a modest, well planned addition that aligns with adjacent zoning and land use patterns. The five acre scale is small relative to prior approvals. For example, the 129 acre Black Cat development -- industrial development just to the south of this property. No traffic impact study was required due to the low intensity use of this project. In the project respects the intent was a mixed-use development Future Land Use Map over the FLUM, a designation while advancing community goals for employment and tax based diversification. So, in summary, this proposal supports Meridian's visions for economic vitality, fits within the existing planning frameworks and reflects a thoughtful collaborative design process. On behalf of Core & Main we respectfully request your approval for this annexation, the future land use map amendment and I'm happy to answer any questions that you may have.

Simison: All right. Thank you. Council, any questions for the applicant?

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor, Mr. Walker, thank you for being here and for your presentation. Could you give us a little bit more information about the sound study? I know that there is a neighbor that was fairly close that had mentioned concerns about some noise.

Walker: Yeah. Absolutely. So, Becky, who is also with me -- is that up? Did you pull that up, Nick? So, Becky gracefully went out to the site and had a reader to go out and measure the sound that was at the existing site. As Nick mentioned this is the second location for Core & Main. They present -- presently have a location here in Meridian and I will let Becky kind of take over and explain the sound report.

Becky: Good evening. Yes. So, I was able to download a decibel recorder onto my -- my iPhone and so I went out to the existing Core & Main site. Okay. Sorry, guys. Okay. This is their existing site. So, you can see I took three different sound recordings. Recording number one was just outside their existing building. Recording

number two was standing directly next to a forklift and, then, recording number three was across the street approximately 90 feet away from their property line. So, this kind of shows you where I was standing. I'm not very good at this. I apologize. Yes. Okay. So, this kind of gives you a summary of the recordings. There are reports and sound attenuation calculations, but it goes to show the closest residence is about 500 feet away from our property line and so I was able to calculate with recording number three that the maximum decibel recorded from 90 feet away was 60 decibels. If you calculate that out to 500 feet away is 44.2 decibels, which according to this WebMD chart is approximately the sound of an average house noise. So, with these recordings we feel really confident that there will be a very minimal amount, if any at all, sound pollution that reaches the Stores' residence or any of the other ones nearby.

Little Roberts: Great. Thank you so much.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Appreciate that. Glen, can you give me a better sense -- do you have a -- as far as the -- the type of use, you talked about low trucks or traffic. Do you already have a tenant for this or what kind of space is it -- is it going to be sort of delivery? Is it retail?

Walker: Oh, no. Core & Main is the -- will be occupying the building. They are the -- going to be the owners of the building. It's mostly outdoor storage -- storage yard on the outside and, then, the single story building is going to house office use and warehouse use. And it's -- if I -- if I hadn't mentioned, I just want to say that this is a single story building that we have designed it to look more like a two-story building to work closely with the comments that we received from city staff and so we feel that we worked really well and try to make the design to the City of Meridian's design standards and we feel that we have done that.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor, quick follow up?

Simison: Mr. Taylor.

Taylor: So, the -- the -- you won't have a retail traffic, it will be the people that work there and, then, some delivery trucks or -- I don't know if it's delivery trucks, but people taking materials there to store it on site. That's the kind of traffic flow?

Walker: That's correct. Yeah. Yeah. There is no retail whatsoever. It's strictly just shipment that comes on trucks and, like I said -- and like Nick mentioned, that the truck traffic is really just about ten trucks a day is all they -- they do in a day. So, you will get the bigger semi-trucks coming in unloading the product and, then, Core & Main will take it off the trucks, stack it into their yard or vice-versa. They will take the product and stack it onto the truck and, then, the truck moves on and delivers. I don't know if you have already been to or seen their existing site, but it's actually surprisingly very very

clean for a type of yard or storage that they do. Core & Main does just a really excellent job of keeping their yard very clean looking.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you. I was curious on your sound study. So, you have -- you know, kind of you measured it and, then, you are doing a calculation to adjust the sound over a different distance. Could you just explain how that calculation works? Is that like a -- something that's kind of standardized widely accepted? How does that work?

Becky: Yes. There is a -- it's called a sound attenuation calculator or a -- I can't remember. Can we go back to it, Nick? Sorry. I have the map -- the calculations in the report that I can show you. So, it's like it's at the very end. Really slow this time. It will be like two pages after this one. Yes. This page. So, this is it. It is called a -- an inverse square law is what they call it. This was provided by the WKC Group, which is a consulting firm, and so you can see that I can plug in the decibel level. This is from recording number one, which was just inside their yard. I was about 15 feet away from the general sound. This distance to the source is the distance I used to the closest residence. You can see in this little photo up at the top. The source was where the sound was recorded and where you are trying to calculate the sound pressure at and, then, the computer calculates it for you to what that anticipated decibel level will be.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thanks. That's helpful. I think having you walk us through that is -- is helpful. Certainly individual situations will vary; right? Just -- I mean because sound bounces off of things and -- and so it's -- it's hard to -- I think it's hard to sort of extrapolate, but I appreciate you kind of walking us through it and that you have used a sort of standardized approach. Curious if at your other location have -- have you all found things you can do internally within the yard to sort of manage -- further manage the sound? If you wanted to kind of walk us through any other potential mitigations that you are considering to be a good neighbor. Because I know that this is a big concern from the residents nearby.

Walker: I do have the gentleman who actually works for Core & Main step in and he could probably answer that question better than I can.

Strader: Perfect.

Van der Veen: Hi. I'm Dan Van der Veen, the branch manager of the local branch here. Yeah, we have -- so, we actually just -- the way for efficiency's sake we have -- so, we are a distributor of -- we have different types of water pipe -- we are a waterworks infrastructure distributor. So, a lot of the exterior of our yard is the best place to house

the -- the pipe, so -- so, really, a lot of it does kind of get encapsulated with the pipe. We have got all of our smaller like fittings and valves kind of in the middle and along the fences is where -- is where a lot of the pipe and the larger fire hydrants and stuff will be stored. So, a lot of that does capture it. We do have three forklifts. They are all, you know, mandated by OSHA to be at certain levels and whatnot and we do require our receiving hours -- so, our operating hours are typically 7:00 to 5:00. We do receiving hours 8:00 to 4:00 just to keep the -- the incoming-outgoing, you know, traffic in between those hours and I guess that's -- we haven't had the case where even any of our employees are OSHA regulated for any ear plugs or anything. It's -- it's really -- it hasn't gotten that high; right?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you. That -- I think that's helpful context for people in the audience as well, just to sort of understand your approach. Maybe just to preview, Mr. Mayor, if you will allow me to preview a question for city staff that I want to ask as well. Like I know when we approved the Black Cat industrial -- and something that's always in my mind is we have always been under weighted, in my opinion, from a high level perspective on industrial land throughout the City of Meridian. Do you all have some kind of a general calculation? We have done this before where it's like this is how much we have compared to how much we would normally expect citywide. If you have any kind of rule of thumb around that. And it might take you a little bit. If you don't have it it's okay, but I just more like intellectually was curious to revisit that conversation, just because I think that was part of our thinking with the development to the south. Thank you.

Walker: Can I speak on the previous question, too? I think it was Mr. Taylor.

Taylor: On the types of uses?

Walker: Yeah. Yeah. Just so we are -- Core & Main is a -- we are a distributor. So, we supply waterworks infrastructure materials. So, we have been in the area and supporting, you know, all the local municipalities for decades. If you recognize the name, like Hughes Supply or National Pipe, those were our names previous and, then, we were HD Supply before Core & Main. So, those names might be more familiar. Our direct competitors are Ferguson Waterworks, Consolidated Supply and HD Fowler. So, it's kind of the same -- if you know those names we are doing the -- the same thing, providing infrastructure, support via main -- mainline piping. So, sewer pipe, water pipe, water services, water fittings and fire hydrants. That's what we are supplying. So, there is -- while there is not retail, there is, you know, contractors if we are -- if we can't deliver it to them contractors might come up there truck to pick up, you know, what they might need.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for the applicant? Okay. Thank you very much.

Walker: Thank you very much.

Simison: So, Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone signed up to provide testimony on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, not for this item.

Simison: Okay. Is there anybody present who would like to provide testimony on this item, either here in the room or online? If you are online you can use the raise your hand function. If you are here if you would like to come forward. Council, no one is raising their hand online and no one is coming forward. Would the applicant like to make any final comments or do you waive at this time?

Walker: Mr. Mayor, City Council, I think we are good., So I'm -- I'm good.

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

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Would it be okay if we check into the city staff on my question?

Napoli: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, so I don't have an exact percentage, but I can get that for you. We did have a study that came out from -- actually this year. It was in 2025. Our long range staff did it. And our zoning district areas -- for industrial we are about at 9.7 percent of the city -- what's annexed into the city is industrial and from feedback we get from a lot of industrial users and people looking for Meridian, because we are the center of the valley, it definitely is a need I would say. So, it's definitely in demand and we do have a lot more general industrial to the -- just to the -- here I can pull up the map. Just to the west of this on the future land use there is a significant portion that will be designated as general industrial as well. Let me find that for you.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Like if -- if -- if you all look at -- like Urban Land Institute type feedback or that sort of thing, would be curious to circle back to kind of what -- what may be a different way of asking the question is when we did our original future land use map and the whole Comprehensive Plan -- maybe a good way of answering this is what was our goal in that process in terms of the amount of industrial we were kind of looking for holistically. That might be -- that might be a different way to answer the question.

Napoli: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, it's a good question. You know, as far as with this -- really the intention -- and I would say specifically for the area that's on the screen, obviously, industrial users are important to the city, important for the valley, but the difference between I would say general industrial, mixed employment and low density employment is really the employment numbers that's significant there. Industrial users -- typically they can provide a lot of employment, but compared to some other uses that we do see in the mixed employment and low density employment, it's not as significant as providing the employment numbers that we really have envisioned. So, when I did say -- I guess just caution for using -- putting I-L in these zones, it is really to hit employment numbers that when the Comprehensive Plan designated this being able to provide the employment, so, you know, future residents and current residents of the city can -- can work and live in the same city and we do have, you know, adequate employment throughout the whole valley. This isn't just for the City of Meridian. We are the center of the valley and we are a very desirable location for a lot of businesses because of that. So, I don't know if that fully answers your question, but I can -- I can follow up with you on exact numbers as far as how much industrial we do have and percentages.

Strader: Mr. Mayor. That would be great if you could find that out. I mean in the time I have been on the City Council I can think of many examples where we have taken industrial land and, unfortunately, it had gone to a different use. I can think of very few examples where we took a use and wanted to go back to industrial. So, this is sort of anecdotally where I was coming from. If you can find that out that would be super. You could just hand me a note or we could revisit it, but I -- I think at some point in the future talking about that again would be good. Thank you.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Not hearing any additional folks who want to provide testimony, I would move that we close the public hearing for Item H-2024-0066.

Overton: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to close the public hearing. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Just some of my -- my thoughts on this. If I look at the Comprehensive Plan and the future land use map and what we want to do, I recognize that there -- there are situations where we want to make some changes and adjustments, because the plan was meant to be a good guide, but it wasn't meant to be a specific detailed document. We adopted this six years ago. Certainly things have changed in our city and the circumstances in which we live. So, some flexibility I think is good. So, whenever I look at an application where we are considering amending the Comprehensive Plan, I -- the first thing I look for is are we still compatible with the idea in the area and if we were proposing a high density multi-family unit here that would clearly not be compatible with what we were hoping to have in this area. So, to me that checks the box in -- in terms of compatibility with the surrounding areas and I appreciate the staff highlighting the differences and sort of the goals we are trying to reach with not having too much of the change here, because it could -- you know, we could have a lot of land tied up with not a lot of potential jobs if it was heavy in industrial. But this is -- looking at the specific application I'm not concerned with it. I think there is good transitions. I think it's in the right part of town. I also appreciate Council Woman Strader's questioning on -- on sort of the percentage we have, because we don't want a community that's just heavy residential. We want a good mix of -- of usage. So, I -- I think this is a good proposal and I will be supporting it tonight.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: And just a comment. I think -- I think it would be good to just like circle back holistically to that kind of comparison that we have done in the past of -- this is kind of the amount we were looking for each type of land use like holistically as a city and this is kind of where we are trending. I think it's not -- it's not something that should affect our -- at least my decision tonight. It's more of just I think helpful to kind of have that sense of like are we on track with just from a high level perspective where we want to head. I -- I feel like I have -- I have seen enough anecdotal information and data over the last, you know, five plus years that I'm pretty confident that, if anything, we have a lack of industrial opportunity and I think this is a decent fit. The other thing like light industrial -- to me light industrial is a bit different. If this was a very heavy industrial use I think I would be scrutinizing it a lot more. If I felt like there was a really bad environmental impact with residential neighbors, if there was -- you know, if there were a lot of chemicals involved or something like that, then, yeah, we would think about the compatibility of those uses more. So, I agree with Councilman Taylor, I think -- I think this is a good opportunity for us and good way to support a local business and I appreciate that we have all the different comprehensive map amendment changes coming out at the same time every year and I feel like that also helps us avoid kind of these one-off situations. This is more coordinated where the public knows if we are, you know, changing from our Comprehensive Plan they know that that's happening at a certain time every year. I think that helps them, too. So, I feel pretty comfortable here on this one.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Unless there is any other comments that my colleagues would like to make, I would make a motion that we approve File No. H-2024-0066 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date May 6th, 2025.

Cavener: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Item H-2024-0066. Is there discussion on the motion? If not Clerk call the roll.

Roll Call: Cavener, yea; Strader, yea; Overton, yea; Little Roberts, yea; Taylor, yea; Whitlock, absent.

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries and the item is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

3. Public Hearing for Mondt Meadows Subdivision (H-2024-0067) by Gregg Davis, Breckon Land Design, located at 6101 and 6162 S. Terrega Ln.

- A. Request: Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map (CPAM) to change the future land use designation on 10.28 acres of land from Medium Density Residential (MDR) to Low Density Residential (LDR).
- B. Request: Annexation of 10.84 acres of land from RUT in Ada County to the R-2 (8.48 acres) and R-4 (2.36 acres) zoning districts.
- C. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 11 building lots (10 new and 1 existing) and 4 common lots on 10.28 acres of land in the proposed R-2 and R-4 zoning districts.

Simison: Thank you, Nick. Next item up is a public hearing for Mondt Meadows Subdivision, H-2024-0067. We will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Ritter: Good evening, Mayor and Council Members. Linda Ritter here. So, tonight we are looking at an annexation, a comprehensive plan map amendment and a preliminary plat. This site consists of 10.28 acres of land. It's currently zoned RUT in Ada county and it's located at 6106 and 6162 Terrega Lane. So, this parcel went through a property boundary adjustment within Ada county to separate this parcel so that it could be

developed for the -- as part of the preliminary plat that you will be looking at tonight. So, the original Comprehensive Plan designation for this property right now is medium density and the applicant is requesting to amend the Comprehensive Plan future land use map to change the future land use designation to medium density -- from medium density residential to low density residential. They are annexing the property. Part of it will be -- 8.48 acres will be R-2 and, then, 2.36 they are looking to zone it R-4. This preliminary plat consists of 11 lots, ten new and one existing. Again, this is the proposed amendment to the comp plan map. These are the future land uses. This is the existing and this is the future. Again, this is the exhibit for the R-2 zoning and this is for the R-4 zoning. So, this is our preliminary plat here. So, these four lots here will be R-2. It has an existing house on one of the lots that is -- currently the property owner's son lives there and this portion is on the property that is adjacent to it. So, they are doing six lots with a future phase and they are doing a temporary turnaround on the property to the north of them, which will be coming in at some point for a plat to be annexed in and platted in the city. So, access to this property is from Sublimity Avenue. This is a property -- this is a roadway that was built by Brighton that is in. They will take access from this road into the property. These four lots will have a private drive on it. Fire did look at this and say that the private drive was acceptable. It is gated. Meets the private drive standards. And, then, the other lots for the R-2 will take access off of the -- this new road Mondt Meadows, with the temporary turnaround. They will have a 20 foot landscape wide buffer along the collector road. The -- the -- the adjacent developer to the east is installing the landscaping along Sublimity Avenue and so the applicant will be adding the landscaping along the new collector road that they are proposing -- local road that they are proposing. And any fencing that they are providing will have to meet the city standards. In their open space they are providing a couple of amenities. They are providing a pergola for coverage and a fire ring and a picnic table bench. So, all of these will be part of the open space that they have there. And on the screen before you are some pictures of the property. It's actually a beautiful location. Again this is their landscape plan. As you can see they are providing landscaping along the collect -- the local roadways here and we are in the process of modifying the landscape plan. They are still going to meet the requirements, but we will have some modifications to it. But they will still meet the requirements of it. Again these are the amenities that they are providing. The fire pit. The pergola. The bench and the table. These are the elevations that were provided by the applicant. These are conceptual elevations that were submitted for the proposed development. The homes -- they will be a mix of different product types. Two-story. Single story. Detached family homes. They will be designed with elevations that create interest through the use of broken planes, windows and stations that produce a rhythm of material and patterns. Design review is not required for single family detached structures. But staff recommends a DA provision provide these elevations that are along the -- facing Sublimity Avenue and will be high visibility that they have elevations, incorporate articulations through changing two or more of the following: Modulations, base, banding, porches, balconies, material types and other integrated architectural elements to break up monotonous wall planes and roof lines that are visible from adjacent streets. Any single story homes will be exempt from this requirement. They do have a waterway that goes through the property -- is the Watkins ditch. It runs along the eastern portion of the property and that -- the

ditch has to be placed within a 38 foot easement. The applicant is proposing to leave the ditch open to keep it as a natural element. So, the applicant is requesting a waiver from Council to leave that ditch open. It has been placed in the common lot, but they need a waiver from you guys to keep it open. There is a dry ditch located on this property. The -- the applicant will need to provide documentation saying that this ditch has been abandoned and is no longer in use and we will need that written documentation from them prior to the city engineer signing the final plat. There are several other easements that are on the property and which written document to -- documentation to relinquish the easement shall be submitted to the city engineer prior to the signature on the final plat also. And these are those easements. There is like a 30 foot easement that runs the length of the property on the north side. There is a 30 foot wide access easement, which we are asking the applicant to vacate access to that private road once the new road has been built and, again, for that dry ditch. Again, I would enjoy living here. It's a beautiful scenery. So, Commission did recommend approval of this. There were no written comments and staff has not received any comments since the public -- Commission public hearing. The comment that we received at the public hearing was from Carson White. Again he resides on the property that will be within that private street area. He is definitely in favor of it. So, there were no key issues discussed by the Commission, no changes to staff recommendation and there were no outstanding issues for you. So, with that staff is asking the Council to approve this application and I am -- I stand for any questions that you might have.

Simison: Thank you, Linda. Council, any questions?

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Just a quick one. Linda, are we taking up the request to leave the active ditch open as part of this application tonight? Thank you.

Simison: Okay. Would the applicant like to come forward? Good evening.

Breckon: Good evening. Jon Breckon. 6661 North Glenwood Street, Garden City. I have a little bit of a presentation. I might kind of flip through that quickly, because Linda was so thorough. I see quite a bit of this is going to be redundant, so I will just kind of skip through it in the interest of time. But it is available to answer questions. School sites. There is an overall plan and this -- this one actually might be helpful. You know, there is -- there is existing ditches on the site. I could expand on that a little bit and -- let's see if I can point here. We have done quite a little bit of work. We are also working on the preliminary plat to -- for the property to the north that Linda mentioned and so as part of that our plan to address the surface water and pressurized irrigation is to -- I have a little trouble here with the -- the mouse. I apologize. Boy, I'm going the wrong direction. I apologize. Here is -- okay. Here we can see there is the dry ditch on the -- on the north that Linda mentioned and -- and there is -- so, there is a pipe that exits there -- gravity irrigation pipe that was previously used for farming and -- and flood

irrigation. Anyway, that's where the water rights come from and our plan is to pick up that pipe and right now it kind of comes down and it doesn't do -- and from talking to all the adjacent neighbors here to the south it really hasn't provided water for those folks for quite some time. Anyway, we are hoping to remedy that as part of these two projects. We will pick that up, we will pipe it over and we have talked to Boise Project Board of Control Irrigation District. They would like to see a pond installed, along with the pump stations and the pressurized irrigation system and, then, we will have a drainage pipe or overflow pipe from that pond that will come down and through this landscape buffer area and overflow into the Watkins drain, which is the larger ditch on the south side that we would like to leave mostly open. It is a substantially large ditch in that the pipe feeding into it is a 48 inch diameter and would be substantial cost to pipe that entire east side there and that's why we are requesting that variance. As part of this irrigation design we have met with the two project owners, as well as the adjacent owners here to the south who are still in the county and we are working on a plan to provide pressurized irrigation for all those folks, because they have water rights off of that pipe. Here is a quick snippet here of that Shafer View Ridge project to the north that we are also working on and planning on submitting preliminary plat very soon. Part of -- part of the inner workings of this is to connect the sewer and water utilities from Sublimity to and through the Shafer View project as well. So, this shows the water -- water line connections, as well as sewer connections. The plan is to connect to the north there and, then, that would drain down and connect to the trunk line in Sublimity Avenue on the east. Now, here is the irrigation improvement so you can kind of see the supply location. There is a shot of the amenities. It's located here in the common area. Common lot. Largest common lot. There is elevations again. Stand for questions.

Simison: Thank you, Jon. Council, any questions for the applicant?

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: You might have answered this, but I'm going to ask it maybe a different way. With the dry ditch, if Council approves this project tonight and gives you the okay to develop and abandoned that dry ditch, I'm assuming there are still active water rights from an irrigation company that need to be legally abandoned through that process.

Breckon: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Overton, yes, the -- the dry ditch would get piped and -- and, then, we would utilize those water rights to provide pressurized irrigation for everyone.

Overton: Thank you.

Simison: Okay.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: The -- on the -- the open ditch that you have there, it sounded like you wanted to keep that open. Obviously there is a fiscal impact, but also you kind of sound like you wanted to make it a natural amenity in a way. Is there going to be a pathway alongside it or is it just going to be an easement and kind of left open? I mean what's your vision for how that may be used? And, then, along that same line will there be a fence line between those properties and the open waterway?

Breckon: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Taylor, yes, there -- so, I will explain all that, that we want to enhance it. Right now it's just, you know, your -- your run-of-the-mill drainage farm7 ditch and so it's -- kind of is what it is. But where -- where we abut -- it's on this east side here and you can see that -- you can see the property line, right of way line there along Sublimity and so what -- what's going on there is we have -- there is that strip on the Sublimity side that that development is putting in a landscape strip and a fence on the property line and, then, we have the ditch and the easement associated with it and that's reflected by the property lines at the back of those two lots and those two lots will have a fence along the back as is required, but it would just -- that -- would like that to be kind of an open vision fence, so that those lots can see it and -- and, then, just enhance that ditch so it still functions, but look nice and, then, tie that into the landscaping along the road frontage here where we have our amenities located right here at the corner.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor, a quick follow up.

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Would that prop -- would the -- along the waterway would that be maintained along with the other green space? Because what I would hate for to see is it just to be an overgrown mess anyway. But is that the plan? Is that -- is that a requirement? Maybe city staff could answer that. Is that required for them to maintain that?

Ritter: Council Member Taylor, that is in the common area. It's in a common lot. So, it has to be maintained by the HOA.

Simison: All right. Thank you very much.

Breckon: Thank you.

Simison: Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone signed up on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, nobody indicated they wanted to speak.

Simison: Okay. Is there anybody present that would like to provide -- if you would like to come forward one at a time and just state your name and address for the record and

you will be recognized for three minutes. If you are online, please, use the raise your hand feature. Go ahead.

