

**Public Hearing for Victory Stake Center (H-2026-0016) by Johnny  
Watson, generally located at the northwest corner of W. Victory Rd  
and S. Linder Rd.**

- A. Request: Annexation of 5.81 acres of land with the R-8 zoning to construct a 22,630 sq. ft. church.
- B. Request: Conditional Use Permit for a church in the R-8 zoning district.

Lorcher: Item No. 4 on the agenda is the Victory Stake Center, which is a request for annexation and a conditional use permit at Victory and Linder and we will start with the staff report.

Parsons: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. As you stated, this is a request for annexation and conditional use permit. The subject site consists of 5.81 acres of land, currently zoned RUT in Ada county and is generally located at the northwest corner of Victory Road and Linder Road. You can see the future land use designation of this property is low density residential. The other thing that I would mention as part of tonight's discussion is typically when we have an LDR designated property residents -- or the Commission and Council usually typically sees an R-2 and an R-4 zoning district associated with that designation. However, in this case churches are not allowed in the R-4 or R-2 zoning district, so in order for them to annex this in and develop it with the stake center as proposed, the code requires them to request an R-8 zone and that's why you see a little different zoning than what you would typically see in an LDR designated area. As staff noted in the staff report, the church use is still generally consistent with the low density residential. We anticipate residential, but, again, through the zoning ordinance there are allowances for some nonresidential uses, which a church is one of those. There is the annexation boundary there and, then, their concept plan or site plan required with the conditional use permit, they are proposing to develop an approximately 22,000 square foot LDS stake center or church on the site, place of religious worship I should say. One of the unique things with this project is access. You can see with the -- the overall configuration of the property and with the future plans of a roundabout at that intersection of Linder and Victory, the applicant's location of a church is very limited in how it can be placed. One of the challenges that came with this project was the number of access points that would be allowed to -- for this property. The applicant worked very closely with the Ada County Highway District and just based on the influence of that roundabout and the limited -- and the limited frontage on Amity Road -- sorry. Not Amity. Linder Road. ACHD was very concerned with access and so they only allowed the applicant -- they have only approved one access to this subject property, which is -- and it's located here. So, that -- this is the one access point that will serve the -- the church. Also in the applicant's narrative they did state that they could have up to 300 occupants at this church at any one time, but, again, the intent is for it to be mostly Sunday worship. There are some limited activities during the week, but the majority of the activity will be happening on Sundays, which is off during -- which is not your most peak travel times, like your -- your typical work week. The applicant's also agreed to try to work on traffic

mitigation or somebody to help with traffic services on Sunday if that does become an issue, to help move traffic in the area if congestion does become a problem. Staff doesn't anticipate that. I don't think ACHD anticipates that either. Here is the -- the proposed landscape plan that the applicant has set forward. Because access is limited -- so, the site here is consistent with UDC standards. The applicant will work with staff on some drought tolerant waterwise concepts and try to minimize water resources as they develop the site and work with staff. Stepping back a little bit for the access, because access is limited, we are requiring that they provide cross-access to the west and to the north. The flexibility that we gave the applicant is we don't want to define a specific location at this time, because as you look at the overall area of -- the vicinity of the area, there are some estate -- large estate lots that surround this property and so they may redevelop in the future or they may not, but if they do redevelop and other local streets are provided near proximity to the church, then, there will be an opportunity for them to tie into that street network or potentially a common driveway in the future to help alleviate and move traffic in the area in the future. At least that's our hope and our goal with that condition of approval. Here is the proposed elevations. One thing that staff did mention in the staff report was the height of the steeple. So, under the code there are some exceptions to allow taller appurtenances for churches and when there is not occupiable space. This particular drawing is over what the height is allowed in the -- by the zoning code. So, the applicant will have to work with staff and adjust his plans accordingly and lower the height of the steeple to -- I believe the staff report called out a maximum of 55 feet. So, they have been conditioned to do that. They have to do that to meet the height requirements of the zone. So, I did look at the public record. I did not see where anyone had provided public testimony on this application. Again, staff is recommending approval of both the annexation and the conditional use permit with the provisions of the DA and the conditions of approval and I would stand for any questions you have on this application.

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Can you bring back up the -- the -- there you go. So, it looks like most of the parking there being on that east side, vehicles are going to have to go behind the building to get to that and there is a real slim area there just on the north. Curious how -- if you had conversation with the applicant about how the vehicles are going to move past one another, is that wide enough for two vehicles, whatnot?

Parsons: So, Madam Chair, Commissioner Perreault, yes, it -- per code the minimum is 20 feet to allow for two way traffic. So, that is more than adequate to -- to allow for two way traffic.

Lorcher: Would the applicant like to come forward?

Watson: Thank you, Bill. Johnny Watson. 1152 Bond Avenue, Rexburg, Idaho. I don't -- I'm not going to bore you with a whole bunch of details, but Bill hit the nail on the head when he said we have worked on a lot of different scenarios to try to make this fit. You know, ignorance is never an excuse or is -- or the city's, you know, problem to -- to resolve, but when you are working with a big corporation a lot of times these properties are just sitting in a database and somebody says, oh, we have got five acres in Meridian and we

desperately need a building. It will work great. But the reality of this particular parcel -- I think, Tina, if I just arrow down that's going to get me where I'm going?

Lomeli: Try the left or right arrows and there is a little bit of a lag, so if you give it a second.

Watson: Okay.

Lomeli: There you go.

Watson: So, they don't always really dig into it deep of what -- what's going to -- what the effect is. So, it looks like you have this nice big lot, but, then, when you actually boil down to it and you talk to our friends or dreams guy at ACHD, that we all of a sudden -- you know, they give us this roundabout to put on there and you really -- we start to give back 50 feet of right of way on two sides. Then we add the footprint of the roundabout and we had to wait until I think in December when they had a hearing or something to decide if it was going to be two lanes or one lane. Found out it was going to be two, so that crunches us a little bit. And we have -- we have had two application -- or pre-application meetings with staff and they were just very helpful and we did our very best to try to get this building to address the roundabout and it's -- I mean the owner uses a standard building and without doing a custom building it becomes way too wide and too -- too much to -- to get it towards that roundabout and -- and -- and comply with the -- let's say the -- the feel good portions of our -- you know, of -- of the unified code of let's get the parking behind the building, let's give the building nice street presence, you know, and so we -- we did a number of -- I mean a lot of scenarios that we presented to the owner and -- and in order just to get their patrons in this building this ended up being the -- the very best we could do. Now, we recognize that we have a lot of parking on that east side and so what we did is we went -- we looked at the landscape ordinances for the 25 foot buffer and our initial approach may be incorrect, because Bill mentioned that we need to work maybe on some more drought tolerant things, but we really tried to boost up that buffer to help make that still a very pedestrian friendly, very nice buffered area around the landscape -- around there and still give you a really good streetscape and get close to the -- I have some just really quick, you know, images, but -- and we will still work with staff, you know, but our intent, you know, is -- I just wanted to show you is that we -- we recognize that we have challenges to overcome and the city has objectives that they want to achieve in this kind of streetscape for their citizens and visitors and our goals are aligned, it's just we are trying to get this -- this thing to fit and -- and get you a roundabout, too. The one in question -- and -- and I probably should have asked Nick or Bill beforehand -- that's a little puzzling to me is we do have -- we are allowed 55 feet is a maximum height and your -- your unified code actually allows a appurtenances. I never can say that word, Bill. An exemption of 20 feet. So, I actually could put a steep -- I could actually build a building 55 feet tall with a -- an appurtenance 20 feet above that, which is shorter than what we are proposing. So, we will work through -- I will work through that with Bill. But at least - it seems to me that I could actually go higher if we wanted to by -- according to your ordinance.

Lorcher: Is that true?

Parsons: Madam Commissioner, Members of the Commission, I -- I don't have the code memorized, but the maximum height in the R-8 district is 35 feet and typically when we have appurtenances they can go up to 20 feet above the maximum height. So, that's where it's 35 feet to the building and, then, an additional 20 feet for the appurtenance, which gets us the 55. That's how we get there.

Watson: So, I -- I have the -- because I -- in Nick's staff report he said 55 feet was the maximum and I read that as --

Lorcher: Yeah. That's at the top of the steeple.

Watson: Right. So --

Parsons: Sorry. That is the top of the appurtenance on the building.

Watson: So, I -- I was incorrect. So, I retract that. So, thank you.

Lorcher: Are you committed to this 65 feet or can you -- or 69 feet or are you amiable to the 55 feet?

Watson: We are dying to build the building.

Lorcher: Okay.

Watson: They -- they really need a building. So, that -- that's probably the least --

Lorcher: Worry?

Watson: Least worry that they have. Yeah.

Lorcher: Okay.

Watson: Yeah.

Lorcher: Did you have any other comments?

Watson: No. I'm good.

Lorcher: I do have a question for you before I pass it on to Commissioner Stoll. Did you have a neighborhood meeting?

Watson: Yes.

Lorcher: And how do your neighbors that are adjacent to your backyard feel about your property?

Watson: Well, we had it back in March and I just barely got out of the hospital, because I was beat to death by them and -- no. I'm -- I'm kidding. We did have a neighborhood meeting and most of them I recognize that are here. I thought it was a really good meeting. We had some really good dialogue. Talked about, you know, concerns. I think -- most of us all share the same concern, which is the impact of the roundabout and I felt like we did our best to show that we were going to be a compliment to the neighborhood. We do understand that, you know, on Sunday we -- we do create a lot of traffic compared to maybe a little more quieter use or something, but we don't have much on as -- on the weekday and we recognize that there already is currently a traffic issue. So, we apologize for that, but we did -- I appreciated the time to be able to talk and meet with them. So, we will -- we will see if they agree.

Lorcher: And, then, until there is actual different access points is -- is your client open to having traffic control to be able to move people in and out of that building --

Watson: Yes.

Lorcher: -- after Sunday service?

Watson: That is correct. The other question is I -- we don't know what the schedule is for the roundabout. If it's three years, four years; right? If we would be able to have an access that we could then -- when the round -- you know, maybe one on Linder to help disperse the traffic right now until the roundabout comes and, then, we remove it as per their guidelines.

Lorcher: Got you. Commissioner Stoll, did you have a question?

Stoll: Excuse me. So, are you amenable to staff's recommendation regarding cross-access if --

Watson: Yes.

Stoll: -- development occurs at a later date?

Watson: Yes. That -- really, I mean based on the ACHD's documents their -- you know, their requirements, it's -- that's really our only option of future relief.

Stoll: And have you brought up the idea of temporary access to ACHD?

Watson: At this stage we are not getting past what the manual says.

Stoll: Okay.

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: So, given the site constraints can you just show -- just out of curiosity share a little bit more about why this is such an ideal location versus finding somewhere else for -- for the church?

Watson: Your community is growing at such a rate and I'm doing another facility that I wish was annexed in -- that I would be annexing into your community that's in the county just right over on the -- where McDermott used to be that I'm going through sewer and water -- you know, well issues in a NP study area and it is a disaster. These types of facilities need -- really need to be on municipal systems and to find property like that available in the area that it's -- the facility is needed is nearly impossible.

Lorcher: Was this land donated?

Watson: I don't know that. I'm sure it was.

Lorcher: Okay.

Watson: But --

Lorcher: Because the one on -- at McDermott that's across the street from my house, the Rice family -- elder Rice donated those five acres to the -- to the church and that's why that one's there. I don't know Victory and Linder if that land was donated specifically for the church.

Watson: Right. We had our neighborhood meeting at the one over on -- I can't think of the -- the road. A mile to the east or whatever. But, yeah, this stake, what they call it, is just busting at the seams and --

Lorcher: Right.

Watson: -- they are just begging me to get this thing built for them, so --

Lorcher: Okay. All right. Any other questions for the applicant before we take public testimony? All right. Thank you very much. Madam Clerk, do we have anyone signed up to testify?

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. We have Cindy Bird.

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

Bird: Thank you. My name is Cindy Bird and --

Lorcher: Just in the microphone, please.

Bird: My name -- thank you. My name is Cindy Bird and we live at 1570 West Victory Road, Meridian.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you.

Bird: And we are straight across there from Linder to these guys and so my concern is that -- and I understand that they are losing part of their -- their property for the roundabout. Eventually myself and our other neighbor apparently would lose our homes.

Lorcher: Oh.

Bird: And so, you know, I understand Mortensen -- Steven Mortensen deeded the property to the LDS people.

Lorcher: Okay.

Bird: And like I said to the LDS people -- you could -- you could have sold it to the county or to ACHD. But they -- I understand that they want to build their church, serve their people and I do understand that, but we don't like losing our homes after 30, almost 40 years.

Lorcher: Right. Have you talked to ACHD?

Bird: When this all started we did. We sent letters. We did. And we thought they were doing the roundabout with just one, but it actually cut -- with the two it cuts the corner of our house off.

Lorcher: Okay.

Bird: So -- and if that's something that we need to do again -- we came to City Hall when they first started all this --

Lorcher: Right.

Bird: -- and -- five years ago when they were going to do it in 2025. So, in 2020 and we pleaded our case and so did our neighbors.

Lorcher: I -- the city is not in charge of the roads, so --

Bird: Right.

Lorcher: -- unfortunately the fight has to be with the highway district and continue to do so. We had eminent domain at our place as well, because I'm on Ustick and the improvements were six inches over the -- our house.

Bird: Yes.

Lorcher: And so the house was ready to be demolished. Mr. McDermott's house, a historical house here in Meridian --

Bird: Yes.

Lorcher: But we were able to negotiate with -- at this time ITD. If we took off the front porch we would be able to be outside the right of way, so we were able to save the house. Now, the disadvantage is the road is right there; right?

Bird: Yeah.

Lorcher: But we were able to save our house, so don't give up because they -- I'm not sure you will get what you want, but they could listen and this could be years away as well, so --

Bird: Oh, good. Good.

Lorcher: It's just hard to say when that might happen, but our role as Commissioners in this case it's -- because it's annexation will go to City Council -- is to make recommendations for the building and the developer is not in charge of the roads either.

Bird: Exactly.

Lorcher: So, we are a little bit limited there as well.

Bird: Thank you. So ACHD and did you say ITD?

Lorcher: So, for me -- I'm in the impact area of Highway 16 --

Bird: Oh.

Lorcher: -- and so ITD owns half of it and, then, ACHD owns the other half of it --

Bird: Okay.

Lorcher: -- and so eventually ACHD will have everything except Highway 16. So, all the local roads along Ustick and Black Cat and McDermott will all be ACHD. But in the meantime we get to deal with all of them and so -- but we were able to save our house by just adjusting the -- our front porch of being able to take that back. But it was years of negotiations. Not weeks. Many letters. Many meetings, so --

Bird: Was that with the roundabout?

Lorcher: No. The widening of Ustick to support Highway 16.

Bird: All right. Thank you.

Stoll: Madam Chair, if I may be clear?

Lorcher: Commissioner Stoll.

Stoll: So, it's ACHD in this situation. ITD doesn't have anything to do with --

Bird: Sorry.

Stoll: ACHD does not -- it's ACHD that you have to work with on the roadways here. It has nothing to do with ITD. ITD doesn't have anything to do with that. But the other thing I want to -- I believe -- and Bill can correct me on this -- the roundabout is not being caused by the applicant. So, the --

Bird: I know. I know.

Stoll: The applicant has no influence on the roundabout.

Bird: We talked to them.

Stoll: Okay. I just wanted to be clear.

Bird: I understand that.

Stoll: Okay.

Bird: Okay.

Lorcher: Thank you very much.

Bird: Thank you. Madam Clerk?

Lomeli: Madam Chair, we have Ed Bird.

Lorcher: Hi. If you can state your name and address for the record, please.

E.Bird: Ed Bird. 1570 West Victory.

Lorcher: Thank you.

E.Bird: Meridian, Idaho. I have two things. Number one, all these pictures show two entrances -- exits and -- in and out and I understand you have only approved one and, number two, how unusual or usual is it for the city to annex in something that's not adjacent to city property?

Lorcher: Oh. We will look into that.

E.Bird: Because everything else is county, except for the big Corey Barton development on the southeast corner that you guys brought into the city.

Lorcher: So, you are across the street and you are county.

E.Bird: Yeah. Forty acres of county.

Lorcher: Okay. And you are saying that the parcels behind the church are also county?

E.Bird: Yes. That was 80 acres and they developed that into five acre lots.

Lorcher: Okay. So, if it's adjacent -- there could be a street in between the adjacency.

E.Bird: Okay.

Lorcher: So, it doesn't have to be property line to property line. There could be a street in between. So, are you saying Corey Barton has a parcel across the street?

E.Bird: Yes. It's cattywampus to it. It's southeast -- yeah. Southeast. And where theirs is northwest.

Lorcher: Okay.

E.Bird: Okay?

Lorcher: We will double check on that.

E.Bird: But the thing that gets me is which one do we believe, the one entrance or the two? And if you have only approved one, then, make them put the plan show one.

Lorcher: Okay.

E.Bird: Okay?

Lorcher: Yeah. And that will be done before City Council.

E.Bird: Okay? Any questions?

Lorcher: No.

E.Bird: Thank you.

Lorcher: We are good. Thank you very much.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, we have Robert S.

Lorcher: Good evening. If you can state your name and address for the record, please.

Schoelkoph: Just Bob. Or Robert Schoelkoph. 2690 South Ariel Lane in Meridian. I'm here to represent about seven people here today, not with a bone of contention, but simply an issue that happened in 2025 during the excavation of the Steve Mortensen property. The owners of the five acre parcels that you see up on the map here were a little north and just slightly west of that. During the deconstruction or up -- leveling out of the property they damaged the irrigation pipes. The unfortunate part of this property is there is an irrigation line that runs diagonally almost I think where that church is about to be built and we all have five acres some of it is product -- produced with animals, some of it's farming -- a mild farming and we are concerned about the water. During the de -- or the excavation of the property the line that feeds our irrigation was destroyed. We couldn't -- in no fault of anybody that I can -- that I'm aware of, I heard that there was a neighborhood meeting. We weren't aware of it. But we were without water for about a month. At our expense we put replacement irrigation pipe in so we could get water. We would like to get reimbursed for that. It's about 18,000 dollars. The other primary or major issue is we are long term residents. I have been there for 32 years. Plan on staying there. Access to water is going to be important when they do that construction. What we put in there for a line is not going to be adequate for what they are planning on building. It was -- it was to get us by for the season. So, I'm requesting two things. I'm requesting to get reimbursed for the cost of -- that is incurred because of the demolition and also we would like to be part of the planning of the routing of that irrigation line and the construction of it, so that we can get access to our water. And that's all I have.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much.

Schoelkoph: Thank you.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, we have Thomas L.

Lorcher: Hi. If you can state your name and address for the record.

Lemenager: Sure. Thomas Lemenager and I live at 2114 West Aspen Cove Drive. And I'm kind of talking about the same thing that Robert did. We were without water last spring for about -- I think it was over a month and I'm more concerned about what's going to happen in the future with this. You know, what -- can there be perhaps a condition put on the CUP that recognizes our line and that it will be recognized in whole and that it be maintained as well. So, we don't want this to happen again basically. You know, we went through this a month and a half without water last spring, so I think everybody's really concerned about what's going to happen and the drawings show a parking lot over the diagonal layout of the pipe and how is that going to be maintained, how is it going to be operational and how are we going to live without irrigation if it's hit again during construction and during the planning it should be recognized.

Lorcher: And is the irrigation for the land, it's not for your home, your own well and septic?

Lemenager: Right. It's for the land landscaping, trees and bushes and -- and that kind of thing.

Lorcher: Okay. We will address that. Thank you.

Lemenager: Thank you.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, we have Patrick -- is it Marone? No one's here. John Fitzgerald.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you.

Lomeli: Rich Thayer.

Lorcher: You are okay? Okay. Thank you.

Lomeli: And Meg Thayer.

Lorcher: You are good? Okay.

Lomeli: No one else has signed up.

Lorcher: Anybody online? Would the applicant like to come forward to address some of the neighborhood concerns, please.

Watson: Thank you. The images that -- that they are seeing on the screen were from our pre-application meeting. It was before ACHD chopped one of our legs off and so if you look at the images that are actually in the packet they only show one access. I also have given my personal contact to Bob and I'm not -- on behalf of the owner, but as a -- as a consultant for the owner I will take care of their -- the needs. I will make sure that they are smiling when we are done.

Lorcher: Okay. And if you can make sure you give your card to Thomas as well, because he has irrigation concerns.

Watson: Yep.

Lorcher: And so what is the -- what is the plan for managing irrigation if there is going to be a parking lot on top of it?

Watson: So, if you -- in our -- in the packet the irrigation canal also has their comments and we have to address those items also. So, if they have a -- I mean if it's actual -- a deeded ditch or whatever we can't impede their water rights --

Lorcher: Right.

Watson: -- and so we will work with them to make sure that that's legally established back to where it needs to be.

Lorcher: Okay. And, then, my only other recommendation is when you go to Council that the pictures of your application are current with just showing the one entry.

Watson: Will do.

Lorcher: Okay. Any questions for the applicant before we close the public hearing? Thank you very much, Johnny. May I get a motion to close the public hearing, please?

Stoll: So moved.

Lorcher: How about a second?

Gelsomino: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and second to close the public hearing for the stake center at Victory and Linder. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Lorcher: You know, I -- like I said before, the stake center at McDermott Road and -- and Ustick is being built right now and that's a challenge as well, because McDermott is a dead end. I'm actually kind of excited for a church to be my neighbor. I -- I am not worried about a huge impact on traffic, because it is short term and it is sporadic, you know, limited to certain days. So, knowing -- I am not a member of the church, but I -- I have gone to different stake centers over the years and I feel that the way they landscape and -- and manage their property and how they -- how they build everything has been very thoughtful and they want to be a good neighbor. So, they are challenged with the restrictions that ACHD is putting in front of them, so I don't feel that they should be held accountable for road improvements that they don't have control over. The ultimate question for City Council is that is this in the best time for the city to annex this property and build this church. That's going to be the question when you approach City Council. So, because - - is this one going to be on sewer and septic or is it city water? So, sewer and septic. So, you are annexing in from the county when there is not full services out there, so that will be the ultimate question from -- from Council. The fact that they are going on septic and sewer by us and staying in the county is -- is fine. I know you have challenges as a -- as a builder, but I do know that most of the stake centers are busting at the seams and they do need more facilities to be able to manage their congregation as well. So, I'm in support of this project to forward it to City Council for annexation and hopefully some of the questions from ACHD can be answered by the neighbors and, neighbors, if you do have questions you are also invited to go back to City Council and address those as well.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Yeah. I'm also in support of this. I think there is also something to like -- to -- to -- that I want to make sure we speak to regarding some of the -- maybe requested conditions that generally fall outside the purview of -- of the Commission, things like reimbursement and, you know, kind of legal recognitions, et cetera. The -- those are all things that I hope are handled, you know, appropriately, et cetera. But -- but this isn't really the forum that can decide -- you know, we -- we can't make anyone reimburse anyone in this -- in this venue currently. So, obviously, you know, that can -- I encourage the applicant and the neighbors to -- to work that out. You know, but that -- that kind of belongs outside of this forum or God forbid in a court of law, rather than -- than here. The same goes for the actual, you know, property lines, et cetera. Those are things that we have the code and, you know, platting and the law to -- to set forth that this body can't actually decide. You know, those kind of more legalistic issues. As for the -- the -- the property itself and the application itself I think -- you know, I have -- I have some slight concerns with the traffic flow, you know, I -- I don't love the risk of it backing up onto -- you know, I don't love the single failure point with just having that one entry-exit that goes into -- behind the church. I don't know that there is anything the applicant could change about the actual application to -- to mitigate those -- those issues. I think that's -- this is an ACHD issue. This is a surrounding development issue. So, for those reasons I'm in support of this. I know it's -- it's a little bit -- you know, there is -- there is some questions around timing, but I don't think the issues are sufficient enough to -- to make me feel this is not the right time.

Lorcher: Right.

Perreault: Madam?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: I really appreciate the applicant's willingness to receive feedback and work with the neighbors. Sometimes we don't get that much -- that much of willing attitude. So, yeah, I realize that Boise-Kuna Irrigation District didn't send their conditions until about less than a month ago, so probably not a lot of opportunity to reach out to the neighbors with that, but those conditions are pretty clear about how to, you know, work with the neighbors in regard to whether their irrigation services are being compromised and I think that City Council will likely want to have a further conversation to make sure those conditions have been substantially figured out before they make a decision on annexation and -- and so I do want to say in terms of timing, once the Linder Road overpass is completed I think that there is going to be a lot more pressure on Linder Road and I think you are going to see that roundabout then. There is going to be some movement to get that done. I mean nothing happens fast; right? So -- but, that being said, that roundabout is going to allow for that traffic -- because now you don't have a stop there, you -- cars are just going to, you know, flow through and it could back up in that entrance, especially since -- as Commissioner Smith shared, you have to kind of go around this small little space in the back to get to the -- to the east parking. I'm not as concerned about the kind of stacking on Victory Road, because even when this area develops with subdivisions -- and it will once the Linder Road overpass is open, that's going to like literally open the

floodgates. It's still a Sunday morning and I think even with a lot of cars that's just like the lowest traffic time, with the exception of overnight that there is. So, I'm not that worried about that. So, that's everything.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Stoll: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Stoll.

Stoll: I'm generally supportive of the application. I appreciate the neighbors coming out and testifying. I think the areas on irrigation as pointed out are covered by the irrigation companies district's conditions. The traffic flow internally does cause me concern, but we live with the limitations that are provided to us by the highway district.

Lorcher: Right.

Stoll: So, with that I will support the application.

Lorcher: Okay.

Gelsomino: Madam Chair, I can't add more to what my fellow commissioners and yourself have voiced, so --

Lorcher: You can add a little more. Give a motion.

Gelsomino: Absolutely. Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Gelsomino.

Gelsomino: I would like to make a motion for the -- or excuse me. After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council of File No. H-2026-0016 as presented in the staff reports -- report for the hearing date of July 2nd, 2026, without any modifications or conditions; right?

Stoll: Second.

Lorcher: Bill, we don't have to add any modifications; correct? All right. Then we have got a second. It's been moved and seconded to approve the Victory Stake Center. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much, everyone.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.