

## **Meridian Planning and Zoning Meeting**

**December 4, 2025.**

Meeting of the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission of December 4, 2025, was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chairman Maria Lorcher.

Members Present: Commissioner Maria Lorcher, Commissioner Jared Smith, Commissioner Brian Garrett, Commissioner Jessica Perreault, Commissioner Sam Rust and Commissioner Matthew Stoll.

Members Absent: Commissioner Matthew Sandoval.

Others Present: Tina Lomeli, Kurt Starman, Bill Parsons, Nick Napoli and Dean Willis.

### **ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Brian Garrett	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jessica Perrault
<input type="checkbox"/> Matthew Sandoval	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Matthew Stoll
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sam Rust	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jared Smith
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Maria Lorcher - Chairman	

Lorcher: Good evening. Welcome to Planning and Zoning Commission meeting for December 4th, 2025. At this time I would like to call the meeting to order. The Commissioners who are present for this evening's meeting are at City Hall and I don't think we have anybody on Zoom. We also have staff from the city attorneys and the city's clerk's office, as well as the city's planning department. If you are joining us on Zoom this evening we can see that you are here. You may observe the meeting. However, your ability to be seen on screen and talk will be muted. During the public testimony portion of the meeting you will be unmuted and, then, be able to comment. Please note we cannot take questions until the public testimony portion of the meeting. If you have a process question during the meeting, please, e-mail [cityclerk@meridiancity.org](mailto:cityclerk@meridiancity.org) and they will reply as quickly as possible. If you simply want to watch the meeting we encourage you to watch this streaming on the city's YouTube channel. You can access it at [meridiancity.org/live](http://meridiancity.org/live). With that let's begin with roll call. Madam Clerk.

### **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

Lorcher: The first item on the agenda is the adoption of the agenda. There are no changes in tonight's agenda. Please note that Item No. 2, Lofty Creek Park, has withdrawn their application, so if there is anyone here tonight to testify for this application we will not be taking public testimony this evening. Could I get a motion to adopt tonight's agenda?

Smith: So moved.

Rust: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to adopt the agenda. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

### **CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]**

#### **1. Approve Minutes of the November 20, 2025 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting**

Lorcher: The next item on the agenda is the Consent Agenda, which include to approve minutes from the November 12th Planning and Zoning meeting. Could I get a motion to accept the Consent Agenda as presented?

Stoll: Move to approve as presented.

Rust: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to accept the Consent Agenda. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

### **ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]**

#### **ACTION ITEMS**

#### **2. Public Hearing continued from September 18, 2025 for Lofty Creek Park (Live/Work) (H-2025-0020) by The Corners Office Design, generally located at the NW Corner of S. Eagle Rd. and I-84**

- A. Request: Rezone of 6.34 acres of land from the L-O zoning to the C-C and C-G zoning districts.
- B. Request: Short Plat to subdivide the property into two lots to allow for the phasing development.
- C. Request: Modified Development Agreement to remove multi-family as an allowed use

Lorcher: Item No. 2 on the agenda -- I am going to motion that the Commission accept the withdrawal of the application of Lofty Creek Park Live-Work, application number H-2025-0020 and that the public hearing be vacated.

Perreault: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to vacate Lofty Creek Park Live and Work. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

**3. Public Hearing continued from November 6, 2025 for Farrington Heights Subdivision RZ, PP, MDA (H-2025-0016) by Studio H Architects, generally located at the NW corner of E. Pine Ave. and N. Adkins Ave.**

- A. Request: Rezone of 2.9 acres of land from the R-4 to the R-15 zoning district.
- B. Request: Preliminary Plat on 4.68 acres of land consisting of 25 building lots and 6 common lots.
- C. Request: Development Agreement Modification to terminate the existing development agreement and establish a new one.

Lorcher: Item No. 3 on the agenda is item number H-2025-0016 for Farrington Heights Subdivision at Pine and Adkins for a rezone, preliminary plat and development agreement modification.

Starman: Madam Chair, just for the record and for the Commissioners' benefit -- so this is a project that the Commission has considered before. You had a public hearing. You deliberated and you reached a decision, which you forwarded to the City Council. When it went to the City Council it was remanded back to this Commission for -- and the applicant also has made some -- some significant or substantive changes to the application. That's why I wanted to mention that to the extent any of the Commissioners did not participate in the -- in the previous hearing that took place on this some months ago, that's perfectly fine, because this is considered to be a brand new hearing. It's, really, essentially a new application that's been revised. It's been published as a new hearing and we will have a new record for this part of the process. So, whether you participated previously or not is -- is not relevant tonight. You are welcome to participate in these proceedings tonight.

Lorcher: So, before we go further I -- my notes got kind of jumbled here, but I would like to explain the public hearing process for those of you in Chambers and on Zoom. Staff will begin their report with findings on how the item adheres to our Comprehensive Plan and our Unified Development Code. After staff has made their presentation the applicant will come forward to present their case and staff's comment and they will have 15 minutes to do so. After the applicant has finished we will open the floor to public testimony. Each person will only be called once during public testimony. The clerks will call the names individually of those who have signed up on our website or if in Chambers you may come to the microphone or if on Zoom you will be unmuted. Please state your name and address for the record and you will have three minutes to address

the Commission. If you have previously sent pictures or a presentation to the meeting it will be displayed on screen and our clerk will help you run the presentation. If you have established that you are speaking on behalf of a larger group, like an HOA, where others on that group will allow you to speak on their behalf you will be given up to ten -- you will be given ten minutes. After all those who have signed up in advance we will invite any others that wish to testify. If you wish to speak on the topic you may come forward in Chambers or if on Zoom you can raise the hand button and if you are on the telephone please press star nine and wait for your name to be called. If you are listening on multiple devices, such as a computer and a phone, please, be sure to mute those extra devices so we don't experience feedback. When you are finished if the Commission does not have any questions for you you will return to your seat in Chambers or be muted on Zoom and no longer have the ability to speak. And please remember we will not call on you a second time. After all the testimony has been heard the applicant will be given another ten minutes to come back and respond. When the applicant has finished responding to questions and concern we will close the public hearing and the Commissioners will have an opportunity to discuss and hopefully make final recommendations or recommendations to City Council as needed.

Lorcher: So, with that we will start with the staff report for Farrington Heights Subdivision.

Napoli: Good evening, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. Next item on the agenda is the rezone, preliminary plat and development agreement modification for Farrington Heights. So, the applicant is request -- is requesting a rezone of 2.9 acres of the 4.68 acres of land from the R-4 zoning district to the R-15 zoning district and leave the remaining 1.78 acres as the R-4 zoning district, a preliminary plat consisting of 25 building lots and eight common lots and a new development agreement to replace the current development agreement. The site is generally located at the northwest corner of Pine Avenue and Adkins Avenue. As shown on the screen the existing zoning is R-4 and the FLUM designation is medium density residential. So, the subject properties were annexed in 2000 as a part of the Farrington Opal application. The zoning granted at the time -- at the time of annexation was the R-4 zoning district. With the annexation approval the properties were subject to a development agreement that restricted the property to adding one additional home on the 4.68 acres of land. The existing DA that is proposed would replace the new DA if approved. In addition, this application was also previously heard by the Planning and Zoning Commission on August 7th of 2025 and was recommended for denial to City Council. Since the hearing the applicant was remanded back to the Planning and Zoning Commission by City Council and the reasons for denial in front of -- the reasons for the previous denial by the Planning and Zoning Commission were due to a lack of open space, a lack of transition between the proposed two story homes and the existing single story homes and the zoning change from R-4 to R-15 being too abrupt. The proposed -- the proposed subdivision this time around is at a gross density of 5.348 units per acre, which is consistent with the medium density designation -- FLUM designation of three to eight units per acre. The surrounding landscape -- this is the current and the previous, just so you guys can get a little look. They did lose five lots on the outer boundary of the site. So, they went down

from 33 building lots or -- yes -- 33 building -- or 30 building lots, I apologize, to 25 building lots, including keeping the three existing homes that are on the southern portion of the site. So, the surrounding landscape consists of single family detached homes to the north, east and west, while to the south is Pine Avenue -- Pine Avenue. The average density for one mile radius is 6.1 units per acre, which is higher than the 5.34 units per acre the applicant is proposing. Single -- single family detached dwellings are listed as a principally permitted use in the R-15 and R-4 zoning districts. The applicant is proposing to keep the three existing homes on the southern portion, as I previously mentioned, and one of the largest concerns of the -- the neighboring residents was the transition from existing single story homes to the proposed two story homes. The applicant has indicated they do not believe single story homes will be financially feasible due to the proposed lot sizes and the applicant has also indicated that the individual -- individual builders will make the final decision on whether homes will be one or two stories. This did raise some concerns with staff and as a -- as a result of this they did -- we did have some conversations with the applicant and did encourage them to talk with the neighbors to get them in contact with some of the neighbors to have another meeting prior to this meeting. I think the applicant will go over some of how that went. But as a -- as a result of that staff is recommending the building heights don't exceed 28 feet, which typically in the R-15 and R-4 and R-8 zoning districts would be 35 feet and that windows be placed on the rear facades oriented to promote privacy for the existing residents and I think the applicant will cover kind of their proposal for those windows on that rear facade. But, however, staff is asking the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council to carefully determine whether the changes are adequate transition to the existing homes.

Lorcher: Would the applicant like to come forward?

Napoli: Hold on, Maria. Almost done.

Lorcher: Oh. I thought you were done.

Napoli: So, since the previous hearing the applicant did revise their common open space, because that was a reason for denial. Let's see if I can get this to work again. There we go. So, they did increase the amount of open space to 10.9 percent of the development, with 7.5 percent of it being designated as usable open space. In addition to this they are proposing a play area and picnic area in Lot 14, Block 1, right on my cursor. So, open space is not a requirement for this property, because it is below five acres. So, it's not a UDC requirement. However, staff wanted to see some open space here with this application and the original application due to there really not being a regional park or neighborhood park in the area. So, having a place for people to recreate, especially with the lot sizes was important. Access to the property is proposed off of North Adkins Avenue -- Avenue, a local roadway on the eastern portion of the site. This local road is a shared drive between the proposed subdivision and existing subdivision to the east and north. The applicant is proposing two accesses off North Adkins with a common drive accessing three properties on the southern portion of the site and three properties on the north -- northern portion of the site. The proposed

design includes variations of one and two-story homes. Through their elevations they have one and two story homes, each featuring a two car garage. These elevations showcase a range of architectural styles, design elements, including lap siding, neutral color accents, brick and stone veneer, varying roof profiles and different home styles. Review confirms that these elevations do adhere to the city's Architectural Standards Manual. Staff is recommending approval with the new development agreement of this application and we have received written testimony from Don Flaten, Stephanie John, Rick Bradley, Bob Flaten, Maralee Turner, Shawn Freeman and Brian Turner. The neighbors providing testimony have concerns with increased traffic in the area, the transition from the proposed development to the existing homes, primarily the two story to the single story. The density being too high. And increases in crime, littering, loitering and noise and I will stand for any questions at this time.

Lorcher: Would the applicant like to come forward?

Durtschi: Can I use the arrows here to -- okay. Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, hello and good evening. For the record my name is Sabrina Durtschi and I am here on behalf of the applicant. My business address is 5179 South Boven Avenue, Boise, Idaho. 83716. And this evening I am so excited to present to you Farrington Heights Subdivision. So, first, on August 7th this year the application was previously before you for your consideration. During the hearing the Commission expressed several key concerns specifically related to the transition with the surrounding neighborhood, the lack of usable open space and the zoning transition. Following the meeting the applicant team went back to thoughtfully re-evaluate the plan to directly address the feedback you provided. On the slide you will see the original layout, which Nick had mentioned included 30 lots and alongside the other side is the revised plan, which now reduces the perimeter lots to five, bringing our grand total to 25 lots. This reduction allowed us not only to soften the projects interface with the surrounding neighbors, but also to expand and enhance the usable open space, which I will highlight in more detail shortly. We feel these revisions directly respond to and effectively mitigate the concerns raised during the August hearing, particularly regarding neighborhood transition and overall quality of space within the subdivision. So, with the updated layout we are requesting a portion of the site to be rezoned, a preliminary plat and a development agreement modification. The changes show 22 new single family homes, eight common lots and three existing homes that are highlighted in white. Our gross density will be 5.34 units per acre and our residential lot sizes will be ranging from a little bit over 3,000 square feet to 9,570. So, with these changes I would now like to introduce you to Farrington Heights. Farrington Heights has been envisioned as a welcoming, modern and thoughtfully planned community that future residents will be proud to call home. In shaping and designing the overall theme we layered in clean contemporary elements inspired by the proposed home elevations. Our goal was to create an in-fill project that feels both timeless and balanced, modern in character and warm and inviting. The site design emphasizes a contemporary aesthetic with a strong emphasis on community interaction and outdoor living. These features work together to create a family friendly environment that supports everyday livability, while still providing moments of shared connection and comfort. So, let me show you our front entrance.

This is our primary entrance on -- you can see the monumentation for Farrington Heights. This concept reinforces the modern identity of the neighborhood and establishes a clear, attractive arrival experience as people enter and recognize the community. With this application we are requesting a portion of the site to be rezoned to R-15. This request is not being made to increase the overall density of the project. Instead, the purpose of the R-15 designation is to provide a little flexibility, which is needed to meet the zoning standards that is often challenging within in-fill environments. As many of you noted during the previous hearing for this application in-fill development can be very complex and the R-15 zone helps us address those complexities by allowing us to create a well-designed, functional and cohesive neighborhood while maintaining the reduced lock count and overall project vision. We believe this request of the R-15 directly supports the creation of a high quality in-fill community. So, to better understand how the site fits into the broader area let's look at the surrounding context in more detail. To the north we have phases four through seven of Danbury Fair Subdivision. These lots were plotted back in 1994 through 1996 and, then, we have an enclaved county parcel directly north of -- north of the site. To the east we have Maas Edition number one and two. That was platted back in 1993. And to the south we have Pine Avenue. Then directly south of Pine is the industrial commercial area that includes the weed and pest control campus and to the west we have phases one and three of Danbury, platted in '92 and '93 and, then, west of that is Avery Subdivision, which was recently platted in 2019. So, what I'm trying to highlight here is nearly all of the sub -- surrounding subdivisions were built in the early to mid 1990s, meaning this parcel has been -- remained open, undeveloped field for approximately 30 years. So, because this land has been vacant for so long the surrounding homes have never had abutting neighbors and, naturally, this creates a more challenging transition for the existing neighborhood, as residents are adjusting to the idea of development occurring next to them for the -- for the first time since their homes have been built. We recognize this and want to be sensitive to those impacts. So, on the next slides I'm going to outline specific mitigation measures we have incorporated to create a respectful, well-designed transition that considers the neighbors' long standing expectations and character for the area. First I would like to note before I start, when I be -- when I decide -- when I took over the project in the end of October I immediately reached out to Nick, to the city, because I know he had been in correspondence with the neighbors and during our meeting I was like, Nick, can I have the neighbors' numbers and he was like, you know, I would prefer if I give them your information, since that's their personal information, which I completely understood. And so Nick had my information and was communicating, but the only neighbor that did reach out to me was Stephanie John and I conducted an on-site meeting with Stephanie and her family on November 11th and they live directly north at 1111 North Adkins and they are the county parcel that has been referenced in the staff report. So, we reviewed the placement and you can see where that arrow's at. That's really their front living area and their front door. It's a little deceiving, because you think it would be off of Adkins, but as Stephanie explained we had conversations and so we went -- I went back to the applicant and we discussed and we made that lot a little wider, so that it could accommodate a single family single level and so we are happy to make this change and happy to have it included as a condition of approval that restricts Lot 2, Block 1, as a

single level. So, we are in full agreement with the staff report's recommendations to limit the height of the two-story buildings to 28 feet and, additionally, we will incorporate transom windows on the rear elevations of the second floor that are adjacent to the existing homes and you can kind of see these pictures where the windows are high enough people can't see out. So, it protects their privacy, but it also allows light into the buildings, so it's not dark for the homes. We feel that it's also important to note that the two-story homes are already permitted in all of your residential zones and we are not asking for any exceptions, any variances. So, we feel that with the window placement, if we do have two stories at those locations, provides the standards for privacy that the neighbors are wanting and we are also willing to commit to one additional tree in each of the lots' backyards for future mitigation for the neighbors as well and we have -- I have updated the landscape plan to reflect those changes. So, during our previous hearing I'm not sure which commissioner it was, but someone requested that we do some side profile visuals for you to see. So, unfortunately, we did not have those at the time, but we have selected a few homes and I have some for you to review this evening. So, first we are looking at 1054 North Stonehenge. This is a corner lot and the proposed home will abut the existing home kind of at an angle. There is a total of 29.6 feet from the edge of the house to the back of the property line, with a -- with a rear setback of R-15 at 12 feet on our side. This will be a total of 41.6 feet between buildings. Just next door to that last house is 1042 North Stonehenge, the -- the home adjacent to the corner lot, and it has a total of 27.2 feet separation. We also have an existing tree that's buffering along the property line that we are going to try to keep to help with privacy mitigation and this will make the separation a total of 39.2 feet between buildings and the last home we are looking at is 1018 North Stonehenge. This home has a much deeper backyard with a total of 53 feet to the back of their fence line. This will give us a total of 65 feet in total between buildings and we feel that the proposed window placement, the overall separation between the buildings provides sufficient mitigation to ensure privacy for the adjacent neighbors. Next let's talk about open space. So, based on comments during our last hearing we understood that the open space was very important. After reworking the layout and expanding the open space we have been able to design a total of .51 acres at 11 percent and this slide shows the landscaped areas all highlighted in green. For our qualified open space our community is at 0.35 acres at 7.5 percent and would include two amenities for our community. Pathway connectivity and walkability is also a priority within our community. Blue will depict all of our community sidewalks. Orange depicts our pathways that connect from the sidewalk to our amenity area and pink illustrates our ten foot multi-use pathway that provides connection along East Pine Avenue. So, we have some newer elevations that we are planning to showcase for Farrington. These conceptual elevations are modern in architectural character. The homes feature clean roof lines, a mix of contemporary gables and shed roofs and a blend of warm wood toned siding with crisp contrasting accents. Window placement provides abundant natural light, while the overall design reflects a fresh modern aesthetic. And for the amenities our community's main amenity area for Farrington is designed to create a welcoming and functional outdoor environment. The central open space features a modern shaded pavilion with seating, a natural play area with logs and boulders, and thoughtfully landscaped edges that blend privacy and visual interest. Expansive lawn areas provide flexible space for



recreation, gatherings and everyday outdoor enjoyment, enhancing the neighborhood's overall livability. One of the items that the Commissioners emphasized during our August hearing was the importance of locating the play area away from the road and taking that into consideration we intentionally positioned the tot lot and picnic area in this interior corner of the site to provide additional separation and a safer area for children and families. We feel the amenities being tucked away offer protection and privacy for the future residents to be able to gather and enjoy. Okay. So, to quickly summarize, we feel that Farrington Heights is a well-designed, high quality community designed to offer a balanced blend of modern livability. Situated in the heart of Meridian this enclave parcel is located near major commercial and employment hubs and provides a well-rounded selection of mid density housing options to meet the standards of the growing population. The City of Meridian's Comprehensive Plan encourages in-fill development that delivers a diversity of lot sizes, housing types and densities. Farrington Heights aligns with this vision by introducing a fresh, modern neighborhood character within an established area, offering new housing choices and a thoughtful range of densities that enhance the surrounding community. With that I would like to extend my thanks to Nick for his guidance, help and support. Thanks, Nick. And we are in full agreement with the staff report's findings. And with that I will thank you for your time, your thoughtful consideration and the opportunity to re-present our project to you this evening and respectfully request a recommendation of approval this evening from you all. Thank you so much.

Lorcher: Before you walk off, do --

Durtschi: Yes.

Lorcher: -- Commissioners do we have any questions?

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: One question on that restriction on Lot 2, Block 1. Is that already in the staff report or is that something that we would need to add to keep that single story?

Napoli: That would be something that would be new. That's correct.

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Madam Chair, thank you. The pictures of the elevations that were provided, I just wanted to understand what the side setbacks are.

Durtschi: Uh-huh.

Perreault: They look very close together, so --

Durtschi: Yes. Madam Chair, Commissioner Perreault, they are -- with the R-15 that's that kind of flexibility we are needing for the in-fill. It's three feet in between the buildings for each side. So, a total of six. Yes.

Lorcher: Is that for all -- all of them or just the ones in the middle?

Durtschi: No. I believe that -- that's the zoning standard for all -- that will be in the R-15, Madam Chair.

Lorcher: Got you. Okay. Any other questions before we take public comment?

Durtschi: Thank you.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much. Madam Clerk, do we have people to testify?

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. We have Stephanie John. And there are some photos that she would like to share as well.

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

John: My name is Stephanie John. My address is 1111 North Adkins Avenue, Meridian.

Lorcher: Okay.

John: All right. So, I live on the -- what is that -- that north border. My whole -- my property is a rectangle, which makes my -- one of my longest lengths across the shared border. They currently want five different homes. One of them they did say -- they just newly said that would be, what, single story. The other four would be two-story, 26 feet. Well, actually, 28 feet. We thought it was 26. So, that's inaccurate. We -- if you look at it and look how those houses would sit, we would have no privacy at all. Just like Ms. Durtschi pointed out, that is the front of our home that faces the field and that's my driveway. That's how the home is. Sorry. So, there is no privacy. You walk out and four people can look -- well -- yeah, four, because that one is single and I will concede to that. But there is a no privacy. Plus we need that sunlight. Our home was built in 1909, which makes that south sun -- winter sun vital for us, not only are those all our main living spaces, it would increase our power -- our -- our heating bill significantly. Plus it would leave us a shadow. I'm worried about snow being stuck in that driveway space or having nowhere to go or melt and no sun on it. I'm worried about darkness in the winter. It's a very big deal. I'm worried about the traffic. The newly approved Pine 43. I have another picture that showed the intersections. We share two intersections with Pine 43, one at Pine and Locust Grove and one at Shellbrook and Locust. On our side it's called Shellbrook, on Pine 43 side it's called State. I did send a picture with them circled. That's a big deal getting in and out of those, especially during high traffic times is -- is a problem. Adding more to that just keeps adding more to the problem. Now, I know that in-fill is hard. I get that. It's so hard. Pine 43 that was an in-fill. I think

that was a great use. Unfortunately, when you are 360 surrounded by existing already built homes that -- sorry, that's where your property is. They have owned this for a long time. They annex. They could have sold and maybe got this earlier, but they are doing it now. The residents in our homes have been there for an average of 17 and a half years. That means these -- these homes are homes that people are taking and living in and raising their children in. Those are the types of homes I want them to build. I'm not saying two-story homes aren't like that, but they don't fit the aesthetic. They are invading our space. They are taking our sunlight. She mentioned that she wants this community to have everyday livability, but she is not looking at the rest of us. That's not okay. I'm not okay with that. They need to address that. That buffer between what is existing and what they are going for is so abrupt. It's abrupt on us. We are R-1.

Lorcher: If you can just finish up.

John: We are R-1 making us an extreme abrupt and that one lot being changed does not really help.

Lorcher: Okay.

John: Thank you so much.

Lorcher: Thank you very much.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, we have Donald Flaten. He has some photos as well.

Flaten: I, too, had the understanding that the maximum roof height would be 26. It's actually 28. I think it best to just kind of read the summary of my comments, which I submitted.

Lorcher: So, before you start --

Flaten: Yeah.

Lorcher: We will need your name and address for the record and you did have pictures?

Flaten: I do. Yes.

Lorcher: So, if you can give that to -- we will just wait a moment and we will get that up and we can do it all at the same time. Okay?

Flaten: Don Flaten. 1111 North Adkins in Meridian.

Lorcher: Okay.

Flaten: Let me know, Nick, when -- I think I see them when they come up here. Okay. And I will comment on this a little just later. I will just read this quickly. As proposed Farrington Heights development will seriously degrade the livability of 1111 North Adkins, our family residence, and that of surrounding established neighborhoods and I would point out on the introduction we referred to a radius of a mile in density. We should really look at that radius from Locust Grove west, because that's where the homes are that are relevant. It's very high density east of that. We had neighbors immediately to the north for over 30 years, boarding the proposed multi-story residences. Tall buildings with minimal setbacks on your property line would cast a sun shadow on the south of our home, including the living, dining and family rooms. They are all south facing, precluding solar heating and direct sunlight during the winter months and virtually eliminating privacy throughout the year. The dramatic increase in residential density would irreversibly increase noise and traffic levels in the immediate neighborhood. Before going forward I will make observations here. This is an illustration based on a proposed 26 foot height. It's actually 28. So, this illustration you see of a two story structure is 1.57 times the height of our structure. It would actually be 1.7. The density -- even if one of those is a one story, we have got them stacked up with six feet between homes, three to four homes bordering our lot. So, instead of having Opus, we are going to be looking -- this is roughly 12 feet high, about the distance to that wall. If I step back here -- you can hear me, can't you?

Lorcher: No. If you can repeat it into the microphone that would be great.

Flaten: Yeah. But, anyway, if we have the next picture, please. I know we have limited time.

Lorcher: We will add time to it for --

Flaten: Oh. Thank you. Yeah. So, we could --

Lorcher: So don't worry, you will have plenty --

Flaten: I just have -- just to get a -- I did a sun shadow picture from roughly a different -- this is just a perspective -- here to insist on a two story development. If we reverse the position of the road it would give us -- the north side is at the bottom of this. We would have the road as a buffer, in addition to the setback, so we wouldn't be looking that close. But we are -- obviously, one story is what is appropriate for the neighborhood if we were to go for -- if they are insisting on two story, simply move the road so the homes bordering us would be on the south end, they would have more space, they would be looking on an open field and we would have a border that would also include that rec area, which the public can't enjoy, only the people moving there. So, it looked real pretty in the illustration. We are going to be looking at a wall of stucco. They are going to be looking at -- at this. So, I think there is one more illustration just to give you an idea. These are 26 or 28 foot height for a distance of 40 feet. It's just an illustration from March showing you that's what the sun shadow is and that's about the same setback, six feet -- six feet between buildings and they are all two-story. So, that's mid-

afternoon in March and that's taken from about 35 feet away from -- it actually -- it's over 40 feet to the two-story structure and you still see it occluded. So, my observation, in summary, because of time. Of course single story detached homes would instead be consistent with the surrounding neighborhoods. If the city were to insist on multi-story residents, however, I strongly recommend the position of the structures currently proposed to be reversed 180 degrees.

Lorcher: Did you get a chance to express your concerns about the switching of the road to the developer?

Flaten: No.

Lorcher: Or are you just bringing that --

Flaten: My only comment is right here.

Lorcher: Right here.

Flaten: In fact, we just heard today for the first time that there might be a -- one of -- pardon me -- one of the structures would be one story bordering it it looks like, but the others are still on the same density. We have no information. All I have is an illustration from February that didn't match the original plan. So, we are seeing these things for the first time.

Lorcher: Okay.

Flaten: But as originally proposed we are looking at a wall of structures six feet in between for the entire south border of our property up to 28 feet high.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much.

Flaten: Okay. Thank you.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, the next person that signed up is Rick Bradley.

Lorcher: Good evening. Thanks for being here. If you can state your name and address for the record.

Bradley: My name is Rick Bradley. I'm at 1321 East Shellbrook Drive, Meridian, Idaho. 83642. My property -- my rear property line borders the development property. I'm -- my backyard is located in the northwest corner of this development and that's particularly the one that has the shared driveway. I know the lady was talking about the rear of the houses having transoms, but that does absolutely nothing for my privacy with the side of that house facing my rear property. Privacy issues are a big concern for every resident. It's a lot different moving into a subdivision that's established with no privacy, as opposed to having that privacy taken from you forcefully, which is kind of

what the situation that's happening here. Setbacks. Three feet side setbacks. You guys are seriously considering that here as a city, because -- I mean everything will have to be fire treated the way it's built, that's going to be way more expensive for the builders to build homes that way. Every resident around them has got at least eight feet on the side. I mean we are almost three times as much side setback as what they are proposing. This is Meridian. This is a city for families to raise families to grow and love each other. It's not to stack people on top of each other. And that's I think what Meridian has lost over the last ten years. Resources in the community are going to be limited as well. I have already noticed since the development of Pine 43 that my water pressure has gone down some and just adding more to that is going to tax I think the limited resources we have. Also road access on Adkins is not adequate for more traffic. I don't know if you guys have ever been to that intersection yourselves, but during -- anytime during the day or evening there is trucks, trailers, stuff parked on the side of the road. It is literally a one lane road getting in and out of there most times. So, affordability, are we just trying to build more 650,000 dollar homes in this city or are we actually really concerned about affordability for families. It's a lot more expensive to build a fire-rated two-story house than it is a single story for a family. The other big issue that we are discussing is there is no access to a park. Well, instead of establishing just a little community park that they never get used. I don't know if you have them in your neighborhoods. We have them in ours. They are not really used. Why don't we make these lots slightly larger, build a little bit smaller homes on them that are single story and actually create a yard for the family. That way you don't need a community center. You can have your own backyard to play with your friends or your children's friends can play. Actually have a front yard. The pictures that she showed, they got like a, what, a six-by-four piece of lawn in the front yard. That is not a yard; right? Are we building apartments or are we building houses for families and -- and there -- the beginning opening speech that she had was she wanted to create a timeless community for Meridian. Well, modern architecture is not timeless, okay? That single slope is quickly fading and nobody's going to -- nobody's purchasing homes like that anymore. I apologize for going over, but there is lots of things that need to be addressed here carefully. I would -- I would hope you guys would consider that. Thank you.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, the next person is Brian Turner.

Lorcher: Good evening.

Turner: Good evening. And I do have some pictures I wanted to share. And while we are waiting, Brian Turner, 1345 East Shellbrook Drive and also a comment up front. The communication for us to reach out to the applicant -- we missed it. We would have certainly and gladly reached out and expressed some concerns and that's something this process has lacked is someone to talk to about it. All right. And I clearly state up front -- I will get to this -- what this picture is in just a moment. I would welcome one story homes. The comments about -- we are used to the -- the space. I'm okay -- I

would -- I would welcome one story homes in this -- this plot. My biggest concern, even with the new plan is the two stories. This picture right here shows Avery -- or Avery Subdivision that is just west of this development. Literally a block. And you can see clearly that there is a buffer between these large very tall two-story homes in the rest of the subdivision and, unfortunately, the remote west end side -- side of that, this house is, like was mentioned, three feet from the fence line and this is what my backyard is going to become, a great big wall of a house next to a house that takes my privacy away. Now, they said the windows would be positioned so to afford privacy, but for some reason I lack trust in that statement. These -- so, yeah, this is my concern. This is what I will be looking at. This is why I am here. Another thing is this is a picture that shows -- I'm standing on Adkins Road looking directly west across from the -- across the site and what you -- what will you notice here is what you cannot see and that is the side of the homes that are straight across. The line of sight drawings that were shown earlier do not show the elevation change. So, these homes are a good four, five, six feet lower in elevation than this -- this property. So, you build 28 feet higher and they are going to be staring over the top of those homes and I just don't see how that fits -- two-story homes fit into this plot of land for -- that's one of the main reasons. And so I see two-story homes here is -- is either greed is driving this or there is a lack of foresight and it's going to anger their neighbors for years to come and I think there is a better solution for this plot of land that would -- that would be agreeable.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, the next person is Maralee Turner.

M.Turner: I also have pictures and I will wait until they are up. While we are waiting my name is Maralee Turner, 1345 East Shellbrook Drive, Meridian, Idaho. 83642. Okay. My home borders the proposed subdivision of Farrington Heights. I'm not opposed to land development if it is approached respectfully and thoughtfully. I propose that a respectful compromise should be reached before this development is allowed to proceed and for your information I was never given the contact information for Sabrina and had I been I certainly would have reached out and given my concerns. I propose that a respectful compromise should be reached before this development is allowed to proceed. That the developers have had to postpone and restructure over the course of several months indicates that that's -- that this development is still far from reaching a beneficial conclusion for all of its bordering neighbors. Currently the developer is partitioning for higher density and taller homes than is prudent for the inadequate space. I am opposed to the rezoning of the small plot from the R-4 to the R-15 zoning district, which is much too dense for this location. The surrounding properties are all zoned for lower density than the proposed subdivision. The developers are also expecting and planning for two-story homes, which will be detrimental to all neighbors on all sides, with the exception of the homeowners who are selling the property as the developers are proposing ample green space to purposely offset the impact for them and them only. While the developers may indicate with photos and words that one story homes are being considered, there is no plan for single level homes, except for that one bordering our neighborhood, which has been a concern for months now. In fact,

according to Matthew Parks, which you can see from your records and I quote: The proposed lots will accommodate second story residences in order to make financial sense. I disagree wholeheartedly. By rezoning this land and approving the current plan the developers will be enabled to build several new dwellings with taller and denser homes than -- than virtually all of its bordering sites in all direction. A height restriction of 20 feet is reasonable for this insufficient space. A height restriction of 28 feet, which Meridian city is considering, would be appalling to us as neighbors. Our homes have existed for nearly 30 years and we value our way of life. Development such as this will impact many families adversely every single day for decades. Please plan for buffers or green spaces on all sides of the development, which I'm showing a picture of a buffer road, which may mean putting the access road along the outskirts of the development and planning for green spaces bordering the road. I will wait for picture number two. Two story homes looming over our backyards will negatively impact our ability to even remotely spend time in our yards. This is understandably very distressing to us. We would have two homes in our backyard like this. Another concern is traffic issues. If you can get to picture number three, please. Even if the developers are required to widen Adkins, the intersection of Pine and Adkins will remain dangerous. The existing building located at Pine and Adkins intersection will not be removed and this poses a danger as the intersection will remain narrow despite the required marginal widening. Please do not be neglectful, disrespectful and careless. I hope that the developers, city planners and architects can be resourceful and prudent as they look for beneficial solutions. Thank you.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, we have Patty Jeffs.

Lorcher: Good evening.

Jeffs: Hi. I'm Patty Jeffs and I live at 1416 East Shellbrook Drive. I'm down on the corner. Two stories is not going to bother me at all. My house isn't that close. However, my friend and I go walking every morning and we have been by the places that they just showed you the picture of and, honestly, that looks over Pine and there is a canal. It doesn't bother anybody. And they put in a nice parking space so overflow of parking can park there. There is no parking space here. We go walking by other condos and things across Locust Grove and the streets are lined with extra cars and I just know that's going to happen here. There is no place for them to park extra cars, except in the streets and this is already a small street. We already have trouble with traffic. We talked to one person over in the other subdivision across Locust Grove and he says, oh, no, this is mostly rentals and there were four young guys -- nice guys and you go around to the back and there is a double car garage. Two of them can park there, but there is four people renting that house. They have got two more that have to go out in the street. My fear is this is going to be rental housing is so high, not family, and we are going to have cars everywhere in the streets. Thank you.

Lorcher: Thank you.



Lomeli: Madam Chair, the next person is Cynthia Johnson.

Johnson: Yeah. I live at 1050 North Adkins, which is right across the street from one of the roads that comes out of the development and my concern mostly is parking, because the houses themselves are so close together that there is no street parking in the development at all for them. They have to use only their driveway parking and I'm also concerned that the street's not very wide, so that I might lose my parking in front of my house and I have three vehicles, so we can -- one in the garage and two would have to shuffle out cars. So, I really don't want to lose my street parking and so that's one of my main concerns would be that.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, the next person is Robert Flaten.

Flaten: Hello, all. My name is Robert Flaten. I live at 1111 Adkins Avenue now. I have been there since I was about eight. So, been there for a while. In all honesty I'm not as well-spoken as these guys. Forgive me. I had a little thing wrote out and I'm kind of just lost, especially after listening to everything that -- with all due respect to the planner or whatever she is -- said -- I will admit her example seemed pretty nice. They look great, but they leave out a lot of what there is that you are not seeing and I don't think that's by accident. I saw her use examples of 45 feet, 60 feet. Where is our example? Because we are looking at about 25 to 30 feet. They -- they very obviously didn't use the corner that we are discussing as being such a problem. That's by design. They are trying to not show you. Again, with all the respect I believe Planning and Zoning, a big portion of why you are here, is to hear the community, to work with them to try and be fair, so that people don't get steamrolled. We are here. There is more of us. Again respectfully, please, don't ignore us. I understand that the people that are going to possibly move here matter. We also matter. We should be equals on all of this. We are not asking to not have people there. We love our neighbors. We get along with all of them. We want the neighbors. But we don't want to be swept aside so that somebody else can make more money. With even that particular involvement, you think about people that go buy homes that move here, a big part of what draws money, you go up into the foothills, it's a view. You are dismantling my home if this is allowed. There is no view. You are going to walk outside and see a wall. I don't believe my kids are safe in the driveway anymore without people sitting there watching down on them. There is all sorts of issues when it comes to parking, when it comes to security. Survivability of our home and everyone else's is very much in jeopardy here. I wish I could somehow illustrate that, but, unfortunately, three minutes really isn't going to put that in an accurate sense for all of you. I thank you very much for allowing me to come here, but I could go on a very long time about this. I understand it's very persuasive, again, to see everything that she put up, but it's just not encapsulating what it is that we have all been fighting here for months. I -- I mean this is so stressful for all of us to be up against this and we, quite frankly, don't -- again respectfully don't want to keep doing this to you nor us. People have a right to develop, but I would love to believe that there is an option somehow out there that can please all of us, not just a few, because those people are

going to come in, they are going to build, they are going to leave. We are the people that are left there forever. We were there before. I would like to think we can be there in the long run, but, quite frankly, this just seems like the stepping stone to running people out of their homes, because anybody reasonable knows that. The person that came over there -- I'm sorry I forgot your name -- she herself explained to me that developments moved into her place right next to her, too close, and she wasn't comfortable with it. She herself did not like it. I can prove that statement was made. She knows what we are up against, but it's being minimized to you so that it can get pushed through. I don't know what to say. Please don't ignore us. We are the community and we are asking that this does not happen. I hope you understand our concerns. I can't ask you to agree with them, but maybe just try to put yourself in our shoes for just a moment. All the things you hold dear in your homes we hold dear also. Please help us. Thank you very much.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, the next person is Cecile Brock.

Brock: Madam Chair, Commissioners, my name is Cecile Brock. I'm the owner of the current property that we are all discussing so -- so heatedly.

Lorcher: Can you list the address for the record, please.

Brock: 1100 East Pine Avenue.

Lorcher: Okay.

Brock: Meridian. I understand that this is problematic for neighborhoods anytime people come in and try to develop. Unfortunately it's part of life. I have -- my family's owned this property since the '40s. We had our own little commune there for a long time and we had five generations sitting on that property. I'm currently the third generation owner. This is my family legacy. If you notice all the names of the streets and everything are related to my -- it's my family, which I -- is neither here nor there I guess, but I have been watching and working with the developers and this is a beautiful project. The pictures and the thought that has gone into this has been very well thought out and they have talked and talked and I don't think I have ever heard of as many meetings as these guys have had as there has been a sign up for like a year. I just hope that you will look at the actual plan and not -- there is so many heated -- everybody's so excited about this whole thing. I don't think it -- I don't think it would -- I don't think it would matter what we did. They don't want to do it. So, I just hope that you guys will take into consideration that these planners have worked very hard. From the very beginning we have been completely in compliance. They keep making concessions. They keep changing, trying to make the community happy. Unfortunately, I'm not sure that's ever going to happen. I appreciate your time for listening to me ramble. Thank you.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, we have Rick Salladay.

Salladay: Good evening. Rick Salladay. 992 North Stonehenge Way. Madam Commissioner and all the Commissioners, thank you for hearing us. I think you heard enough complaints about all the concerns we have. The height is the main concern. You saw from the one picture the guy shot from across the field, you can see our roofs. I can stand in my backyard, I have a three foot wall -- retaining wall. On top of that retaining wall I have a six foot fence. Behind that six foot fence is Cecile Brooks. Friends or neighbors or family have parked a trailer. It's fine. They are perfect people. We get along fine. But I see that trailer four feet above my fence. Now, you think a trailer -- the mobile -- mobile home, it's something you pull behind a vehicle, four foot over my fence. You put a house there. Think about that now, people. That is not going to be four feet above my fence, that is going to be -- whatever window she is talking about, doesn't matter, I'm still going to see their windows, their wall, their house. I realize this property needs to be developed. It's going to be developed one way or the other. But we got to have concerns. Just like the other gentleman said, we want single story homes where people will move. This Pine 43 or whatever it is they built on -- right off a Pine, they insisted that it have certain levels of heights. They wanted to face Pine and be all fancy and cool. They dug in probably about 20 truckloads of dirt and raised that elevation up to what these people have been showing you to the surrounding homes. It's ridiculous. All -- I think we all ask here put single story homes around the surrounding edges. You build your two stories on the inside. On Adkins Lane -- I'm sorry people on Adkins Lane, but put a two-story there. They have got a buffer of the front yard and a street. But this is a money grab the way it is being planned. They are trying to push in more than they can really fit in there and that's what's being developed all across Meridian. If you guys don't see it I don't understand it, but they are pushing more and more in. Right across the street on Locust Grove, all those apartments, three stories high. That's great. That's on the other side. There is a whole bunch of apartments. We were abutting a 35 year old subdivision and I -- I'm not bragging, but I was the first resident in that subdivision before Stonehenge went all the way through. It doesn't bother me. I know we are going to get -- we are going to get developed. I have known that for 35 years and I respect Mrs. Brock's right to do that, but on the same note respect our right for a lower elevation. If you want two stories dig down, put a basement. There is your two stories. Probably cheaper right now than lumber. Anyhow, that's my concern right now, folks. Please consider that elevation issue. I know you guys already considered it and denied. My concern is that the City Council will approve it after you have denied. That's what happened at Pine 43. Thank you.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, no one else has signed up.

Lorcher: Is there anybody else on Zoom this evening?

Lomeli: Madam Chair, there is one person. They do not have their hand raised.

Lorcher: Is there anybody else in Chambers that would like to make a public comment? Would the applicant like to come forward and address some of the concerns?

Durtschi: For the record again Sabrina Durtschi. First we would sincerely like to thank you for rehearing our case this evening. Our intent has been to clearly show the substantial improvements we made in response to your direction, specifically regarding density, neighborhood transition and overall usable space and we hope that these adjustments were evident during my presentation. As you all know in-fill development is inherently challenging. It is, however, a priority of the Mayor and the city's long-term planning goals, because it represents smart growth, utilizing existing infrastructure, streets, utilities, rather than stretching services outward to the fringe, in-fill strengthens neighborhoods by reinvesting areas that already have the bones to support the development. But with in-fill also comes change and challenges and that can be difficult, especially for long established neighbors who have lived next to an open field for a long time. One thing has been clear, meaningful compromise is necessary and we believe that the mitigation measures we have incorporated reflect that compromise and generally respond to the primary concern of privacy. A few things as far as traffic. We are under the threshold for doing a traffic impact study, but we are making improvements along Pine and Adkins and, then, we are going to be removing the main access ingress-egress points on to Pine. We will be making that a safer arterial road with less direct access onto it. As far as sun exposure, I'm not a meteorologist or a specialist in this, but when you have smaller footprints -- and the two stories would have a smaller footprint than a single story, I think that that would provide -- provide greater separation, larger backyards, greater depth in between the buildings. My engineer is here, we might have to bring him up if we have some more technical questions that I can't answer, but the grading -- he said there is a two percent grade difference, but our intent, of course, isn't to grade the site super high and bring fill in so the buildings are high. I think -- and he can maybe speak on it a little bit more, but that is not our intent. Our intent is to minimize the amount of fill that's on the site and to keep everything as level as the site is currently. As far as parking, we are meeting the parking standards. We have a driveway, two car garages that meet -- as far as I'm concerned -- I can look at the written -- that meet the parking requirements for the zoning code and he might want to elaborate on that a little bit more and to mention I am very empathetic and understanding of the neighbors and, yes, I did have a development built close to my house, but they were three story. I begged Council for two story, which didn't happen, and so that's much more intrusive than a two story product. So, to kind of reiterate our commitments that are before you this evening is that we did reduce the density and the number of lots by five on the perimeter of the site plan. We are in full agreement with limiting the two-story homes to a maximum height of 28 feet and that was a number that staff had provided and we are happy to meet that. The windows -- I feel like that is kind of a good compromise. Again, we are kind of like having to find ways to make things work and that the windows in the rear elevations of the two stories abutting the existing homes to the north and west, we are happy to have that as a condition of approval. Again, planting one additional tree in each of the rear yards to provide enhanced long-

term screening and be happy if that needs to be added as a condition and as we stated restricting that to Lot 2, Block 1, to a single story home as requested by Stephanie John at 1111 Adkins. We feel these measures represent meaningful good faith steps to ensure the project not only fits, but fits responsibly within the context of the neighborhood and we truly feel that this is a net good for the overall community for the City of Meridian. I'm happy to stand for any questions if there is anything I missed, if we need to have our engineer get up here, maybe discuss grading a little bit further, I would be happy with that. So, thank you.

Lorcher: Yeah. I have a question.

Durtschi: Yes.

Lorcher: There was a question of -- are these going to be home ownership or rentals?

Durtschi: No. These are all going to be home ownership.

Lorcher: Okay.

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: And what -- and what type of price point? I understand that the ones in the middle are -- are a smaller footprint than the ones on the perimeter, but what kind of price point are you looking for -- for these units?

Durtschi: Yes. I'm kind of looking -- I think they are around the --

Lorcher: We are not going to make you hold to it, but --

Durtschi: Yes. I think they are around the 500, 600 range and I could be mistaken, but -- Brandon is that -- around the fives? Yes.

Lorcher: Commissioners, do we have questions for the applicant?

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: I know there was some discussion about the kind of side profile of this northwest property. This is more than -- yeah, the -- the one that backs up -- both backs up to a property and the side backed up to an additional property. Is the intention to also have transom windows on that northern edge or just to the side of the home as well or would that second story have full windows?

Durtschi: I think -- Madam Chair, let me -- let me get to the right slide. Here it is, Chairman Smith. I think we would be happy to be conditioned on the window placement

and that is one of the larger lots, so I think the potential for it to be a single story, there is potential there as well. So, I don't want to make any commitments, but I think those are the few larger lots that can accommodate a single story and would be happy to condition the extra window placement if needed.

Lorcher: Commissioners, any other questions?

Durtschi: Thank you.

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: So, the neighbors have all referenced that they have received limited communication or no communication regarding the changes that -- that you have proposed this evening. I realize that some of those changes were very recent and maybe there wasn't time and, then, you had stated that staff had given the neighbors your contact information. So, I assume you were just waiting for communication from the neighborhood. Did -- did staff cc you on that communication to the neighbors?

Durtschi: Madam Chair, Commissioner Perreault, no. And I know that this is just one step. We also have City Council and all the neighbors here are more than what -- I'm more than happy to meet with them in between that time. Nick has my information that they can reach out, but I did communicate with Stephanie when we updated the layout. Originally the -- so, Stephanie is the one that lives to the north, the 1111 Adkins, and we originally had the house situated so that took access of Adkins instead of interior and she is like, Sabrina, I don't like that. Can you move the house, rotate it so that the -- it's all rear? And I said absolutely. And so I sent her the update. I don't have the e-mail, but it was -- I think it was before Thanksgiving telling her that we have expanded the lot. We are committing to a single story at this location. So, it was communicated and I -- I'm assuming she got it, because she responded, so -- so, I'm happy to communicate as much as I -- if -- if what -- as much as the neighbors need, so --

Perreault: Thank you. I -- I just wanted to -- it's not -- I'm not placing blame anywhere, I just wanted to see if we could get to the bottom of why some of the neighbors might not have received communication regarding this specific meeting and I -- I know it's a challenging thing to help one of the neighbors and, then, maybe other neighbors come and say, hey, well, can you do the same for my property. So, can you just -- just for everyone's sake can you kind of go through your process of consideration in terms of -- if we do single story, you know, did you -- did you look at that? What was that process like for you and the decision making? Because I know in these situations there is -- there is kind of a lot of assumptions made about the intentions involved with development. I just -- I want to understand all the things that you have done to -- or considered doing to meet the neighbors' concerns.

Durtschi: Sure. Madam Chair, Commissioner Perreault, so, again, I kind of got brought in at the midpoint in October and the developer is -- the applicant is here and he can maybe speak upon all the changes, but the number of layouts, revisions, thoughts, meetings has been exhausted. We have looked at multiple options, repositioning things and we feel that this truly is the best layout. We worked -- looked at the footprints and we are not saying that they are all going to be two-story, but it really is challenging for the -- for the lot size for the square footage if we need it for three bedroom units and so I think that that's why they want to keep the option of the two story, just in case that they -- if they want to do something a little larger, have a little more square footage, that they are able to. And, again, two stories are allowed within your zoning code. We are not asking for excessive amount, three story, four story, I mean it is -- it's kind of a -- it's -- two stories are a standard. So, I -- I do want to let you know that they have looked at this very extensively and we feel like this is the best layout and -- for lot sizes that we have and, again, they have reduced their lot count by five and I believe prior to submitting they lost several lots there, too. So, they have made some big changes and, again, I don't do the financials, I don't know what numbers they need. Obviously, it has to pencil and work. So, I think that they are at that point where they can't make any more revisions.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much.

Durtschi: Yeah. Thank you all. I really appreciate your time.

Lorcher: Can I -- may I get a motion to close the public hearing?

Smith: So moved.

Rust: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and second to close the public hearing on Farrington Heights Subdivision. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

**MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.**

Lorcher: I guess I can start on this one. I appreciate that the developer has made some changes to this to be able to accommodate this space. It's always hard to do in-fill. Like we have already talked about this. For 30 years everybody's used to having some open space, but that open space, that farmland, you know, does not belong to the neighborhood, it belongs to the homeowner, and that homeowner has a right to be able to sell their home or parts of their land and a developer has the right to be able to build. The transom windows, the additional trees, are all very generous options to be able to add to the privacy within this -- within this subdivision, but I don't feel that the modern look compared to the existing houses -- it -- it fits. It's like taking a -- an old -- an old Victorian house and, you know, putting something -- you know, something super modern and glassy right next to it. It just -- it doesn't fit the aesthetic of the neighborhood in my opinion. But I'm not buying there either and maybe somebody else

would like it. I sympathize with the homeowners from the one story to two story and I would encourage the developer to find a way to make the one stories work. I'm not in favor of this for that very reason. I cannot ignore the people who have come forward today. Not only today, but probably to City Council before and are back, you know, again, that -- it is going to get developed. So, something is going to get there. So, be careful what you wish for, because they may change it again and it might get worse. Everything the developer has suggested is within our code. They can put two stories. They can make the streets. The density is allowed. All of those things are on paper and are able to do that, but just because you can doesn't mean you should. So, you know, I appreciate all the -- the changes that the developer has made to do this, but for this particular parcel of land within this established community, even though the density is similar to the -- to the neighborhoods around it, I don't feel like I -- I can support this at this time.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: I -- I kind of empathize with a lot of your thinking. I -- I do think I -- I have -- I could fall on the opposite side if a couple things happen and I don't know that we are talking about respectable compromise and I don't think that the community -- what -- what I'm envisioning out to the community would necessarily be overjoyed at and I don't think the developer would be overjoyed at. I think that's what compromise looks like.

Lorcher: Uh-huh.

Smith: I think I'm at a position where I'm not -- I don't think we are -- personally if it meets the design standards I don't personally think that I'm in a position to judge the aesthetics of a home, for example. I have -- I have always kind of been irked a little bit about character kind of considerations and -- and things like that that are inherently subjective and so I'm going to avoid that. I -- I think a lot of the conditions that the applicant has suggested tonight of, you know, Block 2, Block 1, being conditioned to be single story, limiting the windows to be transom windows, planting additional trees, et cetera, I think all valuable. I think the only thing that is pulling me back is the potential for a series of two-story buildings. I would have no problem if there were a two-story and, then, a single story -- two two stories and a single story and some variance to allow for some -- just some additional kind of feeling of openness on these neighboring properties. So, the two areas that I'm specifically looking at are these two -- if we could pull up a map. I'm looking at -- realistic looking at my own screen with the plat map. I don't know what actual lots they are, but the -- kind of on the -- the western half -- or the western portion, these four northernmost lots and I think conditioning -- I think something like conditioning that -- that northwest lot and the -- I guess if that's number one -- and I'm counting southward -- that lot -- that first lot and the Lot 3 where there is these two houses that each have two homes next to them, those are the two that I'm really like -- if we can get these to ensure that there is one story here I think that could put me over the edge.



Lorcher: Okay.

Smith: So, I think that's kind of where -- where I'm at and I'm not trying to -- I don't want to get too deep into the weeds of is it four, three -- I just think that this kind of section of there being four rooms against two and the potential for them all being two stories kind of -- that's what really kind of gets me a little bit just on the other side of -- of maybe not loving this. So, I mean I would love to hear -- again, I don't want to get too deep into the weeds. I know I have already kind of maybe dipped my toes there, but I would love to hear other Commissioners of -- of maybe recommending something like that, giving the applicant an opportunity to -- you know, maybe they lose one more lot. I don't know if that's feasible or they play with the lot sizes or things like that, but just ensuring that there is some -- ensuring some breakup in -- in that story I think would be beneficial.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you.

Rust: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Rust.

Rust: I'm not a -- I'm not an architect and I don't want to pretend to be one either. I commiserate with Commissioner Smith. I'm a little bit torn on this one. I do appreciate the lengths to which the developer has gone to provide us elevations and I feel like this presentation was one of the best we have had, particularly for a controversial in-fill project. There is very few questions from the Commission. I really appreciate that. I have the plat pulled up here in front of me. I would, quite frankly, like my druthers, I would rather see no open space, bigger lots and height restrictions. But that's -- you know, I'm -- that -- I'm sitting on this side where I just am judging what is brought before us.

Lorcher: Right.

Rust: I like the reduction in density. I appreciate the fact that we went from -- I believe in the old proposal there was five lots that abutted 1111 Adkins and now we are at three and one of them is going to be a single family home that they are offering to make single -- a single story and that directly matches the residence at 1111. So, I do appreciate that. I think my biggest concern is probably that northwest lot. Having lived in neighborhoods where there was very minimal space between homes and there was two stories, I -- I can commiserate with the lack of privacy. Having that on two sides, that's just not ideal. I also would point out, though, that there are two-story dwellings in the subdivision, one of them right in the -- the cul-de-sac directly to the west. So, it's -- it's not something that's not been done before. It's -- in this area there is going to be probably others that pop their tops and -- and go up to gain more square footage. So, I -- again, if I could have my druthers I would probably just condition that northwest lot to be single story. It was already alluded that they might be willing to do that. I -- that would probably be where I shake out and I'm -- my comments on the open space are probably more for future development. I just -- I would rather see open space in the

smaller sub five acre parcels go more into lot sizes than I would into these small cut out parks that are going to be a -- a cost to the HOA, probably not going to be utilized and -- and they check boxes and they score amenities points, but it's not really necessary and not driving the value that -- that maybe we think they do.

Lorcher: Got you. Thank you.

Stoll: I thought Commissioner Perreault was going to go, but I guess I will go. I -- I recall the -- the last hearing we had on it when we denied it and several of the issues that we identified have been addressed towards -- there was a valiant effort to address them. I'm still bothered by the conflict amongst the existing neighborhood versus this development, particularly regarding the two stories. I understand that it's allowed to have two stories versus mandating that there is a one story, but I also saw the value of discussion between existing homeowners and some reasonableness to -- by the developer to adjust the plans to try to address the concerns. What I would like to see is that -- that same discussion occur with the other property owners that are abutting the proposed lots to see if there is some sort of compromise that can be had that will at least get us towards some sort of harmony amongst the existing residents and the new residents that are going to be buying those properties. So, I'm not sure what the formal recommendation is on this, whether it's just a continuance to allow for a discussion amongst the existing neighborhood and the developer, if that's allowable or not.

Lorcher: Are you suggesting a continuance?

Stoll: Kurt, I want to check whether that's something that's allowable.

Starman: Madam Chair and Commissioner Stoll, obviously, you have to reopen the public hearing, but, yeah, that -- if there are questions or issues you think you need -- you need additional information as -- to make your decision and you would like to see, you know, additional dialogue or additional information that comes between discussions between the developer and the neighbors that testified or others that weren't able to be here tonight, I think that's -- that's fine. It should be, you know, not just to continue the -- not just to continue the debate, but to get some concrete information. So, I think it's -- you know, the purpose of the continuance would be get information you need to make a decision as to a recommendation to the City Council. So, I think -- I would encourage you to be as specific as possible. We are going to continue it for X number of weeks and we are looking for, in particular, more information about X, Y and Z.

Stoll: Okay. Thanks.

Lorcher: Sabrina did say that the developer was -- had made as many changes as they were probably going to make. I mean -- so, I mean we can reopen that and address it. I don't -- I don't think that continuing it is going to really make any changes, but I will entertain that with the other Commissioners if you think it might be worthwhile.

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: I agree on the continuance. I think that the developer has probably done kind of the most changes that they are going to be willing to. I have a question for staff. While I'm sharing my thoughts, is it possible to look at the plat more closely and identify which lots have more than say 4,500 square feet -- 4,500, 5,000 square feet and we can discuss limiting the stories on the lots that could accommodate that and -- and -- and, then, see if we can potentially address -- address some of those concerns of the two neighboring lots there on the west side that have two backyards abutting up against them. I wanted to just say a couple things very quickly to the audience. It's always a desire of mine to make sure that -- that our residents understand what our role is in this process more specifically. So, we realize that most of you have never come to anything like this. Probably never even crossed your mind. And there is a -- there is a belief, perhaps, that the city has more control over specific decisions in this process than we do. So, the -- this property is already annexed into the City of Meridian. So, if a property is not annexed the -- the city decision makers have a lot more leeway in requirements that they can make on the applicant. But that's not the case here and so what we primarily have to look at is is the applicant meeting the current Uniform Development Code and the Comprehensive Plan and those things like that and so our decisions that come into play really don't have to do with our personal preferences. I -- I can completely relate, because I have a two-story home right in my very small backyard. At first I was concerned about the privacy, but I have just adjusted to it and -- and that doesn't mean I don't understand where everyone is coming from, but it's -- it's something that all over the City of Meridian we have two-story homes up against single story homes. So, that can be a factor in our decision making, but it also isn't something that we can -- we just have to be careful if we are denying it only for that reason, because the applicant would have the ability to do that. However, we -- you know, we are going to -- we are going to take the whole big picture, but we -- we just have a -- a real specific balance that we have to strike as to why we approve or deny a property, not just based on kind of fears or -- or, you know, preferences on our part and that doesn't mean we are not taking all of your concerns into account, I just want to set the -- the tone for what this decision process is like for the Commission. So, that being said, I agree with a couple of my fellow Commissioners regarding the possibility of limiting the homes to single story if the lots will accommodate. I realize we can't make that decision for the developer and say, hey, 4,500 square feet is enough to do a single story for that builder. But we could ask -- I suppose we could open up the -- the public hearing again and ask. Did you happen to find that information?

Napoli: Madam Chair, Commissioner Perreault, yes. So, there is really only two lots. It's going to be a Lot 2, Block 1, and Lot 7, Block 1. They are roughly about 4,700 square feet both of them. So, the rest of them on the outskirts of the -- the property are 3,500 square feet to 4,000 square feet. So, none of them are in that 4,500 -- above that, besides Lot 2 and Lot 7 of Block 1.

Perreault: Madam Chair, may I ask staff another question? Thank you. What are the depths of the two lots? I can't see on here what the lot numbers are. But what are the

depths of the lots? The one that's off the common drive and the one to the south of that or -- yeah. Are those deep enough to do a single story that's long and skinny essentially?

Napoli: Madam Chair, Commissioner Perreault, so the -- Lot 7 on -- where it touches the common drive is 75 feet and on the north boundary it's 95 feet and, then, Lot 8 below it is the 75 feet and on the south boundary of that lot it's the 84 feet. A matter of single story versus two story. It -- could you build a single story here? Yes. Definitely could. It's -- ultimately they have indicated to us, that's -- two story is their preference for financial reasons. We see -- we have seen single story homes on smaller lots that typically cater to older demographics, but at the end of the day we are not here to design -- or I'm not when they come in with their application to tell them what they -- what home to build on the lot as far as square footage and one, two story. Correct.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: I think kind of where I'm at -- and I would be curious to hear the other Commissioners' thoughts -- is I think these two properties that are kind of the -- maybe the easier choices of conditioning to be one story -- I mean I think those seem like easy candidates. I would -- I would like to maybe condition of saying one additional home on that western boundary, let the developer figure out where it is, but ensuring that at least one of those is single story to, again, ensure some break up. I would like to see it about halfway down if I could -- you know, again, if I could wave my magic wand. But I think where I'm at is for single story is a Lot 2, Block 1, this most northern -- this northern west most parcel and at least one other of these properties in the R-15 zone on the western boundary. I'm curious if that seems like that might be amicable without getting too into the engineering what to build where, while still kind of ensuring some -- some break up. I'm curious to hear their thoughts.

Garrett: Yeah. Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: I don't -- in the time that I have been on the Commission I haven't seen an in-fill, be it commercial or residential, that hasn't been a problem. I mean, I don't know, it -- it -- it seems that everyone has an opinion on an in-fill and -- good or bad and I think the developer -- I -- I'm with Commissioner Rust, I would like to see the open area cut down, because what's the point of that? I mean it really doesn't solve anything and give everybody a little bigger lot and I think if they are meeting the height standards I think it's okay. I mean it meets -- it's within the building codes and it's in what's been approved and I'm -- I'm sorry, you know, I know that there was a lot of concerns over two story versus one story, but in the -- in the sense that it's been undeveloped for this period of time now is the time.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: I think -- I think it might just be time. I will make a motion and if it fails no offense will be taken. I will just look forward to the -- the next best option.

Lorcher: Okay.

Smith: So, after considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council of File No. H-2025-0038 as presented in the staff report with the following modifications: To require that single story homes be built -- or that single story usage be limited to Lot 2, Block 1, east northernmost lot -- northwestern most lot and, then, one additional lot on the western boundary of the R-15 zone. That an additional tree be planted in the backyard of each -- each property in the R-15 zone that board -- is bordering an existing -- or that backs up to an existing property and, then, to limit all second story windows on all properties, which would board -- in the R-15 zone which would border neighbors' yards to be transom windows only to protect privacy.

Lorcher: I need you to make one adjustment on that. The application is 0016.

Smith: I'm looking at the wrong one. Sorry. That would be for H -- wow -- 2025 --

Lorcher: Dash 0016.

Smith: -- dash 0016.

Lorcher: Okay.

Smith: Thank you.

Lorcher: Do I have a second to Commissioner Smith?

Parsons: One more clarification. I think it's important to note that this is R-15 and R-4 zoning. I think it's your intention that it only apply to those -- the R-15 zoned portion of the development and not the R-4.

Smith: Correct. Those are only applied to the second story limitations, the additional tree, et cetera, to the -- the R-15 zoning on the northern -- okay.

Lorcher: So, can you summarize --

Smith: I can summarize. Yeah. So, for applying for the R-15 zoning I would move to approve with single story on Lot 2, Block 1, which is the one that backs up to 1111, this northern west most lot, which is in that top left corner on the map and, then, at least one

additional lot on this western boundary of the R-15 lot, to require the applicant plant an additional tree in the backyard of each of these bordering properties in R-15 as they said they would be willing to do and accept the condition and, then, similarly as they said they would be willing to accept as a condition to limit that all second story windows on any of these R-15 bordering properties be limited to only be transom windows.

Lorcher: Do I have a second?

Smith: I guess it fails.

Lorcher: I guess it does not have a second, so the motion fails.

Rust: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Rust.

Rust: I will make a motion. I move that we approve Farrington Heights, File No. H-2025-0016, with the following conditions: That we restrict Lots 1 and 7, I believe, to single story and the additional tree and the transom windows in the R-15 -- all for the R-15 portion.

Smith: I will second that.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to approve Farrington Heights Subdivision. All those in favor say aye.

(Smith-Rust-Perreault-aye).

Lorcher: Those not in favor?

(Lorcher-Stoll-Garrett-nay).

Lorcher: Are we tied again?

Smith: We are tied again. Rock. Paper. Scissors. Sorry. Kurt?

Starman: Yes. The motion fails. So, three-three does not -- is not a majority, so that motion fails as well. You can entertain a new motion or as we had to do recently for a different application, you could reopen the public hearing and continue until you have a tie breaking vote.

Stoll: Madam Chair, if I can just throw out some thoughts.

Lorcher: Commissioner Stoll.

Stoll: I really like Commissioner Rust's thoughts as far as allowing the developer to explore what they could do with the lot size and whether they could financially make it work out to single story without the green space that's being required in the in-fill development.

Lorcher: So, with that in mind why don't we reopen the public hearing, so that we can approach the developer for a continuance to work on that open space. Can I get a motion to open -- reopen the public hearing?

Smith: So moved.

Stoll: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to reopen the public hearing to approach the developer about continuance of adjusting the plat. Will you come up to the microphones, please?

Smith: Do we need to vote?

Lorcher: Oh, did we not vote? It's been moved and seconded. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Okay. Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Lorcher: I'm all flustered. We don't have ties very often.

Durtschi: No. No problem.

Lorcher: Thank you for --

Durtschi: Yes.

Lorcher: -- being amenable and your patience.

Durtschi: Yes.

Lorcher: So, as a Commission we are a little bit torn --

Durtschi: I see that.

Lorcher: -- on the application and it has been suggested that the open space may be potentially adjusted to offer more lot sizes and to really hone in on the potential of single stories with respect to the -- to the existing neighborhood. Is that something you would consider?

Durtschi: Madam Chair, I think -- we didn't even know that was an option since the last time we were directed to bring more open space, so we would be happy to go back, reevaluate, taking that open space out and making those lots larger, if that's the direction of all the Commissioners, yes.

Lorcher: Okay. So, with that in mind --

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Perreault: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: So, I want to ask a clarifying question. Are we just referring to the lots that are on the perimeter of the development and not the lots internally? Because there is no open space in that section, so -- or are we talking about a -- a revamp of the entire design?

Lorcher: Well, I mean because it's under five acres open space is not officially required, correct, Nick?

Napoli: Madam Chair, that is correct. Under five acres open space and amenities are not required by code. That is correct.

Lorcher: So, should we give the leeway to the developer to look at the entire plat or you just want -- interested in just the perimeter?

Perreault: Madam Chair, that was -- that was my question to the Commissioners is do we need to give them direction or share our thoughts on that? I -- I assume -- I would prefer that they have the option, obviously, to completely redesigned it if they would like. I just wanted to give clarification to them on what it is we are requesting of them.

Smith: Madam -- Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: If I may. Also to -- to throw another wrinkle in here. I don't know that I would personally be comfortable if we remove the open space without reworking that interior buffer, because, again, there is -- there is no real significant open space for those lots. So, I -- I would almost -- for my personal support I -- I would kind of require the whole thing to be reworked if we are removing that open space.

Lorcher: I think we leave it to the discretion of the developer to be able to present something that -- you know, that -- that works for them. Commissioner Rust.

Rust: Yeah. Madam Chair, I -- I think what we have heard from the community is that they are open to development. They understand that this is going to be developed --



Lorcher: Right.

Rust: -- and the consistent item that I have heard is we don't want two stories.

Lorcher: Right.

Rust: So, I would theoretically be in favor of even increasing density by a couple of lots if it meant that we could only get single story. If they would go to single story. I think that that could be an effective compromise. But I -- I think we are seeing the -- the problem with trying to legislate from here what exactly can and can't happen.

Lorcher: Right.

Rust: So, I'm just trying to give my perspective. I would love to not really fetter them in any way and give you as the developer a chance to go back to the drawing board, look at it again, know that the community really doesn't want two stories and -- and see what you come back with, knowing the -- the business case that you have to make and -- and the performance you have to hit.

Lorcher: Yeah. I mean everybody knows it's going to be developed. So, that's a given. The density that you were suggesting, whether it was the 30 homes or the 25 homes, fits into the -- the neighboring communities around it. Like Commissioner Rust said, I think the overall is is that there has been a -- because they -- the majority of them are single -- single story homes that it's intrusive.

Garrett: Yeah.

Lorcher: Commissioner Garrett.

Garrett: Yeah. The -- the need for this open space is -- I just don't see it in that small an area.

Lorcher: Right.

Garrett: And if they can increase the lot size and increase the density, that's a win-win. So, I think that -- but that's -- that's between the developer and -- and whomever.

Lorcher: Right.

Garrett: That's certainly not our purview to dictate that.

Lorcher: And I think additionally that had been a comment that staff had made, because there is no regional park in this area. So, if it is catering to small families now you don't have a space for them to go that with -- within their community. But legally or based on our code you don't have to either, so -- but if they have bigger backyards, like one of the residents said, that maybe that open space isn't as necessary.

Understanding today is December 4th, what timeline do you think you would need -- we will not have a meeting on January 1st.

Durtschi: Okay.

Lorcher: So, our next meeting is the 18th and -- the 16th. No. That's City Council. So, Thursday, the 18th, is our next Planning and Zoning meeting. We won't have one the 1st, that's the first Thursday of January. Madam Clerk, what is the next date in January? Is that the --

Lomeli: Madam Chair, it's January 15th.

Lorcher: 15th. So, with that in mind, knowing that you have December 18th or January 15th, do you have a preference or do you need more time?

Durtschi: I think the sooner one would be fine. Absolutely. Just real quick, just for clarification, so that we don't have to table it again and -- again. But can the roads be reworked? Are you guys wanting the roads in the same position? We -- it's free -- we are free to make any changes? Bill? Nick?

Napoli: Madam Chair --

Lorcher: Nick's having heartburn right now.

Durtschi: I know. I think --

Napoli: -- Members of the Commission, you know, the 18th is two weeks out from today, so we will be sitting here today in two weeks. I know we already have three things on the agenda. Some of them are pretty large projects and I want to be sensitive to the applicant, but if they get me revised drawings, you know, a few days before, which probably is realistic, because you got next week -- they are probably going to be working hard all next week, over the weekend, and I might get it the week of the hearing, yeah, it's pretty tough on -- on staff's end. You know, if that's your guys' purview we will make it happen. But I think January 15th is definitely preferred. It gives us time and if we need to do a special meeting in January -- I know there has been conversations at the staff -- I would be more than happy to -- January 8th could even be a date where if we need to do it I would be happy to be there on that day as well, so -- and I -- I would like to hear from the applicant, too, on what they think on that and -- you know.

Durtschi: And we are going to be sensitive to like your schedule and if you already have a full -- but, obviously, we have been -- we have been working and delayed and we were August and now it's December, so, obviously, sooner the better, but we do -- I mean if you did have a special hearing that would give us a little more extra time, because I really want the next time we are in front of you guys to be like this is what we want, so --

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: I also -- I -- I think part of the conversation was -- well, maybe not the applicant's fault or shortfall there, there maybe was some -- some opportunity for more engagement with the community. So, I think that later date would give some extra time for -- not saying that they -- we are going to reach agreement on everything, but seeing if we can fine tune some stuff to -- to get the community's approval.

Lorcher: Commissioner Stoll.

Stoll: Madam Chair, yeah, I would like to see some meaningful dialogue with the community, the existing neighborhood. That will make me feel much more at ease than -- saw the benefit of having the discussion with one homeowner. The other thing is -- I'm not sure you are going to have quorum --

Lorcher: On the 8th either. Right.

Stoll: So, I think January 15th is probably your best. I think that's the date. Yeah. That's probably your best bet to allow everybody reasonable amount of time. I know it's frustrating from a developer standpoint, but --

Lorcher: We want you to succeed.

Durtschi: Yeah. No. And I appreciate that.

Lorcher: And if it's rushed again, then, we are going to be right back where we are --

Durtschi: Sure.

Lorcher: -- at the same point in time. So -- so, we need to motion to close the public hearing and then motion for the 15th? Is that where we are at? Or just continue? Where am I at, Kurt?

Starman: Keep -- keep the hearing open and you would ask for a motion to continue the hearing until January 15th.

Stoll: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Stoll.

Stoll: I move that we continue the public hearing for File No. H-2025-0016, Farrington Heights, until January 15th for the reasons -- to allow the developer to look at a revised plan to bring back to the Commission and to have meaningful dialogue with the

surrounding landowners to see if there is the opportunity for it to bring some sort of harmony and agreement -- compromise on the proposal that will be presented to us.

Lorcher: Do I have a second?

Smith: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to continue Farrington Heights. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Lorcher: Yes. We will take a five minute break and, then, we will have our next application.

(Recess: 7:48 p.m. to 7:53 p.m.)

**4. Public Hearing continued from November 20, 2025 for 3780 Overland (H-2025-0038) by Jesus Madrigal, located at 3780 E. Overland Rd.**

- A. Request: Annexation of 0.91 acres of land with the R-2 zoning district for the purpose of complying with the terms outlined in the consent to annex agreement for the existing home that is already connected to City utilities.

Lorcher: All right. The next item on the agenda is Item H-2025-0038, 3780 Overland Road, for annexation of .91 parcel of land and we will begin with the staff report.

Napoli: Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, next item on the agenda is the annexation for 3780 East Overland Road. So, actually, on the screen the existing zoning is R-1 in Ada county and the FLUM designation is mixed use regional. This applicant actually has a hook-up agreement with the city. Their well was failing, they are in the county, and they need to hook up to city water and sewer as an emergency hookup and as a provision of that they needed to annex into the city. So, as a result -- zoning obviously the appropriate zone in a mixed-use regional. However we are in the R-2 zoning, obviously, would not be the appropriate zone in a mixed use regional. However, we ought to give them an R-2 zone as a placeholder zoning until that property does redevelop. So, you know, really, we haven't received any written testimony on this one. They do run a home occupation business. It's actually an alteration business out of it right now and one of my DA provisions is that they acquire a home occupation as an accessory use permit here with the city or cease the -- the home occupation if it doesn't meet our standards and they are aware of that. I haven't received any written testimony, as I mentioned, and we are recommending approval with that development agreement. So, essentially, the property will be R-2 and they will have to come in with a development agreement application at the time that it does redevelop and it will likely be

with some of the neighboring properties at the time of redevelopment. So, this is more of annexing them, so they can hookup -- emergency hookup into city services.

Lorcher: So, I don't see anybody in Chambers, so I take it there is no particular applicant here. You are just -- you are -- you are going to plead their case?

Napoli: Madam Chair, the applicant -- he did indicate he would be online. It sounds like there was -- he probably was online. He might have tuned off over the last -- last public hearing, so, you know, I don't think he would have much to say. They are just looking for an approval. They already have the hookup in process to get hooked up to city water, because that well was failing, so -- yes, hopefully they will be here at the Council hearing.

Lorcher: Again I think this is a first where we haven't had an applicant in Chambers. So, we closed the public hearing, since there is no one here to speak.

Starman: So, Madam Chair, that's -- if the applicant is not here to speak, that's -- that's fine. I think we will have the same answer, but I guess I just -- for the record I guess you invite the public to -- I'm not sure if there is anybody on Zoom or not, probably not, but --

Lorcher: No.

Starman: -- if there is anybody in the public that would like to testify that would be fair game as well and, absent that, you can entertain a motion to close the public hearing.

Lorcher: All right.

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: I have a question for staff.

Lorcher: Sure.

Perreault: I thought I read in the staff report that there was a recommendation that the applicant put together a concept plan and so I -- I'm hoping that's not the case, because that would seem a bit excessive to me considering it's going to redevelop all in a much larger swath.

Napoli: Madam Chair, Commissioner Perreault, I need to go back and reread it. I apologize if I read it -- or wrote it incorrectly, but, no, at the time of redevelopment is when we will receive that concept plan. So, I apologize if that was unclear in the staff report.

Lorcher: All right. May I have a motion to close the public hearing?

Rust: So moved.

Stoll: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing on 3780 East Overland. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed?

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Lorcher: Do we have any conversation? Possibly a motion?

Rust: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Rust.

Rust: After hearing all public testimony I recommend that we approve File No. H-2025-0038 for approval as set forth in the staff report.

Stoll: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to approve 3780 East Overland. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Lorcher: I will take one more motion.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Oh, we get stereo. Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Move to adjourn.

Rust: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:58 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS. )

APPROVED

\_\_\_\_\_  
MARIA LORCHER - CHAIRMAN  
ATTEST:

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

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