White: Brian White. 6180 South Terrega Lane, Meridian, Idaho. 83642. So, this is our property that we are developing and just to explain that, there is currently -- they currently just -- Brighton just put a six foot privacy fence right along that east property line. They built -- built it up in a pretty good berm and, then, put up a fence along there and we really want to keep it open, because we have pairs of mallard ducks and blue herons and geese that like to come there and hang out, so if it's all piped in there will be less place for them to do that. We really -- we wanted to have the two eastern lots go all the way to the -- the fence line that's there now, but because of the guidelines they can't be part of that, but we wanted to keep that relatively open. So, it will essentially be kind of part of their backyard. We have lived here for 34 years. No Boise projects or no one has ever even set foot on that -- or done any maintenance on that ditch other than us. So, we feel like we can maintain it and have it still part of the property. These are our children. They are going to build houses there. So, we think it's going to be a pretty nice place. I stand for any questions.

Simison: Council, any questions? Thank you, Mr. White.

C.White: Hello. Carson White. 6162 South Terrega Lane. So, that existing home is the one that I live in there at the corner and the other thing is -- so, as far as the -- the irrigation ditch that I think all the neighbors are excited about finally having access to that, which will be really nice, that those south properties will be able to actually utilize their water. We have always had a hard time trying to get that water uphill. I don't know if you know how water works, but that doesn't go very well. So, that will be really nice for them and, really, just keeping those green spaces open and available for, you know, us to have some nature out there is what -- what we are looking for and other than that I just appreciate you guys' time.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions? Thank you. After you there is two more over there, so --

D.White: Yeah. They are just here for the cuteness factor. Dane White. 10324 West Mossywood Street, Boise, Idaho. I am another brother. I just want to say on a -- just hope for you guys' approval of this plan. It has been a long process trying to get the Comprehensive Plan changed and meet all the city requirements and it has been like the dream of my parents. They have worked really hard to always improve their property, own it, be good citizens and it will be a dream of ours to be able to raise our kids on the same place where we grew up and my kids already love and enjoy spending Sundays over there and we just thank you for your time and consideration and -- yeah. Any questions?

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I was going to ask your father earlier, but, Dane, how many generations of Whites are in the building right now?

D.White: Three. Three generations. Yeah. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Is there anybody else that would like to provide testimony? I do see a White online, so I won't force it, but -- would the applicant like to close? Applicant waives closing.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Seeing no further comments, I move we close the public hearing.

Cavener: Second.

Simison: Motion and second to close the public hearing. Is there any discussion?

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Just happened to have known this family for a long time and I got to tell you how much I appreciate -- we don't see applicants come in very often where it makes sense in today's world to build big lots and big houses in R-2 and R-4 and it makes me feel good to know that you are going to do something and preserve some of this area and we are going to see that low density taken advantage of an area where you have lived for literally decades and I -- I knew it was coming a few months ago and looking forward to this and I think it's going to be a great addition and I appreciate you using that 48 inch ditch as an amenity. I got to tell you I live right on Five Mile Creek and we have baby ducks and baby geese out there right now as we are watching them grow up and that's kind of a special thing for my grandkids. So, I appreciate everything you said. Thank you.

Simison: Is there further discussion on the motion? If not in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: A couple of my thoughts. This is a pretty cut and dry application. In the city we talk a lot about diversity of housing and that often refers to duplexes and multi-family, but this is also diversity and so, Jon, I -- I appreciate even bringing kind of piece

by piece out here really doing some amazing work, really building out a really special part of Meridian and keeping it special. So, I'm in full support. I think this makes sense for the area. It's going to be a really nice addition to south Meridian. Unless anybody's got anyone else -- anything else to say, I'm happy to make a motion. After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move we approve Item 3, Mondt Meadows Subdivision, H-2024-0067, as presented in the staff report of Tuesday, May 6th, to be inclusive of granting the applicant the waiver to leave the ditch open.

Overton: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Item H-2024-0067. Is there further discussion? If not, clerk call the roll.

Roll Call: Cavener, yea; Strader, yea; Overton, yea; Little Roberts, yea; Taylor, yea; Whitlock, absent.

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries and the item is agreed to. Good luck.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

4. Public Hearing for Latitude Forty Three Subdivision (H-2024-0059) by Rodney Evans + Partners, LLC., located at 675, 715 and 955 S. Wells St.

- A. Request: Annexation of 17.27 acres of land with R-8 (13.78 acres), R-15 (2.42 acres) and C-N (1.07 acres) zoning districts.
- B. Request: Preliminary Plat to re-subdivide lots 7, 21 and 22, Magic View Subdivision, Amended into 79 residential lots, 1 commercial lot and 11 common/other lots on 15.97 acres of

Simison: Council, with that we will move on to Item 4, which is a public hearing for H-2024-0059. We will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Allen: Alrighty. Members of the Council, the next applications before you tonight are a request for annexation and zoning and a preliminary plat. This site consists of 15.97 acres of land. It's zoned RUT in Ada county and is located at 675, 715 and 955 South Wells -- South Wells Street. In 2019 an annexation request was approved for the development of a senior living facility on this site. However, the development agreement was never signed and, consequently, the property wasn't annexed. In 2021 another annexation request with a preliminary plat and a conditional use permit for an assisted living facility was denied by Council due to their determination that it wasn't in the best interest of the city at that time. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation on this property is medium density residential for 13 acres and mixed-use neighborhood for approximately 4.4 acres of the site. The applicant is requesting annexation of 17.27 acres of land with R-8 zoning, which is 13.78 acres, R-15 zoning,

which is 2.42 acres and C-N zoning, which is 1.07 acres, for the development of 79 single family residential detached homes, 59 of which are in the medium density designation and 20 are in the mixed-use neighborhood designation. That gross density is consistent with the underlying future land use map designations, which is 4.5 units per acre and the medium density designation in 6.06 in the mixed-use neighborhood designation, which is at the lower end of the desired densities in both of those designations. A commercial building pad is proposed at the south end of the mixed-use neighborhood designated area for a mix of uses as desired. A preliminary plat is proposed to resubdivide Lot 7, 21 and 22 of Magic View Subdivision amended into 79 residential lots, one commercial lot and 11 common and other lots on 15.97 acres of land. The phasing plan was submitted as shown depicting two phases of development, with phase one being on the north end of the development north of the Five Mile Creek. The proposed plat layout provides a good transition in lot sizes and widths to the Wood -- Woodbridge residential development to the west, with most lot lines aligning or only being slightly offset. The Five Mile Creek bisects the site within a one hundred foot wide easement. Access is proposed via existing and proposed local public streets, with an emergency access only via East Magic View Drive at the northern boundary. Two stub streets are proposed to the west to be extended with future development. Three common lot driveways -- excuse me -- common driveways are proposed off internal local streets. ITD has requested a traffic impact analysis due to the development size and anticipated impacts to State Highway 55. The applicant is working on this request. Residents in the abutting Woodbridge development to the west have expressed concern pertaining to the high volume of traffic currently passing through their neighborhood between South Locust Grove Road and East Magic View Drive for access to South Eagle Road and the impact the proposed development will have, which will exacerbate an already challenging situation in this area. In an attempt to alleviate this the applicant is not proposing public access from Magic View Drive. The bridge on South Wells Street that runs along the eastern boundary of the site that provides vehicular access across the Five Mile Creek is scheduled in ACHD's five year work plan to be replaced in 2029. The bridge is currently designed to match existing facilities, which do not include bicycle lanes or pedestrian facilities. However, the width of the bridge will accommodate these improvements in the future when adjacent properties redevelop and provide these facilities. ACHD will require road trust from the developer for the cost of these improvements and include them in their project if this development goes forward. Staff had recommended a five foot wide temporary asphalt pathway be provided alongside Wells Street where the bridge is located over the creek if there is adequate area. However, ACHD did confirm that there is not adequate room for a pathway. The applicant is proposing landscape street buffers along East Magic View Drive and South Wells Street. A ten foot wide landscape street buffer is required along local streets on the C-N zoned property. A segment of the city's multi-use pathway system is proposed from South Wells Street to the west along the north side of the Five Mile Creek, stubbing to the west property line for future extension and to the northwest for connection to the existing pathway in Woodbridge Subdivision in accord with the pathways master plan. There are existing trees on the site that may require mitigation in accord with UDC standards. Fencing is typically not allowed to prevent access to natural waterways. In limited circumstances and in the interest of public safety larger

open water systems may require fencing. A cross-section of the Five Mile Creek was submitted as shown that depicts approximately a three-to-one slope on the north side of the creek and a four foot tall retaining wall on the south side of the creek with an approximate four-to-one slope. Because the slope on the north meets the slope requirements in the UDC for accessibility and maintenance of stormwater facilities of three to one or less, staff recommends no fencing is installed on that side, but does recommend six foot tall wrought iron fencing is provided on the south side for public safety. Council should determine if this is appropriate. A portion of the site is located within the floodway along the creek. A floodplain development permit is required before any grading and the floodplain begins and a floodplain permit is required for each building in the floodplain along the -- along with elevation certificates certifying lowest floor elevation is two feet above base flood elevation. A minimum of 15 percent or 2.28 acres of qualified open space is required to be provided with development. A total of 2.47 acres or 16 percent is proposed as shown on the open space exhibit. A minimum of three points of site amenities are required. A total of 12 points are proposed from the quality of life and recreation activity categories, consisting of a picnic area, a tot lot and sports courts. Several conceptual building elevations were submitted for the proposed single story and two-story single family residential detached homes for each of the lot sizes proposed. A variety of building materials are proposed in a variety of colors and design elements and features with varying roof profiles and wall modulation that demonstrates the quality of development proposed. Conceptual elevations were not submitted for the commercial structure. Compliance with the nonresidential design standards in the Architectural Standards Manual is required. The Commission recommended approval of the project with the requirement of development agreement provisions in the staff report and I will go over a summary of the Commission public hearing. Ben Semple of Rodney Evans + Partners, LLC, the applicant's representative, testified in favor. Robin McCulley commented on the application. Written testimony was received from the applicant Ben Semple, Robin McCulley, Cassy Peck, Celeste Fox, Kathleen Lewis, Tanya Bader, Erin Russell and Raymond Spencer. Key issues of public testimony were as follows: The existing fence along Woodbridge's east boundary, which is the site's west boundary, is crooked and doesn't lay on the property line in many places due to the location of existing trees and poor construction. Request for details on what the plan is for the fencing along the west boundary of the site and desire for vinyl fencing not to be an approved material in this area. The high volume of traffic going through Woodbridge Subdivision between Locust Grove and Eagle Roads, which will worsen with more homes being developed in this area. Long wait times at the intersection of Eagle and Allen at the traffic signal and safety concerns. Request for this area to be rezoned for nonresidential uses. Privacy issues with two-story homes being built next to single story homes and question if two-story homes will have windows facing adjacent rear yards. Request for the developer to provide details in writing of their planned building setbacks on lots next to Woodbridge to be included in the development agreement. Request for the developer to address what future builders can do to prevent drainage issues on abutting lots in Woodbridge due to the higher elevation of the subject property. Ms. McCulley expressed concern about a tree located along her rear property line and how it would be impacted by a new fence. Key issues of discussion by the Commission were as follows: General consensus -- consensus the

proposed development will fit in well with the existing residential development to the west Woodbridge. Recognition of the traffic issues in this area. An agreement with staff's recommendation pertaining to fencing along the Five Mile Creek. The Commission made the following changes to the staff recommendation. At staff's request the Commission included new conditions requiring mitigation information to be included on the landscape plan for existing trees on the site that are being removed with development in accord with the standards listed in the UDC for mitigation as applicable and removal of the sidewalk along the west side of Longitude Drive with provision of right of way to the west property line. Outstanding issue for Council tonight is that Council should determine if the fencing recommended by staff along the Five Mile Creek is appropriate as set forth in the UDC. Written testimony received since the Commission hearing. The applicant submitted a letter in agreement with the Commission recommendation, which included approval to remove the sidewalk along the west side of Longitude Drive, so that a detached sidewalk may -- may be constructed with a landscape parkway when the abutting property develops in accord with the Comprehensive Plan, which desires tree lined streets in mixed-use neighborhood designated areas. As is there is not adequate area to do so, so that is the reason that the applicant is asking for that and staff is in support of that. Several letters of testimony have been received since the Commission hearing as follows: Celeste Fox. She is requesting the developer provide details of their planned building setbacks next to neighbors on Woodhaven -- Woodhaven Street that will be part of the development agreement. She requests clarification about what the builders can do to prevent drainage issues on lots that abut homes in Woodbridge that are at a lower elevation and concern pertaining to the perimeter fencing along the east boundary of Woodbridge. Robin McCulley. Concern pertaining to the existing fence along the east boundary of Woodbridge. The developer hasn't yet discussed the matter with the neighbors. Cassandra Peck. Concern pertaining to the increase in traffic and already congested area and lack of fencing solution along the shared property line with Woodbridge and concern pertaining to the lack of privacy with two-story homes abutting her single story home. And Raymond Spencer. Concern pertaining to the proposed scale and building setback of homes along the west boundary of the site, abutting homes in Woodbridge and the lack of privacy. He requests a 20 foot setback for single story homes and 30 feet for two-story homes. Concern pertaining to the quality of homes built in this development. If the current builder drops out. He requests the -- for the opportunity for the city and the public to review any future changes to the elevations in the event the home builder and/or ownership changes to avoid a potential bait and switch. The applicant is here tonight to present. Staff will stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you, Sonya. Council, any questions for staff?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Would you, please, kind of speak to the fence issue again with the recommendation not to have the fencing potentially on -- let's see here. It says because

the slope on the north side meets the slope requirements in the UDC for accessibility maintenance, Staff recommends no fencing is installed on that side, but six foot tall wrought iron fence. Could you just maybe -- I think I remember the slide that you had, but could you just speak to that recommendation again? I just want to get my mind wrapped around that a little bit more.

Allen: Yeah. Give me just a moment and I will pull up that slide again. So, the UDC basically -- basically states that they feel an acceptable slope for safety is three to one. That's -- you know, one foot up, three -- three feet over, you know, like that. So, the -- the -- the slope on the south side is four to one. That -- that's not deemed to be acceptable in the UDC for safety. If someone should fall out they -- not as easy for them to get out on that slope. So, that is why staff is recommending a fence on the south side. If you feel that it's -- it should also be required on the north side, that's -- that's your call tonight.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Sonya, can you walk through the staff and -- and the Planning and Zoning Commission's recommendation to remove the sidewalk on South Longitude? I guess I'm not tracking where their recommendation is coming from -- and why that's being requested.

Allen: Yeah. So, as I mentioned it's in -- the city's Comprehensive Plan likes to have tree lined streets and mixed-use designated areas. The current area right there, the width of that area does not accommodate a detached sidewalk, so they would have to attach the sidewalk in that location, which would not allow for tree lined streets. So, it will be constructed in the future when the abutting property to the west develops, it just won't be constructed at this time. So, the -- the condition requires them to provide right of way to that west property line.

Cavener: Got it. Thank you.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Just a couple quick questions. Sonya, it says right up front and you mentioned in your staff report that there was a request for a traffic study by ITD, but we don't have that. Has it been produced or is it normal for us as a Council to make decisions on a project when we don't have that traffic study?

Allen: This -- yeah. Mr. Mayor, Councilman Overton, Council, it -- it is. I mean we can go ahead with that. They have asked for a traffic analysis. I know the applicant has been working on that and should be able to provide an update to you on that. To my

knowledge it hasn't been completed yet, but the applicant may have knowledge of that that I don't have.

Overton: Mr. Mayor, follow up?

Allen: They haven't asked the city to weigh in on their -- in their decision on the matter.

Overton: Sonya, in ACHD's report they mentioned that the widths that were proposed by the applicant on both Wells and on Magic View at 28 feet were not acceptable and did not work for their policy and they requested them to be at least 36 feet, but I don't see anything updated from ACHD saying that's been agreed to.

Allen: They really don't have a choice. They have to comply with that, so -- yeah.

Overton: Okay. Mr. Mayor, one last one.

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Sonya, do you know if this application also preserves the right of way for any future development to the south of Woodbridge? The roadway right of way is what I'm referring to on the edge of this development.

Allen: I'm not following. On Woodbridge Subdivision or --

Overton: If the potential for redevelopment happened south of Woodbridge Subdivision from Locust Grove through into this development, is the roadway being preserved in this application, so that that could happen?

Allen: Not that I'm aware of. I believe that our long range planning is working on some -- some kind of solution to the traffic issues in this area, but there is nothing -- there is not a plan -- specific plan at this point.

Overton: Thank you.

Allen: If that answers your question, Mr. Overton. Thanks.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: This has been a tough area to figure out to say the least. So, you know, normally as a city our philosophy has been that interconnectivity eventually helps improve situations. In this case, you know, staff appears to be kind of on board with this recommendation of not having the Magic View access to public traffic and I just kind of wanted to -- to hear your opinion about what the right approach is to this area from a transportation perspective holistically. I think kind of to Councilman Overton's point is

there any kind of long-term vision for how we -- how -- options that could be used in the future to try to improve the situation?

Allen: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, Council, I did speak with long range about that. They -- they are looking at this area. They do not have a -- they do not have a plan at this point, but they are looking at it and trying to figure out some long-term plan.

Simison: And maybe just to expand on that. I mean it's not just -- we -- we -- we are actively going out to get someone to do this work this year on this area and I will say the transportation network is the driving conversation for this more so than the land use, but the land use will also be evaluated. So, in essence, that this decision could impact that, because it will limit the options potentially. I'm not going to say that this wouldn't meet -- wouldn't be able to allow to -- to happen, but it does make a question if this is approved or not. We would be able to do everything that we look to ask the questions in this area.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: No. I think that's really proactive and -- and interesting. Is there any sense of timing on what kind of time frame would be needed to achieve some kind of a plan with different options? I'm just kind of curious about that, because I feel like, again, this area has been really tough to figure out. So, if it was like, okay, this is actively being worked on, we are kind of expecting something, you know, in the next few months that would be really good to know, but if it's a longer term, like much later this year or 12 months from now, I think those are all -- I don't know. I just sort of general question about timing.

Simison: I would like to say by the end of the calendar year is what our discussion was. We -- we had already planned to start this, but we -- we had a -- we hired a long range person. They were here very briefly. They left. We had to refill the position. So, that's what has delayed this project for moving forward until we got the new person on and I understand that this -- this is their number one thing that they are looking at. I just don't know how long it's going to take and I don't want to say three months and, then, have it be longer. Council, any additional questions for staff? Okay. Then I will invite the applicant to come forward.

Semple: Good evening, Mr. Mayor, Members of Council. Ben Semple with Rodney Evans + Partners, 1450 West Bannock Street, Boise. 83702. I sent -- she's pulling it up. Yeah. And I think Sonya did a great job of an overview. I'm going to touch on some of the comments and the questions and kind of the process that we have gone through on this project from the start. So, yeah, again, Rodney Evans + Partners. I'm representing -- Pacific Lifestyle Homes is going to be the builder and, then, Prestwick Capital is the developer of this site. So, there is a builder that's been selected. All the home elevations that you have seen are representative of products that they build. They are more of a custom home builder. They don't do spec homes on these lots. They have a lot buyer that, then, comes in, they have a design studio here locally that

the homeowner goes through, picks finishes, everything on it, so it is very much a custom home design process. Project site south of Magic View Circle, west of South Wells Street. Wells Circle is a cul-de-sac that runs along the southern boundary of this project. That is a public roadway that ends in a cul-de-sac. That could be extended to the west through the other Ada county parcels that are south and Council Member Overton to address kind of that question that you have for staff. Additionally, there is an existing cul-de-sac right of way that is, you know, basically just north of -- just north of Five Mile Creek and that public right of way will be extended to the west to the parcel that's just north of Five Mile Creek and we are doing everything we can to stub to these. So, going back to the start. This is the initial concept that we had for Wells Street Subdivision. Public roads that connected to Magic View Circle. They are in alignment with another road there to the north. After conversations with the neighbors there is some concerns that that connection would drive traffic more so through the development of -- through Woodbridge on their surface streets and so the developer went back and we put together another option for a pre-application conference, which is here showing an emergency connection only. It's ballarded. So, we will have access connected there. This was still looking at public streets internally. We also -- the neighborhood meeting, looking to further reduce impact. We looked at making all the streets north of Five Mile Creek as private and having this as a gated community. There were some concerns about that from ACHD, as well as the existing right of way that is just south of -- or just north of Five Mile Creek. We would have to get ACHD to sign plats and do all -- or vacate the right of way and just wasn't feasible to -- to continue down that road. So, the initial preliminary plat submittal did include the private street and, then, after meetings with city staff we adjusted that to this final iteration. You can see we are utilizing the existing right of way that stubs to a parcel that is north of Five Mile Creek that could be redeveloped residentially and, then, all of the streets are public within this. There is no private gated condition here. And, then, south of Five Mile Creek we are also stubbing to that parcel that is there, both with our Equator Drive that's proposed and, then, Wells Circle that is existing there stubs. I wanted to touch on the sidewalk, the request for the removal of the sidewalk. Along Longitude Drive -- and this is a pretty decent -- so, this road right here, north-south, initially we had attached sidewalk here, but with the detached sidewalk we would have had to compress that whole development area between the western property boundary and Wells Street and rather than doing that we thought it would be nice not only to have -- when this property to the west redevelops, they could build the sidewalk. We could build the planter strip, which right now includes six to eight pretty mature trees that are right on the fence line, that if we don't have to build the sidewalk those could potentially be saved, more so than if we had to build sidewalk there. That was kind of the -- the driving force behind that request. So, it wasn't just because they didn't want to build the sidewalk, there is -- you know, they -- they feel like it meets the goals there. Phasing plan. Again north of the creek was phase one. South of the creek would be phase two. That also includes the commercial lot. Currently it's just a padded build-to-suit lot is what's proposed. Any future redevelopment of that lot would have to go back through a process, come through with the zoning certificate design review type of application. The phase one preliminary plat. This has a lot of our open space. One of the reasons that I think we are -- we like the idea of not fencing the north side of Five Mile Creek is that the majority

of our open space falls along the edge of Five Mile Creek. There it has very low slopes. We will have our playground, tot lot, picnic area and the ten foot wide pathway that runs along the north side of the creek would all be right in that area. So, it really creates this seamless really nice kind of microclimate down in there with the creek. We would be able to address some of the -- if there is any noxious weeds or any other plant material that needs to come out we could remove that and, then, enhance that -- that corridor as well. We are working on getting an arborist report for the site. Phase two. We have additional open space, as well as two pickleball courts that will get built down there. And, again, the -- the condition of requesting a pedestrian connection to the front door of the commercial building in the future, we will stub that pathway to that site, so that in the future the development agreement would cover the need to extend that to that building when it is designed. Here is, again, our open space exhibit. We are at 16 percent open space. Picnic area. Sport courts. A little playground area for -- for children to play in. With the floodplain area it's hard to identify a space for open -- for an open space area that would, you know, be more developed I guess for look like a pool or a clubhouse. We have tried to really highlight that Five Mile Creek corridor through there and really have that be as the -- a very high level amenity. The landscape plan. This has not been updated per the staff report for the detached sidewalks within the mixed-use area south of Five Mile Creek, but that is currently in process, as well as the other comments regarding the -- the landscape plan. There is a fencing plan. Again, the fence that's shown on the south side of our open space here would not be built, but we would have fencing along the back of these lots as they will back up and, then, have -- to -- to grade that out effectively retaining wall with a -- a fence on top of that and you can see the styles of fencing at the bottom of this exhibit. The builder has been in conversations with some of the neighbors to the west in Woodbridge. Is going to continue those conversations with them to figure out this fence line issue. It is -- kind of jogs all over the place. When Woodbridge built that fence I don't know if they just left trees and worked the fence around them. The site has been fully surveyed. The surveyor is going back out to pick up additional information to really highlight this area, figure out what can be done and where the fence needs to go. But that is something that the developer has told me and I agree with him and believe him that he is going to be working with whoever he can to figure out this fence line issue, which seems to be one of the hot button issues for the neighbors and just these elevations that Sonya had provided, any of these could fit on any of the lots or the -- the smaller option could fit on any of the lots. The larger 50 foot wide product is specifically chosen for that western property boundary along Woodbridge, as it complies more with those lot sizes and home sizes on that side. The Woodbridge side has a mix of one and two bed -- or one and two-story homes. That's what this builder would like to do on his property as well. These are some real world photos of product that Pacific Lifestyle has built here in the valley. I believe Ryan, one of the heads of Pacific Lifestyle Homes, is -- has taken at least one of the neighbors to some of these communities just to show them the quality of the product. These are the concerns of the traffic. ITD. We did get our scoping memo into them. They responded and said that it was an appropriate traffic impact analysis, so it wasn't a full study of the traffic generated, it was what would this development -- what are the impacts this development will have on the ITD system there on Eagle Road. There is not a whole lot that can happen. ITD has purchased all

of the right of way that's available along there. They have done everything they can to this point. It doesn't mean that they won't come back and ask for some sort of mitigation from this development, but we do have that -- the engineer was just wrapping up their QC on it. They are getting that back to ITD I believe this upcoming week, if not later this week. So, we anticipate getting a response with them -- from them at some point. ACHD didn't require a traffic impact study and the city didn't either, but we are going to comply with ITD. Again, talked about fencing. Setbacks is another issue that had been brought up a lot by neighbors. The R-8 -- the R-8 district that we are proposing would allow a 12 foot rear yard setback along the western property boundary. The homes that my client builds he feels comfortable that the majority of them would remain about 20 feet from the rear property line. He is not comfortable restricting in the development agreement a setback to 20 feet, let alone 30 feet. That would basically take up a third of the lot depth on that side. These lots were specifically designed to accommodate a very nice home that they build and provide a very nice backyard. Their buyers don't want a tiny backyard either. They are going to want trees in their backyard to protect their privacy as well from two-story homes that are on the west. So, there is -- it's -- it's really just a matter of, you know, these -- these homes will fit very easily on these lots. They are not squeezing it to the setbacks, but they really don't feel comfortable having a restriction placed in the DA that would push them further than the Woodbridge side has to be. The Woodbridge rear setback is 15 feet, so we feel like 12 feet is pretty appropriate with the higher density, knowing that these homes -- you know, they might have a covered patio that goes to that 12 foot, but, you know, the majority of them they felt comfortable with where -- and this was a conversation had at the neighborhood meeting as well as afterwards. Home heights. Again, one and two-story. They will meet the standard for the zone, 35 foot maximum, which is the same height maximum in R-4 or Woodbridge to the -- to the west. Drainage. As the Council is well aware all drainage has to be collected and kept on site. The engineer is working on those grading plans right now to ensure that that west side they understand that that is a problematic area. There is some common area on the south side of those blocks -- or that block of lots to accommodate that drainage there, without having to move it too far. And, then, the lot alignment ratio we are at a one-to-one number of lots, 15 to 15. It's really hard when my client wants to build a 50 or 60 foot wide product to really match those up, because Woodbridge's lot sizes are not consistent and with that I would stand for any questions. We, again, are in agreement. We will have a development agreement pulled together here pretty soon and, then, all the other conditions we agreed to.

Simison: Council, any additional questions?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I do have a question a little bit on access. So, I'm just looking at my -- my maps here. Do you anticipate the majority of people who would purchase a home here would access through Allen Street off of Eagle Road or are they going to be coming primarily

through -- from Locust Grove through Woodbridge Drive and accessing it that way? What's -- because I see very limited access to this.

Semple: Mr. Mayor and Council Member Taylor, yeah, it's a challenge here. We have public roads that connect from Eagle Road to Locust Grove. They are all open public roads owned and maintained by ACHD. We have limited options for creating additional connections. We are trying to create connectivity as much as possible and what isn't really reflected -- or I didn't touch closely on was that we went -- we started with closer to 90 lots and we are at 79 now. So, we are really trying to respond to the neighbors' concerns and traffic concerns. To answer the first part of your question, though, I guess it kind of depends on where they are going or coming from, but Eagle Road is closer than driving through the neighborhood to the west. So, I -- I mean it's just a choice of which way they want to drive I guess. If they have to go to Eagle Road they will go there. If it's busy they might take the road through Woodbridge. Again, public streets.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor, quick follow up.

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: So, if I am coming home from work from Boise -- let's say if I'm coming down the freeway, I get off on Eagle Road, can I turn left there on Magic View Drive, Allen Street on Eagle or is that -- is that -- do I have to go up to the -- I'm just trying to think where do I turn? Can I actually turn off of Eagle Road left?

Semple: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Taylor, you can turn left at the traffic light that goes into St. Luke's.

Taylor: Oh, yeah. That's a signalized intersection there.

Semple: And, then, the light -- you don't have to go to the light if you are leaving and exiting onto -- there is another way to get -- to turn right onto Eagle Road.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Ben, you -- you touched a little bit about some of the neighbors' concerns about setbacks and you indicated that you weren't necessarily willing to put a condition on yourself for 20 feet when Magic View is at 15. Twelve is a little rough. Would -- would you and your client be willing to accept the condition at 15 feet, so that you are mirroring exactly what's going on in Magic View?

Semple: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Cavener, can I follow up with you during my rebuttal?

Cavener: Yeah. I think that would be fine.

Semple: Thank you. Okay.

Simison: Okay. That will be it for now, so -- Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone signed up on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we had lots of names. One person marked they want to speak and that's Robin McCulley.

Simison: Can you, please, say your name and address for the record?

McCulley: Hi. My name is Robin McCulley. My address 728 South Woodhaven Avenue, Meridian, Idaho. Mr. Mayor, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Council, quickly, I have lived in -- at this residence for ten years. The past ten years, as you -- as many of you know we have been fighting for this for a while now. I think the biggest question you have to ask yourself is this the right fit for that area? We have a lot of traffic happening. Probably many of you cut through our neighborhood like so many in Meridian do from Locust Grove to Eagle Road. The traffic issue is a huge issue. I know you guys are talking about possibly mitigating traffic. We were told by this particular -- not builder, but owner that ACHD had no intention of putting that through road there. They said it's too close to the highway. That's what we were recently just told. So, I know that you guys say you are working or going to talk about working on that. So, we have gotten a little mixed things that we were told about that. So, that's important to know. We also should consider that we have that rehabilitation center on the corner, Meridian Meadows. The parking for that is poor at this moment. Those people are all parking in the lots adjacent to their property at this time, because there is not enough parking there as it is. Also the property to the east of this property that we are speaking of is deemed for a higher residency. So, I believe it's deemed for apartment complexes. So -- an apartment complex. So, eventually, that will be even more traffic in that area. Things to consider for us that I think while you are thinking of this. We are concerned about the fence that my property is facing the new property. As he -- as we said, there are pins already there from a previous survey and those do not make the fence. There is a solid eight, ten, twelve inches where the property -- the existing fence and the line is and there are several trees, mine being one that there is a tree in between, and we believe that it could potentially be on our property or at least halfway between ours and theirs. We did reach out before we went here tonight with them and try to mitigate and talk with them about the fence, so that we could bring it forward and say this is how we - - we have all agreed upon that. That was unsuccessful. The other question is the connecting of the pathways from their property to ours and along that creek line. The biggest thing is a guarantee from the builder. If we are saying 79 houses back there, if during this volatile time in our economy, if this builder decides to not build the 79 houses, will it be changing? A lot of unknowns with commercial building on the end. What is potentially going to go in there, how much more traffic will exceed it? I just would really love for you guys to think about it. Is this a good fit for our city, for all of us, for the travelers, whether it's through our neighborhood or not. There is a lot going on there. I know Councilman Taylor had asked about turning left onto Magic View. Unfortunately, it's not a direct turn. You have to go down to the light and turn around the

Chevron and come around. That's only a two way stop and we already have potential dangers there. People are running that thinking it's a four way stop. It's not, I know ACHD is talking to the residents now about putting speed bumps through our neighborhood, because we are getting upwards of 2,500 cars through that neighborhood at a time and so that we are talking about speed bumps at this time for that and, then, adding these additional homes and business will definitely cause an impact in that area. So, we just ask that you will reconsider is this a good fit for our city and for that area. I'm sure many of you are familiar with those -- that -- that area.

Simison: Thank you. Council, questions?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Strader. Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you, Robin. It's been a really tough area to develop. There are pluses and minuses to everything. Something eventually is going to go here. Pros and cons. I mean to play devil's advocate, at least with this proposal the lot lines match up really close to what Woodbridge has. I guess as you are sort of thinking about this, maybe just to level set, so the City Council makes land use decisions, but we don't make decisions on individual developers. So, we can make a determination about zoning, annexation, but I have never seen us say it must be this developer and if this developer didn't do this project no other developer would be allowed to do that. I -- I just wanted to share that feedback. That -- that -- that's not something that we typically do. We try to avoid kind of picking winners and losers among developers. Like only certain developers could do certain, you know, projects. That -- that really wouldn't be fair for us to do that. So, I just kind of wanted to have that dialogue with you, because I have heard a couple of comments from different people, including yourself tonight, about like this is a volatile environment. What if they don't build it and we end up with like less quality homes around us? I don't know if I'm -- I hope I'm not misinterpreting what you were saying. I just kind of wanted to clarify on my end and, then, maybe hear some more from you about your concern.

McCulley: I think the biggest concern, because we have been through several different attempts at this property, is that nothing could change in -- in the 79 houses. If it's approved tonight at 79 houses and one commercial lot, it can't, then, change to 95 houses, smaller areas, smaller, you know, lots, that type of thing. I think we have worked really well with these -- this builder and these -- these people to try to -- because we -- we as well, the community of Woodbridge, we know something's coming. Everything's coming. We get it. We have been fighting for this for ten years. It is a very beautiful part of our city and, you know, we are very blessed to be across from the Police Department and -- and -- and the area that we are and so we want to keep it beautiful -- beautiful for everybody. I mean I think across from St. Luke's, you know, it's very well-known, it's very well-traveled, and I just think that that area is definitely becoming more dangerous for our children that play on the roads -- for all of us. We -- we get out, we walk, you know, and that kind of thing and -- and the idea that this, you

know, could change potentially from what they are asking if anything changes that -- I think that's where it's coming from is --

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Would it be okay if we have Sonya maybe give us -- maybe give Robin a little bit of an overview on what could change and what couldn't change. Would that be okay?

Allen: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, Council. So, yeah, staff is recommending a development agreement as a provision of annexation of this property and the development agreement will require the applicant to develop the property generally consistent with the plans that they submitted with this application and that includes the preliminary plat, the phasing plan, the landscape plan, open space and amenity exhibit and the conceptual building elevations. So, when an applicant comes in to develop we will be reviewing those concept -- or, excuse me, those -- those detailed elevations when they come in to assure that they do meet those quality of development that they proposed with this annexation and if they don't meet those we will reject it and require that they either provide better elevations that are consistent or that they apply for a modification to the development agreement to change the elevations and we have done that in the past for several different developments. So, that -- that is how we can assure that you have the quality of development that you are seeing with this application. As far as the preliminary plat, we would not consider any development plan that proposes more building lots to be consistent with the provisions in the development agreement. They could go with fewer lots, not -- not significantly fewer, but a few fewer lots and we would still consider that consistent, but not more than what they are proposing now. So, hopefully, that answers your questions and -- and we wouldn't -- a little further on that. We wouldn't allow any less qualified open space either. They could do more, that -- we consider that generally consistent, but not less. So, we want the bar to be high with what they are proposing with this application. Thank you.

Simison: Counsel, any additional questions? All right. Thank you very much.

McCulley: Thank you.

Simison: We -- we have someone online.

Johnson: Yes. I'm going to unmute. Idaho Senate, you should be able to unmute yourself.

Simison: Who could this be? Yes, if they are technology challenged it's definitely Mr. Bernt.

Bernt: Can you hear me?

Simison: Yes, we can.

Bernt: Does it really say Idaho Senate on your side?

Simison: It does.

Bernt: I apologize for that. It's my personal Zoom account. Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, my name is Treg Bernt. I reside at 531 South Tiburon Avenue in the Woodbridge Subdivision. Grateful for this opportunity to speak to you this evening. There is a reason why the application from 2019 is the only application that's been approved by this body. There has been many others that have come before us and -- or excuse me. You. And I sat in your seat before, so apologize for using the word us. But there is a reason why others have been denied and it's because of the type of use that will be in that area and the type of traffic that it -- this -- these type of developments will bring. It will be tough for any type of development to make sense for this area until the unincorporated Ada county subdivision to the south is redeveloped with -- that -- that has to do with the future land use map and the -- and the future comprehensive plan. It's all about connectivity and I don't care if you are coming from Locust Grove or if you are coming from Eagle Road, it -- it's very difficult to -- to navigate these areas during certain times of the day and the amount of traffic that comes through these areas is significant and I don't believe this has anything to do with the developers that have come before your body in the past or the builders, I -- I believe that the builder is going to build a good product. I -- I believe that the -- the developers from the past and this particular developer have good intent, but until there is more connectivity in this area you will have problems and these problems aren't going away. So, next comes the argument well, then, you know, it's our -- sometimes developments just aren't ready and sometimes it's okay to say, no, not right now, but maybe in the future when -- when we are able to have more connectivity in the area and I don't believe that that's going to happen until the -- until the property to the south is redeveloped. It's just a reality in this area. It doesn't matter what time of the day it is, there is -- there is backed up traffic -- and I forgot the road. It's the road that goes -- it's the unsignalized -- it's the unsignalized access to Eagle Road, to -- to 55 from this area. It doesn't matter what time of the day it is, traffic's backed up a hundred yards sometimes and it could be in the middle of the day. So, I'm, obviously, here to testify against. I appreciate your time and -- and it's unfortunate that we are not ready as a city to take on projects like this in my opinion and I can't -- and I can't wait for the day until we are able to when there is more development to the south that will allow this to happen.

Simison: Thank you, Mr. Bernt. Council, any questions? Okay. Appreciate it very much.

Bernt: Thank you.

Simison: Okay. We did have other people signed up, but no one wished to testify. Is there anybody that would like to come forward and testify at this time? Go ahead and come on up.

Bader: Council Members, I'm Tanya Bader. I live at 624 South Woodhaven. I'm one of the 15 homes that butts up against where this property is being built. We have lived there for 20 years. We have been to a lot of meetings. Council Woman Strader, we have had properties that we have approved. We have gone to all the meetings. My kids have been in this building a ton, dragging them with us. There is a property north that we did approve and they were single story townhomes. Unfortunately, that builder built, what, three sets of townhomes and, then, filed for bankruptcy and I think Corey Barton owns those -- that property now and nothing's ever been built there. So, we have approved. The senior center that was going to be approved, we all met with those -- that was right behind my house. We approved that as well. So, we are not against development. But every time our plea to the city is help us with this limited access. We are stuck with the Eagle Road -- years ago, 20 years ago, you could turn left off Eagle Road onto Magic View. You can't do that anymore. They put up -- because traffic got worse and worse. Locust Grove. We have taught both my kids to drive. It's chaos on Locust Grove. When both my kids went to Renaissance High School we taught them to go out to Eagle Road at the light, drive all the way around, so they could go to the fire station, turn left at that light, so they could go to school. It's, what, a quarter mile away? But they have to go all the way around. Even today my daughter had an appointment. We were six cars back at 3:30. Chaos. And, then, when Danik was approved the gymnastics center across the street from our community on Locust Grove, parents are insane, like coming out if -- there is always near accidents. It's just -- we begged for lights there. We are total we have been denied for lights. If that road on Bentley, which there is a light, the -- the south of us, that would be huge. If we had a plan to open that I would gladly cut through this new neighborhood to get to that light. It would be perfect. But we have -- we haven't had any help from the city and we are always our biggest plan. This builder that wants to build here, the homes are gorgeous. I think they are lovely. I love their design. I just don't think the city has a plan. It's been 20 years and we haven't had any help. It's just getting worse and worse. So that's where we stand with this. It has nothing to do with a builder, nothing to do with what's being built back there, it's just we need a better plan, because the -- we are just so -- it's challenging. That was the word that came up. Very challenging. Thank you.

Simison: Council, any questions?

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Are you -- were you aware that, actually, the city changed to zoning --

Bader: Yes.

Overton: -- on the subdivision to the south, allowing it to be developed in a different fashion than it sits now?

Bader: I don't -- no, I think we -- it was changed to build those little townhomes. You know which area I'm talking about? I don't think it has a name. It's by Rigley Meadows.

Overton: Okay. So, what I'm referring to is the subdivision to the south between the interstate and Woodbridge --

Bader: That -- that road that goes through?

Overton: That on our master plan we changed the zoning, the city did, several years ago, on what could be developed there that's now different from what exists there today.

Bader: No.

Overton: I just know if you knew that had been done by the city.

Bader: I just know that the road is still not open.

Overton: That is correct.

Bader: That's -- that's all I care about. If you opened it up it would be huge. I think this would be less of an issue. That would give us there ways in and out. I -- I feel like living here so long, like the city doesn't always make the best decisions, like Silverstone Plaza, it took me 17 minutes to get from Eagle Road at the light to TopGolf is where I work in that area. Seventeen minutes. And Eagle was backed up. This is like at 8:15 in the morning. So, I just -- and also with something Robin talked about is Meridian Meadows, the senior facility, that was assisted living. That was a huge problem. That was one of the issues we had was like is there enough parking and that they -- we were assured there was enough parking and, then, guess what, not enough parking where the bus is it was actually Cascade Transportation that ended up calling the city and saying we can't fit our buses through here, because people are parking so tight. So, I don't know where -- whatever is built where are those people going to park? It's just kind of -- and we have been walking in our neighborhood for 20 years. If you -- those stop signs that are there, you can take them down, because they are run a hundred percent. We watch them, we -- we look at the people -- we make eye contact with them. Those stop signs don't exist. And if they do stop, then, someone's hitting them and they are knocked over.

Overton: Thank you, Tanya.

Bader: Thank you.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Tanya, I have a question if you want to come on back. So, I'm curious how you access -- you live in Woodbridge.

Bader: Yes.

Taylor: Do you get off Eagle Road? Do you go down to Meridian Road? How do you actually get there? And I'm curious how often you use the signalized intersection there across -- right where St. Luke's is on Allen Street to go around the Chevron, is that -- is that your typical access point through Eagle Road through that?

Bader: I go to the light, because the traffic that -- if you go to the right the south of Chevron, like my husband will turn there, I can't do it, I -- it's too much traffic. So, I go to the light, I wait until it's green and turn right and I work over in Silverstone Plaza.

Taylor: Do people -- is it common for people to go up to Franklin and around to get there, to come down through Locust Grove, or do most people try to turn there on Allen?

Bader: People turn there. I -- there are -- one of the things that was brought up in Planning and Zoning is that -- one of the members made a comment that the roads are public. We don't own them. And I don't really have a problem with the people going through the neighborhood if it's faster. We all cut through people's neighborhoods. It's just the limit -- it's -- like it's -- it's just the access that we only have two entrances and exits that we are just kind of stuck.

Taylor: Thank you.

Bader: Thank you.

Simison: Is there anybody else who would like to provide testimony on this item? Why don't we go ahead and take a ten minute break and, then, we will have the applicant come back up and close at that point in time. So, take a recess until 8:15.
(Recess: 8:06 p.m. to 8:16 p.m.)

Simison: All right. We will go ahead and come on back. It looks like everyone's back in their seats and ready to go. Ask the applicant to come forward to make final comments.

Semple: Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, again, Ben Semple with Rodney Evans + Partners. 1450 Bannock, Boise, Idaho. 83702. So, I guess a couple quick things. Parking for this project, all these homes have two car garages, all the driveways accommodate a minimum of two cars in them and, then, some of the public streets are wide enough that they will have parking on one side or the other. So, we are very comfortable that this project will be able to accommodate any parking that is associated with the homes and I wanted to reiterate what Sonya had mentioned, that the development agreement will memorialize the number of homes, buildable lots, the elevations that are proposed and, then, the commercial development area will have to come back to the city through a CZC and comply with all the UDC standards through

that review. So, there will be another bite of the apple, if you will, on that commercial development. Regarding the density and just traffic generated here, you know, the -- the future land use map for this area is medium density residential and a mixed-use neighborhood. That could allow for denser residential development than what is proposed right now or commercial uses that drive more traffic than what is proposed at this time. Neither ACHD or the city staff brought up some of the concerns that we have heard tonight during our pre-app or any of the subsequent meetings that we have had regarding access or traffic. ACHD didn't require a traffic study. ITD just asked us to evaluate the impacts from this development. But at no point did someone say, well, you can't develop this, because the access won't allow you. I mean that effectively creates an undevelopable property unless you went extremely low density, which, then, doesn't comply with the comp plan. So, ultimately, I feel like we have gone through multiple iterations on this to reduce our lot count. We have looked at ways to design the road system to encourage traffic to use a state highway and the larger road systems in the area. Unfortunately, we can't extend the roads from an Ada county development to the southwest and it -- yeah, I mean we are -- we are really doing everything we can. Regarding setbacks, I did talk to my client about that. For the most part it's -- it -- it could be accommodated. It's a struggle. There are some homes that there is some bulb outs at the corners that restrict the lot depth, which that we run up against that setback if we make it larger than 12 feet. The developer had indicated that if it's, you know, a tipping point for a decision, 15 could be accommodated, but they would like the development agreement to include a provision that a covered patio could extend to the 12 foot setback as allowed in the R-4 -- or R-8 zone. And I would stand for any additional questions you might have.

Simison: Council, any additional questions of the applicant? Okay. Thank you very much.

Semple: Thank you.

Simison: I will leave that up to Council if you -- we just heard from the applicant. The applicant has the final word, so --

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Neighbors have been through a lot of these and typically the process is the public testifies, then, the applicant. If that person hasn't provided any testimony I -- I would be happy to hear it if she wants to provide it, but, then, the applicant will have another opportunity to provide any other follow-ups. Ma'am.

McDougal: Thank you. Thank you.

Simison: Just wait until you get up to the microphone, please.

McDougal: Yes. Thank you. My name is Janet McDougal. I moved here in 2013 and I have attended the council meetings before and everyone said that they agree it's a challenge. Well, I have been to these meetings and I learned that Green Hill Estates, which is north of us, is not part of Meridian. For whatever reason they were never annexed. Locust Grove Heights, which is to the south of us, is not part of Meridian. For whatever reason they have never been annexed. Our area was called Snorting Bull when the developer came in and that's inspired me to be the snorting bull and to come up with this comment that maybe Woodbridge should no longer be involved in Meridian. Let's go to West Ada -- or Ada county and see how they are going to handle us and you don't have to worry about us and you don't have to say it's a challenge. We are paying our taxes to you and we feel like we have been neglected. Now, we are neglected because of this anomaly of ACHD that's not responsive. The -- the streets cannot handle all the traffic. They are not coming up with any plans and, you know, I'm becoming an aggressive driver now, because I moved to Meridian and I have trouble getting out. So, I'm at fault for being in there when it's yellow and turning. I'm at fault in going around. I'm at fault for being an aggressive driver. Thank God when I go home tonight I don't have to worry about the traffic. I'm shaking, because I am so upset about coming to these meetings and finding out, sorry, we can't do anything. It's not the developer's fault. Let the developer work with Ada county. They are not part of you yet. You want to -- you want to annex them because of the revenue. Well, how about deciding we don't want to be part of you and let Ada county take care of it. Thank you for your time. And if you have any questions I'm more than happy to answer.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Jan, thank you for coming tonight and being the snorting bull.

Simison: Maybe just a couple of general -- and if the applicant wants to come back up and make any final comments they are -- they are more than welcome. I will save my comments for after your final comments.

Semple: Yep. Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, if this could happen in Ada county I'm sure that my client would, you know, look at that, but as far as I understand when you do a subdivision development project, Meridian is a forced annexation jurisdiction, so we are required to come into the city to provide that revenue. That's really all I had. I'm not going to be as colorful. Thank you.

Simison: Okay. Thank you.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I would like to take a moment to have a rather lengthy comment. Woodbridge was approved in 2001. I happen to remember that. When it was first developed phase one had Woodbridge Drive as the collector street and when it was laid out it had a collector street going all the way through to Magic View and it was going to be one long raceway. So, the City Council at the time decided to modify phase two of Woodbridge, so that it was residential streets, not collector streets. The idea was it was going to be traffic calming. Well, what ended up happening is it was the only cut through between Eagle and Locust Grove and that cut through traffic was going in front of houses now instead of on a collector street. Looking back I talked to those council members at the time, that wasn't their best moment, but we live with what those decisions were at the time. We all heard that have lived in that subdivision a long time that it was supposed to be part of a medical corridor and we all love that medical corridor idea. Well, that medical corridor idea is not gone. One of the things that concerns me enough that I need to make a statement tonight is I think we don't have the right information in front of us this evening to make a decision to approve or not approve this application and here is the reason why. This is probably one of the best applications we have had on this property and I know that, because there is not 125 of you sitting in the room, because Woodbridge will get up and they will protest when something is wrong and you have approved three of five previous applications. You are not anti-growth, you are just trying to find out what's the best one. Two thousand vehicles come west of Wells Street on Magic View. That traffic count over 2,000 vehicles was in 2021. We don't have a more current one, but we know it's higher than 2,000 vehicles a day. Seven hundred and ninety-four vehicles a day are expected to come out of this development and that's only with 79 homes. The problem we have got is if we just looked at this application on its own and let it happen we could be absolutely jeopardizing the future of redevelopment to the south of Woodbridge coming from the signal on Locust Grove all the way through and into this area that we are talking about redeveloping and if we do that, if we screw that up, then, we are all stuck with what we have got now and it will never get better and as a city that's a huge mistake that we could make and I will tell you the part that no one's mentioned tonight that needs to be on the record. On September 10th this City Council approved an expansion of the Idaho State University Health Science Campus, 23 acres across the street from Woodbridge on Locust Grove, and if we don't get that project done that creates that extra housing and right of way and roadways that come through to the south of Woodbridge, we will not be able to provide the housing necessary for Idaho State University's Health Science Campus and can you imagine where that traffic's going to go. So, we would not only be getting it coming from the east side, we would be getting it from the west side and it would be so broken we -- I can't even begin to describe what we would be facing. So, to my Mayor and Council as we sit here and to the applicant, you have a tremendous application. You truly do. And they acknowledge it. But we have a tremendous problem and I think we are not in possession of enough information tonight to know for a fact that we are not jeopardizing that future development that has to happen to make this whole area work. We have to remember as we are looking at traffic and traffic studies are done, that there is a huge difference between business traffic and residential traffic. We had an application earlier this evening, you folks were sitting in here and they were talking about business traffic 7:00 to 5:00, Monday through Friday. When it's residential traffic it can go anytime 24

hours a day, seven days a week, which is usually when all of our children in Woodbridge are riding their bicycles on the sidewalks headed to the pool and enjoying their lives. So, that's why when it's residential I get that much more concerned about the impacts we are going to have with in the 279 homes that make up Woodbridge today. So, what I'm asking the Mayor and Council to do is -- we need to consider not making a decision, continuing or making the ultimate decision on this application tonight. I don't think we have the information in front of us. I think it's premature that we make a decision on this project because of the area it is and the potential for destroying our opportunities for the future development to the south of Woodbridge.

Simison: Thank you. If I can just add a little bit on -- on to that element and, you know, I -- I think it's just -- just so people understand where things are. So, the last -- 11 months ago, the state of the city, I specifically called out this area as one that the city needed to do some studying on and that was followed by putting money in the budget for -- to hire someone to do -- help do this work, which Council approved. Unfortunately, we had a staff member leave and it -- so, it took a little while. The RFP -- the RFQ closes on Friday. So, this Friday, in theory, we will have someone that we can start engaging with to do the work and in my conversations with the team, you know, our goal was to have this done by the end of this calendar year. This does encompass both land use and transportation, but transportation is the number one component that they are going to try to get done quicker, but if the land use comes into it, it will take a little bit longer to finish besides December. So, in some regards I think that there is a light at the end of the tunnel, because I think whatever we come up with will be the plan moving forward for Council and, you know, I'm going to give my own two cents and I'm sorry for those who are on Council, I think it's only one or two, but when we did this last time I think we kicked the can down the road. There was a lot of people from that subdivision that came out in the county and the Council I don't think went where -- we probably should have been taking a hard enough look and -- and solve this issue in 2019 -- 2019 to 2020, at that point in time, which is why we are coming back to do it again, because we really didn't come up with a real solution. Yeah, we did a land use, but we didn't really do a transportation component and we knew if we didn't -- without a good transportation component it's not going to work. Since then, as John's mentioned, ISU has come into the equation. So, really, what we are asking -- our RFQ is looking to go from Eagle Road actually all the way over to Meridian Road, because it's not just this section coming through here, the central has real problems with a 90 degree followed by an immediate left at that point in time and it goes -- actually go all the way over to Waltman, because in order for that property to develop the transportation network it's supposed to come in off of Corporate, which would be the back half bottom of this evaluation from Eagle Road all the way over. So, I feel bad that this information wasn't shared with the developer. Maybe they -- maybe they were aware, maybe they weren't, but, you know, this has been something that's been contemplated for at least a year by the city and, like I say, it's -- it's going out for consideration. Now, personally, the north half of this project is -- you know, I think you could go. I don't -- you know, that part is -- I think it aligns. It's not in the area where anything is going to be impacting. The possible transportation, but the -- the south portion from the creek on down to the Interstate, somewhere within there is likely going to need to be a road connection and

what, where and how if -- if this were to be approved it's -- it's limiting that dramatically in that point. May only allow for one possible road network connection to exist. But this is what we are going to be working on in theory, but if Council votes a certain direction I don't know how that will impact our RFQ. It may not. We still may have that conversation. But it's -- it's a much different conversation to this area. So, I -- I agree with Councilman Overton's comments that, you know, I -- I think that this is, unfortunately, just a little early, but I do want to get there, so we can make decisions, because everybody -- everybody needs to have good information, so quality decisions can be made long term for this.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I'm -- you know, kind of where I was going with this in terms of where my head is at, it's about the same as when we started the hearing, which is I think if we are actively studying this as a city and actively trying to come up with a solution, which is what I'm hearing from you, Mr. Mayor, then, the course of action that makes the most sense to me is a -- I guess a much longer continuance at this point while we do that work. This -- we have -- everyone is correct, like we have -- we have seen multiple applications for this area and the truth is we are really not going to be getting to a sustainable point until we can figure out the transportation solution here. I really do think that that's where we are at. I do like the north part of the proposal as well. Like I -- I think that the -- the lot lines matching up are very nice. I think the quality of the homes are very nice. Like I think from the neighborhoods' perspective that part of the development is a really nice fit. So, that's why I was kind of challenging a couple of you in your public testimony a little bit, because, you know, it's going to take time to get this right, but there are parts of this proposal that are very compelling, but I just don't think holistically we are quite ready yet. It feels like more connectivity is the answer as opposed to less. I think with ISU that that is a consideration and something that -- that we can take into account as we kind of work through a solution for this. It -- I think as a city we have to own this. You know, people are frustrated, because there is not an answer here and the developer is frustrated, the neighbors are frustrated, I am frustrated, but I appreciate your commitment, Mr. Mayor, to really working on this and trying to find some kind of at least a partial answer to this by the end of the year I think is the right approach. That's where I'm at.

Cavener: Yeah, I -- Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: As much as I want to, I can't support this application tonight and if I was -- if I was the applicant I would be rightfully frustrated. The city made a decision when we redid the Comprehensive Plan to look at this part of Meridian differently. At the time we were told that staff was going to handle that -- those changes and that didn't happen and, then, Mr. Mayor, you were correct, at your state of the city last year you called for

this and it's taken a year and if I'm the applicant I would be very frustrated that here at the 11th hour I'm being told, oh, we will have more information for you next week. I think we have done the applicant a disservice. So, if they are frustrated I don't blame them, I'm frustrated. Likewise, if I'm the public who comes to these meetings and you see a new application time after time and you are frustrated, I share that frustration. I'm frustrated, too. My hope is, Mr. Mayor, is that we are going to become a little bit more proactive about our communication both to the residents about what's occurring in this area and to the development community. Council Member Strader hit the nail on the head. We have -- we have failed in our -- in our execution on this, both in our planning and our communication and I -- I hope that not another year goes by before we start to have some answers on this.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: While I sit here looking at the list of things that I felt like I didn't have enough information on and that just is what we have gone over tonight. I think the bigger picture is so critical for this area and I'm partly at fault. I helped kick that can down in 2019, helped kick it down the road when we had an opportunity. But hindsight's always better. And so I think we are kind of at a point that we do need a continuance until we have more information.

Simison: Council, would you like to have the applicant come back up?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, I think it's incredibly appropriate. The applicant has some comments. I think, Mayor, and for our staff, you know, it sounds like maybe this is headed towards a continuance, which certainly I'm -- I'm in favor of. I think being able to give the applicant some understanding of a runway in terms of timing, so they can go into this with eyes wide open as well, whether it's three months, six months, 12 months, 24 months.

Simison: The short answer I have is end of the year for a majority of it, but it kind of depends upon who responds. What if we don't get any responses? You know, what -- you know, the negotiation to get them on board and, then, the time frame, because, you know, the public -- it will be a public process. You are good. Trust me.

Semple: Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, I really appreciate this conversation. I appreciate that you recognize that we are in a tough spot here. What I did here, though, is that you guys like the north half of the project and the south half is really the part that is kind of in limbo. That's where you are looking for a connection through.

Simison: Potentially. It may be okay, but we don't know yet.

Semple: Sure. So, I mean I think we would rather have a continuance than a denial, obviously. Is there a potential that if we work with staff to look at phase two being

contingent on this additional information and this study for the south half, which is phase two, but allowing for the north half to continue at this time? Is that something that -- and I don't know if you can answer that right now, but that is kind of our thought process right now. Obviously, we have a developer, landowner and a builder that has put in a lot of money and time and effort to get to this point and I think it would be -- it's something that they would consider, you know, to allow the city to explore their options for connectivity and still exercise some development rights that they -- they have.

Cavener: I would be open to that.

Simison: I -- I said it, so I'm okay with it, but I don't get a vote on it, so --

Cavener: And, Mr. Mayor, I -- I certainly am supportive of maybe continuing this for three to four weeks to give the applicant time to meet with staff on a -- on a multi-phase approach that would be guided potentially with conditions in the development agreement, particularly about the southern portion, recognizing that that southern portion would either come back as a separate application or further continued. No. Reevaluate in a month. I -- I -- to me that makes sense. I think it addresses the larger concern, while allowing the Council to get some better data on the piece that is maybe a little bit more problematic.

Simison: And, frankly, it allows you to work through the public process. You are going to be part of the process helping make determinations about what that looks and feels like and how that would be impacted in a lot of ways.

Semple: And I think, Mr. Mayor, we would be welcome -- you know, we would welcome that opportunity to provide that input and coordination with the city to find the right spot for that connectivity.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I think -- I think that gives you a path, an opportunity. I want to be open. I think for me it's the context of what the possibilities are to address this area from a transportation perspective. It's kind of important for me that those possibilities are outlined and that I come away with the determination definitively that the north part of your project could proceed without foreclosing one of those paths. So, I haven't really received that feedback. So, I just want to be open that -- I'm open to that; right? But if that information were to come back and it were to become clear that like proceeding with the north part of your property kind of piecemeal without an answer could be problematic I think. I also think it could be problematic if -- if there is an option that city staff comes up with that would impact the north part of your project and if you were to sort of foreclose that by proceeding, but I -- I -- I think keeping this open and continuing it makes sense and we could do a check in on that component of your project in a few months. But it does sound to me like -- at least what I'm hearing and I would love for

people to -- the Mayor to weigh in if it's not the case, but at least what I'm hearing right now is that answers would come in December like more full city answers about what the plan is for this area would come and so I think it will be hard to move forward with a part of your project if there are big questions still kind of unanswered. So, maybe it's three months or what have you, whatever you are comfortable with to check in, but you may not actually get the answer that you want at that point. So, I -- I just think it's good for you to be aware of that. It sounds like you are. Yeah. Either a continuance or a withdrawal of the application is probably what makes the most sense. I would -- if I were in your shoes I would ask for a continuance to -- to try to work through it and, again, you know, I think we all own it, but I think we -- we apologize to everybody, because it's a -- it's about that situation, but we do need to fix it. We need to actually get an answer for -- for this area and I think that's what everyone is aligned around doing in this meeting, so -- I guess that's my feedback for you.

Sample: And so, Mr. Mayor and Council Woman Strader, I appreciate that a lot. I would like to highlight that the north part of this project we are accessing with the public right of way that is stubbing to the west that preserves that connection. But north of the creek we have Woodbridge to our west that is all fully developed. The county subdivision that is looking to be redeveloped to provide connectivity would -- I feel like is the path for bringing a road through from the west and so, really, south of Five Mile Creek is the part that is available. There is a parcel between our south half and that county parcel -- or county subdivision to the west and Wells Circle stubs into a cul-de-sac at the south end of that property, that large green space right by the hospital symbol there. Yeah. Right there. Just north of that is a separate outparcel and so it feels like -- I mean Wells -- where Wells makes that bend, that's where that cul-de-sac comes in, which would fall right along the southern edge of Woodbridge and that will be extended with -- you know. And that's owned by a separate entity, but they could theoretically extend that to the west property boundary and, then, get into that subdivision -- that county subdivision to the west. And I feel like the north half really stands alone. There is really not a whole lot that could be done to provide additional connections to the west from that point.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Just from a common sense perspective, I would tend to agree with you; right? But not -- not -- not knowing ahead of time what some future report will outline as potential solutions, it's just I wanted to caution you that I -- I just -- I don't want you to look at it like in three months you have got a slam dunk on the north part of this development, because I don't think that's the case. I think we need to take a hard look at it, figure out what the possibilities are with city staff and -- and really how the RFQ goes. I mean there is just a lot -- I think that, again, you know, professionals come up with all kinds of solutions to things and sometimes they may surprise us. So, that's all. It -- it's just a caution to you that, you know, it may not be a silver bullet is all. But, you know, I -- I'm very sympathetic in the sense that, you know, you all have put significant resources into this and I -- as -- as a business person myself I very much understand

that. You know, we pride ourselves on -- on being a very business friendly city and also a city that listens to our neighbors and tries to respond to their concerns and creates good -- good neighborly adjoining land uses and has appropriate transitions and I mean the one thing I -- I will say is like if there is not a line of sight into -- like if in three months there is not like some kind of a solid plan coming together with a high level of probability, I do feel like just adding additional housing to the north, without having a path to solving this, is just making the problem worse in many ways. So, again, I'm open, I -- I just kind of wanted to talk through that.

Simison: And without doing the math thing, I'm not mapping how many homes are in that northern part.

Semple: Fifty-nine.

Simison: So, secondary access will be --

Semple: We have emergency --

Simison: -- emergency works. So, we have got -- that will stand alone in that case, so -- okay.

Semple: And just as some more context, the city's pathway system connects to Woodbridge right there at the southwest corner of the north portion of the property. The sewer main, the trunk line also runs right through that space, so that's where we would be talking in, so it kind of stands on its own as well.

Simison: My -- my guess is once we get somebody on board to help us with this -- I mean I think staff personally -- our staff would eliminate the northern half very quickly, but I think with a -- someone else on board we could get that eliminated. I have not seen it in any consideration at any level to this point in time and so, hopefully, we will at least be able to take that off the board relatively quickly for conversation.

Semple: I have Ian Connair with Kimley-Horn. He is the civil engineer on this that did this work on the traffic study.

Simison: Did you apply for the RFQ? I'm just kidding.

Connair: I wish. Yeah. Great to hear about that. I wish I actually had. Ian Connair with Kimley-Horn. You know, just to kind of touch on a few points here, Council Woman Strader and Councilman Cavener. Bad with names, so I hope I pronounced those correctly. To Ben's point about the northern portion of the site, Council Woman Strader, I appreciate you, you know, saying that with common sense. It does make a lot of sense. And Pacific Lifestyle Homes is a quality builder that will be matching a lot of the intent of, you know, the preservation of high quality living that comes with the Woodridge community or Snorting Bull if we want to read plat names. I come to you not as a snorting bull, maybe more as a whimpering dog as an engineer who values seeing quality communities added to Meridian, as I am a citizen of Meridian myself. Ben brings

up the constraints of the northern piece and I would like to echo a point that was made early on in the presentation that ACHD has a five year plan to -- to improve the Wells Street bridge that crosses Five Mile Creek. Regardless of any engineering study that comes out of your RFQ, there is no way that ACHD is gladly going to abandon a brand new bridge that they construct within five years. If that RFQ suggests a collector road that sweeps and replaces Wells Street's current alignment, fantastic, but you are going to be in an uphill battle getting ACHD to gladly throw away the engineering plans they have spent thousands of dollars producing. So, if you look at the constraints that bind our northern property, we have got about -- I believe 58 single family lots in R-8 zoning there, which complies with the future land use map very well. Sonya pointed out that it is significantly less dense than we could apply for within that future land use. You have an ACHD bridge that has been invested in and is built within their capital improvement plan funding plan and you have Five Mile Creek to the south. We are not planning for any access to Magic View Drive in compliance with the requests of the Woodbridge Subdivision neighbors. So, everything we are doing within that northern portion is as constrained as possible. I love master planned communities. I love the idea of a medical facility. You know, sparkling on both sides of Eagle Road, but I agree that planning for a long time has not shared that vision. So much so that within our city staff report we were never suggested to provide a collector road stubbing to the west. If you look at ACHD's functional classification map, what you guys all should have access to, it does suggest that a collector road would align with your RFQ running through the -- the county land there. That was never suggested to us by city staff within pre-application meetings, within our P&Z and here tonight at Council as well. Everything here is shown as a local road and we would appreciate if Council could understand the constraints that face our northern portion, while allowing us to have a continuance to negotiate with each department within the city to figure out the best plan for the southern portion. I thank you for your time. Stand for any questions, along with Ben. Again, whimpering dog. Sorry for the shaky voice.

Simison: Thank you.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor? Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Much like asking where we all want to go for dinner, we all have good ideas and they are all different ideas. You know, four weeks is probably too aggressive. I also think it's beneficial for the applicant to at least have some insight about maybe where the city is headed with this RFQ. So, I'm hearing some folks say in four months, hearing some say two. We will make everybody unhappy and maybe go for three months is kind of what I'm thinking. Council, I don't know your thoughts on that. If three seems appropriate. I'm open for any insight. If not I'm prepared to make a motion. Or at least maybe ask the applicant for some insight about some potential dates.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Just kind of weigh in a little bit. I haven't made any comments yet. But I think it -- we need to have enough time so the applicant can see where we are sort of headed on -- on this and get some more feedback. I -- I'm -- I'm usually one to be pretty willing to allow a project to move ahead when it sort of matches up with all the things we have asked them to do, but I remember being on the comprehensive plan as an at large community member discussing this area for quite some time with lots of ideas and I remember my take away being is we just didn't really know what we were going to do. So, we just kind of put some future land use designations as what we thought we would like to see with a lot of hope, so I am glad to hear about the idea of really unlocking the entirety between Eagle and Meridian Road, because it's really -- like you said -- I think you brought it up, Tanya, that it's kind of just -- you are just sort of locked in there. But that's the entirety of that -- of that two miles there. But the idea is that we can maybe put together a plan that shows us a path forward on all of that, I think that's fantastic. I don't -- I think four weeks is too soon. Obviously we don't want to delay it too long, but I think we need at least -- two months is -- is kind of short to me. I would be okay with that. But I think we need at least three or four months, so that the applicant actually has some -- some real feedback from the city on where we are going on this. So, I could support that.

Cavener: So, Council, you know, in August we have got National Night Out on -- on August 5th. The next week would be August 12th, which I think puts us about 13 weeks out from tonight. Does that seem -- I see -- I see a shrug and a nod from the applicant, so I think they seem cautiously okay with it. All right. So, Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I'm going to move that we are going to continue tonight's public hearing or application H-2024-0059 to August the 12th and the reason why I'm doing that for those that are here is that we still want to invite you if you have got other feedback or commentary you are still welcome to pass that feedback along to the City Council, which we will receive in preparation for our continued item on the 12th.

Overton: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to continue this item to August 12th. Is there any discussion on the motion?

Nary: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Mr. Nary.

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, between now and August would you -- would you like this renoticed? If so, do you -- who do you want -- do you want the city to

absorb that cost of the renoticing? If -- if so we just need to have that clear, just because it will come up.

Cavener: Council, I would look for your feedback on that. To me if we renotece it I think the city should be covering those costs, but -- okay. So, I'm seeing nods, so thank you, Mr. Nary. Mr. Mayor, I think my motion, then, should be amended to include that we are going to continue to August 12th. Have this meeting renoticed at the city's expense.

Overton: Second agrees.

Simison: Second agrees to include that component. Is there further discussion? If not all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the public hearing is continued to August 12th.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

ORDINANCES [Action Item]

- 5. Ordinance No. 25-2081: An ordinance (965 E. Ustick Rd. – H-2024-0063) annexing a parcel of land located in the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of Section 6, Township 3 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit “A”; rezoning 1.11 acres of such real property from the R1 (Estate Residential) zoning district to the L-O (Limited Office) zoning district; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; repealing conflicting ordinances; and providing an effective date.**

Simison: With that we will move on to Item 5, which is Ordinance No. 25-2081. Ask the clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. It's an ordinance related to 965 East Ustick Road, H-2024-0063, annexing a parcel of land located in the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of Section 6, Township 3 North, Range 1 East, Boise meridian, Ada county, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit “A”; rezoning 1.11 acres of such real property from the R1 zoning district to the L-O zoning district; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the

Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; repealing conflicting ordinances; and providing an effective date.

Simison: Thank you. Council, you heard this ordinance read by title. Is there anybody that would like it read in its entirety? Seeing none, do have a motion?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 25-2081.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Ordinance No. 25-2081. Is there discussion? If not, clerk call the roll.

Roll Call: Cavener, yea; Strader, yea; Overton, yea; Little Roberts, yea; Taylor, yea; Whitlock, absent.

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries and the item is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

FUTURE MEETING TOPICS

Simison: Council, anything under future meeting topics or a motion to adjourn?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I move we adjourn our meeting.

Strader: Second.

Simison: Motion and second to adjourn. All in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it. We are adjourned.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:58 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

_____ MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON ATTEST:	_____ DATE APPROVED
--	------------------------

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK