

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:00 p.m., Tuesday, December 1, 2020, by Mayor Robert Simison.

Members Present: Robert Simison, Joe Borton, Luke Cavener, Treg Bernt, Jessica Perreault, Brad Hoaglund and Liz Strader.

Also present: Adrienne Weatherly, Bill Nary, Sonya Allen, Clint Dolsby, Scott Colaianni, Joe Bongiorno, Steve Siddoway and Dean Willis.

**ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Liz Strader	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Joe Borton
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brad Hoaglund	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Treg Bernt
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jessica Perreault	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Luke Cavener
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mayor Robert E. Simison	

Simison: Council, we will go ahead and call this meeting to order. For the record it is Tuesday, December 1st, 2020, at 6:00 p.m. and we will begin tonight's City Council meeting with roll call attendance.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

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

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

**COMMUNITY INVOCATION**

Simison: Our next item on the agenda is the community invocation, which this evening will be delivered by Pastor Jordan with Real Life Ministries. If you all would take this as a moment to join us in the invocation or take this as a moment of silence. Mr. Jordan.

Jordan: Thank you, Mayor. Let's pray. Lord, just come before you and first just want to say thank you for this Council -- City Council and Mayor, the leadership of our city. In the midst of the time that we find ourselves in their leadership has been incredible and thankful to be in a community because of their leadership. I pray, God, that you would bless them tonight in the midst of their meeting. Help them to make wise decisions for the best of our city. In addition I pray you bless them as we get closer to Christmas season, Lord, may this be an amazing time in the midst of a hard time with our family and friends. Just bless their life and bless their service to our community. We pray this all in your son's name, amen.

## **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

Simison: Thank you, Justin. Next item up is the adoption of the agenda.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I move that we adopt the agenda as presented.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor, I second the motion.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

## **PUBLIC FORUM – Future Meeting Topics**

Simison: Madam Clerk, did anyone sign up under Public Forum?

Weatherly: Mr. Mayor, my apologies. They did not.

## **RESOLUTIONS [Action Item]**

- 1. Resolution No. 20-2245: A Resolution of the Mayor and the City Council of the City of Meridian, Establishing the Appointment of Scott Walters to Seat 1, Randy Spiwak to Seat 3, Taryn Richmond to Seat 6 and Shawn Keating to Seat 7 of the Meridian Solid Waste Advisory Commission; and Providing an Effective Date**

Simison: Okay. Then the next item up -- we will move on to our agenda items. Resolutions. First item is Resolution No. 20-2245 and this is a Resolution to appoint four members to our Solid Waste Advisory Commission. Had the opportunity to sit down with the Commission President Steve Cory and do interviews for these positions. It really is putting half the people -- you know, half the commission up -- I don't know how we got off, Mr. Nary, on this one where we are just slightly off in terms of having a lot of our Commission being appointed at this one term, compared to normal. You try to have them a little bit more spaced out. But we do have reappointments to the commission, as well as a new reappointment from a former individual who moved to Boise and is serving as the -- someone who is a professional in the area -- from his years on the commission prior to that in Scott Walters and I don't -- I think many of you probably are familiar with Randy Spiwak, his involvement with HOAs in our community is legendary and he was looking for a way to get involved and very knowledgeable, very interested in, you know, how this impacts our -- our local homeowner associations and, then, Taryn Richmond definitely

brings a marketing aspect and as SWAC is looking at ways to continue its great public involvement in education and their new innovative programs that we just saw, such as Trash to Treasure, having that -- that interest and expertise I think will serve them very well as they look to build on those successes as we move forward. So, I would be happy to answer any comments or questions. I do see we have Mr. Trash Talk Tom on here as well if you have any questions about where SWAC is headed, but -- or take a motion.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Maybe a comment and a motion. Some fantastic appointments and reappointments and excited to see SWAC continue their work. With that I would move that we approve Resolution No. 20-2245.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I second that motion.

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

**MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.**

Simison: I do see we have Taryn on the call. I don't know she would like to make any comments, but if she would be happy to have her unmute herself and make any -- any comments. Well, I don't see her unmuting -- or unmuting herself, so we will just go ahead and move on at this point in time and say thank you, Council, for your confirmation of those appointments.

## **ACTION ITEMS**

- 2. Public Hearing for Pura Vida Ridge Ranch (H-2020-0064) by Jay Gibbons, South Beck & Baird, Located at 3727 E. Lake Hazel Rd.**
  - A. Request: Annexation of 26.34 acres of land with R-8 (6.64 acres) and R-15 (19.69 acres) zoning districts.
  - B. Request: A Preliminary Plat consisting of 157 buildable lots and 35 common lots on 26.34 acres of land in the R-8 and R-15 zoning districts.

- C. Request: A Planned Unit Development with a request for a deviation from the dimensional standards listed in UDC Table 11-2A-7 to allow reduced building setbacks in the R-15 zoning district.

Simison: So, with that we will move on to our Action Items this evening. First up is the public hearing for Pura Vida Ridge Ranch, H-2020-0064. I will open this public hearing with staff comments and turn this over to Sonya.

Allen: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. Can you see the presentation and hear me okay?

Simison: Yes, we can.

Allen: Thank -- thank you. The applications before you are a request for annexation and zoning, preliminary plat, and a planned unit development. This site consists of 26.34 acres of land. It's zoned RUT in Ada county and is located at 3727 East Lake Hazel Road. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation is medium high density residential, which calls for eight to 12 residential units per acre. Annexation of 26.34 acres of land with R-8 zoning, which consists of 6.64 acres and R-15 zoning, which consists of 19.69 acres, is requested for the development of 157 single family residential homes consisting of a mix of detached, attached, and townhome units at a gross density of 8.23 units per acre, excluding undevelopable areas consistent with the medium high density residential future land use designation for this property. The area proposed to be zoned R-8 consists of the upper rim area at the southwest corner of the site proposed to develop with single family residential detached homes, which will provide a transition to future medium density residential development to the south. The area proposed to be zoned R-15 consists of the slope and the lower valley area on the remainder of this site proposed to develop primarily with townhomes and a couple single family residential attached units, which should be consistent with the future medium high density residential development to the east and west. A development agreement is recommended as a provision of annexation. A preliminary plat is proposed to subdivide the property consisting of 157 buildable lots, consisting of 30 detached, two attached, and 125 townhome units and 35 common lots on 26.34 acres of land in the R-8 and R-15 zoning districts. The plat is proposed to develop in four phases as shown on the phasing plan on the right. The first phase is nearest Lake Hazel Road, with subsequent phases progressing to the south, with the last phase at the southwest corner of the site, which requires a public street access to be provided from the south. Access is proposed via one public street and one emergency only access via East Lake Hazel Road. One stub street is proposed to the west and two stub streets are proposed to the south for future extension and one stub street is planned to the east boundary of the site from Poiema Subdivision for interconnectivity. A bridge is required to be constructed across the Ten Mile Creek to the east on the subject property in this location. Alleys and common driveways are proposed off internal public streets for access to the proposed units. Traffic calming is proposed on road three, which is over 750 -- excuse me -- over 700 feet in length by narrowing the street down to 24 feet between road six and seven. Roads three, if you can see my cursor here, is right here. That long stretch. The ACHD five year work plan shows Eagle Road

north of Lake Hazel widened in 2023 and Lake Hazel east of Eagle Road being widened in 2024. Preliminary plat lines are shown in red that are either in process or have been approved. And just to note, the -- the prelim lines depicted to the south are outdated and reflect a subdivision, Sky Break, that was recently withdrawn. A planned unit development is proposed to enable the development of a mix of single family residential detached, attached, and townhome units on the site at a gross density of 8.23 units per acre and that, as I previously stated, excludes the undevelopable slope areas, while preserving the natural topography of the property and the Ten Mile Creek. This property has significant topography which prevents development of over 25 percent of the property for buildable lots. The applicant states there is a 58 feet height difference between the valley floor and the rim, with an average slope of approximately 40 percent. As part of the planned unit development the applicant requests deviations from UDC standards pertaining to building setbacks as shown on the preliminary plat, sidewalks, landscaping along pathways and cul-de-sac and block lengths. The details and justification for such is included in the staff report. A 35 foot wide street buffer is proposed along Lake Hazel containing a berm and landscaping is proposed within common areas, except for the portion of the site that's on the hillside. No landscaping or sprinklers are proposed as the area is proposed to be left natural and unimproved. The applicant states low growing vegetation currently exists in this area that doesn't require supplemental moisture and installing an irrigation system would cause unnecessary damage to the hillside. The homeowners association is proposed to be responsible for reducing fuels on an annual basis at a minimum. A fire safety plan was submitted as requested due to staff's concern about the potential danger of wildfires in this area. The plan illustrates how the proposed development plan will comply with the current Boise City Fire Prevention Code 7-01-69, Chapter 49. This plan has been approved by the Fire Department subject to some minor modifications. Qualified open space in excess of the minimum standards. A minimum of 2.63 acres or ten percent is required. A total of 5.25 acres or 19.92 percent is proposed, consisting of half the street buffer along Lake Hazel, linear open space, MEWs and open grassy areas of at least 50 feet by 100 feet in area. This does not include the unimproved hillside area. Site amenities in excess of UDC standards are proposed. A minimum of one qualified site amenity is required. Proposed amenities consist of a ten foot wide 1,631 foot long segment of the city's multi-use pathway system along the east boundary of the site adjacent to the Ten Mile Creek. A 16 foot by 16 foot shelter with a picnic table, two eight foot by 12 foot arbors with benches for common areas and a dirt trail and a paved five foot wide pathway -- pathway on the hillside. Four workout stations and a tot lot with children's play equipment. Pathways are proposed around the perimeter of the development and internally with connections to the multi-use pathway along the creek adjacent to the east boundary of the site. A pathway and trails are also proposed in -- in the unimproved slope area providing pedestrian connections between the upper ridge and lower valley lots. A parking plan was submitted as shown that demonstrates compliance with the off-street parking standards for residential uses. A total of 20 additional off-street parking spaces are proposed for guests and many parking lots dispersed throughout the development and an additional 88 spaces can be accommodated off street, for a total of 108 extra spaces. This is down from 157 spaces shown on the previous plan, due to recommendation by the Commission for revisions to those areas. As noted the Ten Mile Creek is a natural waterway that runs along the

eastern boundary of this site. As such the UDC states that fencing should not prevent access to the waterway. However, in limited circumstances and in the interest of public safety, larger open water systems may require fencing as determined by the City Council, director, and/or the Public Works director. Fencing is not proposed or desired by the applicant. The applicant states water flows year around in the creek, is shallow and slow flowing, at an approximate depth of 18 to 24 inches and is overgrown with cattails as shown on the pictures here. The depth of the waterway in relation to the surrounding land is approximately six feet from the top of the bank to the bottom of the channel and the width is approximately 15 to 20 feet. Fencing the creek would likely impede the irrigation district's ability to maintain the drain. Because this is not a large open water system with deep fast flowing current, staff is not overly concerned. However, any waterway may present a hazard to young children. For this reason staff is recommending fencing is installed along the creek to restrict access, unless otherwise waived by City Council. The applicant is requesting a waiver to this requirement from you tonight. Conceptual building elevations were submitted for the single family residential detached and townhome units that consist of a variety of one, two, and three stories, with a variety of vertical and horizontal siding, stucco, brick, stone veneer accents with wood and timber design elements, with gable style shingle roofs with metal accent roofing on some elevations. Updated concept elevations were submitted for the three story units as shown that more closely align with the style of the other units in the development. These units incorporate a combination of flat and single pitch roofs at a height of less than 40 feet, with each having a rooftop deck. Two story elevations in the same style shown on the right were also submitted as another option. The final design will be enhanced with additional materials and design elements to be cohesive with the other units in the development to ensure quality of development within the PUD in accord with the UDC, the applicant, at staff's recommendation, submitted design guidelines for the overall development to be included in the development agreement that promote innovative design that creates visually pleasing and cohesive patterns of development. To ensure compliance with these guidelines and the design standards in the architectural standards manual, staff recommends all structures, including single family detached, are subject to design review. The Commission recommended approval of this project. Jay Gibbons, the applicant's representative, testified in favor. Annette Alonso, representing the Southern Rim Coalition, testified in opposition. Written testimony was received from Jennifer Loveday. Key issues were the opinion that existing roadways in this area cannot support additional traffic without improvements and schools can't support the influx of children this, along with other developments approved in this area, will bring. Concern pertaining to the density proposed. She felt it was too high. And lack of a buffer to adjacent rural property where a horse facility is located. Preference for more and larger open spaces to be provided. And this was addressed with the revised plan. Connectivity between the upper and lower portions of the development and protection of the southern rim area and preservation of the natural hillside. Key issues of discussion by the Commission were as follows: The plan for wildfire -- wildfire prevention on the unimproved hillside area. Timing for development of the R-8 portion at the southwest corner of the site. The desire for fencing to be provided along the creek for public safety. The capacity of existing area schools to handle additional children and the new schools planned in this area. The desire for more and larger usable common open spaces to be provided. As I mentioned

this was addressed with the revised plan. The upper and lower portions of the development to be better integrated and would like to see a better plan for the hillside. They were in favor of the three story product and usable roof area and location of the units against the hillside. They were in favor of the fitness loop amenity and trail system between the upper and lower portions of the development. The Commission made the following change to the staff recommendation. They were in favor of the three story product type with the flat roof, but wanted the design to tie in better with the other units and those were the updated elevations that I shown previously -- had shown here on the screen. So, they did update those since the Commission hearing. There are a couple outstanding issues for Council tonight. The applicant requests Council approval, as I mentioned earlier, to not construct fencing along the Ten Mile Creek. If Council doesn't feel fencing is necessary to preserve public safety, condition number 3-D should be deleted. And the applicant requests approval to submit final design guidelines for the development after the hearing for inclusion in the development agreement. Those were required in the staff report to be submitted prior to the Council hearing tonight. There has been no written testimony since the Commission hearing. Staff will stand for any questions.

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

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you very much, Sonya. And I don't know if we have other folks on that have looked at the schools. Just looking at Mountain View High School, over 2,500 enrolled, capacity for just shy of 2,200. That's pretty far over capacity. I guess we have got COVID. Maybe that's an element. But I heard there is an expansion project at Rocky Mountain. Could you give us a flavor for their ability to take on additional students?

Allen: I cannot. Council Woman Strader, I'm not sure if comments were submitted from Miranda on that or not. I'm -- I would have to look.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I had copied the clerk on some questions about that to Miranda earlier today. It was a little later in the day. I'm not sure if she's had time. I just was hoping for an update on that topic.

Allen: Yeah. She must not have. I haven't been copied on anything.

Strader: Okay. Mr. Mayor, one more.

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I guess a general question for staff. Maybe not necessarily for Sonya. But I'm curious what -- exactly what part of the property is within the five minute response time and what part is not. We could save that for later if we are going to speak to them.

Allen: I believe -- is Joe on tonight?

Simison: Yes, he is.

Allen: Bongiorno.

Bongiorno: Yes. Give me just a second. I was just about to pull up the map when you asked about it.

Allen: Yeah. It is included in his comments in the -- in the agency comments on the public file.

Bongiorno: Yeah. I believe the -- all along the bottom edge of the -- I'm just getting in there right now. Apologize. Okay.

Weatherly: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Yes.

Weatherly: I'm happy to add the comments that Miranda e-mailed out, if Liz was unable to see them earlier. Regarding the schools.

Simison: You did see a response from Miranda?

Weatherly: We do have a response from Miranda talking about the capacity at Rocky Mountain and how they are handling it and what Miranda's take was on it.

Simison: Yeah. If you would like to share that with all Council.

Weatherly: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Miranda's e-mail says: From seeing how Rocky Mountain operated pre-COVID and overcapacity and hearing how Mountain View is operating now, I feel safe saying just about over -- just about 450 overcapacity is a good enrollment for our high school to sit at. This due to the fact that students travel, change rooms, co-op, et cetera, high schools have more opportunities to get creative with placement than the other two levels. Rocky Mountain, for example, with 1,800 capacity, was above 2,200 before they started having real issues, aside from student parking.

Strader: Thank you.

Bongiorno: Madam Clerk, if you can allow me to share my screen, I can show the map.



Weatherly: Mr. Bongiorno, you should have ability now. At the bottom of your screen you should have a green button that says share screen.

Bongiorno: Got it. Can you guys see that map now? Okay. So, you can see the -- the -- the slime green is our five minute response time. So, we are just cutting off the bottom edge of the -- the map.

Strader: Mr. Mayor, a quick follow up.

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: And so -- but -- thank you very much. What I was curious about was also -- because of the topography, does it make it so that getting to these other areas is a real challenge or not? Like I don't have a flavor for what this hill looks like, not living in that area, and so does that mean that's like 30 seconds over the five minute fire response or does having this big hill make a huge difference? Just wanted to get your take on it.

Bongiorno: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, this -- this particular area -- because they did give us good access all along the hillside, the response to the hillside may be, you know, an extra minute, 30 seconds, depending on traffic and weather, but they gave us -- they ran the road along that hillside, as I'm sure Jay will talk about, and that -- that also gives us a buffer as part of the fire plan that we made them submit to the city. So, getting to the hillside shouldn't be an issue for us, it's just that extra time turning the corner, getting around and actually getting to the hillside would be the -- the issue. Obviously, we have -- you know, station eight potentially, is less than a mile away, which would make this whole area green solid once that is up and running.

Simison: Council, any further questions for staff? Okay. I see that the applicant has joined us. Mr. Gibbons, if you would like to state your name and address for the record, you will be recognized for ten minutes. Fifteen minutes. Sorry.

Gibbons: Can everybody hear me? Okay. First of all I will identify myself. I'm Jay Gibbons. I'm the owner's representative. My address is 2002 South Vista, Boise, Idaho. If you will allow me to share my screen, I will -- I have a presentation. Can you see my presentation okay?

Simison: Not yet, Jay.

Gibbons: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Mayor, Councilmen, pleasure to be before you tonight.

Simison: Jay, we don't see it yet.

Gibbons: Oh.

Simison: Now we see it.

Gibbons: Okay. Are we there now?

Simison: Yes.

Gibbons: Can you see it okay?

Simison: Yes.

Gibbons: Okay. So, Pura Vida Ridge Ranch, as staff presented, it's on the south side of Lake Hazel Road. Abuts Boise Ranch on one side, a new subdivision with the Calvary Church, Poiema Subdivision. You have got Hillsdale Park -- Park and South Meridian YMCA half a mile to the -- to the north. So, we are here to ask for annexation into the City of Meridian with R-8 and R-15 zoning classifications. We have got a proposed development of 157 building lots and 35 common lots and a whole lot of amenities, connections, and a whole lot of open space. A total of, you know, almost 41 percent of our 26.34 acres is -- is open space, natural and otherwise. We are proposing a bridge connection over Ten Mile Creek, which provides a secondary access to all future phases after phase one. We also stub to four adjacent properties -- or three adjacent properties and four stubs and we did have a traffic study approved by ACHD, which will require improvements to Lake Hazel, depending on -- you know, what level of improvements depends on how quickly, you know, our development progresses and the timing of that, you know, if it's in conjunction with ACHD's proposed project or if it's in -- it starts before ACHD's project. So, I have laid out here basically the Commission's concerns that we addressed at the September 17th and October 22nd hearing. We did secure a recommendation of approval and with -- with the recommendation that we explore a three -- a three story flat roof product on 32 lots and I will show you where those are in a moment. We tried to come up with a -- with a unique design in order to meet the Comprehensive Plan medium high residential. It calls for a whole lot of density. We had an attached product for the most part. All the R-15 is -- is an attached single family residential lot project. Each -- each home is on a lot and most of the buildings are connected four to five -- three, four or five units -- or lots to a -- to a building. It's phased. We -- we are required to provide a firewise plan, as suggested by the Fire Department. P&Z wanted to see it before they would entertain any kind of motion or a recommendation and so prior to October 22nd we -- we prepared a firewise plan. We prepared architectural design guidelines and as staff said, I'm asking for -- the reason I don't have them finalized at the moment is I need Council's input on the three story. We have to come up with a -- with a three story treatment -- a plan that works for the city, so that I can finalize those. They have to be finalized and, you know, codified in the -- in the development agreement. So, we need to figure out where -- which direction to go on that. So, that's one outstanding issue. So, this is -- this is our original plan. We did have three public 24 foot streets that abutted the hillside through the P&Z process. They wanted to see more cohesive connected open space and they wanted specifically some open play area. So, like I said, this is -- this is the particular connection points that we were required to -- to put in and -- and we did coordinate with all the owners to the appropriate locations. They line up with the adjacent development plans and it took some time to do that, but it's all been copacetic, which is good. So, our updated site plan -- in the center you will see there

