

**Public Hearing for Solara Estates Subdivision (H-2025-0013) by
Jadon Schneider, Bronze Bow Land, located at 1695 E. Amity Rd.
and 4940 and 5060 S. Locust Grove Rd.**

- A. Request: Annexation of approximately 15 acres across three (3) parcels of land from Ada County into the City of Meridian with requested zoning of R-8 and R-2 from RUT which includes parcel q numbers S1132223130, S1132223210 and S1132223320.
- B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 14 single-family lots, including one existing home site to remain and five (5) common lots for a total of 19 lots on 9.72 acres of land (parcels S1132223210 and S1132223320).
- C. Request: Alternative Compliance to reduce the landscape buffer along the street adjacent to Lot 11, Block 1 by 50%.

Smith: All right. Next item on the agenda Item No. 4 is for H-2025-0013 for an annexation, preliminary plat and alternative compliance for the Solara Estates Subdivision at Amity and Locust Grove Roads. We will begin with the staff report.

Ritter: Good evening, Commissioners. So, again, tonight we are here for Solara Estates Subdivision. So, this site consists of a little over 15 acres of land. It's currently zoned RUT. It's located at 1695 East Amity Road, 4940 and 5050 South Locust Grove Road. So, the annexation -- they are requesting a zoning designation of R-8 and R-2. The church -- the -- the existing Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints would like to be zoned R-8, because churches are not allowed in R-2 and R-4 zones and the preliminary plat -- the subdivision is requesting a zoning of R-2. So, the preliminary plat will consist of 14 building lots and five common lots for a total of 19 lots on approximately 9.72 acres. They are also requesting alternative compliance, which is an administrative process to reduce a portion of the landscape buffer along the street adjacent to Lot 11. So, along this portion. They did submit some building concepts for this and staff is recommending that lots -- the rear and side lots of facing and Locust Grove, that they provide -- incorporate articulation through change into more of the building modulations, recess -- projections, recesses, step-backs, pop-out, bays and porches. So, all of this is for any of the two story lots. Single story homes will be exempt from this. So, these are examples of the homes that they are proposing for this -- for their preliminary plat. These are the amenities. So, R-2, only -- it's only required to have eight percent open space and not the regular 15 percent that's required by most of the zoning and so these are their amenity details. They are proposing a covered shelter and picnic tables. So, there is hard surface here where the pic -- covered sheltered and the picnic table and an open grassy area. This is their open space exhibit. So, the existing home will remain here. So, as part of the alternative compliance as you can see once you put in the requirements from ACHD, which is requiring 50 feet of right of way from the center line to the lot, so there is 17 feet of right of way, plus a three foot wide gravel shoulder and a ten foot wide multi-use pathway, along with the city's 25 foot landscape buffer. So, there is approximately four feet of

difference between the house and the landscape buffer. So, what is being requested is that that 25 foot landscape buffer be in an easement instead of a common lot. We will -- the director has agreed to allowing a reduction of the landscape buffer around the area where the -- where the driveway is and, then, the rest of it will be 25 feet, but it will all be within an easement and not within a common lot to help mitigate some of the issues on this lot. Another thing -- so, the church will remain as an existing church. With annexation it will be required to hook up to sewer and water, as well as the existing home. With annexation, as the church is not proposing to do any kind of expansion, alterations, so currently the parking lot and the access do not meet current city standards. If there is any additions or modifications to this they will have to meet the current standards. But staff did propose if the Commission or the Council warranted maybe a temporary five foot sidewalk along Locust Grove and along Amity for the church, but it's not anything that the -- that staff is requiring, is only if the Commission thinks it's warranted and recommends that Council requires it, because at this point the church itself -- it came in -- so, they are not really -- they are not requesting any modification, again, but they agreed to the annexation solely to provide a path of annexation for the Solara Estates Subdivision, because the properties are under -- and, again, because the properties are under two separate ownerships we are requesting two separate development agreements to govern each property. ACHD has not -- and, again, as this church was approved through a CUP process within Ada county and they have more access points than that would be allowed within the city, unless the Commission recommends removal of some of those access points, staff is not recommending removal. ACHD has not submitted anything requiring them to remove any of the access points. The report from ACHD basically just looked at the annexation and not for any kind of development on this property for the church. So, they did not require any improvements for the church or removal of any access points at this time. If the church comes in for any -- again, if it comes in for any kind of modification it will have to go through the CUP process, because currently it's nonconforming for some of the things and at that time it will be looked at by ACHD for any kind of improvements that would be required along the frontage of this property. So, basically, it's kind of a straightforward development. It's 14 buildable lots and the lots are bigger than what is normally required, because R-2 requires 12,000 plus square feet of land for the lots and they are -- they are proposing around 22,000 square feet of land. So, their density is about 1.44 dwelling units per acre. So, pretty straightforward. So, at this point I would be happy to answer any questions that you guys might have regarding this development proposal.

Smith: Are there any questions for staff?

Perreault: Mr. Chair?

Smith: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Looking at all the drawings I'm trying to understand why the church property needs to be a part of the development. It looks like that this isn't going to, you know, be built onto their parcel. Is that not the case?

Ritter: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Perreault, so the church is not part of the development, it's just annexing in so it can provide a pathway to annexation for the properties to the south. So, without the church annexing in the properties to the south do not have a connection -- a pathway to annexation, because they are not close to any of the properties that are already annexed into the city.

Perreault: I see. Okay. Thank you.

Smith: Any other questions for staff? Would the applicant like to come forward and, please, state your name and address for the record.

Schneider: Good evening. Jadon Schneider. 3770 North Jackie Lane, Boise, with Bronze Bow. I'm the applicant working on behalf of the developer and the owner. First off thank you, Linda, for -- she killed it. I don't have too much more to say, other than I appreciate her saying it's a straightforward development, because we really feel like it is. Let me try to pull this up here. Yeah. So, Solara Estates Subdivision, as Linda said -- I will try to just kind of briefly go through it. I had a lot more to add to it -- or not a lot more to add to it, because Linda did a great job running through it herself. As Commissioner Perreault asked, there the proposal is for the annexation of the church, because the north property, north of Amity Road, is the area for the southern boundary for the city in this area. So, in order for this project to go forward the church would need to be that path to annexation. As Linda mentioned, there is the three parcels in total, just about 15 acres. The two parcels on the south side are what's proposed as the Solara Estates Subdivision portion and, then, the church parcels to the north is that annexation portion right there. This site is just at the corner of Locust Grove and Amity right here and I will just kind of talk a little bit more specifically about the actual proposal for the subdivision itself. As Linda said it's about ten acres in total. It's a rural-urban transitionary area. The proposal is for those two lots. The goal with the subdivision between the owner and the developer is that they wanted to create these nice larger estate lots, because they really feel like this would fit well in this project. As Linda mentioned, they are about 22,000 square feet, so just about half an acre. They are a little bit over half an acre in total for all of that and ACHD reviewed and approved what we have proposed to them so far. So, we are really happy with everything that we have received back at this point and just kind of a few nuances to the project. As Linda mentioned, there is an existing home on the property. That is the owners -- the current owner of the property. Their plan is to stay in that existing home and stay there throughout the development and post-development, too. So, obviously, they want to see a project that comes together and looks nice, because they have to live with it, just like the neighbors, if this group be approved. So, they want to see something nice that comes together quite well. So, just one thing that I wanted to mention about this site that makes it unique and makes it special and why they would like to do some of these larger homes and what would look nice in this area. It's rather elevated in the southwest corner of the site where the existing home is. This is just a Google street view looking from basically the southwest corner out towards the northeast. So, you have this nice view corridor in here in this area. The existing home is about 40 feet higher -- the finish grade is about 40 feet higher than the furthest point at the northeast corner. So, if you go from the southwest and northeast it's trailing down. So, what the goal is with

this site is to create lots that provide these nice view corridors, so you can have this view as it's stepping down naturally. So, the benefit of that on top of it all is the fact that the neighbors' homes here that already have nice views, we are hoping to protect those as well. One of the things in the staff report that it mentions is R-2 has a zoning that speaks specifically to height standards of 35 feet. So, with their homes -- them being the neighbors -- and the current owners, their homes being in that highest elevation there, the idea would be they would still have homes that would have that view opportunity and maintain that throughout the development. Just talking about where it's at and just trying to show congruent development with this subdivision, you have Reflections Ridge Subdivision to the north, Paisley Meadows to the north and Southern Highlands Subdivision to the east. So, we are trying to show that this subdivision isn't on an island, it's not way out there in the distance. I know we talked about the path to annexation and sometimes it can get a bit, oh, hey, piecemeal the project together, because you have these weird lots that show this long skinny path to annexation. We really feel that it is close to the city and it's just in that congruent development growth area. Just talking about the future land use map. This is in that low density residential. So, the development itself with the R-2 -- or when I say the development -- the subdivision portion is in that R-2. So, the goal is to keep that R-2, keep that low density residential, which is in the future land use map itself. Traffic considerations. ACHD in their staff report spoke specifically to a number of the improvements that they are planning on doing in their capital improvement plan and in their five year work plan. Amity Road is proposed to be upgraded to five lanes. Locust Grove is upgraded -- or is proposed to be upgraded to three lanes and, then, the big one is there is going to be a multi-lane roundabout at the intersection of Amity and Locust Grove. Interestingly enough, in that five year work plan it is dedicated to be designed in 23-24, so as I understand it it is either designed or it is in the works of being designed with the idea of it being constructed in the near future and coming online sometime soon, which would be great for this development and, hopefully, great for any sort of traffic concerns that there might be, obviously, of -- well, obviously, but in theory a roundabout intersection is going to work a lot better than a four way stop intersection. As Linda's mentioned open space right here. The idea would be to have plenty of open space for this subdivision, even though it is a smaller subdivision, try to have that amenity space centralized where people can go congregate and something that looks nice for all the residents there. Linda mentioned on it -- and, you know, I will just try to add to it, not -- not that she didn't do a great job, but just try to explain the alternative compliance request. Basically ACHD is asking for a 50 foot right of way on this side of the road. It's a hundred foot total. So, giving up 50 feet to ACHD and, then, following city's code, which would be another 25 feet for a landscape buffer, would mean that this -- the new property line for the existing home, as Linda said, would be about four feet away from that existing portion. So, here is just kind of a quick cross-section of what that would look like. The idea being giving up both 50 feet of right of way and 25 feet for landscape buffer would cause this site -- this home to be, one, within the setback and the existing driveway to basically render it unusable. So, what the developer is requesting is they would like to give up the full 50 feet of right of way to ACHD as they have requested there, but go through the alternative compliance where instead of adding a 25 foot landscape buffer in this area, they would reduce that down to a 12 and a half foot landscape easement with increased number of trees and shrubs and things like that to

add that landscaping buffer to meet the intent of the code with still allowing the existing home to, one, not be encroaching on a setback and, two, that driveway to maintain usability through there. So, the idea from the owner and from the developer is still to meet the intent of the code. However, in an alternative way and I'm happy to explain that more in detail if there is any questions about it. I know that the first time I was trying to work through it -- it's a bit tricky. As Linda said, there is some elevations that we wanted to talk about overall, but just as a project in a whole we are really happy with it and I would -- oh, just wanted to mention on the staff report -- the one comment that Linda brought up about the temporary pathway around the church property, the only comment that the developer had was with the roundabout coming in from ACHD the question of is the temporary pathway necessary if ACHD is going to be coming in and putting in their roundabout and their sidewalks in this area. Not so much from a, hey, we are trying to skirt any sort of responsibilities that we are trying to do, but mostly the idea of there is not a lot of pedestrian traffic in this area at the moment, so it was just a question from the developer on, you know, hey, we understand what the intent was. If there wasn't a roundabout coming in in theory right around the corner is there -- you know, then, yeah, absolutely, makes a lot of sense. But if it is going to be built by ACHD when they come in and they build out their entire thing, that was the only comment from the developer on that. And, then, one other comment that I caught just reading it before the meeting, in the amenity portion in the staff report I think it mentions a fire pit and I don't think -- I don't think we have proposed any fire pit in there. It had the picnic shelter and it had the gazebo or the picnic tables and whatnot. If I'm wrong I'm wrong, but I think I saw it in there. The only thing is I don't think that the developer had originally said we were going to put a fire pit in that community area. So, just -- just -- I -- it may have been -- it may have been in there and I -- or it may have been missing it. But, anyways, I would be happy to stand for any questions and I appreciate your time and especially appreciate Linda's time and all the work she's done on it. Thank you.

Smith: Thank you very much. Commissioners, are there any questions for the applicant at this time? All right. I did have -- sorry. I did have one question.

Schneider: Yeah.

Smith: Knowing that the -- knowing that the area to the east of this development is on the future land use map of medium density residential, rather than low density, without having slightly different height considerations and things like that, has there been any discussion or consideration of that for when those are developed trying to have the -- have your development set up in a way that they are not at odds for view shedding and things like that when those developments go in? Obviously, you can't predict the future, but --

Schneider: Of course. The main comments that we have been having so far with -- with talking with builders and trying to figure out how the developer is putting it together would be to have those homes closer to the higher side of the lots, so that they can maintain their view with that exact idea. If there is a future development that comes by, obviously, it's tough when you say, hey, you know, we are selling you this view, but someone could,

obviously, come and develop it. The adage of don't buy a view you don't own, it gets tough. But the idea would be in this one to try to put the homes in a location that would add the most height for them, so that they could continue to see hopefully with the same idea of not blocking views of existing neighbors because of that exact idea. We -- we don't want to be a bad neighbor to anybody and build a house and block their view in any way.

Smith: Thank you.

Perreault: Mr. Chair?

Smith: Mr. Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you for bringing that up. Along those lines I just have a recommendation.

Schneider: Yes.

Perreault: We have another neighborhood west of here where there is large lots. They are still in the county and it bumps up against MDR and there has been a battle on that property for a very very long time and so I would just recommend to your home buyers to let them know that there is going to be a different density and I know that's not ideal to let them know that, you are trying to sell homes. I'm a realtor. I understand. But that has - - just that one thing would have really -- I mean it's been literally development after development -- development that's tried to come into that MDR space and the neighbors have just fought it and fought it. So, you will actually do yourself a favor if you do that.

Schneider: Understood. Thank you.

Smith: Commissioners?

Schneider: Great. Thank you.

Smith: Thanks. Now, move on to public testimony. Madam Clerk, is there anyone signed up to testify?

Lomeli: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have Kathy -- is it Carter? Corter? Okay.

Smith: Is that you? Would you like to come up and speak? Okay.

Lomeli: Next on the list is Codi Bills.

Smith: Just, please, state your name and address for the record.

Bills: Good evening, Mr. Chair and Commissioners in the council. My name is Codi Bills and I reside at 5060 South Locust Grove Road. We are actually the owners of the existing house involved in this project. My husband Curtis and I are Idaho natives and we know

how sacred Idaho farmland is. We actually have raised our four sons there and we actually taught them how to farm and we own other farmland in other areas as well. We are in a different stage of life and we are ready to kind of take a break with the farming and we didn't want to move, we could have moved and sold out to a big -- you know, big huge developer and high density and that's not something we wanted to do to ourselves or our neighbors and so we actually interviewed developers and partnered up with these great fellows and we feel like this subdivision will just be an asset to the community. We had a really fabulous neighborhood meeting back in January. Most of the neighborhood -- neighbors were very glad that it wasn't high density. They were happy to see that they were just half acres. There were a little concerns about traffic, but we feel like, you know, with the proposed developments coming up and with it only being 13 homes it shouldn't have an impact on the traffic and with existing construction that's going on right now is making a big impact on -- on traffic jams on Locust Grove, but that will definitely soften up as those projects get finished up. We love this area. We have no intentions of leaving and so that is why we are in full -- full support of this project and actually have been hands on.

Smith: Thank you. Are there any questions? All right. Thank you very much. Madam Clerk, is there anyone else signed up to testify?

Lomeli: Yes. Mr. Chair, I have Mark Agenbroad.

Smith: And just, please, state your name and address for the record.

Agenbroad: Mark Agenbroad. 1420 East Amity Road. And thank you for your time. We are some of the newer folks in the area. We have been there 32 years and others 50 plus and, obviously, things have been changing and most of -- we are not -- we are all in county, so we maybe don't fit in here very well, but I kind of speak for eight to ten of those folks that have one to 12 acres in this area and nobody is excited about further development. As you can imagine with the Brighton developing a mile off of us and the traffic there, people are just less than excited about more and more. So, our -- you know, if we are going to do a development why not one acre lots that fit in with the surrounding areas and -- and just the impact to existing property owners. We know that the intersection is going to change. ACHD has gone through multiple project managers trying to make something work there and they have kind of shot themselves in the foot a number of times, but, anyway, will there be turn lanes to allow for the increased, you know -- and I -- it's probably not a city issue, but just traffic lanes. It only takes one car to back up a bunch of people trying to turn into or out of a subdivision and so -- and those are just some of our concerns, just the growth in itself and just something that fits in with the existing area and the impact to our properties. Thank you for your time.

Smith: Thank you. Madam Clerk.

Lomeli: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have Mike Homan -- Homad. Okay.

Smith: Anyone else?

Lomeli: Okay. And she hasn't signed up, but the lady in the front aisle here would like to testify.

Smith: Ma'am, would you like to come forward and testify? I said would you like to come up and testify? And, then, just -- you can grab one of those microphones and give us your name and your address for the record.

Capell: My name is Bonnie Capell. I have got a little bit of vertigo, so that's what --

Smith: Okay. All right.

Capell: We live right behind the Bills, kind of, and just a little bit in. We have been there for 50 years and this is a bit of an adjustment, but we like the neighbors --

Smith: Could I -- sorry. Could I bother you? Could you speak into the microphone, so we could hear you. It's totally okay. You can move it.

Capell: This way?

Smith: Yeah. That's totally fine.

Capell: Sorry.

Smith: No worries.

Capell: I wasn't going to do this and I don't think my husband wants me to. But our concern is losing our view, because we are -- if the Bills' house is right there, then, there is another -- this is the lot we are concerned about, because we live -- this other thing here that's been rooted, so it doesn't show all our messes. You know. That was supposed to be a joke. Is where we live and if there was a big two story house there or even one with a real high roof it would cut off our view and I just wondered if there is any way that you can put in a contract or so on that there wouldn't be a real high two story house there. We are trying to cooperate with the rest of us and we want to probably subdivide our property, because we have four plus acres right above it. We used to own the whole thing and gradually as we get older and older -- I'm only 25. It -- it gets more of a concern. Plus we have children that all think they should have a part. Anyway, that's all -- that's all I wanted to do is express that concern, that that lot directly below us could be put in a contract some way that it doesn't spoil our view. Okay. Thank you for letting me break the rules.

Smith: Well, thank you so much. Is there anyone else who would like to -- or, Madam Clerk, is there anyone on Zoom or --

Lomeli: Mr. Chair, yes. There is a Julie on Zoom that's raising her hand.

Smith: All right. Julie, would you like to speak? And, then, can we have your name and address for the record.

Edwards: Sure. My name is Julie Edwards and I'm at 1310 East Mary Lane and the first question I had --

Lomeli: Just one second. We can't hear you very well, so if you can -- I'm going to adjust the microphone volume and if you could speak up.

Edwards: Okay. Can you hear me better?

Smith: That's great.

Edwards: Okay. Holding it close. So, the first question I had was already answered and it was why the church was on the same application as a residential development. So, thank you for answering that. Secondly, traffic. This morning -- it's always a concern most weekdays, as this morning, it was backed up heading northbound from about the library at Locust Grove and Lake Hazel all the way to Amity and, then, another stretch from Amity to the Victory roundabout was just a solid line and I just think that that's going to get worse. Like the gentleman had said, you know, one person turning -- heading southbound turning left into the subdivision will hold up a line and, likewise, somebody exiting that subdivision trying to make a left will not happen in the morning hours or the late evening hours and I just wanted to say also in regards to the traffic that, you know, we have seen so much growth in this part of town specifically and it really sort of boggles my mind. When I saw the Bills' house being built, you know, the neighbors and I were all saying, wow, I can't believe somebody is building that close to the road. It's -- it's awfully close to the road and just with knowing that the road -- Locust Grove in the future would likely be widened, I was just curious and this might not be a question you can answer, why it wouldn't have been suggested to them while they were doing permits and whatnot to set that back further and, then, that would have eliminated the need for the alternative compliance request and that goes along with just -- it seems like the bending of rules happens often and so, therefore, I feel like developers just plan what they want, knowing that there is a good chance they will get the variances they want and that could just be a coincidence that's happened in my neck of the woods. I know Brighton has had a lot of variances and so I just feel like, you know, we have rules, we should stick to the rules as best we can. And, lastly, another question is say down the road the church closes and the lot is up for sale and it's sold to a developer, now is there anything that says that that zoning would go back into R-2 or R-4, because it's no longer a church requiring an R-8 zoning? And, lastly, I'm glad this isn't an apartment building going in, but, again, thank you for your time.

Smith: Thank you very much. Madam Clerk, is there anyone else online?

Lomeli: Thank you, Mr. Chair. There is one more person online, but they are not raising their hand.

Smith: Okay. If you would like to testify if you are online, please, raise your hand. Otherwise, is there anyone else in Chambers who would like to come forward? All right. With that I guess would the applicant like to come back forward?

Schneider: Jadon Schneider. 3770 North Jackie Lane, Boise. First off, yeah, thanks for everybody who spoke and stepped up and I know public speaking isn't always for everybody, so I appreciate when -- when people step in and provide their opinions and their thoughts on it. Just trying to answer as many questions as I can. Mark and Julie both specifically asked about the right of way -- or, sorry, the roadway itself. ACHD hasn't provided any sort of requirements to the developers specifying, you know, an additional turn lane or anything into this one here. Kind of going back to the idea of the capital improvement plan from ACHD, they are planning on widening this road to that five lane portion. The size of the development being 14 building lots didn't require any sort of traffic impact study, so ACHD did not require that. Obvious -- when that usually is triggered there is around a hundred lots. So, that's -- that's coming back to the traffic portion. One of the comments that the Bills had made -- Codi had mentioned to me was just Eagle Road has been under construction for so long and it's kind of kicked a lot of traffic over here onto Locust Grove. So, it's noticeable that there is traffic on Locust Grove that's backing up, especially when Eagle Road is going through so much construction right there. I don't live in the immediate area, but that's my understanding of -- at the current state what's happening and if you are out there today I'm sure. Julie asked about the location of the existing house and it kind of ties into Bonnie's question about view corridors and everything there. The existing home was placed there when the Bills built it, mostly because they were working with Bonnie and her husband in regard to trying to find a view corridor that didn't block their neighbors. It's kind of interesting on the site itself, if you can see my mouse, the site is highest at that northeast -- or southwest portion -- portion of the site and from the Bills' backyard it drops down about 15 to 20 feet right off of the back of this patio area right here. So, the actual portion of Lot -- I don't have the lot of numbers on here, but the lot that Bonnie was talking about right there is about 20 feet lower already just in this short distance, mostly because there is just a high point in that very corner and it coincidentally worked out well for the Bills to build their house there, which did meet all the setback standards at the time and didn't block any views from Bonnie at the time as well. So, the -- the idea coming forward from them wasn't that they were trying to jam their house into the corner and get away with something later in the development, obviously, that's not what Julie was referencing, but it wasn't -- there wasn't an intent to try to cause some sort of alternative compliance request, but that was kind of the backstory that I was given on -- on what was happening there. The other idea on the alternative -- alternative compliance is the fact that they are trying to comply in an alternative manner. They are not trying to ask for a variance and say, hey, we can't do this and just let us slip away without doing something to try to make this work. So, alternatively they are trying to make something work there. And, then, yeah, just going back to Bonnie's question specific with that view. The whole idea right there is just to try to preserve those views for not just them, but all the homes, especially the Bills and especially anyone who already has those existing homes. That idea being that there is that pretty steep drop off, which allows them to work there. I know that the developer has been talking with Bonnie specifically and asking like, hey, you know, what would work

here? So, I believe that they have already been trying to make that happen and there is a good way naturally with the topography to make it happen, where no one's views are blocked. Thanks.

Smith: Thank you very much. Commissioners, are there any questions? I do have one question regarding that southern property and I will try to use my words to describe the specific building or specific location that I'm talking about. The kind of center bottom building right on the left side of the cul-de-sac -- the western side of the cul-de-sac right there --

Schneider: Uh-huh.

Smith: -- how much lower -- like what does that incline render -- I mean I don't need exact numbers, but roughly speaking is that still kind of on a similar plane as that southbound property, because that's -- I'm thinking of the view. That's kind of the building in question.

Schneider: In the preliminary plat we do have the grading -- the existing features plan. Would we be able to pull that up, because it has the topography in there and it would show it. If we don't that was -- sorry. That was kind of what I was referencing to the 15 to 20 feet. That lot is the lot that's about 20 feet lower -- or in the center of that lot. So, that hopefully answers, but there is in the preliminary plat application, there is the existing features, which includes the topographic elevations on there as well to see it.

Smith: That's -- that's fine. I think knowing that general height with also the 30 foot limit for even the two story with the zoning, I think it -- that makes sense to me. Okay. That's the only question I had. Any Commissioners have any other questions? Great. Just double checking. Yep. Okay. Cool. Is there -- can I get a motion to close the public hearing?

Stoll: I move to close the public hearing.

Perreault: Second.

Smith: Moved and seconded. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion passes. I didn't say thank you. Thank you by the way.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

Smith: Discussion. Which Commissioner wants to go first?

Perreault: Mr. Chair?

Smith: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Five years ago when the city was doing their Comprehensive Plan, their future land use map, we had a lot of requests to keep the residential out here in R-2 and so I

think this is a really good use for this area and of all of the different kind of residential that can go out here and, then, it has gone even further to the south as was mentioned, this will be a much lighter use and so I'm -- I'm in support of this application. I think the applicant has thought this out well and it sounds like they will continue to work with the neighbors to accommodate as best as possible. So, I feel like this is a really good use for this -- for these parcels.

Smith: Thank you. Other Commissioners? Commissioner Sandoval.

Sandoval: Mr. Chair. Yeah, I agree with almost a half an acre per lot, very very low density. Good fit for the area. On that temporary sidewalk portion, you know, I don't think that we should include something like that, especially with the development of the roundabout and there is no adjacent sidewalks. So, it just doesn't make sense to ask for that.

Smith: Commissioner Stoll, do you have any?

Stoll: I'm supportive of the application, so you get good use for the land, it's within how the area is developing, so --

Smith: Thank you. Yeah. I think this is a good development thing for the R-2 as looking at ACHD's five year work -- work plan and like the applicant was saying, the design phase was 2023-2024, the right of way is slated for -- for -- on Amity Road for 29-30. So, usually, ACHD doesn't like to sit on right of way too much longer after acquiring it. So, I -- you know, hopefully, at some point there should be some easing congestion, at least east-west and, then, you know, Locust Grove I think, you know, the -- south Meridian does need -- need some good attention. I think that's been a focus for a minute. But I think overall these specific properties -- I think the developer is trying to work to be a good neighbor. I can see some ways to -- you know, the right site selection or the right property or housing construction, housing design in the right locations can -- can hopefully abate any concerns about kind of that view and losing that view. Also, hopefully, mitigating those concerns with that eastern medium density residential. That is the one thing that I do want to make clear is -- is the future land use map has some -- some medium density residential to -- you know, to the east and that's what that's planned for; right? And I don't know when that's going to happen. I don't know if it's going to happen anytime soon, but I think this is an area where this development is actually going to be a very valuable transitional space to keep that the rural character on the west and the south, while still allowing for a more natural transition into kind of more suburban Meridian to that northeast. So, I think I'm fully supportive of it. I appreciate the neighbors' concerns in the comments and I understand for a lot of people who have kind of been in this area for a while, I understand that change is hard. Our -- our goal is to identify the -- you know, what is the best and the highest service for the City of Meridian and for its residents as a whole and I think this is some -- something like this could actually do a great job to that end. With that is there a motion?

Perreault: Mr. Chair?

Smith: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Just -- just one more comment. I don't have an issue with the alternative compliance request. I mean ACHD is requesting 50 feet for when they eventually widen the road, so that's going to be there and I mean, obviously, we can't move that existing house. So, I don't think that's -- I think that's going to be a minimal impact. I'm not concerned about it. In light of that, I would like to make a motion. After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council a File No. H-2025-0013 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of September 4th, 2025, with no modifications.

Sandoval: Second.

Smith: It's been moved and seconded. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries. Oh.

Ritter: I just need you guys to -- I know Commissioner Sandoval had said something about the temporary sidewalk, so that needs to be in the motion, whether or not you are recommending it or not.

Smith: Okay. So, we will rewind about 30 seconds.

Ritter: And you can add the alternative compliance in there also.

Smith: Okay. So, we will need to just make sure I guess for the motion whether we want to allow the alternative compliance and then -- which I think you have covered, but also that temporary sidewalk.

Perreault: Mr. Chair, I apologize. Could you run that by me again? We need to include in the motion the alternative compliance decision and also the temporary sidewalk? Is that right?

Ritter: Yes, please.

Perreault: Okay. Thank you. I will do my best. Mr. Chair, I think you have to ask for a new motion or shall I withdraw my motion?

Smith: Kurt, is there a best way to do this?

Starman: I think a couple choices. One, you can amend your motion with the concurrence of your second or you can withdraw the motion and, then, do a new motion. Either way it works.

Smith: I think -- I think maybe amending the motion might be the simplest.

Perreault: Sounds good. All right. I move to make a new motion. After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council of File No. H-2025-0013 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of September 4th, 2025, with the following modifications: The Commission is in agreement to grant the alternative compliance request to reduce the required landscape buffer along the street frontage of Lot 11, Block 1, to 12 and a half feet and the Commission is not in agreement with staff's recommendation -- excuse me -- the Commission is not in agreement with the need to add a five foot temporary sidewalk within the ACHD right of way on the west and north side of the property.

Smith: So, second concurs? Who was the