used to be two residential homes in between -- or road four went around it. We took road four out. Took those two units out. We actually moved them -- took a parking lot out, last 14 spaces, and put them over next to the -- the drain on the south side of the bridge access road and that created -- we have open play areas, a passive soccer field, plus we have a tot lot, plus there is the exercise equip -- fitness equipment station in that space and there will be a bike -- bicycle repair station at the same location, because the trail system you see up the natural hillside will be a dirt trail. It will have rest stations on it as well. It will -- as staff said, it is a 58 foot plus high rim to the upper left. We don't have vehicular connection to that and that is our very last phase and we recognize that this will not be developed until the property to the south comes up with a development plan and gets to a phase that provides that connection. There are 30 lots in it. Pedestrian bicycle wise it does connect to and through the rest of the development. Our pedestrian circulation plan, as you can see, all the red is the sidewalks along the roads. They are on both sides of the now 27 foot wide roads that have the three story product, which is between the hill and road three on the southeast portion of the hill, basically, and that is only -- or we are not proposing three story units anyplace else in order to provide a good transition to, you know, neighboring properties. But we have -- we have a whole lot of pedestrian connections, including the multi-use pathway that runs along Ten Mile Creek. So, our two story product, we -- conceptually these are a townhouse project like the River District in Eagle that I was involved in. Very nice variation of colors, textures, materials, timbers and what have you. Roof plains. A lot of windows. It's a very popular product. It's very -- you know, they -- they fill them up just as soon as they could -- they could build them and these ones have -- these ones backup -- they are all reloaded. They backup on a -- on a shared driveway. All the utility connections come in through the -- through the driveway. The front door is on a MEW -- common MEW between the -- between the two buildings and it's a -- it's a very nice product. We also have a two story that's more in the center of the development that is a two car garage. They have 20 by 20 concrete pad driveways and, again, they have multiple colors. They have multiple roof plains and textures and -- and, you know, that we are trying to come up with a really cohesive way to tie all of our product together. Our proposed three story product -- it's 24 -- around 24 foot wide, but they are actually 64 foot lots, but we have a 40 foot depth, which includes a two car garage and the -- the 20-20 parking pads on 27 foot wide roads meets the fire code and these have a combination of flat and single pitch roofs and each unit has a private deck. It's on the top. It's on -- it's on the third floor of the front. It's on the second floor in the back -- back ones. So, you have -- you have decks that look out on a MEW and you also have decks on the -- on the backside on the -- on the roadway side itself and it provides a lot of choice for future residents. Our R-8 product is consistent with the R-15 product type that have, you know, similar colors, textures, roof planes, lots of variety. And all of our -- so, we ask for exceptions to the R-15 setbacks as staff showed you, but R-8 product will conform with the -- with the current city -- the city standard of R-8 setbacks. This is our recreation and fitness plan. It illustrates a three-quarter mile loop, using the multi-use pathway connections around the perimeter along the base of the hill, all the way across. It connects to open space -- usable open space all along the way and the yellow dots are the different fitness stations. We have four of those scattered equidistant, basically, around the development -- or throughout the development. We think it's a -- it's a very -- we are marketing to, you know, a new generation fitness based

and recreation based and -- and we have got a lot of opportunity on this -- this unique site, this unique layout for development. So, to get back to the fencing question, condition 3-D speaks to fencing along the -- along the creek. City standard, as the former pathway manager didn't require fences along the creeks themselves, we ran into issues with irrigation districts tearing them up when they were trying to clean out their ditches on occasion and the city's responsible for -- for, you know, repairs at that point. Want to avoid that. So, as a creative solution we believe we still need a fence between public and private space, so we are providing -- we are proposing a five foot wrought iron style fence that goes between every building and, you know, that -- so, that the driveway -- the shared driveway has a -- has a fence setback in -- from the end of the driveway, so you have the landscape buffer between fence and the driveway itself and, then, there is -- there is still a five foot strip at least to the -- that will be landscaped along the pathway itself and, then, there are gates across the MEWs -- there are fences with gates across the MEWs that will allow our -- our residents, future homeowners, to access the multi-use pathway, but still limit public access into their private space and -- and so I'm going to ask for Council's dispensation to say, okay, you don't have to put a fence along the canal side of the pathway itself, because we are going to fence the entire length of the pathway on the private side anyways. So, as I have spoke, we were talking about the architectural design guidelines. Those will be integrated in the CC&Rs, enforced by the HOA, reviewed by the development's future architectural review board. Those haven't been finalized, like I said, because we don't have an agreed upon -- with the city anyways -- as far as what the three story form of that building is going to be. So, those -- I have some modifications to make to that before I can actually submit those and incorporate them into the development agreement. We did provide a draft wildland urban interface fire safety plan. It's a draft, because, again, we need a development plan to be finalized, so that I can augment what I have proposed as a draft and include specific plant materials, building materials, and what have you that will be on the buildings to -- to -- to create that defensible space and setback between the hillside -- the base of the hillside and the homes themselves, plus how -- to set the terms for long term maintenance by the HOA annually, semi-annually it could be -- you know, it could be monthly. But we don't want to -- if we irrigate the hillside, you end up with increased, you know, vegetation. That's -- that's more fuel load -- fire fuel load. So, you know, we are -- we want to -- we want to be safe all the way around and so it will -- it needs to be approved by Meridian Fire, the final iteration, and it, too, will be integrated into the CC&RS and the design review or the design guidelines themselves. So, here are some perspectives that I prepared. They are real scale. The buildings don't show color, because we -- we -- we want the feel of the community more so than -- than just trying to sell the current colors of that -- of the homes and the textures and the materials themselves. So, what it shows that, you know, we do have the Ten Mile Creek that runs the entire east border of the property. We have looked at these pathways and you can see that they are -- just in the distance is the 58 foot rim. There are some -- some homes proposed up there for scale. Back here in the corner these are the only 32 -- these are the only three stories. There are 32 three story lots. Everything else is a two story product. This is our entrance. Future right of way -- right of way improvements that will be landscaped and augmented and we will have a -- you know, we will have a sign. We will have to come back for a sign permit for a sign. So, this -- in the lower left corner -- yeah, lower left corner is our shared driveways, basically.

Well, actually, this is the alley itself. So, you can see you got the alley and you have the parking pads, two car garages, and -- and, you know, it's -- we want to have landscape between the driveways as well. So, it's not just a sea of asphalt or concrete for that matter. And, then, this is looking down a MEW in the -- in the lower right corner. Looking at the MEW and you can see it's actually larger than -- than you think it is and it will be very nicely landscaped. And, then, in the upper left corner we show the new three story product and this is the -- the two story product. You have just on the right side of that two story product is where the new open space that we put in with the tot lot and the open play area. You can see that the three story -- even three story is still really commiserate with the -- with the top of -- the roof on a two story is. So, it's not like a big scale issue. It blends and will work out pretty good and in the -- in the upper right corner you can see the open play area. We will leave the trees on the perimeter. We have a tot lot and, then, we have some different views from different aspects that -- down from the bridge looking at the hill, that's -- that's -- you can see the three story houses are still way below what the elevation of the top of the ridge is. They are kind of hidden. It's a great place to have a different product. With that, you know, we feel our proposal complies with the comp plan, it complies with the development code. It's compatible with existing and planned future developments in the vicinity. We have Lake Hazel is a mobility corridor. That's why on the Comprehensive Plan, the future land use map, it's -- it's projected to be medium high residential because of the mobility corridor and we are trying to meet that standard and provide a development that isn't multi-family, it's single family. That's what we -- what we want to hang our hat on. We have neighborhood -- we have street connection to the neighboring -- neighboring properties. We provide exceptional recreational opportunities and open space and we provide a unique housing type that gets to the next generation. So, with that I will stand for questions.

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

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you for being here this evening, Jay. That was a -- a well -- excuse me -- a very well done presentation. Thank you. Appreciate that. I have three -- three questions for you if I may and you can -- or you can respond to them -- I'm sorry, I have a frog in my throat tonight. Excuse me. You can respond to them in whatever order you prefer. The first one is -- is just curious about why this -- this level of density in this location. I have seen a few of these types of properties in south Boise that are not -- not close to services and this one as well. It's not really going to be within walking distance of services. We have a really good idea of what's going in surrounding this property and I'm just curious why this -- this level of density somewhere where there is -- it's walkable within the development itself, but it's really not walkable, you know, outside of it, with the exception of maybe going up to the YMCA and just -- just want to know your thoughts on that, what -- was it just the geography and the challenges of the property itself that caused this amount of density to go in? I guess I'm just trying to -- there is something about it that -- that makes me feel like it doesn't quite fit in this location. So, I'm trying to reconcile

that. And, secondly, also curious about concerns regarding parking. So, I noticed on the maps that some of these units are going to be over 2,000 square feet and in the -- in the application present -- the application letter, the summary that was sent, it says that this is well suited for young professionals and empty nesters. So, I guess I'm trying to just understand a four bedroom, 2,200 square foot home, that fits that type of demographic and if -- you know, if it's the young professional and they have two or three roommates that also have vehicles, where do we put four vehicles and that kind of thing, especially on -- in the units that don't even have a 20 by 20 driveway. And, then, my third question is who is regulating the parking concerns on private roads? So, I would anticipate that the homeowners association is doing so, but what -- you know, what is going to be established, what's going to be put in place if, you know, a neighbor with a three-quarter ton parks in front of my house and I'm getting ready to leave for work kind of thing. I think that question is probably -- probably pretty clear. So, if you wouldn't mind answering those, I appreciate it.

Gibbons: You bet. Mr. Mayor, Council Person Perreault, so first question as far as density is concerned and why -- why we have this much density is -- is, like I said, Lake Hazel is a mobility corridor. It's the only road on the south side of the freeway that connects from Gowen Road all the way to Robinson Road in Nampa and so also, you know, it's -- the city's Comprehensive Plan drove this -- this density at this point and it's been asked as to why, but -- but it's because it's a mobility corridor and so that you could get more density if you went to multi-family homes or multi-family apartments, but we want to bring families here. We want to bring, you know, young -- young people that don't have families that come -- I'm over 55, I would like one of these potentially. I'm tired mowing two acres of lawn at this point in my life, but -- so, the density was -- was driven by the city's wishes to have a higher density in -- in this particular location, as between, you know, basically, the three properties, you have got the church property that has a plan, our property, and the property to the -- to the west of us, those properties are all in the medium high density district according to the comp plan and if we proposed single family eight or ten thousand square foot residences, we can -- we couldn't comply with the -- with the comp plan. It would be same ol, same ol, basically. But we wanted to provide a unique style for a different lifestyle and, you know, the site is quite challenged typography, as well as -- you know, you have got the Ten Mile drain and it's 50 plus easement, it's entirely -- our property line is on the east side of the ditch. It's all across our property. Can't develop in the floodplain. It does have a floodplain. And so it's just challenging. But this is -- this is where -- where we found a happy medium to work within the city's comp plan and with staff in order to make this development work within code. As -- as far as your question parking wise, yes, that -- that original -- my original narrative was based on the plan that we had. We had a ton of parking lots all along the base of the hill there. There was parking where the -- the three roads were, four or five and six, that now there is two that are around the three stories. We -- Planning and Zoning Commission wanted to see more green space and we didn't need that level of parking per se, plus we added a new product type that had -- that had, you know, driveways and they actually -- you know, they have doors to enter off the product type -- you can get in -- you know, guests can come in through the -- the door off the driveway, as well as the front door off the MEW. So, I think we have a happy medium. We do have -- we have parking all along the -- the 33 foot

road, which is the major road that runs kind of southeast or northwest. But also to that -- there are no private roads. They are all public roads. We do have alleys and we do have shared driveways. But all the roadways are public roads. So, the HOA isn't -- isn't who is going to drive the parking requirements. ACHD has also required that we -- we have no parking signs in particular locations to ensure that shared driveways don't get blocked or that people don't park on the 27 foot roads. There is no parking on the roads around the -- around the three story units themselves. So, we really -- when we first developed this concept we -- we -- because of what we saw in Eagle, didn't require a lot of parking, we wanted to add a lot of parking, so we purposely made wider roads and have parking less to do that. We -- we changed the plan, because the Planning and Zoning Commission asked us to. And, actually, you know, it was an improvement. So, did I answer all your questions?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Yes, I believe so. Thank you so much. I know I threw a lot at you. So, I -- yeah. Just, you know, we -- as you know, federal requirements don't allow -- don't allow property -- real estate to be marketed to a particular demographic and so you have to just kind of be prepared for whatever type of individual or family wants to purchase in an area. So, I always want to make sure that we have covered all of the possible issues. So, thank you very much.

Gibbons: That's why we added the tot lot as well, because you don't know who your future market will be.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: A couple questions for Mr. Gibbons. Jay, are there any 20-by-18 driveways that -- that remain? I know that was an issue. Are they all 20-by-20, which I think is the required size?

Gibbons: Mr. Mayor, Councilman, yes, all -- all -- all the driveway parking pads are 20-by-20.

Hoaglun: Great. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: And the other question --

Gibbons: Originally -- originally some of them were drawn at 18-by-20 and staff pointed that out. So, when we updated the plan there was -- everything's 20-by-20.

Hoaglun: Great. Thank you. And follow up, if you might, Jay. On the single family site on top of the hill, I think I heard Sonya mention that that hillside is, you know, a 40 percent slope, which is -- which is quite steep and, of course, with homes up against that there is that out of sight, out of mind mentality. Is -- is the homeowners association going to be in charge of preventing dumping or having homeowners clean up if they want to dump grass and leaves and trash over the back fence going down the hill, which also represents a fire hazard, but how will that be enforced?

Gibbons: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Hoaglun, that -- yes, that is -- that is part of the CC&Rs, as well as the firewise plan, which will be part of the CC&Rs. There won't be any dumping and the HOA is certainly responsible to enforce those.

Hoaglun: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Thank you, Jay.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thanks, Mr. Mayor. Jay, great seeing you. Appreciate you being here tonight. Interesting presentation. Interesting product. I'm hoping you can talk a little bit about kind of the phasing plan, recognizing phase four is -- is somewhat required on the connection piece, but in terms of phases one, two, and three, how quickly do you or your -- your employer plan to start building?

Gibbons: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Cavener, so, yes, the R-8, the fourth phase, that is entirely dependent on others. We are -- we are not in a hurry for that. We can -- we can only develop phase one, which is basically from Lake Hazel down around the loop -- the first loop there, that's our phase one. Can't go beyond that until we have secondary access, which -- which means building a bridge across the creek and so initially, you know, we are going to turn around and get a final plat together and -- and -- and move on -- on phase one as -- as fast as we can. Also one other challenge with Ten Mile Creek in the floodplain is that until the development to the north -- Brighton replaces that culvert across the road and -- and that culvert is intended to reduce the flood potential, that's -- that's the -- that's what backs up at the moment and drains like so many other culverts throughout the city on Five Mile Creek and Ten Mile Creek and others. Until a LOMAR is adopted, you know, that -- that's a -- that's a process, it's -- it's underway, but it's going to take some time before we can build anything, even in phase one, along the creek itself. So, we are limited by a lot of neighboring development at the same time and so, you know, as much as I would like to say, yeah, we would like to build it out in the next five years, is that feasible given all the pieces falling into place. Maybe not. We might have to stop a little bit, but, you know, we are prepared for it. My -- my owner and developer are very interested in specifically the product type and the potential for what it brings to the area and so that's -- you know, they would love to build it as fast as they could, but we will see -- we will see how it shakes out.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?



Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Jay, being real frank, if you guys are slower on this it makes me feel better. I think the product type is really unique. I do have just some concerns about firestorms to the slope. Without a doubt the impact on the schools. Obviously, we know we have got some roadway improvements that are coming down the pipe, but to be able to get a good sense about what this looks like calendar wise for you is helpful.

Gibbons: Councilman Cavener, one thing about the schools, too, is that they came out in -- in the first hearing is that technically there are two schools, one on Lake Hazel to the west and one someplace -- and I'm not sure that it's the high school on Amity, but there are two -- two schools in the pipeline to be built already. I don't know the exact locations, but that -- that takes some of the heat off as far as schools are concerned. The road improvements -- as you know road improvements only come with development anyways, but there are -- there are a number of improvements that we have because of the traffic study that we -- that we conducted and had approved by ACHD. There is a number of improvements that we are going to have to do as part of the development plan anyway. Including, a bunch of right of way, but -- but improving the road itself is one of them.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you very much, Mr. Gibbons. We -- in the past the city has had several areas that have been redesignated into federal floodplains and it's caused a big headache with homeowners. Certainly with their ability to improve their properties to get out of a flood just really has caused some bad situations. Can you give us a feeling for what kind of construction you are imagining? Are you going to be grading this? Like how are you going to handle the proximity to Ten Mile? And, then, I guess maybe a follow-up question to what Mr. Cavener is asking -- or just a statement. I'm of the same mindset. Schools are really far over capacity and like a source of frustration for me is that I don't think we are building in a projection on the absorption of the students that we have already approved in developments that are coming up and so I look at this like 400 overcapacity to me may not be a realistic number. Would you be comfortable limiting your phasing in some way or agreeing to develop in certain phases, you know, at different milestones, maybe along with our Fire Department, or something along those lines that would give us some assurance about when each phase will happen?

Gibbons: Mayor, Councilman -- or Council Person Strader, as far as the floodplain is concerned and improvements to the property itself, part of -- so, we have got to treat our -- our -- our storm drainage on site and that means that the -- that the runway has to be three foot above the highest groundwater. We do have high groundwater, so we are going to have to raise -- we are going to have to do a lot of raising of the site as well. It's going to also help our future homebuilding efforts as far as getting them out of the floodplain. So, those things will be addressed when our -- our engineer starts his work on the -- on the final plat itself for constructing utilities and what have you. But, you know, that's --

that's one of the challenges. There is also -- you know, there is -- the geotech report pointed out, you know, we have high groundwater and we have -- it's been historically pasture and so there is -- there is going to have to be a lot of -- a lot of grading to shore up the structural stability of the soil itself, too. So, as far as grading and the floodplain is concerned, when it's all said and done we will have adequately protected our future residents from the flood -- floodplain,. Future improvements across Ten Mile will certainly help that as well and we also want to play -- play well with -- with our neighbors and our future residents, our neighboring properties and the city at large. Remind me what your second question was.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I was curious if you would be open to tying your development agreement to like some type of a phasing plan in terms of timing. At least that would make me feel more comfortable. I can only speak as one Council person here. If all these homes were delivered within a year I would be extremely uncomfortable. I don't think that's your plan. But I would be really uncomfortable. I'm uncomfortable from a fire perspective, first and foremost, like the five minute safety thing to me is kind of a hard line. I have been having a very hard time going past that five minute marker. I just feel like if we are making exceptions all the time what's the point of having a standard and so if you could tie your phasing to fire access and we are building a new fire station, that might make me feel better or if you wanted to just create some type of milestones of when you are going to build each phase over time. For me it's really schools and fire are my number one concerns. And, then, just in general this location. You have got the wildfire risk. You have got the floodplain. You know, hats off to you, you have certainly got grit, you are not afraid of the -- of the biblical risks of this location, but I -- yeah, I -- I -- I have faith that you can figure those things out. Your answer previously gave me some comfort. But I just -- I do have concerns in general about the location as well, so --

Gibbons: Mr. Mayor, Council Person Strader, so a development agreement is somewhat a negotiation between the city and a property owner-developer that guides that development and -- and I believe that -- that we can -- we can certainly work with the city to come up with a phasing or milestones or whatever that takes. I don't know what those are and -- and it may be a moving target a little bit, but we can -- we can certainly sit down and -- and we can figure that out. It's a -- it's a challenging sight all by itself, so -- so, making so much adjustments to the -- to the phasing plan and, you know, building pattern and what have you, yeah, by all means. Let's do it.

Strader: Thank you.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you, Mr. Gibbons, for stating that. I agree with Councilman Strader's concerns. They are the same exact concerns I had as I was reviewing this preparing for the meeting and I would also be very much in favor of a phasing plan. I realize you can't give specific dates, you don't know that yet, but just have a general idea of a timeline that might meet some of what the city is already working on in terms of providing services to that area.

Gibbons: Mr. Mayor, Council Person Perreault, yeah, that's -- you know, I'm not familiar at the moment with what the status of Fire Station No. 8 is or, you know, the school plan or, you know, the school's funding plan, which is always a wild card in everything, too. But, yeah, if we can -- if we can, you know, sit down and share some information and we have worked very closely with -- with Fire Chief Bongiorno to date getting to this point and his -- his comments and his direction helped us, you know, lay out the roads and the phasing in the first place. So, between staff, Council, and Fire Department and whatever we can -- we can certainly, you know, come up with some guidelines.

Simison: Jay, just out of curiosity, the -- what impact, if any, is there if you are never able to develop phase four from the -- what is offered to the residents here? You -- as you said before, you have no control over the access based on the -- whatever develops up on the north side and while -- or, I'm sorry, in the south up on the bluff, but let's say that's 30 years out before that property ever develops just for whatever reason, how does that impact this development in your opinion?

Gibbons: Mr. Mayor, as far as the R-8 itself is concerned and because of the access challenges for that matter -- and there is no existing home up there at the moment. Granted that access will be cut off, because it comes down a massive cut and fill graded road down to Lake Hazel and, you know, access through another neighboring property, you know, a driveway into a driveway, basically, is certainly possible and until that point -- if it never develops, if -- it is not make or break for the rest of the development plan. It is -- what we really show from the -- and the reason we have R-8 up there in the first place is because that's kind of what the exist -- what the potential development -- we have been through two developers and two different developments -- three different development plans for that south property to date just getting to this point and they have been before us and ahead of us in the -- in the -- in the city process twice and I found out tonight they have been withdrawn again. So, you know, that -- that top of the hill can sit, it's got -- it's got the existing house that could remain in perpetuity for that matter.

Simison: But from a practical --

Gibbons: But we have a plan. If -- if we get access we have a plan on what -- you know, what this piece of property can become.

Simison: But from a practical standpoint HOA costs, amenities, none of that is -- how much of that, to your knowledge, would be impacted? None?

Gibbons: Mr. Mayor, not -- not a whole lot. You see that -- you know, there -- there are three or four pieces of open space connections and, really, if nobody lives up there and all we have is an existing house up there, we don't necessarily have the connections that -- that -- that need to go to the roads per se, we could -- you could simply -- you could actually, you know, connect the trail across and it wouldn't -- it wouldn't impact it. So, it's not a huge expense to -- to the -- to the homeowners association beyond, you know, maybe vegetation control to the -- to the existing vegetation, as well as the native vegetation that's up around the house itself, so --

Simison: Okay. Thank you.

Bongiorno: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Yes, Deputy Chief.

Bongiorno: I was just going to follow up with what Jay was saying. If -- if that property isn't developed, it still has to be maintained by the fire code. So, they can't just let it run rampant with weeds or anything like that. Code Enforcement wouldn't allow it and it would -- it would have to be maintained, especially in this area with that hillside, we would -- we would want to make sure the hillside and that upper area are taken care of via the fire plan. That plan would just include that area until it's developed.

Simison: Okay. Thank you. That was kind of what I was getting to is if you remove those homes from an HOA perspective cost, amenity element, how does that impact the rest of the plan for the people that are going to live there. Costs and maintain elements that -- just curious. It is buyer beware as always when -- with what those costs are, but --

Gibbons: Mr. Mayor, I don't believe that it would be cost prohibitive to maintain them. Basically the R-8 on top of the bluff from -- you know, from a fire perspective, vegetation control and what have you, that's -- that's -- compared to what's happening on the valley floor and amount of green space and manicured lawns and things that are down around the homes and stuff, minimal maintenance on top of the hill from -- from that perspective is -- is -- I don't have -- I can't give you a dollar figure, but it's not -- it's not a big amount. Provides more open space.

Simison: Council, any additional questions for the applicant?

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor. Confirmation on the -- on the fence along the waterway on the east boundary. Did you -- Jay, just remind me. Did you say that you were going to put up a fence or not?

Gibbons: Mr. Mayor, Councilman, we are going to have a fence on the -- on the -- on the home side all along Ten Mile. We are proposing not to put a fence on the other side --

Bernt: Okay.

Gibbons: -- next to the waterway itself. Most of the -- the rest of the city's pathways -- existing pathways that run along the drains and creeks are our natural flowing, low volume, and you will see -- typically you will have fences at the -- you know, the backs of the residential lots that backup to the pathway, but there isn't another -- another fence between the waterway and the pathway. I know of one instance where there is and the irrigation district hates it, because they got to reach across it and it tears everything up, it's in the way, and so we -- we -- we still want a fence, but we want to separate the -- you know, the -- the residential lot owners, the homeowners, private -- quasi-public private, you know, MEWs and what have you from the public pathway itself. So, it will still be fenced for safety reasons, but --

Bernt: One last question for you, Jay. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: You had requested that final design guidelines for the development be considered after this meeting this -- tonight and I think you answered the question of why that was the case. Do you need any further guidance in regard to that from -- from this body or are you comfortable with some -- do you have what you need to submit if -- if -- if there is no changes at all? And, if so, do you have what that looks like?

Gibbons: Mr. Mayor, Councilman, my issue with not having them at this point was we didn't have a three story product that -- that the city had voiced any support for previously, other than, you know, a concept and so I kind of needed to hear from Council as to whether -- you know, if you hated the elevations for the three -- three story product that we presented or, you know, the two story product or the similar three story product that we presented tonight that you saw from staff, then, you know, back to the drawing board there, then, we kind of got to hold onto the design guidelines, but unless you have -- have serious heartburn over -- over what we presented, then, yeah, we can go -- have that information and go forward and pull it all together. I have to come back with a development agreement anyway.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Mr. Gibbons, I -- I like the elevations of the three story. Could you give us just -- I apologize, I don't know the background of -- I did read that the -- that the Commission was in favor of that, but can you give us some further insight into how that benefits the whole development in terms of does it allow for additional space for -- if I understood from

your comment earlier that this will have a 20-by-20 driveway on these products; is that right? Where it didn't have that on the -- on the two stories?

Gibbons: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman --

Perreault: What's the benefits of this versus the other?

Gibbons: Yes. So -- and this is -- so, code requires you have, you know, 85 feet -- or 80 feet of, you know, private open space where each -- each lot -- which typically consists of a stoop or a patio on the MEW or what have you and we showed a concept -- we showed three concepts of a three -- with three different products at P&Z and they really liked the potential to have a three story unit that had, you know, a private elevated deck space and so we reached out to an architecture consultant to work with this over the past couple of weeks to put together some -- some new concepts and this is kind of what she came up with and it's -- it's an interesting product and it does have the private deck space elevated up on a roof and, you know, we can work in the similar design elements and materials and treatments, colors, what have you in the design guidelines just to make these and the two story all fit together and so, you know, that's what we were trying to accomplish and they do have -- they do have two car garages and they do have -- because they are only 40 feet deep, the buildings themselves, and, then, I have room on a 65 foot lot to put a 20 by 20 parking pad. So, I have -- you know, I have now a four -- a four bedroom, three story house, basically, because I have four parking spaces or I can have less bedrooms and have guest parking on my property for that matter.

Simison: Council, any additional questions?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Maybe just a comment. I really like the three story. I -- it's a -- it's a different product than we usually get here. I like that it's tucked in on the ridge. I think that -- that kind of makes it a little easier. It does block people's views. Generally like having a different kind of product. So, that -- that aspect I do like. Yeah. I -- I'm in favor personally of that look.

Simison: Okay. Thank you very much. This is a public hearing. Madam Clerk, do we have anyone signed up to provide testimony on this item?

Weatherly: Mr. Mayor, we had four people sign in, none of which indicated a wish to testify.

Simison: Okay. If there is anybody that would like to testify on this item -- we have nobody in the -- in the room, but if you are on the Zoom line and you would like to testify, please, use the raise your hand feature at the bottom of the zoom platform, so that we can identify you and bring you in to provide testimony. And if you are on the phone you can use star

nine to unmute yourself and be brought in to be able to provide testimony on this item as well. Council, it appears we have no one who would like to testify on this item. So, would the applicant like to make any final comments?

Gibbons: Mr. Mayor, I -- I will stand on our discussion and my -- my presentation and comments earlier. Hopefully I addressed your concerns and your questions appropriately. And other than, you know, the condition 3-D with the -- with the -- requiring a fence on the path -- on the creek side of the pathway and the DA requirement, we have no issues with the rest of the conditions.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Jay, would you recommend that we modify conditioned 3-D, rather than eliminate it, but modify the language to account for what you described in your presentation? There is wrought iron fencing, it's just not located -- but to change that language to capture what you have presented?

Gibbons: Councilman Borton, that -- that is what I would propose is to modify 3-D, but -- but modify it to accept the wrought iron style fencing five foot -- and it's detailed on the -- on the landscape and fencing plan.

Borton: Okay. Thank you.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: And to that point, you know, as -- in our neighborhood we have the Five Mile Creek and the pathway system that runs along there and -- and there is no comparison -- from what I recall from being out in that area, you know, that has lots of weeds and cattails and different things and Five Mile is -- is a flowing, deeper type of waterway and we don't require any fencing of any sort between the pathway and that waterway. Again, to Jay's point, the irrigation district doesn't like it and it kind of separates you from that -- from that -- that part that makes it nice being along water and kids play down there and whatnot -- and I wouldn't let really young kids play down there, but -- so, I don't see the need to have that fencing when we don't require it under waterways that are faster flowing and deeper. So, I think that makes sense to me if we just go to a condition that notates the wrought iron fencing that would be in place there. And I don't have any issues, I don't think, with the inclusion of the design for -- for the DA after looking at that. You know, that's a matter of taste, do you like modern, do not like it, but having something like that -- I think Council Woman Strader, you know, put it well, but the location and how it fits the typography and whatnot and -- and that makes sense. So, I don't have any issues with that either.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Maybe a question for Sonya about the fence requirement from staff. Can you just give us a little bit of background as to what germinated that requirement?

Allen: Yes. Mr. Mayor, Councilman Cavener, it is a -- it -- it's a requirement in our code that if we feel it needs to protect public safety -- preserve public safety that fencing be provided. I didn't want it to be my call, but code calls it out as a director -- a Public Works director or the City Council decision.

Simison: And just in that area, I can tell you that it's hit or miss further downstream or upstream as you flow up through Tuscany where we have sections which have no fencing requirement, but the homes have fences and further down where you have a fence between the pathway and the waterway in other sections. So, it's not a consistently applied principle in this area one way or the other. Along Ten Mile anyways.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Question maybe for -- for Sonya. If we decide to work on some kind of a phasing plan -- you know, I'm not sure what that would look like. It sounded like a couple of Council Members might be in favor of that. How would staff recommend that we achieve that? Would it be best to do that at a later development agreement and have Council give guidance or how -- how would they recommend that we go about doing that?

Allen: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, Council, you know, if Council wants to weigh in on it the project should be continued probably. The issue is, as I understand it, the Fire Department doesn't have funding as of yet to construct the fire station. So, I -- I think it's going to be a difficult thing to do. As well as for the school enrollment to know how to phase the project at this point based on those concerns.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I guess I would be curious to get the Fire Department's feedback on when they think the new fire station would be delivered at the earliest, assuming it did get funding, in order to have a -- you know, put some guardrails around an idea. Personally -- I'm just throwing an idea out there and maybe get the applicant's feedback. I mean if we said, you know, we don't want more than one phase delivered per year, would that be something they would be amenable to? So, I guess I would look for feedback from both the Fire Department and the applicant.



Bongiorno: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, the -- the tentative -- if everything was to move forward with -- we have the design going right now for seven and eight. If they were funded and staffed, I believe Chief Butterfield told me that it would be later in 2023 when they could be up and running.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I certainly don't want this conversation to get into the weeds or to, you know, funding of different fire stations and when -- when those stations might happen and if they don't happen. I don't -- I just want to say that I don't -- I don't believe that those decisions have been made and I believe that those decisions will be made this next year. I don't even think that there is decisions that have been made -- concrete decisions that have been made in regard to where seven and eight will be. I know that staff continues to call station eight in south Meridian and -- and station seven in north Meridian, but those decisions haven't been made yet and so I think it's real important that we take pause before we start, you know, preemptively talking about where fire stations may or may not be or -- or if these fire stations will even be built. So, I think that having this discussion right now in regard to fire stations is -- is very much premature. I don't know how you could -- I don't know how we could answer those questions right now personally.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Well, I think that's a great point and I think that's what I'm feeling uncomfortable about and what I can't really wrap my head around. I guess what I'm wondering that if there is even a precedent for City Council approving a phase of a project without annexing the whole thing or how we could go about trying to -- trying to do that. I -- I'm open to all ideas and being creative. I totally agree with Councilman Bernt. I just -- I'm trying to find a way to get to a yes and I -- I'm just uncomfortable right now with the idea that we could have this, you know, three -- three phases of this project with what I think are different risks than usual, different topography than usual, three story buildings and possibly be outside of the five minutes. I -- I'm just -- I wish there was a way we could try to address it.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Question maybe for Mr. Nary. Mr. Nary, if the Council was supportive, could we approve this project, but include a limit on building permits being issued until either a date certain or until a fire station -- again, whatever -- whatever the reason Council decided was -- was established. Are we able to do that?

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, Council Member Cavener, well, certainly if the -- if the applicant is going to agree to that we can. I mean if that's a condition of a development agreement and they won't agree to it they won't sign it and, then, we won't annex the property. The one thing I want to caution the Council on is -- and Council Member Strader made this comment -- this is not a fire department standard, it's a fire department goal and it is a goal that is met and not met all over the city for various reasons and so it's -- it would concern me if that was the sole reason you didn't like this project. It doesn't sound like it is. But I want to be sure that I make it clear that it's got to be more than just this five minute goal that we have. Is it in the best interest of the city if you can't provide fire protection to the degree that you all are comfortable with from a public safety standpoint. So, that's just the difference between that. So, the limitation -- again, as Councilman Cavener is asking, we can do that. I don't know -- I'm not sure how to do it. I'm not sure what metric we would put in a -- in a contract that would be something that the applicant would be comfortable with, too, because, again, they would, then, be putting their risk on the city's building program.

Bongiorno: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, on that point, when we -- when Jay and I were working on this phasing plan, phase one -- and I don't know if you want to show them, Jay, which area that is for the first phase. That -- that's that big chunk that falls within our five minute response time. Our goal, as the Mayor -- Mayor stated -- or Treg mentioned. Basically I call it the racetrack. That -- that horseshoe area is -- is the area that's in phase one that I was comfortable with with the access that we had. The other part of the -- the factor that we need to look at was the reliability rating of Station 4, which right now is -- other than Station 1 is one of our lower reliability rating -- rated stations and, then, on top of that the next closest fire station is Station 14 in Boise and they have the exact same reliability rating that Station 4 does. So, they are really not a whole bunch of help, but we are in that same boat there. So, that's what I would be looking at as far as phasing goes. Again, like -- like Treg said, this is -- this is -- it's a goal and that's the goal -- or sorry. Bill Nary mentioned it's a goal and we like to keep that goal and, then, on top of that we also look at our reliability rating of the station.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I mean to elaborate on my comments, I don't think that there is something written in stone that says if you are outside of five minutes it's a red light and if you are inside of five minutes it's a green light, but I think as a responsible member of City Council that we should have adequate fire services and to me I personally am looking at it through a framework of a fire response time and so that's just how I'm looking at it and I'm planning to stick to it.

Simison: And just so -- from a practical -- or from a -- you all will see this at some point in time in the not too distant future, but from a CFP standpoint, first station is 2023, which would be October of '23. Second station is 2025, which would be October 25, where they are, to Councilman Bernt's point, not determined, whether or not they meet those years,

undetermined, but if they both want the same time October 23 would be your general expected time frame.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: My thoughts on -- on fire response times and -- and to me it comes down to access, which I think Deputy Chief Bongiorno has pointed out, you know, phase one has access, it has emergency access, and, then, from there it is dependent upon other property owners on what that access and the timing of that access will be and if those things aren't developed and -- and hearing from the applicant that this is going to take a while for these phases to be developed, you know, I think comments from Council Woman Strader and Councilman Cavener about that helps, you know, that -- that does help with everything that is going on with roads, with schools, with fire stations, that timing. The difficulty is -- and I appreciate Council Woman Strader's enthusiasm to try and let's quantify that and see if we can make that work. In my mind as I try to work -- work it through, it -- it's exceedingly difficult and I don't know if we can come to anything that would be satisfactory when it's based on other properties and access and having that safety factor of getting vehicles in and out to respond to an emergency. So, I'm more reliant on how this phases out over time and having that ability to respond appropriately in having -- with having the right access. So, less so than -- than being right there at five minutes, but having that access and that ability to respond.

Simison: Just to also comment on one other thing, that I -- I am meeting with the superintendent this week. I know that they have activated a full-time boundary committee and one of the questions I plan on bringing -- bringing up with her is what is going to be their threshold for determining when those boundary committees should re-adjust school boundaries, because I think to the point that part of this is -- we have had this conversation. The school district controls some aspects of, you know, the overcrowding at any school or development based on adjusting their boundaries, but what is their willingness to do so and how does that impact these decisions. But that may be something that we can -- I can get at least some direction from them on that in the future. So, you -- Council has a comfort level of making approvals when schools are already overcrowded to know how the district or when the district plans to look at those and make those adjustments. I don't think that there is an overcrowding amongst -- there is -- there is still seats within high schools within West Ada that they would not be over enrollment at the high school level to my knowledge. But I will try to get at least some guidance for future conversations. It doesn't help you today, but just so you are aware.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: One last question from me. This question is for Chief Bongiorno. Question for you, buddy. So, at the end where the -- where the boundary stops, where our five minute

goal is in phase one, how long would it take to get a firetruck at the furthest point in the subdivision? Are we talking 20 seconds, 30 seconds, ten seconds? What is that -- and I'm not even talking about phase four, that's a completely different conversation that I don't even know how you would be able to quantify that right now, but just thinking -- sorry, Luke. I know what you want. I can read your mind. From section one, two and three, at the end of phase one how long would it take to get a firetruck to -- like end of phase three? Is that better, Luke? Can you hear me?

Cavener: Maybe the rim is a good -- I think a good example.

Bongiorno: Mr. Mayor? Mr. Mayor, Council Member Bernt, it would probably be like another minute, minute and a half. I mean, again, it's -- it all varies on weather and -- you know, it's a variable number. Like that's a total guess, but I would guess another minute, minute and a half over the road running code.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor, one follow up.

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: Chief, we are talking about more than a minute, though, for sure. I mean we are not talking about ten or 15 or 20 seconds. We are not talking seconds, we are talking -- we are talking over a minute; is that correct?

Bongiorno: Yeah. Probably another minute, minute and a half.

Bernt: Okay.

Bongiorno: Yeah. And, then, the whole reason -- sorry. Mr. Mayor, Council Member Bernt. The whole reason we did phase one where it was was because I was comfortable with the access and, then, phase two, that's where that bridge would have to come in and so we would have to see at what -- where the construction is on the -- the project that was approved to the east of there, because they have to have that access completed before they can build phase two and three. So, that -- that is a condition of them building phase two and three from me was they have to have that bridge built and access completed. So, they are kind of stuck there until that bridge is built.

Simison: Deputy Chief, not to question your judgment, but -- I mean this is less than a quarter mile from -- I mean I'm looking like a -- maybe an eighth of a mile -- 700 feet. You are saying it takes us a minute to a minute and a half to drive 700 feet at code?

Bongiorno: Well, you -- you have to remember a minute I think what is appropriate, but you are also -- you are looking for addresses. You are trying to find -- you are trying to read street signs. I mean it's not just -- and stop. You slow down as you get closer, because you got to try and figure out where you are going.

Simison: Right. Deputy Chief, I guess my point -- you would be doing that at the top of this horseshoe -- the same equation exists where ever you are going to stop.

Bongiorno: True.

Simison: So, if you -- but if you are only driving another 700 feet, you are transitioning that decision 700 feet down the road -- I guess that's my -- when I look at it it's like is that really accurate that it takes us that long to drive 700 additional feet down a straight road.

Bongiorno: Like I said, it was a guess.

Simison: Yeah. Okay.

Bongiorno: So, a minute. It's going to take time and it's not -- it's not -- it's not seconds, I can tell you that. It's probably about a minute to get down that road farther. Again, you got to look at traffic, you got to look at weather. There is variables that are unknown. Plus the other thing we have to look at is if Station 4 is not in quarters, then, it's -- it's a moot point anyway.

Simison: Correct.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I just wanted to make sure that my microphone worked.

Simison: I'm looking for any motions or additional conversation from Council.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I don't know how much more conversation we want to have, but I'm happy to at least kind of share where I am on this is I really like the concept, I really like the project, I just have some real general concerns about the impact of this project in this part of Meridian right now. So, as it's presented I'm not supportive of it at this time. I don't know how the rest of you all feel, but we are all quiet, so I figured -- if others feel differently, I'm really open to hearing some of that feedback and maybe seeing something differently that I'm not.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Been somewhat quiet. I appreciate the dialogue. It's a project that I haven't had in prep for today and nothing today necessarily changed it, a concern that would lead me to not want to move forward and approve it. I think all of the discussion is well taken for sure, but it seems to certainly fit with the type of plan that we intended there, the -- the comp plan, the future land use map. I thought the diversity of housing, I thought it was unique and creative and I thought that the applicant seemed to respond well to P&Z's concerns. I asked a question about the fencing, which I thought was an adequate remedy there and -- and having staff address the design guidelines through the DA didn't cause me any particular concerns. So, it doesn't mean that -- that the concerns raised aren't valid concerns, but I just felt like the applicant met what's necessary for this project in my eyes to proceed. So, I -- I didn't have concern with it.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, I think it's been a good discussion. There is a lot of issues here and all of the comments are valid and worthy of consideration. We wrestle with this quite a bit in a lot of different locations and it's -- they aren't easy decisions, because the points are -- are very valid. You know, I do look at this site with that phasing plan and thinking, okay, that -- that is what works for here and this is a difficult site to develop with the -- where it is up against the hill, with the Ten Mile Creek and the issues that are with that, and will we get something better down the road or will we get something worse and it -- when I look at all the issues the applicant has addressed, they figured out a way to address the Commission issues and staff issues and I'm thinking that -- that is a critical component to this. If they didn't figure those out that -- that becomes a different ballgame to me. But they figured them out, they will phase it in a way that will work I think and it's just -- I know where I'm going with the fire station in our community and where they have to be located and making that a priority, because they are needed, whether it's north or south, we need more fire stations and that is something that we will be talking about here in the near future. But for me I can be supportive of this -- of this project with -- with the plan moving forward and with the changes that we can make to it. But I think overall it's a good concept and I think Councilman Borton pointed out that it -- it is -- it does fit what we require for -- for this area. So, you don't like going -- going back and making changes on people when they put in what -- what we want for particular areas in development. So, that's where -- where I am on this right now. Thanks.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I love the project. I think it's a really great addition to this area of Meridian if it's built. I -- I guess what it comes down to is -- is a philosophical thing that I have been thinking about a lot. Is it better to get the right project in the right place or is it better to make sure that we are ready for the right project and that we have adequate, you know, services -- especially safety services for an area. If we could have found a way I think

with staff's help to be more creative, especially on future applications with phasing and we had a way to either have milestones or a way -- a way to do that, I would have been all over yes on phase one and yes on phase two and the fire department signed off that we had adequate fire services there, but if we can't have a phasing plan, I just don't feel like it's the responsible thing to do to approve this. It's not just the five minute response time, which I understand is a goal, but it's having an adequate response time. The fact that we have three story buildings and the fact that it's near an area that we already know has an increased risk for wildfires, I just don't feel good about approving it without some kind of guardrails around a phasing plan, unfortunately. But it may very well move forward and I -- I do love the product and think that it would be a beautiful addition to Meridian.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Well, I guess I will go next. So, it isn't often that we get to this point in the hearing where I'm still a bit on the fence. I usually have -- I'm really leaning one way or the other. I can completely see both sides of the considerations. Excellent points made by my fellow Council Members. I don't -- there are some things about this project that I really like and some things that I don't like, but as far as what's best for Meridian, I feel like this is just a couple years too early and it really has nothing to do with the designs of the homes, the renderings -- I mean we -- we talked through all of that this evening through the movement of traffic and the sizes of the -- of the residences, all those kinds of things. I mean there is some -- you know, this is designed about as well as you can possibly -- possibly get I think with all the limitations that are created here. I do appreciate that the applicant has said that if phase four does not happen it won't -- it won't affect the rest of the phases. I -- I -- to be candid, I -- I lived through the downturn in real estate and I saw a lot of these types of properties that were contingent on the development of the property around it or contingent on a particular service that needed to come in that didn't and, then, the economy changed and, then, a portion of the development was finished and a portion wasn't and this property has a lot of what ifs, a lot of the -- you know -- you know, this has to happen -- the south side has to -- the development to the south has to develop for that connection or the development to the east has to develop this connection and I just -- there is so many of those in this and I -- I -- like Council Woman Strader, I'm really struggling with getting an idea of what comes in what order and how that aligns with ACHD's plan for the roads, how that aligns with -- you know, I really -- West Ada doesn't have a specific plan as far as funding goes. We don't have a specific plan as far as funding goes. So, that's really tough for us to come back to the applicant and say, hey, can you line up a phasing plan with those intended or expected future improvements to our services and so I think for me what it really comes down to is, you know, are there so many variables that could cause this to not be completed, whether it's over five years or whether it's at all or -- that's just I think the -- the difficult thing for me is, you know, there is -- there is a lot of outside factors that the applicant can't do anything about and -- and so I really do -- there is so many things about this project I like. I'm -- I'm really hesitant to say that I would vote no, I just am -- I'm concerned about the timing. I feel like it's a couple years too early and that's not because there isn't demand, there is absolutely

demand in real estate, there is absolutely buyer demand. These would sell. It's not so much that, it's just that we have to be able to make sure that we can provide those services to the residents in a satisfactory way. So, I'm not sure that that -- that that's clear, except that I think I'm -- I'm leaning -- I'm leaning more towards a no than a yes at this point. It's a tough decision, because I think there is so many good things about it.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: It looks like it's my turn. I'm going to take my mask off for two seconds, just so that Councilman Cavener can hear me clearly. I -- a while ago I -- I installed a bunch of flooring in the River District over in Eagle where, you know, this -- this -- this product is very similar to that, according to what Jay said, and I always loved that subdivision. I have loved everything about it. I love the -- just how it -- it's just different. It mixes things up. The elevations are great. I know the builder over there really well, dear friends of mine and they just did a great job with how they made those -- those homes look over there and -- and when I found out that this was going to be similar, I was really excited, because this is something that I don't know that exists right now in the City of Meridian and I think that it's pretty cool. I think Jay and his team did a great job with the design, like everyone else has said, and I -- looking at it I -- I think that given some of the complications that may or may not exist, I still believe that this would be a great addition to our community. This evening, you know, I really enjoy these -- these conversations that we have amongst ourselves. It's -- it's truly an honor, in my opinion, to be able to work with Council Members who care and who put forth the effort to be prepared and whether we disagree or whether we agree or whether our opinions are different or whether they are the same, I really appreciate the dialogue and the respect that -- that -- that -- that goes on within these conversations this evening, this discussion. So, I want to thank each and every one of you for it. Thanks, Jay, for the presentation. It was great.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Our public hearing is still open; correct?

Simison: It is.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, would it be possible to ask the applicant a couple of questions?

Simison: Sure. Mr. Cavener --

Cavener: Jay --

Simison: -- go right --



Cavener: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Jay, you have heard kind of some feedback from -- from my colleagues and I tonight and -- I mean I think if you are doing a tally you kind of know where this is -- is headed and maybe a potential tie. I'm curious to your thoughts about us being supportive of a continuance to maybe allow you and -- and in your builder-owner to discuss maybe a more concrete phasing plan that could address some of the concerns that have been brought by a couple of my colleagues and I.

Simison: Jay, you're muted. Jay, you're muted.

Gibbons: Can you hear me now?

Simison: Yes.

Gibbons: Okay. So, I think that, you know, phasing is a -- is a huge issue in your mind, especially from a fire perspective and service perspective and given the opportunity to study that further and figure out if we can find a way to, you know, make it more to your preference we would certainly relish that opportunity.

Cavener: Great. Thank you, Jay.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: On that note, it -- I'm going to make a -- I would like to make a motion to close the public hearing, if everyone is --

Cavener: Second.

Perreault: Thank you.

Simison: Motion and second to close the public hearing. All those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I get the sense that Council will be comfortable with giving the -- the applicant some additional time to possibly get some more of our concerns and questions answered and I would like to be able to do that versus having a vote for denial this evening, if -- if Council so will, so I'm going to make a motion to continue -- let's see. I want to make sure I get the right file number. Make a motion to continue H-2020-0064.

Simison: Council Woman Perreault, we closed the public hearing. Do we have to reopen it to continue it?

Perreault: Oh, you are right.

Simison: So --

Perreault: Yes. I apologize. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I move that we reopen the public hearing for H-2020-0064.

Cavener: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: My apologies. It's been a while since I have made a motion for a continuation. I move that we continue -- actually, before I make that motion, if we may ask the applicant if there is a date and time in mind that might work. I'm not sure how much time they prefer to make some investigation.

Nary: Mr. Mayor?

Gibbons: Council Woman Perreault, I -- given it's December and I don't know what your Council schedule is per se, so we are -- we are open to suggestion, of course.

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, you have two -- you have two weeks of hearings on the 15th and the 22nd. So, it either would have to be next week -- well, we couldn't do it next time. Sorry. We don't have a regular session next week. We could continue it to next week if -- if it's only going to take a week. I think it's going to take longer than that, so you are really looking at January.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: My recollection is that the next couple weeks after -- following the 8th there is four hearings on each of those weeks. So, it's -- it's a very full -- five -- four and, then, five. Four on the 15th, five on the 22nd. So, that's very full evenings and -- just so you know.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I'm showing on the calendar that we only have a work session on January 5th. Could we have the clerk confirm that.

Simison: She just stepped out of the room. Do we have any -- would the -- would the noticing for that even be known yet? I don't think it would be.

Perreault: Okay.

Weatherly: Mr. Mayor, we only have one item noticed for a public hearing on the 5th of January.

Simison: So, we would have public meetings that night.

Bernt: Hey, buddy. You're on mute, buddy. Mr. Gibbons.

Simison: Jay, if you are trying to speak to us you are muted.

Bernt: I think he's talking to himself.

Gibbons: Were you asking me if that was acceptable to a January -- what -- what was the January date? The 5th? Yeah. That's fine. I -- I think that, you know, we -- we can meet with who we need to meet with, as well as, you know, you are talking about sideboards and milestones. I think we can come up with some proposals for you to discuss and kick around and see if we can get it done that way.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: That being said, I will finally make the appropriate motion. I move to continue file number H-2020-0047 to the date of January 5th, 2021.

Cavener: Second.

Simison: Can you repeat the motion? For which file number?

Perreault: Yes. My apologies. I gave you the wrong file number, didn't I.

Simison: Yes.

Perreault: For -- I move that we continue the hearing for H-2020-0064 to the date of January 5th, 2021.

Cavener: Second agrees.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to continue the hearing to January 5th. And I'm a little disappointed, I was really looking forward to voting this evening personally, but I hope maybe I will also get an opportunity on the 5th to cast my vote if things remain the same. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it and the motion is agreed to and this is continued.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Gibbons: Thank you.

Simison: Council, I'm going to go ahead and call a recess and we will reconvene at 8:15. Ten minute recess.

(Recess: 8:05 p.m. to 8:15 p.m.)

**3. Public Hearing for Prescott Ridge (H-2020-0047) by Providence Properties, LLC, Located on the South Side of W. Chinden Blvd. and on the East Side of N. McDermott Rd.**

- A. Request: Annexation of 126.53 acres of land with R-8 (99.53 acres), R-15 (8.82 acres) and C-G (18.17 acres), zoning districts.
- B. Request: A Preliminary Plat consisting of 377 buildable lots (323 single family residential, 38 townhomes, 14 multi-family residential, 1 commercial and 1 school), 39 common lots and 6 other (shared driveway) lots on 123.53 acres of land in the R-8, R-15 and C-G zoning districts.

Simison: All right. Council, I will go ahead and bring us back from recess and next item up is a public hearing for Prescott Ridge, H-2020-0047. I will open this public hearing with staff -- staff comments and turn this over Sonya.

Allen: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. The next application before you is a request for annexation and zoning and a preliminary plat. A private street application has been approved by the director for the project. This site consists of 122.8 acres of land. It's zoned RUT in Ada county and is located on the south side of West Chinden Boulevard, State Highway 20-26, and on the east side of North McDermott Road. A little history on this. A portion of this site consists of Lot 18, Block 1, Peregrine Heights Subdivision. It was formerly a deed restricted agricultural lot for open space, a nonfarm

that has since expired. The Comprehensive Plan future land use designation for the property is on nine acres along the highway. It's mixed use regional and medium density residential to the south, which calls for three to eight units per acre and that consists of 113.5 acres of land. Annexation of a total of 126.53 acres of land with R-8 zoning, which consists of 99.53 acres. R-15 zoning, which consists of .82 acres. And C-G zoning, which consists of 18.17 acres is requested for the development of a mix of residential and medical office uses, including a hospital with emergency care. West Ada School District plans to develop a school on the eastern portion of the annexation area separate from this development. A master plan for the residential portion and concept plan for the medical campus portion of the site is proposed. The residential portion will include a mix of single family residential attached and detached homes, townhomes, and multi-family residential apartments. The commercial portion will include two three story structures, a 181,000 square foot hospital, with 60 in-patient beds, and a 67,000 square foot medical office building that will provide medical services geared towards women's health and pediatrics. Retail restaurant uses are planned on the first floor of the medical office building to serve the employment area and adjacent neighborhood as desired in the mixed use designated areas. Two different concept plans were submitted for the medical campus as shown. Option one depicts the medical office building adjacent to the out parcel at the northeast corner of the site and option two depicts the medical office building at the northeast corner where the outparcel is located that is currently not a part of this application. If the applicant is able to obtain this parcel, the office building is proposed in that location. And just a note, the medical office building was proposed closer to the west side of the development. At the request of the neighbors they did make this shift, so -- just so that you are aware. The single family residential uses are principally permitted in the R-8 and R-15 zoning districts. The school, multi-family residential development, and hospital will require conditional use approval of the uses prior to development and are subject to specific use standards. One of the standards for hospitals that provide emergency care is that the location has a direct access on an arterial street. However, because the UDC prohibits new approaches directly accessing a state highway, no other access is available, except for North Rustic Oak Way, a collector street, along the east boundary of the site, which connects to the highway. The City Council should determine if this meets the intent of the requirement and, if so, it should be memorialized in the development agreement. If not, Council may deny the emergency care component of the hospital use. ITD has denied the applicant's request for direct access to State Highway 20-26 for the medical campus. A preliminary plat is proposed consisting of 377 buildable lots. Sorry. I'm having problems advancing my slide here. There we go. Consisting of 317 single family residential attached and detached units, 38 townhomes, 14 multi-family residential, one commercial, and one school lot, 41 common lots and six other shared driveway lots on 123.54 acres of land in the proposed R-8, R-15, and C-G zoning districts. The minimum lot size proposed in the single family residential portion of the development is 4,000 square feet, with an average lot size of 6,028 square feet. The average townhome lot size is 2,302 square feet. The overall gross density is 2.99 units per acre, with a net density of 7.49 units per acre. The gross density of the R-8 portion is 3.07 units per acre, with a net density of 6.9 units per acre. And the gross density of the R-15 portion is 6.8 units per acre, with a net density of 13.46 units per acre, consistent with the density desired in the associated medium density residential and mixed use regional designated

areas. The subdivision is proposed to develop in nine phases, as depicted on the phasing plan, over a time period of four to five years. The north-south collector street will be constructed from West Chinden Boulevard in alignment with Pollard Lane across Chinden to the north and extend to the southern boundary with the first phase. The commercial and single family residential portion of the site will develop first, followed by the townhomes and, then, the multi-family residential apartments. The school property is not included in the phasing plan, as it's under separate ownership and will develop separately from the residential portion. Access is proposed in the residential portion of the development via one collector street, Rustic Oak Way, from Chinden, which extends through the site to the south boundary and will eventually extend to McMillan Road. Access via McMillan is proposed at the west boundary. A collector street is proposed from Rustic Oak to the east for access to the school site. Stub streets are proposed to adjacent properties for future extension and an additional stub street is recommended by staff to be provided to the outparcel at the southwest corner of the site and that is -- if you can see my cursor here -- this parcel right here. Access is proposed to the commercial portion of the development from Rustic Oak with a frontage road running through the site parallel to Chinden connecting to Serenity Lane to the west for access to Chinden. This is proposed instead of a backage road for consideration by Council, since a public street isn't desirable in this area. This would be just used as an emergency access until such time as the property to the west redevelops and this actually functions as a frontage street. The director has approved private streets in the townhome portion of the development with a MEW in accord with UDC standards as shown. The ACHD five year work plan shows no road improvements in this area. Chinden was recently widened to five -- or, excuse me, four travel lanes adjacent to the site. Preliminary plat lines are shown in red that are either in process or have been approved. A parking plan was submitted for the overall development that depicts a total of 497 on-street parking spaces available for guest parking in the single family residential portion of the development. Qualified open space is proposed in excess of UDC standards. A minimum of 10.51 acres or ten percent is required. A total of 12.41 acres or 11.8 percent is proposed consisting of the street buffers along collector streets, McDermott and Rustic Oak, open space areas at least 50 feet by 100 feet in area and linear open space. A minimum of five qualified site amenities are required. A 3,750 square foot clubhouse with restrooms, an exercise area, office and meeting room, with an outdoor patio and a swimming pool, one large tot lot and two smaller tot lots with play equipment, an enclosed dog park -- although this area may be just a pocket park with no dog facilities depending on what is desired for future residents. Segments of the city's multi-use pathway system. Additional qualified open space exceeding 20,000 square feet. A pavilion. Barbecues and seating area with a firepit in accord with UDC standards. Sample photo elevations and renderings were submitted for the different home types planned in this development as shown. Homes depicted are a mix of one and two story attached and detached units of varying sizes for the variety of lots proposed. Building materials consist of a mix of finish materials with stone and brick veneer accents. Staff is recommending articulation and other architectural elements are provided on elevations facing collector streets for two story homes. Elevations for the multi-family residential structures will be submitted with the conditional use application. A conceptual rendering was submitted as shown for the main medical building. The Commission recommended approval of these applications to City Council. Stephanie

Leonard, KM Engineering, and Mitch Armuth and Patrick Connor, Providence Properties, the applicant's representative, testified in favor, along with Betsy Hunsicker representing the proposed hospital and Randy Peterman, an adjacent property owner. No one testified in opposition of the application. The following folks commented: Cary Pitman. Sue Ropski. Val Stack. Paul Hoyer. Cory Coltrin. Doug Haneborg. Heidi Wilson. Charles Hey. Bonnie Leighton. WH Pacific representing the property owner to the west of Peregrine Heights. Written testimony was received from one person Josh Femreite, the chief of new schools for Gem Innovation Schools. And the key issues of discussion were as follows: Gem Innovation School is in strong support of the project, as their future campus lies approximately 300 yards to the south and will be able to provide kindergarten through 12th grade public education options for future residents. They would like the 30 foot buffer extended along the entire east and south boundaries of Peregrine Heights Subdivision for a buffer to high density residential uses. Higher density I should say. Would like more of a transition to the lots at the southeast corner of Peregrine Heights Subdivision, either with larger lots or common area. Not in favor of proposed access via Serenity Lane. Concern pertaining to future access for Serenity Lane residents via Chinden. Mrs. Ropski is concerned with location of trash dumpsters and parking adjacent to their property. Preference for the hospital to be located closer to the Chinden-Rustic Oak intersection away from low density residential lots at west boundary. Mr. Peterman is in favor of the proposed development as it will bring services to his property for development. Preference for the parking on the east side of the three story medical office building to be relocated to the west side of the building and the building shifted further to the east, so that the building is further away from adjacent residential properties. Concern pertaining to traffic on Serenity Lane if it were to be open to the south and the safety of children as there are no sidewalks along the private street. Concern pertaining to future restriction to access to Serenity Lane from Chinden Boulevard and resulting delays to emergency services to Peregrine Heights. Request for -- for provision of a fence or a gate at the south end of Serenity Lane cul-de-sac to keep it private. Request for the larger estate lots that abut the south end of Peregrine Heights to be carried over to the south side of Tanker Drive. And, finally, the property owner to the west of Peregrine Heights is in favor of the proposed frontage road along Chinden for access to the collector street. Key issues of discussion by the Commission were as follows: Preference for the applicant to obtain the outparcel at the northeast corner of the site in order to develop commercial, retail, restaurant uses, on the site. In favor of the variety in housing types and lots of proposed -- lot sizes proposed. The Fire Department's preference for a direct unhindered access to the site via Serenity Lane. Meaning not affected by a gate, bollards, or a chain. Opposed to right-in, right-out at Serenity Lane-Chinden Boulevard, as a fire engine will not be able to access the site from the east via Chinden. The provision of an electronic gate at the south end of Serenity lane for emergency access to Peregrine Heights and to keep the lane private. Trash enclosures should be located away from adjacent residential properties. In support of the reduction in height from four to three stories for the hospital and medical office building. Preference for the medical office building to be shifted further to the east and/or rotated. The provision of only one MEW in the townhome portion of the development. And general support of the revisions made to the concept plan for the commercial development,. Would like the applicant to work with ITD on noise abatement along the west boundary adjacent the State Highway 16. In favor of the walkability of the

development and especially the medical campus in support of the changes to the townhome portion of the development and the additional open space. And, finally, would like the applicant to work with staff to reduce the number of lots along the southern boundary of the subdivision to provide a better transition planned R-4 of the lots in the Oaks Subdivision. The Commission made the following changes to the staff recommendation: They required noise abatement to be provided along the project's west boundary along North McDermott Road adjacent to the future extension of State Highway 16. Relocation of the parking on the east side of the medical office building to the west side of the building and shift the building further to the east away from adjacent residential properties. Provide an electronic gate that is approved by the fire department for access to serenity lane from the south and reduce the number of lots along the southern boundary to provide better transition to the R-4 properties planned to the south in the Oaks Subdivision. Those lots were reduced by five along the south and southeast boundaries in the revised splot. The only outstanding issue for Council tonight is the Council should determine if the proposed access to the hospital from the collector street, North Rustic Oak Way, meets the intent of the UDC requirement 11-4-3-22, which requires hospitals that provide emergency access to have direct access on an arterial street and as I mentioned previously ITD did deny a request for direct access via Chinden for the emergency care component of the hospital per the letter to the applicant dated May 5th, 2020, that's included in the public record. Alternatively, Council may deny the emergency care component of the hospital use. There has been one letter of written testimony submitted since the Commission hearing from Randall Peterman. He is in favor of the proposed development. Staff will stand for any questions.

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

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor, I want clarification from Sonya on something.

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: Sonya, that issue of the Rustic -- North Rustic Oak Way being a collector and ITD says they have to have direct -- direct access on an arterial, there is no arterial running north-south between McDermott and Black Cat, is there? I can't think of any, but --

Allen: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Hoaglun, no, there is not.

Hoaglun: So -- and North Rustic Way, if I follow, is a -- while it's a collector it's getting close to the half mile mark, maybe -- maybe it's not. But just looking at an aerial you had shown earlier, it's like, yeah, it's getting close to a half mile between Black Cat and McDermott. Is there going to be any light between McDermott and Black Cat that's planned? Is North Rustic Way eligible for that or only if it -- since it's a collector they won't even consider that?

Allen: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Hoaglun, yes, a traffic signal is planned at the location where the collector street is.



Hoaglun: Okay. Thank you, Sonya. Appreciate that.

Allen: And this -- this collector street will extend between McMillan -- or excuse me. Yes. Excuse me. McMillan and the highway as well.

Hoaglun: Thank you.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: So, similar issue to last time. The clarification -- I'm looking at the Fire Department's comments in their agency comments. It's not clear to me from this map what part of this development falls within the five minutes and I wanted to just clarify the eight minute -- it looks like in the staff report an eight minute response time toward McDermott. So, how -- how does that kind of -- probably a comment for Mr. Bongiorno. But how does that -- how do we go from five minutes to eight minutes and just understanding that.

Bongiorno: So, Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, and also, Madam Clerk, if I can share my screen again, please. I can pull up the -- the map again. I have got it ready this time in anticipation.

Weatherly: Sonya, if you will stop sharing for a second, so Chief Bongiorno can hop on.

Bongiorno: Okay. It's coming. You got to tell me when it's up.

Simison: It's up.

Bongiorno: Okay. So, this is the five minute response map once again. The problem with this is it was developed off GIS and a couple issues with this that I want to point out that really doesn't make it completely accurate. Part of the problem -- the first problem is where Highway 16 ends and McDermott begins, Station 5, which is the closest to this property, cannot come down Chinden Boulevard and make a left onto McDermott Road. They have taken that turn out. So, that's why there is no green in -- on McDermott Road at all. The other problem is where Rustic Oak slash Levi connects right in this area here, the green stops right here, because that's the end of the road. So, once Rustic Oak gets pushed through, which I'm sure Stephanie will talk to you about the phasing plan, they plan to build Rustic Oak -- this whole section in the first phase. So, the -- you can see how far down Chinden our five minute response goes. So, you can kind of extrapolate and take that in -- once we make this corner the -- the five minute response is going to extend pretty far into this development. So, the picture that -- I can't remember when I did this report, if it has the updated picture or not. So, our green will creep into this quite a ways. The other thing I wanted to point out, since we were talking about fire stations, this piece of property down here in the corner, that is a piece of property that the -- is planned for a fire station. So, if I turn the future five minute response time on, that's what

it will look like when that station is built and staffed and running. So, we completely cover that area one hundred percent.

Strader: Mr. Mayor, a follow up.

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Thank you very much. So -- okay. So, if -- let's say that -- I understand what you are saying and it sounds like this is really based on a satellite thing and so your common sense would say when that road is extended, then, the five minute response time is going to be bigger. Is it going to cover -- and I'm sorry to put you on the spot. Is it going to cover 90 percent of this, if you were going to have to peg a number? Is it going to cover 80 percent? Fifty percent?

Bongiorno: It's probably going to cover -- I mean, again, because you can see how far down Chinden we can go. Again, that's at a 55 mile an hour speed limit. But if you just -- if you have that amount that's going to put us well into this subdivision. It's kind of hard to see, but this -- this is the subdivision -- you know, proposed subdivision is right here. So, we will be well within this subdivision with our five minute response. So, I would be comfortable saying we would cover a good majority of this and, then, once they do connect to McDermott we do have Station 2 that can come this way and -- and get to this subdivision if Station 5 is out. So, we would have multiple ways to get to this, as well as Rustic Oak, once it connects in with the Oaks.

Strader: Thank you.

Simison: Council, any further questions? Okay. Then we will go ahead and recognize Staff for 15 -- I'm sorry. Recognize the applicant for 15 minutes. I will turn this over to Stephanie.

Connor: All right. The applicant here. Can you all hear us?

Simison: Yeah. If you could state your name and address for the record, please.

Connor: My name is Patrick Connor. Address is 701 South Allen Street, Meridian, Idaho. And I also have someone else here with me.

Leonard: Hi. Stephanie Leonard with KM Engineering, 9233 West State, Boise. 83714. Can you see our screen yet?

Simison: Yes, we can.

Leonard: Okay.

Simison: And you are recognized for 15 minutes.

Connor: Thank you. So, like I said, my name is Patrick Connor. I'm with Providence Properties and we build communities throughout the Treasure Valley. Prescott Ridge is a master planned community in northwest Meridian. Tonight our application is for annexation, zoning, and preliminary plat approval. The project location, as Sonya has stated before, is just south of Chinden and just east of McDermott Road. The subdivision is right here in white. Everything you see in pink or green is either under construction, approved, or built. So, as you can see this project is right in the middle of a whole lot of projects that are either underway or finished. Real quick about schools and since they are shown on here, the West Ada School District property is part of our plat because of an improper lot split years ago. They were part of an illegal lot split to make it an illegal parcel and to get to annexation and zoning. Also shown here is the Gem Prep Meridian future K-12 public charter school and we are currently assigned to the Pleasant View Elementary School, Star Middle School, and Meridian High School. Once Owyhee High School comes in we will probably be part of that attendance zone. Here is the future land use map. A majority of the parcel is medium density residential and, then, unfortunately, the north part of the parcel is mixed use regional. Current zoning map. We are surrounded by R-4 to the south, R-8 also to the south and, then, general commercial to the north. Tonight we are applying for three different zoning categories. The majority is R-8, 99 acres. R-15 about nine acres. And commercial -- general commercial about 18 acres. Here is a snapshot of the preliminary plat. As Sonya said, we have about -- sorry. We have 317 single family lots, 38 townhome lots, which are three or more unit buildings, eight single family attached units, two to a building. Two multi-family lots, which we are proposing four-plex -- a four-plex building on each of these lots. Forty-one common lots. One lot, which is a West Ada school parcel to the far east side and, then, one lot, the proposed medical campus, which we will get into detail later, about 18 acres, which abuts Chinden. We have over 12 acres of qualified open space, about 11.8 percent, which is shown in green. Talking about the open space and site amenities. This is the overall plan. We have a central clubhouse and pool, large tot lot with a community space and restrooms in the clubhouse. We have a number of pocket parks scattered throughout the project. We find this to be really important for building community and offering a small place of recreation for residents no matter where they live within the larger community. Two smaller tot lots are also shown. A dog park area on the west side. And recreational pathways throughout project. Here is some renderings of that large open green space with a clubhouse, pool, and large tot lot. And here is a render of the smaller tot lots that are strategically placed within the community. One of the biggest amenities that we have noticed in communities in Treasure Valley is having a really strong pathway system for recreation walking, biking, running. What's shown here are the pathways that are within common lots that connect to the public pathways that are along the public streets. You can see we have two points of access as a connection to the future school site, as well as two points of connection to the medical campus and points of connection to the parcel to the northwest of us. We also have a ten foot Parks Department pathway running from the pathway along Chinden through the project that connects to the future school site. Here is the phasing plan. As we said before, there is nine phases. The approximate build out -- we usually develop two phases a year, so at this pace it would be a three to four to five year project, depending on our timing. The first phase of the project is shown here and as the Chief Bongiorno said earlier, we have committed to building the full build out

of Rustic Oak or Levi Lane through the whole project from our southern boundary all the way to Chinden. This is really important for fire access and ensuring that we have two points of access to the project and help with response times for within our community and also on this next slide it also helps response times to the project around us, especially Oaks North to the south. Once this full build out of Levi Lane or Rustic Oak gets done, it will provide additional routes for emergency services and a full installation of this collector will help the entire region for their response times. Also the Police Department commented that it will improve the police response times as well. We have 15 neighbors to west that large lots -- large lots and large homes and part of our application shows us stubbing a road to the Serenity Lane. Serenity Lane is a private road and to be able to ensure that it main -- it maintains its privacy is a big priority for the neighbors there. So, we have committed to building a -- a gate access and dual gate will be used as emergency access only initially and it's been approved by the Fire Department as well, as long as we have an Opticom access device, which is a remote way of opening the gate in case of emergency. In working with the neighbors over the past year on this project and in different presentations, this is the concept that they said that they would prefer for that southern access point along Serenity Lane. Now we are going to talk about the housing types and the variety of housing that we are proposing tonight. We have five main housing varieties. A majority of the project shown in yellow is the mixed -- a mixture of 45 foot, 50 foot, and 60 foot homes. These are traditional single family residences. The next slide's category is shown in blue and these are 40 foot lots, which come with the optional zero lot line to help add the variety to the streetscape and offer a -- a different sort of housing type within the single family community. Showed in purple are our large lots, which are between 70 and 100 feet, facing strategically around the Peregrine Heights community as a transitional lot size between their large lots and our single family community. Shown in green here is a townhome project with the details -- the townhomes and single family detached units and our multi-family project. It shows the four-plexes, each on an individual lot, each four-plex sitting on an individual lot. I also want to note that the driveway and the parking space is also an individual lot within this multi-family four-plex. Here is some typical home elevations for single family lots on the 40 foot planned attached single family for the zero lot lines and included are our plans for our mixed variety of 50 and 60 foot lots. Diving now into the townhome portion of the project. This is one area that we are really excited about bringing to the City of Meridian. We worked really hard with the fire -- the city and the Fire Department to ensure this is a good product that is also going to be safe for future residents. What is shown is 46 total units, 29 of those are rear load townhomes, which are shown in the middle and on the one part of the project. These have basically rear entry -- the two car garages and, then, the front doors of the units open up to in this middle area common MEW on the north part with their own sort of private smaller common space. On the west side of this townhome project we have nine front load townhomes, which each have their own private backyards. And, then, on the very south side we have the attachment duplex homes that front onto a public street, but have the backyards that open to the common MEW. Also within this project we have a limited pocket park, which includes a pergola, barbecue area, seating, and a fire pit as shown. We wanted to keep the MEW open for kind of passive recreation and this is more kind of a space for gathering and program activities. This is a private street, as I said before, that goes to the project. All the homes on the private street, with

the exception of the duplex homes, that front on the public street. It was really important for the fire department to have two points of access on two separate roads and so we accommodated that here. Here is some elevations of the rear load units we are offering. The front load units with the backyards and the front load duplexes. I also want to note that every unit here has some space of -- whether the front load, rear load, or the duplexes has some backyard or front yard space that can be fenced off. So, you can let a dog out in the middle of the night or have your small space to have a small vegetable garden that you can call your own. But also have the communal area of the common areas that you can share. Here is some examples of MEWs of some projects that our team has worked on around the country and here is some renderings of the communities and the gathering area. So, going into the multi-family four-plex plats. As I said before, there is 14 units -- or 14 lots within this project with the four-plex units, totaling 56 total units in this area. Because this is a multi-family project it will need to come through the conditional use permit and the design standards. Just really quick about our home quality. Along with Brighton Homes we are committed to building Energy Star certified homes. Last year in the Treasure Valley we led the Treasure Valley in the amount of homes that were -- that received this Energy Star certification. That's something that we are really proud of, building energy efficient homes, as it's important to the environment, but also offers lower energy costs for our homebuyers. We have a design center here in Meridian where every homebuyer will come and make all the selections within their -- for their house. We were most recently on the cover of the Parade of Homes and here is some images of that model home in Star. And, lastly, about the medical campus. Approximately 18 acres on the north side of the project in the mixed use area. This medical campus comprises of two buildings. One is the larger medical hospital in the center of the site, which is about 181,000 square feet and, then, the medical office building located in the northeast corner of the site as far close to Rustic Oak and Chinden as we could get it. Because of the offset from the future light on the corner of Chinden and Levi Lane as a full access, 660 feet down Levi, it was mentioned and by code we are required to offer a frontage road that extends to our far boundary or parallel to the state highway shown here in the pink. I also want to touch -- touch on that we have a -- a bike trail along the southern and the western part of the project with considerable dense trees to offer screening for the neighbors. We have rotated this building as many ways as I can count to ensure that they both function as a hospital, but also design to not interfere with the neighbors to our west and we have accommodated them in a number of ways. One is we actually lowered the -- the building height from four stories to three stories, which is a notable change. A majority of this hospital is actually single story, with just the center areas as a three story. The medical office building here is also three story. As Sonya said before, currently this outparcel is not part of this application. The medical group that is the user for this site has agreed on terms for this parcel and if this greater parcel is entitled and zoned to the intended use, this outparcel will become part of the project, which is shown in this next -- this next slide. It has moved all the way to the northeast corner. I want to quickly touch on a couple things as part of the -- as part of the mixed use requirements for the city. We wanted to have some integration with the surrounding area, which I have shown here and the outdoor area, the courtyards and outdoor dining that are integrated with our pathway system to allow people within the community to use this space as areas where they can relax or have a bite to eat, but also people that are users of the hospital can also share

this area. It also could create some sort of community there and also softens the use of the hospital in this residential area and that's shown here as well with the revised layout, assuming that outparcel comes into the property. I also want to note that the outparcel will be annexed and zoned at a conditional use permit process and that will come into the project at that point. Here is some images of some visioning of what this medical campus will look like and the integration within the community and just real briefly this is an overhead image of the history of St. Luke's along Eagle Road and Interstate 84 and how over time when St. Luke's came there was a majority of a residential area, but there is a lot of stimulation of development that happened because of the anchor of this medical center. We are well aware of the medical center on the north side of Chinden Road and we are actually really excited about the efficiency of uses of having two medical centers across the street from each other. One, it provides a better product for the residents of Meridian in offering a variety of services and, hopefully, more competition for a better product, but also a sharing of positions, a sharing of thoughts and ideas and employers and having this be an area and a magnet for really good paying jobs and services for the community -- that serve the community. So, one thing I am looking forward to is potentially along Chinden, additional parcels coming into development for services that can serve the community as well. So, that is our presentation. Thank you all for allowing us to present tonight. The plan I represented to you is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the vision of the city. We are providing a diverse housing variety, types, and densities to appeal to many different buyers across the segment of our population. We are fine with all the dimensional standards and the zoning categories and we believe that the medical campus is a -- a model for this project and the mixed use designation and we consider it to be a real anchor for the community and just having the opportunity for future employees of the hospital being able to walk or ride their bike to work is something that we look forward to and we think that is a very positive thing for the community. We think that this project will really add community to the City of Meridian and that it will be a -- a model community as far as integrating a number of different housing varieties, but also land uses within the project. We are complying with all of the conditions that were brought forth by the Planning and Zoning Commission and a lot of the changes that were made we think will make this a better community for the future and that concludes the presentation. So, we stand for questions.

Simison: Thank you, Patrick. Council, any questions of the applicant?

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: One question to the -- the applicant. How -- and you may have said it and I may -- may have missed it and if you did so I apologize. How do you propose getting services to your subdivision. For example, water and such?

Connor: Yes. Thank you for bringing that up. I meant to touch on that. So, services come from the south from the Oaks North Subdivision. We have a verbal agreement with the developers of that project, with Toll Brothers, and we have agreed upon terms verbally

to extend those utilities in a timely manner and so that -- that is something that we are currently working on with the -- the group that currently controls the water and sewer south of us.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor, follow up.

Connor: The agreement will be finalized with this approval.

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: He answered my question. Thank you.

Simison: And that probably dovetails into the question I had is in terms -- kind of piggybacking a little bit on the question Council Woman Strader spoke about earlier is the location of phase one and this is at the very end as it pertains to the fire staff. Is that because of the water-sewer connection?

Connor: Yes. That is accurate. The -- and I can go back to that drawing of phase one. Yeah. So, the water and sewer will come here -- Rustic Oak all the way north to Chinden. Another, you know, reasoning for that is we want to ensure that the services are available for the -- the hospital parcel, as well as the school parcel. So, that is one of the reasons why this road runs all the way from the south to the north, as well will run all the way to McDermott to our west.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Maybe just to pivot into a detail or a little rabbit hole for a minute. If you could zoom in on either your elevations or your -- like site specific plan for the multi-family, I have some questions about that. Thank you. I looked at the amenity exhibit and I didn't see, you know, a tot lot or some type of an amenity for the -- the multi-family. Am I off track there?

Connor: Right. So, as part of the conditional use permit process we will be required to have ten percent of -- of this parcel as part of open space. So, it's not necessarily shown well on here, because we don't have that much detail yet, but with the conditional use permit process we will have, you know, whether it's a tot lot or some sort of open space or an outdoor picnic area as part of this particular area.

Strader: Mr. Mayor, follow up.

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Doctors make the worst patients and multi-family apartment owners are probably more keyed in on this stuff. I'm a little bit concerned in terms of ensuring that there is an

amenity like a tot lot. I don't think it's fair for the kids and apartments not to have a place to play. That's the first point that I would like to make. And, then, additionally, I -- I know we haven't seen a lot of detail with the elevations. A lot of these garden style apartments that have exposed concrete stairs I have a real concern about as well. I know of several of these garden style apartments that have had stairs actually collapse or break that have those concrete stairs that aren't covered. So, I would like -- I would like to make sure that's not going to happen. And, then, just -- I would like to understand the intention with these. Are you intending to -- I understand there will be a common management company, but are you intending to sell each apartment complex to individual owners or are you contemplating common ownership?

Connor: So, the intent is that there is one owner of each building and so they -- you can look at them as investment properties for renting. It could be owned by one person who has, you know, four friends and each one has their own unit. I mean it just kind of depends. But the intent is that each building has a single owner and to touch really quick, Council Member, on the concrete stairs, all of those are covered -- I don't know if you can see it well in this rendering. It's not great. But there is an interior hallway -- interior slash exterior open hallway with -- that has the covered stairways. These sort of details as far as the tot lot and having a suitable recreational space I agree with you and that is something that we are going to have to work through with the conditional use permit with the public process and ensuring that this is a really great project for -- for families or anyone who chooses to live in this community.

Leonard: I'm going to add something, too, Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader. I believe that there is a condition in the staff report, too, that Sonya included that requires us to have one management company that will handle the leasing and maintenance of the entire multi-family development. So, that will ensure some consistency in the maintenance of the open space, even though the units -- or the buildings themselves will be privately owned.

Strader: Mr. Mayor, follow up.

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I guess I have -- I have a concern and I'm not sure how you could address it and I'm not sure how pivotal it would be with my decision, but it's okay to have a common management company, but I have seen a lot of situations as a multi-family real estate owner myself where you have really disparate ownership from out of state owners and there is a lot of deferred maintenance issues and that's part of my concern. I don't know if there is a way to address that. I'm going to chew on it for a while. But that's partially where my concern is coming from. I just want to make sure that this part of the development is going to be as high of quality as -- as the rest of it.

Leonard: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, I might just add real quick. As part of the conditional use permit I believe staff can probably condition us to possibly include a draft CC&R or maybe have some stringent requirements for that part of the development, too.



That might be something that staff could touch on a little bit more as far as kind of the amount of -- the condition that they could include with the conditional use permit. And maybe mulling on it a little bit longer would kind of give us all some time to be creative about what that might look like, too.

Strader: Thank you.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault. Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Excuse me. Not to belabor that same point, but I have the same concern as Council Woman Strader. There are a few projects that exist in Meridian like this that have individual owners and there are consistently issues with deferred maintenance. If I may suggest that when the homeowners association is designed and set up that potentially the exterior maintenance be all managed by the HOA, instead of the individual owners, meaning, you know, the roofs and the siding and the painting and whatnot. That may be one thing -- one way at least to the -- as far as the appearance goes to keep some conformity and there is only so much you can do about the maintenance on the interior if they are owned individually. But we have had discussions about this before as a Council and I think in general there is a preference -- I don't want to speak for my fellow Council Members, but if I remember our last conversation there is a preference for single owner for those types of developments. So, just wanted to put that out there.

Connor: Council Member Perreault, that is absolutely something that we are accustomed to doing and that we are -- are definitely willing to have. So, we -- when we go to the commissioners for the process we will ensure that that's part of the conditions of maintaining the buildings and ensuring that we have a consistent exterior maintenance and that's -- and that's how I envision that the project to be managed.

Bongiorno: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Yes, Deputy Chief.

Bongiorno: Just to take one more swack at that dead horse, I also agree with Council Woman Strader as well. When the buildings are individually owned, as far as trying to enforce the fire code, it becomes quite a challenge for my inspectors to try and drum up 16 different building owners to try and get them to get their sprinkler systems serviced. So, if we could do it the HOA thing or something, that would definitely help the fire department as well. So, thank you for that comment, Liz.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: While Deputy Chief Bongiorno is unmuted I have a question for him in regard to a section of his analysis about a ladder truck and I -- and that is the closest ladder truck is Station 1, which is 13 minutes away. Just wanted to pick your brain, Deputy Chief, and get your thoughts and what you think about that.

Bongiorno: Mr. Mayor, Council Member Bernt, the fact for the multi-family -- really the -- the -- the ladder truck is in our first response for a structure fire. You get a ladder truck and three engines and a battalion chief. So, for the ladder truck to get there, if they were to do any rescue or -- or operations -- fire truck operations on the multi-story buildings, it's -- it's a 13 minute response if they are -- if they are in their house. I did pull the numbers for Eagle, because Eagle is straight down Chinden and straight down Eagle to their fire station and it's roughly right about the same amount of time. I think one was 12 minutes and one was 13 minutes or something to that fact. So, at some point as our city grows we will be adding a second ladder truck and that will help with that issue. Because anytime you do have a working fire they -- you get the same response. Again, so you get another ladder truck and three additional engines. So, that's always a concern when we start adding multi-story buildings, like the hospital, because, you know, our -- our -- we only have one ladder truck and it is from this point 13 -- 13 minutes away.

Bernt: Follow up, Mr. Mayor.

Simison: Council Bernt.

Bernt: That's a big concern for me. This -- this is in a section of our city that almost couldn't be further away from Station 1, to be honest with you, and so if there was an incident where a ladder truck was needed, a 13 minute response time -- and I believe you said in your -- in your report that that was during the best of times. So, if -- if it was during rush hour or in the morning where there were more vehicles on the road, that potentially could be, you know, 13 minutes plus. It's -- that's a long ways.

Bongiorno: Yeah. Mr. Mayor, Council Member Bernt, it is and when I did my presentation to Council a couple weeks ago I did -- I did misspoke. That ladder truck that we are getting is -- it's -- it's not a replacement, it's -- it's an addition to.

Bernt: That's what I thought.

Bongiorno: Yeah. And I guess the replacement for the ladder truck is a couple years off in the -- in the CFP. So, we will have two ladder trucks. One will be used as a reserve, but at some point if we -- if we were to put it in Station 7 or Station 8 or somewhere on the north end of town it could be utilized and, then, we would have two truck companies. That benefits the citizens and it also gives us a better insurance rating as well.

Bernt: Thank you, Chief.

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Deputy Chief Bongiorno, while you are on I wanted to follow up. You had mentioned there is no left -- you cannot turn left heading west on Chinden onto -- onto Black Cat. How long is that arrangement going to last?

Bongiorno: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Hoaglund, if you look at the map that's up on the screen, we can't make a left onto McDermott is where that left is and it will be that way until Highway 16 is pushed through.

Hoaglund: Okay. And that's -- that's -- that's what I thought. You know, that Idaho 16 corridor -- I think they are in phase two right now and doing some acquisitions and rights of way and starting on some different things. I remember a seminar -- ITD open house I went to and phase two was a 265 million dollar project. Phase three they have the connections where they add however they are going to do this bypass and 20-26 is slated in -- in phase three. That's only 185 million dollars for all that work for these connections. I have no idea where the state of Idaho is going to get that money. I mean we are how many millions every year falling short on just maintaining what we have. So, I guess I'm going to transition that, after I get off my soapbox, to the applicant to talk about some transportation issues that -- that might arise from that. So, let's -- Mr. Mayor, if I could, I would like to kind of ask some questions of the applicant on some transportation issues.

Simison: Go at it.

Hoaglund: All right. Well, thank you. Patrick, we -- we -- one frame of reference that I have is I look at St. Luke's and you showed that slide and thank you for that, because there is a lot of similarities here where you are on a state highway, there is going to be access onto a collector and that was one of the things I wanted to double check is that emergency access for ambulances and whatnot coming down -- here you show Levi Lane, which I think is North Rustic Way on another slide. Is it going to be Levi Lane first of all?

Connor: Currently that's the name of the driveway, but it will be North Rustic Oak. It's just shown this way that that's the road to the north, but it will be official North Rustic Way.

Hoaglund: North Rustic Way then. And that is a workable solution for emergency vehicles, ambulances coming into the emergency portion off of that light to -- to come in that way? Will that work?

Connor: So, currently that's -- that's the access, given you do not have direct access to Chinden. Now, I do want to touch on this one part of that is this particular medical campus is not a trauma hospital that's like a St. Luke's and St. Al's, they are really big trauma issues. This is strictly the -- the emergency is more of kind of like an urgent care use and it's really only there because of the level of surgery that they would essentially do on the medical campus and it's required to have there as part of the medical campus and so we do not essentially -- maybe the intended user of the medical campus can offer some more

detail on -- on the use of that ambulance, but -- and also another thing is there will be an access and there will be the lights and the sirens that we typically have when you think of ambulances around residential areas.

Hoaglun: Great. Well, thank you for that. That's -- that's good to know. However, I also realize that as we grow as a community and this area grows and Star builds out, remembering how St. Luke's on Eagle Road grew and grew and grew and I think they had emergency things right from the get go and you won't, but, you know, trying to look ahead and seeing, okay, what will that look like five years, ten years, 20 years from now and the impacts that will be there, are we setting the foundation for that to be able to expand and to grow and planning it the correct way. So, hopefully, we -- we get it right right out of the box. I also was curious, because, like I said, using St. Luke's as the -- as the reference point on Eagle Road, if you are heading east on Chinden Boulevard they will -- ITD will not allow a right-in or right-out from the medical campus onto -- onto Chinden in the middle of that property or towards the -- closer to the west edge of the property?

Connor: That's correct. We did apply for an emergency right-in, right-out directly to the state highway. ITD didn't -- did not allow that access. And if we are talking about the medical center, the user -- Betsy Hunsicker actually has her hand raised to speak a little bit on that. Is it okay, Mr. Mayor and Commissioners, if she chimes in?

Hoaglun: Yes, I'm fine with that, Mr. Mayor. Is the city clerk going to let her in? Is she in?

Hunsicker: Hi. Can you all hear me?

Simison: Yeah.

Hunsicker: Oh. Okay. There was a blue circle there for a while. Hi. My name is Betsy Hunsicker. I'm with HCA Healthcare Westside Medical Center. So, just to -- the way we oriented the emergency department and with the hospital was along that Levi Lane or Rustic Oak Street, so the ambulance access actually will be -- we designed it to be more direct off of that -- from that access. So, that should work for us. I -- I totally agree with what you are saying, that, you know, we really envision this being a hospital that meets the kind of immediate needs of that community with women's care, surgical care, more, you know, kind of -- more reflective of a community with a small emergency room, but you are right, as it grows it likely would -- you know, it's likely that could grow as well, but -- but we did intentionally design it, so it's oriented along Levi Lane or Rustic Oak, so that would be a better access for the ambulances.

Hoaglun: All right. Thank you for that. And, you know, looking at Luke's on Eagle it seems they make it work that way and I think that would be workable that way. If we go back to that other slide you had that showed the full development, Patrick, or whoever is controlling that, one of the concerns I have -- until that left turn is allowed onto McDermott I do have some concerns that with that light there and as it gets built out people are going

to be coming down, you know, North Rustic Way and, then, making their way over to McDermott as -- as a shortcut and when that road is completely built to -- to McMillan, I'm just wondering how in the world -- if -- if we don't have these access points on that Idaho 16 corridor built out yet, how -- how that's going to be -- be workable. I'm not saying it's a deal stopper, but it's -- it's just one of those things looking -- looking ahead going if they don't allow certain access points for people to fully turn left or turn right or whatever direction people want to go, people will find ways to cut through and find shortcuts and go through residential areas and just something I think we need to be aware of as -- as this whole thing flushes out with that Idaho corridor -- Idaho 16 corridor in the works. So, I don't know if you have a comment on that. I'm assuming there is traffic calming measures here. It looks like that street along the big open space would probably be more than 700 feet and you have some traffic calming things going on. If you might mention that. Yeah. Right through there.

Leonard: Mr. Mayor and Councilman Hoaglun, we have -- we have worked extensively with ITD on exactly what you brought up as a concern and McDermott Road is actually going to terminate in a cul-de-sac just north of our northwest corner and so on that road -- our first phase, if you probably remember, pointing at the screen, if you can see my cursor, but Levi Lane to the south is Oaks North, it's going to be constructed and, then, over to the west we will be including about 65 residences in our first phase, which will stub that roadway over to McDermott Road. So, that will be a connection point there and Oaks -- Rustic Oaks North is actually intended to be a collector roadway, so it's meant and has been forecasted by the City of Meridian and Ada County Highway District on the master street map to be a road that will kind of collect more traffic and take stress off of more heavily used roads. So, in this case the intention of that roadway is to take most of the traffic that would usually be going over to McDermott or over to Black Cat and kind of give them a central -- a halfway point to go north and south. In regard to your question about that traffic calming, yes, that was a comment that ACHD had and that's something that will be easy to mitigate. We do have a couple of roads that are exceeding the 750 foot length. I think primarily the one that's on the southern boundary, kind of adjacent to the homes on the Oaks North Subdivision -- and the reason for that is we actually couldn't put stub streets in there. There weren't any that were provided with that subdivision. So, Levi Lane or Rustic Oak Way technically have some roads that kind of intersect in between, so it doesn't qualify for that 750 foot length requirement, but it will still, obviously, make sure that that road is properly mitigated for any traffic concerns and it's safe for folks living in the area as well to assist, so --

Hoaglun: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglun.

Hoaglun: Stephanie, thank you for pointing out those intersections. Yes, that's -- that's a very good point. And it looks like for Levi, North Rustic, you do have setbacks there, so those houses -- the -- the backs of them will have some setback from that road, so they are not right up against it and if that's going to be a main -- it's still a collector, it's classified

as a collector, but they will -- they will -- they will have some buffer from that being directly on the roadway; is that correct?

Leonard: Yes. That's correct, Mr. Mayor, Councilman Hoaglund. We will put a 20 foot landscape buffer along the Levi Lane -- or Rustic Oak. Sorry. So, that will provide a nice buffer area for folks that have their homes backing onto that roadway. We also have a ten foot multi-use pathway, which Patrick mentioned, that kind of extends along the -- the entire north-south roadway there, so that will provide an additional barrier.

Hoaglund: Okay. Good information. Thank you.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: While we are still on the topic of transportation, so Sonya had mentioned that Council needs to determine about the proposed access. You know, that being a collector -- Rustic Oak being a collector, instead of arterial, which is what is required in code for emergency care. So, we talked about what -- whether this really classifies as emergency care or not. So, I have a couple of questions regarding that. One, do you believe that this does classify as emergency care under our code and, number two, we had the same conversation with the hospital that's going to be going in nearby -- going into the north and that is, essentially, going to dead end into their development and they originally had intended that to be -- I mean that -- that will be a -- that can't be an arterial, because it, essentially, dead ends and it's a very short street, but they are going to design it in such a way that it has the capacity of an arterial, where it's going to be like a boulevard entrance, and so is that a conversation that's been had? And I would like to actually hear from the applicant and from the staff -- and from staff on whether that's a possibility here in this situation and so that it gives the -- the usability of an arterial, but -- but it's not actually, you know, designated that way. Hope that question made sense.

Leonard: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Perreault, I think -- so in regard to designing it as an arterial roadway, I don't know that we have got enough space to design it to that width or to include a boulevard entrance. I mean I think what we have actually shown here is exactly what we need for the collector. In fact, we had to be kind of creative with ACHD in dedicating the correct amount of right of way, which I think is like 16 plus feet. So, I don't know if that would be an option. I think we, you know, certainly would be willing to think about what an option could be. I think we are lucky in this case, because the medical campus is directly abutting the state highway and we don't have any other uses that will be kind of in between those two uses and the way that we have designed the medical campus specifically is to kind of limit the number of access points that are on Rustic Oak. We have just one full access point that's up to 660 feet south of the intersection there as required by code and in allowing -- or providing that frontage road and, then, just one right-in, right-out that's shown a little bit further north of that. So, hopefully, that will alleviate, you know, any concern there, but a little tricky, but I think it's a little bit different

of a design than what's at the subdivision to the north, so -- and I apologize, but I don't remember the first part of your question.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: It was -- it was whether or not you agree with this being considered an emergency care facility under Meridian's code in -- in terms of requiring it to be an arterial. There was some conversation about this not necessarily being like an ambulatory hospital.

Leonard: Thank you. Mr. Mayor and Council Woman Perreault, I think we might defer to Betsy on that question, just because she has a lot better of a feel for how their hospital operates. So, we will go ahead and let her talk.

Hunsicker: Yeah. And I -- I have to admit I don't know that I'm personally well versed in how the emergency use is defined by the City of Meridian, but from -- from my perspective most hospitals have an adjacent and attached emergency room and that we are proposing it with that is to not actually require it to have an emergency room by the state of Idaho, so it's something that as -- when we come back for -- I think there has to be a future permitting of the actual hospital, so, you know, when we come back at that point in time we will be more specific about the actual services being provided in this location, but for now we are proposing it with an emergency room. So, I would assume an emergency -- a full service emergency room would -- would meet your definition at this point in time.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I wanted to drill down for a second into the open space. We are in the middle of updating our open space requirements and we have a workgroup, so it's a big focus for the city I think to increase our standards and really take a hard look at what qualified open space means. So, I just -- I kind of wanted to understand if you take out the open spaces on a couple of these lots that are small that don't meet the minimum dimensional standards and I personally don't count like buffers and things -- I just don't. I understand that we do, but I don't. So, what's your real open space I guess is my question that -- that's outside of those categories and, you know, do you think that's appropriate for an annexation and -- and the level of -- the quality of development that you have here?

Leonard: Mr. Mayor and Council Woman Strader, I think -- it's hard to calculate that kind of off-the-cuff, but if we were to take out the buffers, which is a hundred percent I think of the collectors and, then, 50 percent of the -- it would probably be around like ten percent with what we are showing here. I think the -- the blue outlines are shown on the screen, as you can see here, with the exception of the large central open space, are all areas that qualify under the open space ordinance. As far as -- we are not showing any linear open

space, which is always a little bit tricky, but all of those spaces you see here would qualify under the ordinance.

Strader: Mr. Mayor, if I may, could we have staff --

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: -- respond as well if they have that handy.

Allen: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, staff did that analysis. As I stated it exceeds our UDC standards. The UDC does count buffers, so we have to count those. I don't have the -- I don't have the counts without those handy, though.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I would like to understand what percentage of the qualified open space is being contributed by buffers and what our open space would really be if we didn't have that. That's just me. I understand what our requirements are, but this is a massive development and it just seems like it would be -- so, if the applicant gets a chance -- it may not -- the decision may not hinge on it necessarily, but I would like to know that information if -- if it's possible.

Leonard: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, I think -- I mean we can certainly try our best to guesstimate. The buffers do not offer a lot of usable open space in this regard. So, I think, you know, looking at the usable large open space, such as the -- almost four acre central park that we are providing, as well as multiple-use pathways that are included along all of Rustic Oak and to the east and along Chinden as well as to the small tot lot and the large tot lot, that the usable open space that -- I believe if we were to calculate would actually probably be over the ten percent. I think we are at 11.8 with the buffers included and I'm just trying to think about how far those all are to kind of calculate square footage, but I think it would be pretty minimal compared to the entire open space that we are providing overall.

Strader: Thank you for your commentary.

Leonard: Thanks.

Simison: So, any additional questions for the applicant or staff? Okay. Well, this is a public hearing. Madam Clerk, do we have anybody signed up to testify on this item?

Weatherly: Mr. Mayor, we had a few people sign up, no one indicating a wish to testify. I do see one hand raised, though.



Simison: Okay. Well, we will go ahead and go to the person who has indicated a desire to speak under their three minutes allotted time frame. If there is anybody else who is on the Zoom call that would like to testify, please, indicate so by raising your hand and we will bring you in one at a time to provide testimony. Madam Clerk, who is our first person you are bringing in?

Weatherly: Mr. Mayor, that would be Cary Pitman.

Simison: Cary, if you can unmute --

Pitman: Can you hear me?

Simison: Yes. We can hear you. If you can state your name and address for the record.

Pitman: Cary Pitman. Address is 63 -- 6203 North Serenity Lane.

Simison: Thank you. You are recognized for three minutes.

Pitman: Can you -- can you bring up the slide of the frontage road's access proposal? Yeah. That one there. I'm the first house on the left when you come down Serenity there from the north going south. That -- that -- the corner of my property and that frontage road is only like 21 feet on the right of way. Is that going to be a one-way or two-way road? Oh, my gosh. Can you hear me?

Simison: We can hear you. Do you have other comments or would you like staff to answer that question?

Pitman: Yeah. Go ahead, staff, answer the question on the -- that frontage road in -- in that --

Allen: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, I --

Pitman: -- and going east --

Simison: Go ahead, Sonya.

Allen: I believe it's 20 feet wide. The applicant can correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe it's 20.

Pitman: And that's -- that's substantial for two-way traffic?

Connor: So, real quick, Mr. Mayor and Council Members, the -- we believe that it's actually 26 feet wide and it is intended for two-way traffic that's on that frontage road. There is no parking or there is no -- there is no backing along that. It's strictly a driving way.

Pitman: Well, I would dispute that from my statement I put out there from the corner of my fence to the -- the fence that's out there right now is 21 feet. So, I will dispute that. Also what is the CMU wall? The CMU wall behind my --

Connor: It's a type of masonry wall. It's required between commercial land use and residential land uses. So, it's an eight foot masonry wall to help with privacy and noise screening between two separate land uses.

Pitman: Well, that will be great for the view that I used to have, so -- okay. But, anyway, I would dispute that -- that measurement between there and the right of way, so -- I don't know where you guys get that measurement from, but I have measured it consistently different in there. And that's -- what -- what is the frontage road used for? Access for employees or ambulance and emergency vehicles? What is the -- what's the purpose of this frontage road? Staff?

Allen: Mr. Mayor, I'm not sure if you want me responding directly or --

Simison: Yes. Yes. Please -- please do.

Allen: The purpose of the frontage road at this point will just be for emergency access to the site. When -- when and if the residential properties redevelop and the property to the west of Peregrine Heights Subdivision redevelops commercially, that will provide a frontage road along the state highway. City code requires it to reduce access points to the state highway.

Pitman: So, that will be emergency access to the property to my west? So, the property to the west?

Allen: It will eventually be a frontage road that's -- that's used as an access road -- a public access road to the properties to the -- from the properties to the west to the collector street, Rustic Oak. But right now, until those properties redevelop, it will just be used as an emergency access to this medical center complex.

Pitman: So, if somebody turns the wrong direction off of Chinden and comes down Serenity and blocks that emergency access road because of -- there is a gate or bollards or whatever could end up being down there, is that going to be an issue for someone?

Allen: That's -- Mr. Mayor, that's a question for the Fire Department. I'm not sure that this is a required access. I will defer to Joe on that.

Bongiorno: Mr. Mayor and Cary, it -- that access is required for the medical campus if it gets approved and moves forward and it does have to be 26 feet wide because of the three story portion of the building. Thirty feet or three stories requires 26 foot wide roadways for the ladder truck.

Pitman: That's 13 minutes away.

Bongiorno: Correct.

Pitman: At this point. Yeah. So, my -- my concern is that -- and not that I would want this to happen, but if I am coming from my property and I'm going out to Chinden and should there not be bollards or a gate or whatever there and I'm going to turn right on Chinden and I have my -- my -- my truck and my camp trailer and somebody pulls up behind me and you need emergency access down that road, who is responsible for that? I mean is it -- if I can't get out on Chinden and I have got the road blocked essentially. Does that make sense?

Bongiorno: It does and we would hope that with lights and sirens going that you would do your best to get out of the way.

Pitman: Well, that would be my hope. But I just don't want to be -- I prefer that that not be an issue -- or be something that I would be put in front of, but it appears that that's not going to be -- that's just going to have to be a one time -- hopefully, if any, one time. All right. That was my questions for tonight. Thanks for your help.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions for Mr. Pitman? Okay. Madam Clerk, who is our next person to testify?

Weatherly: Mr. Mayor, that will be Doug Haneborg.

Simison: If you can state your name and address for the record after you unmute yourself that would be great. Mr. Haneborg, you are unmuted now. If you want to try speaking. Madam Clerk, if we want to try bringing in somebody else right now and maybe communicate with Mr. Haneborg for a phone-in number if necessary.

Weatherly: And so, Cory, you will be next. One moment, please. Mr. Mayor, our next will be Cory Coltrin.

Simison: Cory, if you can unmute your mic and say your name and address for the record.

Coltrin: There we go. Yeah. This is Cory Coltrin at 6178 North Serenity Lane. I am the third home south of Chinden on Serenity Lane there and so I am the home that is going to be looking directly at a three story building it looks like and I would just like the Council to consider getting that hospital all the way over towards to the east as close to Levi Lane or Rustic whatever and getting it away from the -- our -- our neighborhood over there. Just fudge it over there as far as you possibly can. You know, we have been here 22 years now and have enjoyed a wonderful view and, obviously, we are going to lose that, but, you know, with a -- with a pool in the backyard and stuff it's going to be pretty uncomfortable having a -- having three stories looking down into my backyard. I don't care how much landscape you put in there, it's going to be -- it's going to -- it's going to be pretty detrimental to us and I would appreciate it if you guys would consider fudging that over just as far east as possible.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Yes, Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Would it be possible for the applicant to comment on Mr. Coltrin's concern and the possibility of moving that further east? Just curious if they had looked at that in their design.

Connor: Yes. Mr. Mayor, Council Members and Mr. Coltrin, we have moved this building around quite a bit. Initially -- I don't -- I'm not familiar with your name, but we had it even closer to the residences and it was oriented north-south. We have moved it as far over as we can possibly get it in order to provide sufficient access into the project for the -- for the buildings -- for the roads for safety and also to have sufficient parking along Levi Lane. So, that -- where the building is is as far east as we can get it and we have put it about every way we could. Initially the building was oriented so the loading zone was adjacent to Mr. -- Mr. Coltrin's house and we rotated it to accommodate concerns of the neighbors. So, the loading zone is on the south side. So, we have looked at this thing and tried to move it and talked to the HOA representative today for over an hour about the location of this building and I hope they will have a chance to testify as well as kind of more back story and how the building has moved around and shifted and where it's at I believe is -- is as far away from the neighbors as possible. I think it's over 300 feet as it is right now and as I said before, it's -- it's three stories, which I know it isn't one story, but it's certainly not four, which it was initially. So, we did lose one story and it is one story on one half of it and, then, the other half is three. But, yeah we moved that building as far away from the neighbors and also guaranteeing access off of Levi Lane for safe access.

Simison: Patrick, just a follow-up question to that, because you mentioned the parking along Levi. I'm just curious why is that parking needed there, as compared to on the back, since there is no real access into the building from that side?

Connor: So, the -- the parking between the hospital and Levi, they try to have parking surrounding the building where ever it's at. We need to have sufficient parking adjacent to the ambulance entry and the urgent care center as close as possible. They need to have a certain number of spaces adjacent to the urgent care as possible. This building -- HCA has -- has built these hospitals around the country and in working with the architect for over six or seven months of how to get this thing designed, they are experts in how these things need to be designed and organized for patient safety and patient privacy and everything like that and so where that parking is adjacent to the building, as I said, is as close as we can possibly get it over and while maintaining safety and privacy for the patients.

Hunsicker: Hi. This is Betsy from HCA Healthcare again, Mayor and Council Members. If I may add, we -- you do need to have parking over on the emergency side. Initially we did have more parking around the perimeter and that was also a concern of the neighbors

that employees will be parking and coming in kind of at all hours and be adjacent to their property with that, so -- so, that was also -- you know, we were trying to address their concern around just traffic on the perimeter backing up to people's homes and like Patrick said, it was turned so the tall building -- the three -- it was four stories previously and those went north-south. So, obviously, the longest perspective, the -- you know, the width was blocking the neighbors and now turning the width has -- has less -- doing that less or, you know, it's -- it's a narrower profile the direction of the neighbors. So, I -- I just want to kind of reinforce what Patrick said that we have moved this building and the MOB a lot and we have taken an entire story off of the building, which is a pretty significant change from -- in terms of making it a viable project and so I -- you know, I think we have -- we have really tried to accommodate the neighbors concerns pretty significantly.

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: We have had conversations in the past about not wanting to -- I mean just really upholding -- I guess upholding Meridian's desire to have a premier community; right? That's -- that's part of what we -- what our value and our goal is as a city and we have talked about not having projects where there is a lot of concrete and a lot of blacktop. I'm curious if the applicant had considered any kind of parking structure, rather than having just asphalt and if that would free up any space for them to have some more retail or restaurant. To me it seems like it's just a really small amount, almost kind of like the retail and restaurant was put in there as a concession to what staff had suggested and I don't feel like it's a significant part of this project. So, just curious if -- if there was any consideration of a parking garage. I know they are -- they are very expensive and maybe it's completely cost prohibitive, but I would like to hear their thoughts on that.

Hunsicker: This is Betsy and, Mayor and Council Members, I will try to address that. You are right, parking garages are very expensive. We initially had the MOB separate from the retail, but in the desire to move the MOB as far east as we could we -- we really had to put it all together. So, that was actually something that we initially had an office building and, then, we had two -- I think we had two separate pads that were retail on the corner, but to move that building further east and make that work -- we consolidated that and I think that the downside of the parking structure is that you end up putting that on the western end of this property, which I think would be undesirable for the neighbors to be backing up to a parking garage. That's based on the previous conversations. We did not propose that at any point, so I'm speculating, but based on other feedback that would be -- that's what I would have expected to have heard. But there is a -- but those are the other -- that's my commentary on that.

Simison: We still have at least Mr. Haneborg. Have we tried to bring him back in, Madam Clerk?

Weatherly: Mr. Mayor, I'm going to take a different approach and just give him permission to talk. Doug, you are unmuted.

Simison: Mr. Haneborg, if you can hear us if you can try to speak.

Weatherly: Mr. Mayor. Mr. Haneborg, the phone number that you can try calling in on is 1-669-900-6833. Once you dial in enter code 86133943545.

Simison: Madam Clerk, maybe we can put that up somehow, let him -- we don't know if he was sitting there with a pen and paper ready to write that down.

Weatherly: Mr. Mayor, it will take me a few minutes, but I would be happy to do that.

Simison: Okay. Council, we have people who have already spoken asking to -- raising their hands again. Oh, we do have someone who has dialed in. Madam Clerk? That raised their hand to speak.

Weatherly: Yes, Mr. Mayor. One moment. They should have the ability to unmute themselves and speak.

Haneborg: Can you hear me okay?

Simison: Yes, we can. If you can state your name and address for the record, please.

Haneborg: Okay. Yeah. Doug Haneborg. 6002 North Serenity Lane, Meridian, Idaho. 83646. Sorry about that. I was having some technical difficulties with the microphone. But, yeah, thank you guys for giving us an opportunity. I'm the current HOA president for Peregrine Heights and for time sake we asked some of the neighbors to just e-mail in questions or concerns that they had up to this point and so I have a short list here of just some questions or concerns. They pertain to both applicant and staff, but I don't know if it's best if I just kind of list them out and, then, we can address those or -- or what's best. But I also want to start off by thanking both Patrick and the hospital, they both have been, you know, great to work with and have listened to our questions and our concerns and have done the best to their ability up to this point to try to accommodate us, so we do appreciate that as well. One of the concerns that was brought up also recently was the possibility of another gate, probably on the north side of Serenity Lane. There is still quite a bit of concern of people trying to access through the neighborhood there and we will end up with maybe even twice the amount of traffic if people are going down to figure out that it's a dead end or they reach the gate at the south lane and, then, they have to turn around and come back through our neighborhood again. So, you know, either another gate there or a private road or dead end type sign we feel would -- would help that. There has also been some concern about that frontage road and the access road there and some confusion, too. We just would like some clarification. There is really nowhere else along Chinden Road that has any frontage road that I'm aware of, even down to Eagle Road, you know, where it's probably the busiest intersection, there is really to my knowledge no type of those -- that type of frontage road and it's such a short little section here and there is some concern with the traffic having to go through that parking lot and weave through there and just kind of what the future purposes is -- what is the land to the west of us going to be zoned as? Is that going to be primarily residential? Are they

planning commercial zoning there? So, there is just some concerns there. We would also be interested in seeing if maybe we could get a rendering or more detail -- Patrick did provide some of the pictures for the gates, so we appreciate that. And the style. We are just curious more of what that would look like at the front entrance if we are to put one there on the north side. We would probably have to widen or put in a cul-de-sac type area for cars that are not able to access through the gate or if they have to turn around, because that is a fairly narrow private road there on the north side. So, in going back to that frontage road, the 600 feet that's required off of Levi Lane sounds like that's like a city code or -- or something like that. The UDC 11-3H-4B.3. There is -- there is some curiosity about the actual frontage road itself, it being so close to Chinden and with the future expansion of Chinden and there not being that much room there, are there any ordinance or city code that there has to be so much room between Chinden and that frontage road. That's a concern as well. There is some questions about fire hydrants and future city water that would most likely be coming through our neighborhood. We are currently all on septic and wells and so there is some questions about that and concerns about that. But the need -- do we need to address some of these or should I stop and let --

Simison: Just keep -- keep going.

Haneborg: -- people try to answer some of those things or --

Simison: Typically you testify and questions will be asked.

Haneborg: Okay. And so -- yeah, there is just some concerns about that with the -- like fire hydrants, we probably need one on the north and the south side at least our neighborhood. I don't know what the city codes are for that, even though we are not, I don't think, part of the annexation, but with the water and things in the future coming through. Pertaining to the hospital, there is some questions and concerns about the lighting in the parking lot transitioning from west to east. If there is the possibility of doing like lower type parking lighting or -- or things that aren't so high up in the air that they are going to be shining into residents backyards or causing a nuisance for those homes that back up to the hospital, if they can maybe do -- do some type of lower lighting and, then, they can maybe get taller as they get closer to the buildings. But that's somewhat of a concern as well. You know, any of those -- we are -- we are aware that there is a sound barrier, but there is still some concerns for like trash and snow and noise from like HVAC units that will be on top of the buildings. So, there is just some concerns there still with noise and smell and lighting concerns as well. Also I don't know if Patrick or somebody can pull up a picture further down of the neighborhood of the larger estate lots, but they did do -- they did eliminate it looks like one of the lots there. There is some concern. Typically a home is the biggest purchase that a family makes and so these are all -- our lots here are all, you know, six, seven, eight hundred, nine hundred thousand dollar -- some approaching a million dollar lot and homes here. They are all at least an acre plus. And so there is some concern about, you know, how many lots are butting up to those properties. There is still four properties butting up to the very southeast corner lot there and so we are just curious is if, you know, there is still something that can be done there

with concern to property value possibly going down, you know, going from an acre, you know, with nothing next to it and, then, all of a sudden now there is four lots that butt right up next to it, whereas the other properties only have two that are butting up to it. So, just concerned that other -- it might devalue possible future square footage for some of the homes and properties. Going back to the fire as well, that five minute access. It seems to me that that's currently the situation, but just curious as Chinden also develops, it sounds like there has been talks of getting rid of the middle turn lane and maybe doing a concrete wall. There are no current points for u-turns anywhere, so it looks like from that map that the fire chief put up that currently it's green, but in the future when there won't be ability -- when there will be a right-in, right-out there on Serenity, what does that look like when Chinden is expanded, there is no u-turn anywhere there, Chinden eventually goes down to a two lane beyond -- east there of Highway 16 and there is really no u-turns anywhere beyond that. So, there is just some concern with fire access being able to get to the residence in a timely manner with there being no u-turns on the right-in, right-out.

Simison: Thank you, Mr. Haneborg. Any further comments? If not, we can start --

Haneborg: Yeah. I'm just scrolling to make sure I didn't miss any here real quick, but I think the majority of them -- oh. There is questions about the second access point to McDermott and it seems to me like -- or seems to a lot of us that from the beginning the point of the access road up north was to create a second access point, but there is questions as to does McDermott not justify that and/or taking an access point over to Black Cat, like through the school or -- or north or south of the future school site there, if there is a way to tie into maybe Black Cat that way as well, because it seems like we are cramming these two access points in just north of us, which I think in the future, from what we understand, the plans are that that will be closed off completely, because it's going to be too close to Highway 16 is our understanding. So, there is some questions about that. I think that's the gist of it. I'm sure there will probably -- there could be still some other questions that we -- we didn't get to address right now that some other people might chime in and still want to ask, but I think that was -- were the majority of it. So, yeah, we can address those on transportation and fire and -- yeah. So, that will be different applicants and the staff that can maybe chime in on some of those concerns and questions that we have.

Simison: Okay. Council, any questions?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I guess the question I have for the HOA president -- I apologize, I didn't catch his name, but do you feel, sir, like you had a neighborhood meeting and that you have had an adequate opportunity to understand, you know, the details and -- I guess I'm just asking do you feel like you want more one-on-one interaction with the developer and city staff? That's certainly not in the cards at the moment, but feels like there were a lot of detailed questions.



Haneborg: Yeah. I feel like there is something -- I think some of us in the neighborhood feel like some of this is being thrown together, you know, and -- and we have been talking with Patrick for like over a year and, like I said, he has been great about answering questions and helping us. Some of this is not even with Patrick, some of it is more like fire or transportation. So, there is kind of a blend here. But I feel like as a neighborhood, you know, we are doing our best to ask our questions and try and get them answered and I think, you know, a lot of them have been. As you guys can tell from this plan, there has been a lot of changes and -- and that's -- you know, a lot of that has come from our suggestions, which we appreciate, you know, the flexibility and -- and them doing that and so I just think there is some concerns. I mean, like I said, you know, the biggest purchase most people make is their home and so for a lot of people here they have used their purchase, you know, in the last few recent years when prices have gone up or they are people that have lived here for 20 years and, you know, it's a big change, because a lot of the value here was -- were the views of the mountain and so there is all these proposals here and there is still some unanswered questions like about the frontage road that we feel like we are not really getting the answers on that makes sense. Like I -- like with the frontage road itself we are passing through a parking lot and, then, it's like Cary was saying, it's like butting up right next to his property line and, you know, eventually the plans are to close Serenity for future ITD planning it sounds like. So, yeah, I feel like there is just still some unanswered questions that we are not sure on.

Strader: Thank you. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Yes.

Strader: You know, it -- there is a lot of detail and it's a really big project and I -- I'm only one -- one City Council person, but I think it's okay to -- to take our time in making a final decision and getting it right and if -- we could do this all night. We could be here until 2:00 a.m., but maybe continuing this to give some opportunity for staff and others to hash out some more detailed one-on-one meetings might actually work out best. That -- that's just my two cents.

Simison: Let's start with getting the questions answered, because I think a lot of them are quite simple questions that I could answer, but I'm going to defer to staff and let them do it. Council, any -- any questions for Mr. Haneborg?

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Hoaglund.

Hoaglund: Not a question, just a response to one of his and has to deal with the property values and just for -- speaking from personal experience, Doug, you know, I -- my wife and I are rural property -- her family's farm and -- and we -- we experienced the same thing that you are looking at going through and that is having houses right up next to you and losing the views, I sympathize. We miss that. But it happens. And I have to -- have to tell you, though, with now having three houses behind me -- well, two plus a fraction of

the other one, except for '08 and '09 when everybody's property values went down, we have not experienced any property value decrease because of the development and those houses up against ours, so -- I mean if that's any solace, which, you know, this is a tough pill to swallow when -- when development comes calling and I understand how your folks feel, but it can be a good thing if -- it sounds like you have got developers who are listening to you, which is always good and we want to certainly take a hard look at this and make it a good project, if that's where we end up going, but just wanted to share that with you, that at least from my experience when development moved in, because of the type of development, the quality and whatnot, we didn't experience any property value decrease, except for those -- those bad years for everybody. So, hope that helps.

Simison: Deputy Chief, would you like to respond regarding the fire-related questions?

Bongiorno: Sure. I will jump in. Mr. Mayor and Council and our caller -- I also didn't catch his name. So, a couple items. So, looking at access, as far as access goes, there is two things that we are looking at here, the proposed medical campus, because it has a building that's over 120,000 square feet and it's three stories tall, it -- that parcel alone requires two separate accesses and the two accesses have to be at least half the diagonal of the property apart. So, that's one reason why there is the frontage road over to Serenity Lane, so we would have one access on the west and one access on the east and, then, as far as the connection to McDermott goes, it's the same thing for access for the subdivision. Anytime you have more than 30 homes on a subdivision, you have to have two separate accesses. So, once Levi Lane or -- or Rustic Canyon is -- or Rustic Oak is built, they will have two separate accesses, one to the north and one to the south, and, then, also they are giving us an access out to McDermott. So, there will actually be three accesses, which is better. As far as Serenity Lane goes -- and it's my understanding that the north end -- the end up against Chinden Boulevard is going to stay open until the roadway is widened. Now, I don't know when that is scheduled to be widened, but it's my understanding when they do the full build up -- build out of Chinden Boulevard there will be a cul-de-sac on the end of Serenity Lane. You have to remember a cul-de-sac is 96 feet in diameter. So, that's going to eat up a lot of ground when they go to put that cul-de-sac in. There was no talk at least to me about another gate at the north end of Serenity Lane. Again, my goal the last time we talked about this at Planning and Zoning was we would like unhindered access and I was okay with the gate on the south end of Serenity Lane, because we were going to put an Opticom device on it, which would -- which would give us quicker access into your subdivision. As far as fire hydrants go, you -- because you are not in the city, I don't believe -- and I will defer this to Clint to fill in, but there will be no fire hydrants that I'm aware of brought up Serenity Lane. So, I believe there is one at the north end somewhere near that gate and, then, there is probably going to be one on the proposed medical campus nearby, but there are no plans to bring a fire hydrant onto Serenity Lane. That's all I had written down. So, if there is anything I missed --

Simison: Deputy Chief, I think -- I think the one thing that if the access changes, but maybe if you will just want to reiterate the point about where fire Station 7/8 is planned to be built, so that they are aware of where the future response will come from by the -- and that will occur well before Chinden is ever built out to six lanes.

Bongiorno: Correct. Mr. Mayor and City Council and our caller, yes, Station 7 or Station 8, whichever one we are going to call it, is within a mile. I don't know if -- Patrick, if you want to quit sharing I can -- I can bring that map up again. I still have it open. Let me know when it's up.

Simison: It's up, chief.

Bongiorno: Okay. So, here is Serenity Lane right here in this little green area and, then, right here over by the high school is where the -- we own this land right here, this -- this little Idaho shaped piece of land. The city -- I don't know if we have closed on it yet, but we own that piece of property and that is where the -- one of our proposed fire stations is going to go. So, once that station is open and built, we just have a quick jaunt down McDermott and, then, we are into that area fairly quickly. Again, with the -- with that station built that's what our five minute response time looks like in that area. So, the whole thing is green. And, actually, if we zoom out a little bit we cover -- we cover quite a bit. So, we will actually go almost into Star with that fire station being built.

Simison: Thank you, Deputy Chief. If we can now go to Mr. Dolsby just to confirm the water-sewer infrastructure in this area.

Dolsby: Yes. Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, as a part of this development if -- Patrick, could you bring back up that -- yeah. Thank you. That the services are going to be stubbed down that little stub street that goes to the bottom. Yeah. Right there. There is water and sewer services that will be in that road when it gets stubbed to the end of that cul-de-sac and the plan to serve that Serenity Lane would be that -- that those water and sewer lines would be taken up in the future up Serenity Lane. We don't have any plans to do that as a city project, it would more than likely -- it would be done as kind of as an as-needed basis as the septic or the wells fail in Serenity Lane. So, right now we don't have -- we wouldn't have any plans to bring services up Serenity Lane or put fire hydrants in, but in the future water and sewer would most likely go up Serenity Lane to serve those homes.

Simison: Thank you, Mr. Dolsby. And, Sonya, I'm going to turn the rest over to you to the best of your ability to follow up on any of the additional questions.

Allen: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council. I'm not sure that I got everything he was asking, but I can cover a couple of them that I remember. There was some conversation about -- or concerns about light trespass. When we review the actual detail plans for the site with the certificate of zoning compliance and design review, we do require a photometric plan to be submitted from a light engineer and lighting cannot trespass onto adjacent residential property. So, we will be reviewing a photometric plan with approval of this project. Frontage roads. Typically we like to see a public street. The reason we did not require one to the west is because of the Peregrine Heights, the residential development, and the feasibility of it redeveloping anytime soon, we didn't -- we didn't feel like it was probably very feasible that that would happen. So, rather than require a stub street -- a public stub street to residential property that couldn't go

anywhere for quite some time, we looked at the alternative of a frontage road. So, that will provide access eventually to the property to the west, which is part of the future mixed use and interchange designated area and the State Highway 16 interchange. Yes. In that area there. Are there any other questions that I missed?

Simison: I think -- Sonya, I think the only thing that I had -- and I just -- what is the land use designation that this area to the west is?

Allen: Yeah. It's mixed use interchange. MUI.

Simison: Okay.

Allen: And it -- it's just basically for low traffic mix of uses.

Simison: Is that primarily residential-commercial in that --

Allen: It could -- yeah. It could be that. We want -- we want to see more uses that don't generate a lot of traffic, so offices, possibly some residential, low intensity commercial uses.

Simison: Okay. And, lastly, I will turn it over to the applicant, if you feel like there is any questions that we missed from the questions that were asked.

Weatherly: Mr. Mayor? Excuse me. I saw Steve Siddoway raise his hand. I moved him over.

Simison: Okay. Mr. Siddoway, did -- were there questions that were asked for you as well. You are looking a little Bohemian Rhapsody right now.

Siddoway: Mr. Mayor, can you hear me okay?

Simison: Yeah. Now we can hear you. Yeah.

Siddoway: No --

Simison: Steve, maybe turn off your video.

Siddoway: -- have one question -- all right. Can you hear me better now?

Simison: Yes.

Siddoway: Okay. I have been in communication back and forth during the hearing with our pathways project manager Kim, just to confirm something that I had a question about. If there -- it might be easiest to describe if we could bring up the slide that showed the -- the pathway network. Can we switch to that one? I think it's number 13. Yes. So, this line on -- actually, does look correct, but there is a part that's missing -- well, so as long

as the conditions of approval are adopted as they are already written we are fine, but from -- from the -- where the red line crosses what's shown is Levi Lane -- it sounds like it might have a new name now, but there is also a requirement to continue south to the southern edge -- yes. Right there. Of the subdivision to connect to a pathway that's being constructed in the Oaks Subdivision below it. So, I just want to make sure that that is also happening and hasn't been left off intentionally.

Connors: Mr. Mayor, Council Members, yes, this is also a ten foot pathway. I neglected to show it on accident, but, yes, it does run full length to this property.

Siddoway: Okay. That takes care of my concern. Thank you.

Simison: Patrick, did you guys have any -- any additional comments to Mr. Haneborg's questions that may have not been addressed by staff?

Connor: Yes. Yes. Mr. Mayor, Council Members. Thank you, Mr. Haneborg, for testifying. The -- the notion of the gate on the north end of Serenity Lane was just part of the conversation today that we had with the neighbor -- neighbor representative in a way to keep traffic from going down through them on accident. Whether a gate is a desirable for our access there -- I think there is other solutions we can provide, whether it's signage. We also have some -- some space here that we can provide a turnaround point -- if you have made the wrong turn that this is a private road, a private community, it will be accessible for them to turn around. This is some space and we are happy to do this as part of the application. As -- as staff said, the lighting study will happen in the conditional use permit process and we are more than happy to work in creating lighting that is not going to be a distraction and that keeps the sky dark and keeps the parking lot safe. Down at the front end of the property these are R-4 homes that are adjacent to this lot, because of its location on the corner. This particular homeowner is actually one of the landowners for this overall project. He supports the project. He is in favor of it. He is fine with the four neighbors adjacent to his parcel. Initially at the first Planning and Zoning Commission we had five lots adjacent to his and we added this green space here to mediate and it actually made the lots quite a bit larger than we initially had them. Again, if and when in the future of Serenity Lane does terminate at the north end at this point, it makes this access point even all the more critical, so we are happy that is planned here and that it will be there for future fire access. As of now with the gate it will be for Serenity use only, but that will be a primary access point in the future for access onto Chinden. And, then, just -- just to touch on some of the coordination we have had with the neighborhood. I believe it was December 17th of last year -- so, coming on a year that we had our very first neighborhood meeting with this project. It seems like five years ago with how this year has gone, but -- so, the first neighborhood meeting. We had a follow-up neighborhood meeting in the springtime and, then, we had another conditional use permit meeting specifically about the medical campus. So, we actually had three official meetings. That doesn't count the number of phone calls I have had with members of Peregrine Heights. Text messages. E-mails. You know, a couple hours each month the past three months at these public hearings working through some of these issues and we have made a lot of concessions, we have made a lot of changes. We have got a lot of

really valuable input that has made this project better and as best as I think we could possibly make at this point. The -- the concerns were completely valid and they completely make sense as far as the frontage road and transportation access and things like that and that's just going to be part -- part of the project because of the way that the code reads and the way the project is situated. I think we made a lot of accommodations to be the best possible we can be. We think that the medical campus is a really integral part of this overall project in making a true mixed use, but also an economic hub and a tax base for the City of Meridian. I just want to touch on two other points that we haven't had a chance to comment on. The multi-family portion over here -- like we said, there is one common management company, so there is one point of contact in the case of fire and emergency and that's the intent and that's the purpose of having that single management company is to ensure that the whole community is safe for emergency responses. That's the way that these projects function as we build in neighboring municipalities around the Treasure Valley. And, lastly, the parks -- there is some discussion on the amount of land that we are using for parks, excluding the buffers. I just also want to touch on -- there is a future school site over here with the school amenity, whether it's ball fields or playgrounds and things like that, that is another part of this project that's not being shown, but it is neighborhood amenity and it is part of a public facility that can be used by citizens of this area. And as far as the Parks and Rec, we think we have done a really good job in scouting these usable pocket parks with actual amenities, but also leaving some area for creative space and be able to throw a baseball or kick a soccer ball or, you know, pull -- get on a sled. So, I think we are really proud of this project, we are proud of what the community will become as it grows in the future and -- anything else that --

Leonard: I think you covered it.

Connor: Okay. I think that covers several questions. If you have anymore questions we are open to them.

Simison: Thank you, Patrick. Do we have anyone who has raised their hand wishing -- they wish to testify, Madam Clerk?

Weatherly: Mr. Mayor, we do not.

Simison: Okay. Patrick, I don't know if that intended to be your wrap up or not, but, Council, any additional questions for the applicant before we officially go to them for any final comments?

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: A couple of questions. Patrick, on your last comment, help me understand how the school site is part of the project without any apparent connectivity. At least from what

we are looking at on the screen right now is a good example. What road connects to the east?

Connor: Hold on one second. Let me pull up a different map. This probably does it the best. So, as I stated in the very beginning, but there is about 28 acres here that's owned by West Ada School District and the history here is a lot of these parcels in this area were illegally subdivided many many years ago. So, in order to have this particular parcel owned by West Ada School District legally annexed and zoned, their -- their option was to join in our plat and so it's shown here strictly for the intention of being annexed and zoned, because it's owned and will be developed by the school district itself, it's not necessarily part of our phasing plan or our project, but it is part of this application. Yeah. The -- this road here -- if you can see my cursor. That's West Rambling Street. That is part of the school district parcel. It's kind of like a panhandle. And that is their access road to the collector road and into their project. And that's also an ACHD collector road that will eventually connect to Rustic.

Borton: Okay. Okay. Thank you. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: The second question concerns the -- the outparcel on that northeast corner. Correct. So, it's not part of this application, but your reference to the other -- the map that shows if it were -- yeah. So, this is the actual application and plat, but you have got another one that has -- there you go. So, that -- that parcel -- it looks like it's about 130 feet wide and it looks to be completely useless. So, why wouldn't we wait until that parcel is part of this application, at least with an affidavit of interest that allows you to include it, because I don't see any scenario where the application makes sense without it. And it sounds like, to your credit, you might not either, which is why this is what's shown to us. So, why wouldn't we wait until that is a hundred percent certain to be part of this?

Connor: So, this is kind of getting into the minutia of that -- sorry. Mayor and Council Members, this is kind of getting into the minutia of that particular parcel and how the deal is currently structured. That parcel -- it is a very kind of oddly sized and shaped parcel. We are including it and showing it here, because there is a -- it was recommended by staff to not leave any parcels not included and also it works better as an overall project in allowing us to have this as far away from here as possible and offering two points of access and because of the way the contract is negotiated for that parcel, a significant amount of money would go hard upon getting this in the contract and getting it part of this application, the intent with the -- with strategy of the negotiation is if this parcel is annexed and zoned, it gives the hospital enough confidence to go hard -- or to go hard earnest money for this outparcel based on negotiations. If we wait or if it's part of this application and, then, for whatever reason it does not go through, it is a very expensive outparcel that is now unusable for the desired intent. So, like I said before, we do want to have this outparcel part of this application, part of this project. We want to bring it in during the conditional use permit process and annexing and zoning and we are showing this building as part of it. We wanted to show it in both ways, because we wanted to show that the

project can be developed and could be developed without this outparcel. Our complete intent is for it to look like this at the end of the day, but because our application excludes the outparcel we are showing it here. It can be developed like this. It can work. But that is not how we want it to be and that's not how -- if we are approved tonight and this was annexed and zoned tonight, this outparcel now becomes part of the project, there is enough security there for the hospital to move forward with the -- with the acquisition of that parcel and so this will be part of the conditional use design of the application.

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Just a quick follow up. Patrick, I -- that's amongst a lot of good concerns that have been raised I think by the -- by the public and fellow Council Members. That one for me is paramount, meaning the absence of that as part of this is a critical omission. We have seen other projects where you have -- there is an adjacent parcel under contract and you have a binding affidavit of interest or an automatic trigger upon annexation and there is -- there is zero room for any opportunity for it not to be included and -- and just the remarks about -- even a potential that it might not be included -- anything can go sideways unless you already haven't locked up contractually with absolute certainty. It didn't sound like you are there yet and there is risk, I understand, with -- with money going hard without it. That's the concern, because while this project technically could go forward without it, oftentimes we have been reluctant and have said maybe it's not time yet, because the parcels aren't complete and this -- for me that was one of the concerns in prep for this that I was hoping there was a different answer. I just didn't see anything which provided certainty and leaving that outparcel -- if -- if the very -- even if it's really unlikely, but the likelihood is greater than zero where you can't guarantee it won't happen -- that parcel would be a problem for a long long time and perhaps completely unbuildable. So, those are the -- those are some of the concerns on that issue alone that -- I don't know how you -- how that survives today, quite frankly. That's -- that's a big one.

Leonard: Mr. Mayor and Councilman Borton, thanks for your comments. I think -- this is, obviously, something that's been a very big deal throughout the duration of this whole project and my understanding is -- I haven't been involved since beginning of us working on this, but I'm saying that we were trying to get a hold of the property owner for that outparcel for quite some time to get them to be a part of this project at the very beginning of it and we weren't able to make contact and, then, as the project came to fruition, obviously, there was more interest from the outparcel in being included and as such it's kind of brought forth a weird situation where it's almost like a Catch 22 where if we include them at a certain point, then, they know that their property is valuable and it just kind of becomes -- it would be tricky, I guess, to require us to include them as part of this, knowing that they would be the only reason we would get maybe a recommendation or approval in this case. If that makes sense. I would be interested to maybe see what Bill Nary thinks or if there is legal counsel here just to kind of see how that would work, just because I'm not familiar with that whole -- of that kind of -- it just seems a little bit -- it could be strange I think.



Hunsicker: This is Betsy. Can I -- can I chime in here? This is Betsy from West -- from HCA West Valley. So, we actually have -- if it's not executed yet, we are almost to have an executed purchase and sale agreement on that property. We are already looking at a demolition -- we are already looking at demolition companies. The seller was out of town and unavailable for several weeks. I mean it's been a very challenging situation just to get them to -- you know, kind of to get it done, but -- but we have -- we -- we agree to all the terms and we have that PSA -- if it's not executed, then, it's very close to be executed.

Borton: Okay. Thank you. I appreciate the update. And Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: I'm not trying to be a wet blanket, but I think it's beneficial for you, for sure, just to hear that concern. There have been very rare circumstances in different applications in prior years where the -- the unintended event actually occurred and you have -- whether it's a spite strip or just the -- the extremely rare, but problematic outparcel or spite strip that in hindsight we could have avoided and so that's why I'm being -- at least just trying to openly express that concern, that we have seen it happen before. Nothing's a deal until it's a deal, so without that one hundred percent certainty and maybe that comes very soon, but it's not here tonight. So, amongst the other areas of concern that one's just a problem.

Simison: I completely agree personally. I think it's hard to judge a book by a different cover. Until that cover is part of it you don't get to -- you don't get to approve this project based on what may or may not happen in the future, you can only approve based on what's in front of you today. In my personal opinion. So, maybe a suggestion at the time we are at. Council Woman Strader had a suggestion to put this off for additional opportunities for -- to talk to the residents. I don't know if that's as important as it is for this outparcel to be determined if it will be part or not officially of a future application and if additional time would allow that to be wrapped up, since we hear it's close. As well as talk to the residents.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Yes, Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I -- I could just summarize, I guess, where my head is at. I feel like I -- I just don't -- personally I just don't think we are there yet. I also don't think there is any sense in rushing through something that's not fully flushed out of this size and scope. I -- I would be okay with making a motion to continue it. I guess I would hope, you know, not only that we could -- certainly the developer would have an opportunity, if they wanted to take it, to continue the good work they have done in working with the neighbors, flush out any more concerns, hopefully come back to us with that remaining parcel acquired or under a contract or something more certain, to Councilman Borton's point, and, then, I -- I personally still have a few concerns about the multi-family development, the different ownership of those buildings and wanting to see some type of an amenity there and an

open space concerns that remain, because I -- if my fellow Council Members feel differently, they want to chime in, otherwise, I will make a motion to continue.

Simison: I'm -- I'm getting general agreement that that would be the direction, the preference from your Council. Maybe a question for the applicant or -- or Betsy, if she's still here. How long until they think further decisions could be made upon the outparcel?

Connor: We believe that -- Mr. Mayor, Council Members, we believe that the contract is there, the buyer has just been out of the country off and on throughout this year and so it's been hard to pin down. So, we think that -- we think that the purchase and sale agreement can be executed very shortly and it can be included in the application.

Simison: So, very shortly during the holidays, is that January 5th or further out than that?

Connor: Okay. We would need time and maybe -- maybe staff could advise us here, because it -- we are actually changing the application, we will have to renote the neighbors, have an additional neighborhood meeting before the next hearing. If we can get a variance from that we would appreciate it and just have the application show as it's shown on the screen now as intended and since that affidavit and the outparcel be part of the application.

Allen: Mr. Mayor? This is Sonya.

Simison: Yes, Sonya.

Allen: If -- I just want to speak up. If we are going this direction, if -- if this property is obtained and they do file a request for annexation, that part has to go back to the Commission. Well, not back to the Commission, but it has to go to the Commission and they have to make a recommendation to Council. Are you thinking of delaying this application that long? Anyway, just a consideration for you to be aware of.

Simison: Mr. Nary, I know at one point in time the question was that they would do something through the CUP for the outparcel. Do you -- how would you envision this moving forward if it was delayed with that as part of the process?

Nary: So, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, what I thought I heard Mr. Connor say was that their intention was -- would be to bring that back with the CUP and an annexation at the same time. So, I think that was their intent. If they -- if they want to do it now, Sonya is correct, you are going to have to amend this application, restart the process, put this on hold to get that other one to catch up to this one, so that it's one project. Or, I guess, alternatively -- I know this is a delay as well, but it sounds like that's the direction Council is considering -- you could remand this back to the Planning and Zoning Commission, because it still has to get amended, attached, connected together, one project, reviewed as a whole, all of the neighborhood meetings, all of that has to be done over. So, either way this either sits until it catches up to it or it goes back and they all get connected together at P&Z.

Simison: So, I guess I will ask the applicant, based on those directions, if they have a -- a desired way to move forward.

Allen: Mr. Mayor? I'm sorry, this is Sonya. May -- may I interrupt real quick?

Simison: Yes, Sonya.

Allen: The -- the outparcel annexation would really be separate from the conditional use permit for the hospital. The medical office building doesn't require a conditional use permit. That wouldn't prohibit them from bringing in two separate applications, a conditional use permit for the hospital and an annexation for the medical office building, but they are not really the same application. So, I just wanted to clarify. Thank you.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Frankly, I -- I'm not tracking any of that. So, I -- I think there could be some benefit, honestly, to going back to Planning and Zoning, because I feel like they have -- they will be able to hear the concerns from Council and -- and help maybe iron out some more details if it's needed. Yeah. I guess -- I think there is a consensus from Council that we are not ready to make a decision on this tonight, because we don't feel like we have a full application. So, I guess does Planning staff have a recommendation on the optimal way to do this or does the applicant have a strong opinion and -- and some timing that they want to suggest for a tentative -- or for a date to hear -- to have a discussion?

Leonard: Mr. Mayor, Council, I would like to maybe question if we could do another option in potentially tabling this application as it stands now to provide enough time to finalize the purchase agreement that Betsy mentioned with the condition, obviously, that we would need to annex and zone that parcel to be able to use it as part of this project and potentially maybe add some information or some phrasing to the DA to that effect. Is it maybe an option. Just so that -- that the project doesn't get held up too much, just knowing how long this process usually takes. Is that something that the -- the Council might consider?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Just so I understand, is the applicant requesting that we approve part of the project to move forward and not the entirety of it?

Leonard: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, no, that's -- I'm sorry if I incorrectly stated that. I'm asking if we can maybe continue this project with the knowledge that we haven't yet acquired that parcel, but the understanding that it's quite possible that we will. Essentially, if -- I guess the way I'm thinking about it is if we have come to you with this

project and said, hey, we just bought this parcel, it's included in this concept plan, you could potentially have approved the project as you see it now, with the understanding that we would have to, obviously, annex that parcel in and zone it before we can develop it and, then, potentially include the condition or something phrasing wise in the development agreement that would see -- that we would need to do those things to be able to develop the -- the parcel. The reason being the residential and the medical campus are -- although in the same project they are both -- you know, they have different timelines and different -- different phasing plans and it would hold the rest of the project up contingent on the medical campuses movement I guess.

Nary: So, Mr. Mayor?

Leonard: If that makes sense.

Simison: Mr. Nary.

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, I guess one of the concerns I have -- and I don't know if Sonya has an opinion about this, but the problem with that, Stephanie, is that the record itself will be very disjointed, because you are going to have a record that the only thing they are going to be technically listening to at Planning and Zoning is the annexation of that one outparcel and a very broad conversation in how it's going to connect to something else that's not in front of them and, then, it's going to come back with a -- with this map that you are showing us tonight, which, actually, isn't the project map. It's the proposal if you had the other piece. So, the Council is really considering what you have, not what you might have, and so it really isn't the same thing. I know it seems small, but from a legal standpoint if -- if we were to be challenged on this decision, a district court is going to have a very hard time trying to piece this together as a -- one project when it's really now presented as two projects. It isn't simply like adding a piece to a campus, like with St. Luke's where they added the northern pieces, there is -- those were different. So, I'm really concerned about trying to just even hold it until the other one catches up. I -- it makes more sense to me from a legal standpoint to remand it back, get this amended, get your meetings done, get the noticing done, look at the project as a whole and, then, there is one decision based on one giant fact and record, than two.

Simison: Well, Council, you have heard your recommendation from legal. I would either suggest you are going to do an up or down on what you have in front of you with an outparcel or remand back to Planning and Zoning for further direction at that point in time.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I move that we remand file H-2020-0047 back to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Simison: So, before we -- do we need to close the public hearing and, technically, I don't think I have given the applicant the final statement yet. To be remanded or closed first?

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, the -- it's okay to leave the record open, because you are going to probably have to be writing in or providing comments, so that's not a problem for the record. Probably should give the applicant the last word first before you make a motion.

Simison: Okay. So, would the applicant like to make any final comments before the motion you heard moves forward?

Connor: No. Mr. Mayor, Council Members, we don't have anymore comments on that. We defer to legal advice.

Leonard: Yeah. Thank you, Bill, for your comments on that. That does make sense.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Do I need to make my motion again?

Simison: Yes. Make it one more time and, Mr. Nary, any specific comments that you would like to include -- have included in that motion?

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, I think Council Member Strader -- I think simply to remand it, again, to reconsider this application with the additional outparcel being added. It sounded as if the Council would not be interested in this project without it. So, if that's your desire, I would include that. They will have this record, so they will have all your comments besides that. So, that would be my only suggestion.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: So moved.

Simison: All right. Do I have a second?

Perreault: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second. Is there any discussion on the motion?

Borton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Borton.

Borton: Yeah. Thank you. Just very briefly. We don't -- to the applicants, we appreciate your patience and in -- in the somewhat clumsy nature of this process, but it really is truly designed to make sure we have an opportunity to get it right and in the very few times we remand a project to P&Z there has been a really good reason for it and there has been -- things have gotten better. So, it's -- it's not done lightly. We understand that time is critical, but -- but I think you can appreciate the concern on this particular issue. So, that's all.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any additional comments on the motion?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: Do we need to select a date for their hearing at this time or will that be handled separately?

Simison: That will be handled separately.

Perreault: Okay.

Simison: Hearing no further comments, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it. The motion is agreed to and the item is remanded.

**MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.**

Simison: Thank you very much for working through that this evening and we look forward to seeing the complete full better project hopefully soon.

Leonard: Thank you all. Appreciate your feedback.

Connor: Thank you.

Leonard: We will see you soon.

#### **ORDINANCES [Action Item]**

- 4. Third Reading of Ordinance No. 20-1905: An Ordinance Amending Meridian City Code Section 10-1-1, Regarding Adoption of 2018 International Building Code, 2018 International Residential Code, 2018 International Swimming Pool and Spa Code, 2018 International Energy Conservation Code, 2018 International Existing Building Code, and Respective Local Amendments; Amending Meridian City Code Section 10-1-2, Regarding Amendments to International Building Code; Amending Meridian City Code Section 10-1-3, Regarding Amendments to International Residential Code; Repealing and Replacing Meridian**

**City Code Section 10-1-4, Regarding Amendments to International Energy Conservation Code; Amending Meridian City Code Section 10-2-3(B), Regarding Plumbing Permit and Inspection Fees; Amending Meridian City Code Section 10-3-3(E), Regarding Electrical Permit and Inspection Fees; Repealing and Replacing Title 10, Chapter 4, Meridian City Code, Regarding Adoption of the 2018 International Fire Code and Local Amendments Thereto; Amending Meridian City Code Section 10-5-1, Regarding Adoption of 2018 International Mechanical Code, 2018 International Fuel Gas Code, 2018 International Residential Code Parts V And VI, and Respective Local Amendments; Amending Meridian City Code Section 10-5-2, Regarding Amendments to 2018 International Mechanical Code; Amending Meridian City Code Section 10-5-3, Regarding Amendments to the International Fuel Gas Code; Amending Meridian City Code Section 10-5-4(H-M), Regarding Amendments to Part V (Mechanical) and Part VI (Fuel Gas) of the 2018 International Residential Code; Adopting a Savings Clause; and Providing an Effective Date**

Simison: Okay. Next item up is ordinance. It will be the third reading of Ordinance No. 20-1905. I will turn this over -- ask the Clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Weatherly: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. This is the third reading of Ordinance No. 20-1905. An ordinance amending Meridian City Code Section 10-1-1, regarding adoption of 2018 International Building Code, 2018 International Residential Code, 2018 International Swimming Pool and Spa Code, 2018 International Energy Conservation Code, 2018 International Existing Building Code, and respective local amendments; amending Meridian City Code Section 10-1-2, regarding amendments to International Building Code; amending Meridian City Code Section 10-1-3, regarding amendments to International Residential Code; repealing and replacing Meridian City Code Section 10-1-4, regarding amendments to International Energy Conservation Code; amending Meridian City Code Section 10-2-3(B), regarding Plumbing Permit and Inspection Fees; amending Meridian City Code Section 10-3-3(E), regarding Electrical Permit and Inspection Fees; repealing and replacing Title 10, Chapter 4, Meridian City Code, regarding adoption of the 2018 International Fire Code and local amendments thereto; amending Meridian City Code Section 10-5-1, regarding adoption of 2018 International Mechanical Code, 2018 International Fuel Gas Code, 2018 International Residential Code Parts V and VI, and respective local amendments; amending Meridian City Code Section 10-5-2, regarding amendments to 2018 International Mechanical Code; amending Meridian City Code Section 10-5-3, regarding amendments to the International Fuel Gas Code; amending Meridian City Code Section 10-5-4(H-M), regarding amendments to Part V (Mechanical) and Part VI (Fuel Gas) of the 2018 International Residential Code; adopting a savings clause; and providing an effective date.

Simison: Thank you. Council, and those present, you have heard this read by title. Is there anybody who would like it read in this entirety? Seeing no one ask for that, do I have a motion?

Perreault: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Perreault.

Perreault: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 20-1905 with suspension of rules.

Simison: No suspension is necessary.

Perreault: Oh, because she read the entire -- the entirety --

Simison: It's that we had all three readings over three weeks, so --

Perreault: Oh, got you.

Simison: I have a motion and a -- do I have a second to the motion to approve?

Hoaglund: Second the motion.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve the third reading -- or Ordinance No. 20-1905. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

## **FUTURE MEETING TOPICS**

### **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

#### **5. Per Idaho Code 74-206A(1)(a) To deliberate on a labor contract offer or to formulate a counteroffer.**

Bernt: Mr. Mayor? I failed to mention during the -- the adoption of the agenda that we no longer need Executive Session, Item 5. We handled that business in our previous Executive Session after the workshop.

Simison: So, you are moving to vacate Item 5 from the agenda?

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I move that we vacate Item 5 from the agenda this evening.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, second the motion.



Simison: I have a motion and a second to vacate Item 5. Is there any discussion. If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay. The ayes have it.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Bernt: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Bernt.

Bernt: I move that we adjourn the meeting.

Hoaglund: Mr. Mayor, I second the motion.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 11:00 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON

\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK