

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:01 p.m., Tuesday, March 3, 2026, by Mayor Robert Simison.

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

Other Present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Bill Parsons, Linda Ritter, Jamie Leslie, Steve Taulbee and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

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

Simison: Council, we will call this meeting to order. For the record it is March 3rd, 2026, at 6:01 p.m. We will begin this evening's regular City Council meeting with roll call attendance.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

COMMUNITY INVOCATION

Simison: Our next item is the community invocation, which tonight will be delivered by Mick Armstrong. If you would all, please, join us in the community invocation or take this as a moment of silence and reflection. Mick, good to see you.

Armstrong: Father, we thank you for the liberty and justice we enjoy. We thank you for the prosperity of our community. We thank you for the blessings you have given us and thank you for these people that serve in the matters of -- of our safety, public services, property decisions, development and things that we don't always all agree on. And, Father, I just pray that we can have civil discussions even when we vigorously disagree and particularly thank you for the work of our police force in resolving a matter where one of our buildings was attacked and something we didn't really expect in this community and just -- just pray for continued safety, vigilance and just that we can continue to be a good place for families and a good place for businesses, in Jesus' name, amen.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

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

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: There are no changes to the agenda. I move that we approve it as published.

Little Roberts: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND RECOGNITION

Simison: Council, anything under announcements and recognition?

PUBLIC FORUM

Simison: Okay. Mr. Clerk, anyone signed up under Public Forum?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, there is no sign-ups.

RESOLUTIONS [Action Item]

- 1. Resolution No. 26-2572: A Resolution Establishing the Appointment of Eryn Turner to Seat 8 of the Meridian Arts Commission; and Providing an Effective Date**

Simison: Okay. Then with that we will move on to Item 1, which is a Resolution No. 26-2572 and this is the appointment to have Eryn Turner to Seat 8 of the Meridian Arts Commission. Council, in your packet you had Eryn Turner's application. I'm sure for many of you she is no stranger to yourselves. She has been with the Meridian Library Foundation most recently and has been doing a lot of work with them and in other ways throughout the community. But she has been -- as I have -- I have got to know her through that -- through that effort and she is -- just was looking for a way to get engaged with our community and the -- further in a way that she was already doing that and I'm happy to answer any questions about Eryn, but she is a lover of all things art. Does -- has a wide variety of what she does for hobby and a patron and so I think she brings a great -- yeah, non-professional, yet semi-professional with watercolor being her favorite

thing, but it's not her profession, because she does do another job full time. So, with that happy to stand for any questions. Or an action.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton,

Overton: I move that we approve Resolution No. 26-2572, establishing the appointment of Eryn Turner to Seat 8 of the Meridian Arts Commission.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Resolution No. 26-2572. Is there any discussion?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Real quick want to commend you. I feel like, man, we have had a really great crop of committee members and I just -- I really want to appreciate your efforts in vetting those candidates. I just feel like each time that we get some of these appointments I'm continued impressed with the level of talent that is in the residence serving our community and just want to appreciate your great work on bringing these great names forward.

Simison: Thank you. We have a lot of great talent in the community, so it's -- sometimes it's a little difficult telling other people no. Okay. If nothing else, all those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the item is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Simison: And Eryn is not here, but one -- the one thing I failed to mention -- and it will be interesting to see. We didn't want to do this specifically and now that she is appointed she can't back out. Eryn has a lot of grant writing experience in her day job and I think that's something that our Arts Commission was really looking forward to. This may be looking at applying for grants for further work. But we -- we won't hold her to doing grant writing all her -- her time on the commission, so -- appreciate that.

DEPARTMENT REPORTS

Simison: Okay. With that we will move on to -- well, it says Department Reports. There is nothing under Department Reports.

PUBLIC HEARINGS [Action Item]

2. Public Hearing for Tong (H-2025-0049) by Dara Tong, located at 485 E. Overland Rd. Rescheduled for March 10, 2026

- A. Request: Annexation of approximately 0.496 acres of land from R1 in Ada County to the R-4 zoning district. The applicant entered into an agreement with the city to annex within six months of receiving City Utility Services due to a failed septic system.

Simison: Okay. Then we will move on to Item 2, which is a public hearing for H-25-0049. Reopening this public hearing, Mr. Nary? Okay. So, we are not going to open this public hearing, but would staff like to make any comments on this item?

Ritter: Good evening, Mayor, Council Members. The applicant just didn't post the site correctly and requested that March 10th be their next hearing date, so -- and staff is okay with that.

Simison: Okay. Any questions from Council? Then do I have any motions?

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Overton.

Overton: I move that we move public hearing for Tong, H-2025-0049, to March 10th.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to move this item to March 10th. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the item will be moved to March 10th.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

3. Public Hearing for 1725 W. Pine (H-2025-0050) (Continued from February 10, 2026), by William Veloso, located at 1725 W. Pine Ave.

- A. Request: Modified Development Agreement to the existing development agreement (Inst. # 111072107) in order to refine the cross-access provisions to establish a more purposeful and coordinated cross-access plan that aligns with future neighboring site uses and anticipated re-development patterns along W. Pine Ave.

Simison: So, next item up is Item 3, which is a public hearing for 1725 West Pine, H-2025-0005, continued from February 10th. We will continue this public hearing with comments from staff.

Ritter: Good evening, Mayor and Council. So, tonight we are here -- the applicant is proposing to modify an existing development agreement to revise the requirements for the required cross-access. This property is located at 1725 West Pine Avenue. It consists of 0.76 acres of land and it's zoned C-N. No -- with the modification to the development agreement they are asking that no cross-access be proposed on the east side of the property, which will -- we hope to eventually connect with Linder Road -- with future redevelopment of this area. This is the site plan showing the parcel right there for Pine across from Meridian High School. Again, this is the modification that they are requesting to remove that cross-access from the east side of the property. So, a little history on this property. In 2009 this property was approved for -- this area was approved for annexation and change to the future land use destination on about 2.05 acres. It consisted of three tax parcels from medium density residential to commercial. This also included annexation and zoning for the property in question and to have it zoned with C-N. A concept -- conceptual development plans were approved with this proposal to retain the existing structure and construct a 70 foot by 81 foot addition to accommodate a Flow Aquatics. That's a business specializing in learning to -- learn to swim lessons for beginners and, then, in 2016 there was a loan and verification letter requested by the property owner, which talked about the single family dwelling on there, because they wanted to rebuild on the property. But, again, the single family dwellings are not permitted in C-N, but because this residence was still there and still being in use and the use had not ceased for 12 consecutive months, it is considered non-conforming and it can remain as long as it is not expanded or extended without following the provisions of our code for alterations or extensions. And, then, in 2019 City Council approved another application for this property which removed the previous development requirements for it and -- but it still kept that provision for the cross-access in there. So, we met with the applicant several times to review his request regarding this cross-access, with the understanding and that we would not be supporting that, because our code requires cross-access. Our UDC 11-3-A-3, access to streets, talks about cross-access and, then, UDC 11-3A-19, the site design and circulation, which also talks about providing cross-access to provide better mobility and maneuvers for vehicles throughout development areas. So, although the -- the applicant did provide us with several illustrations regarding what future cross-access could look like on the property, we still found that the removal of this condition is premature and it should be requested through a development application, so we can get a better understanding of where that cross-access should be. We also provided some accident data of our -- again, the table there -- and that report -- the reported vehicle accidents in the vicinity of the subject project. So, this data indicates approximately 18 reported accidents in this area by various factors and so we -- we believe that this data supports the need for the improved cross-access beyond what is currently proposed by the applicant. In talking with our Police Department they also had concerns regarding this property and not providing the cross-access. As you can see here they have stated that Pine is heavily traveled during several times every day because of the high school. Again, they recommended being

required to have the cross-access. Again, this is a commercial business. It's a commercial property, even though it still just has a residential unit on it, but once it's -- the applicant determines what type of business he would like to put here, the traffic would be increased from what is there for a single family home. Again, with this staff is still just recommending -- we -- we are recommending denial of this application. Again, as we said, we feel that his request to remove that cross-access point is premature, because the applicant has not submitted any kind of development proposal I'm not sure if the applicant is sure of what they want to do on the property yet with the number of iterations that we received and so once the applicant has determined how he would like to develop his property and maybe work with the neighboring properties to determine how that area may redevelop because it is commercial -- the future land use for that area is commercial and so we would want it to go to the east and not to -- just to the west, because you run into the residential areas there, so that doesn't benefit anyone. And with that I will stand for any questions that you may have.

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

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I do have a question. Directly to the east of that property is an identical building, which I think has an existing business on it -- or it seems to appear that it does. I'm just -- yes. It would be 1705. I'm wondering does that have a cross-access agreement on already? Do you know the status of those properties? Because what I'm wondering is if we are looking at requiring the eventual access to Linder Road, what of the other properties may or may not already have those access agreements?

Ritter: So, currently these are still residential, so they may have just a residential use on it and not a commercial use on it. So, at that point they would not be required to have that. But when these -- when they do redevelop they will have that requirement.

Taylor: Okay. Oops. There are commercial uses here. This is a daycare and I'm not quite sure what this is.

Simison: Council, additional questions for staff? Okay. Would the applicant like to come forward? State your name and address for the record, be recognized for 15 minutes.

Veloso: Yes. My name is William Veloso and address is 1725 West Pine Avenue, Meridian. And -- perfect. Presentation already pulled up.

Johnson: The keyboard's going to be your best bet.

Veloso: Oh. Cool. Thank you. Just going to try it. Perfect. Cool. Mayor and Council, thank you for your time this evening. I'm here regarding a requested modification to the

cross-access provisions within the existing development agreement and I would like to begin by saying that I support the city's long-term goals here for connectivity, access management and reducing driveways along Pine Avenue to increase traffic safety. My proposal doesn't increase any access points here. Under both the existing development agreement, as well as my modifications being proposed, the total number of approaches on this block will ultimately be reduced from seven to two. Eventually when the other properties do redevelop and just for context this block consists of several small commercially designated parcels along Pine and just for complete clarification on the westernmost property at 1785 West Pine there is an existing business, that's Zimmerman Auto Body Shop, and, then, 1705 West Pine referenced in the last question is called Launchpad Ministries and they are a church service where students from the high school can cross over for something similar to a seminary period of religious release period and, then, 1625 Pine is a limited office use and 737 North Linder is that daycare. I would like to begin by clarifying the existing parcel configuration. Staff's position is that preserving that eastern cross-access may allow future redevelopment to ultimately create connectivity toward Linder. I understand that objective. However, based on the existing parcel configuration, current access spacing standards and surrounding development pattern, I haven't been able to identify a realistic access compliant pathway that would achieve that outcome without speculative multi-parcel redevelopment and so here effectively the eastern stub out, I -- I provided at that southeast border of the property and after that you will find a dashed line going onto the next property. If you follow both of these, these are the only direct paths to the two properties that do have frontage to Linder. One of them involves going through LLA preschool, that daycare that currently exists, and operates as a business and the other one reaches 1625 West Pine, which is significantly close to the intersection there, a place where approaches are generally not recommended due to traffic safety. So, obtaining that cross-access to Linder eventually is -- is effectively the big question here of how that will occur. Any future connection to Linder requires -- or relies entirely on frontage parcels redeveloping -- redeveloping, coordinating access and receiving agency approval. So, even with cross-access extended across that eastern parcel access to Linder would still depend on the frontage parcels there, restructuring in compliance with access spacing standards, which is the primary difficulty here. So, the impact of the requested modification that I'm making, which is removal of the eastern cross-access provision, that it -- well, realistically, the requested modification removes the eastern stub requirement entirely. This does not eliminate the possibility of future redevelopment, it does not prevent parcel consolidation and it does not prevent internal cross-access along the western parcels. What it does recognize is that this eastern stub is not what determines whether future access to Linder ultimately occurs. If comprehensive redevelopment were proposed in the future circulation would be evaluated holistically at that time. My request simply acknowledges the physical realities of the existing parcel configuration, while still supporting the city's long-term circulation goals. I respectfully ask that Council consider whether maintaining this stub meaningfully preserves the future access to Linder or whether the requested modification still achieves the intent of the city's access management policies. If Council believes this issue is better evaluated in conjunction with the development agreement and proposal, I respect that and will proceed accordingly. However, I

respectfully ask that you just consider whether the existing cross-access language is proportionate to the realistic redevelopment potential of this block under current conditions. Thank you for your consideration.

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

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Can you talk a little bit about your anticipated possible uses in terms of a business, like what type of traffic that you might be expecting. I'm not sure if you know exactly what that would be. Just kind of curious what -- what we are looking at, because I -- I wasn't familiar with Launchpad. I wasn't sure what it was, but that makes sense. I mean you are talking about kids who can walk from the high school. So, you are not looking at a lot of traffic. How is yours different?

Veloso: Oh, that's a -- you know, that's a fair question. So, realistically, the point of evaluating the potential for the modification to develop -- the development agreement at this time is realistically to understand what the options are and whether this would be approved before investing the financial resources required into developing a development plan, but if that's something that Council would like to see in conjunction with this application I would be happy to present that.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor, a quick follow up.

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: So, these -- this is kind of an interesting part of the community, which was clearly residential and now with -- we are looking at some kind of a transition potentially to -- it is commercial, but what does it look like in five, ten, 20 years. They are small parcels. How do you envision -- I mean I would be kind of curious to know if you were envisioning something where you are taking the building down potentially and building something bigger based on the decision we have tonight or if our decision tonight determines, you know, entirely what you decide to do with this property, because it's just -- it's kind of tight, it's kind of congested. I would think that there is some limited options, unless they are -- these parcels are combined. An owner comes in, buys up multiple parcels, redevelops more than just what you are looking at. So, can you give me a better idea what your -- your thought is in terms of the options available to you, what you are interested in and like the possible constraints with if it only stays a single -- single parcel for you, what you can do with that?

Veloso: Yeah. Absolutely. That's a really good question and I think you hit the nail on the head there. All of these parcels are small and they are independently owned and several of them are already developed. We have Launchpad. We have Zimmerman Auto Body. We have that limited office use at 1625 and we have that daycare already

on Linder. And so, realistically, the chances that someone is going to come in here and scoop up out of the parcels and kind of knock everything down or do one comprehensive plan seems speculatively unlikely, especially given the existing nature of the current businesses. So, it seems to me that it's most likely that each of these properties will develop independently and that said your question was mostly related to what my vision is for this and I would say that given the size and the location, it's simplest to convert the existing building into a commercial use that may involve an addition or something else, but I don't envision like knocking it down and rebuilding something from scratch at this time.

Simison: Council, any additional questions? Okay. I think you are good for right now.

Veloso: Thank you.

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

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, first -- yes. First is Julianne Ashcroft.

Simison: Good evening. If you could state your name and address for the record, you will be recognized for three minutes.

Ashcroft: Okay. Julianne Ashcroft. I live at 2044 West --

Simison: If I can get you right in front of that microphone.

Ashcroft: 2044 West Pine Avenue. So, I'm just west of the LDS seminary building. So, I get the experience of all of that traffic on Pine and in the mornings you can't make a left-hand turn to head towards Meridian High. I have to go all the way around the block to Ten Mile, down Fairview if I want to go to the other end because of the traffic and if you look at where any access time -- the only -- from where that is on there, you have got the kids coming -- there is two direct lanes right out of Meridian High. There is not a wide enough center lane for anybody to make one in one way or the other. So, the only really safe way is either only a right-hand turn in and a right-hand turn out or on Linder and, you know, there is no -- there is a crosswalk, there is a bus stop there, and you have got kids coming out and in the evening, 2:30, you can't make a left-hand turn. I mean it is really a nightmare from -- really from the driveway of 2150 West to Linder and there is no break, there is nothing breaking the traffic up, so you get a kid turning right, and a kid turning east out of Meridian High and you have got that access right there, you have got them turning -- there is no -- that's not wide enough road for a center lane and it's a disaster waiting to happen. More so than what's already happened. So, if you look at Linder Road where that daycare is, you have got two lanes, you have got two lanes and you got a wide center lane. So, you can get in that center lane, you can make that left-hand turn, you can get in that center lane, you make that in and out. Easy access. You cannot do that on Pine and the traffic -- I challenge you all to come on by and drive up and down that street anytime you want, 7:00 to 8:00 10:30 to 11:00, come and hang out at 2:30 and see you cannot do a left-hand turn. I

mean -- and it's not just the kids at the high school, because I call Meridian Pine as your speedway. They slow down from Locust Grove, because you got the sheriff's department right there and, then, you don't have a light until you get to me and, then, you have Meridian and, then, you don't have another light until you hit Linder and, then, once you hit Linder it is a speedway all the way to Ten Mile. So, it's pretty heavily traffic all times and realistically I just -- I -- I think we should be proactive on this, but we don't need to be reactive and wait until there are tons of more wrecks, more kids' deaths. Linder is the safest way to take this, because we don't even know what businesses he is going to put in there. You don't know what kind of clientele, how much traffic and if it does have to go on Pine the only way you could do it realistically safe is where probably -- I have walked up and down that street many times with my dog and so I would just say lay on your right-hand turn and a right-turn -- turn in and out. But, remember, you have got the four lanes, the -- the designated turning lanes. You don't have that on Pine right there. You got a crosswalk and you turn and there is those kids and there is not a -- ACHD doesn't have one of those crosswalk lights across like they have on Linder. So, I really think that you really need to think of the traffic and the safety of anybody on that road with a bus stop and all of that right there. So, I highly oppose anything else going on Pine --

Simison: Thank you.

Ashcroft: -- as an access road. Thank you for your time.

Simison: Council, any questions?

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Thank you for your testimony. I'm just -- you mentioned the crosswalk and I'm just trying to envision in my mind where there is a crosswalk from Meridian High.

Ashcroft: It's just about right -- so, you have got -- there is the one -- the main one where they are coming out and the crosswalk is kind of like right there. So, the kids all lined up, because they -- they can't park them down Pine. The parents line up just west of the seminary building all along there. But there was a crosswalk on that main road. It's not lit up and it's dark in the mornings and parents feed in and out, people -- trailers, trucks, they don't even acknowledge that crosswalk there and kids will stand for a long time waiting to get across that road. So, it is really a safety trap and you got a bus stop right there and, then, you got kids coming out of high school and, then, you got from Ten Mile traffic over to Linder and there is no break anywhere through that whole stretch of the road.

Whitlock: Follow up?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Thank you. And -- and I appreciate that and I have already accepted your invitation and driven that at 7:00 to 8:00 in the morning and 2:00 to 3:00 in the afternoon -- or parked there on Pine Avenue during those times of the day, because traffic doesn't move and I was curious about the crosswalk, because, again, I think you have people either coming out or going in right there at the crosswalk to the school. Then you have got Tall Pine Place to the south, which you would have people exiting, plus all the cross-traffic on Pine.

Ashcroft: Correct. From Linder on the high school side -- and I honestly -- I apologize, I don't know what that building is right there, but the buses is where they pull in there and that's only allowed for the buses. So, they make the left, they make the right and, then, that center lane goes like this and it's gone. So, then, you keep -- so, you have -- then the kids come out and you see that line and, you know, sometimes they get impatient. They are kids; right? I have been there, too. So, I'm just saying there is no light, there is no break anywhere in the traffic. Once you hit -- and so a lot of times you will -- I will drive down the road and pull in the subdivision and have to do a U'ie and come back and you will wait a long line in the light. So, you are going to back traffic up on Pine to the Linder light if somebody's waiting to make a left end turn into an access ,there because there is not that -- it's not wide enough for a turning lane or vice-versa. But, you know, to me I just ask that we relook at this and we take a -- a proactive approach to the safest approach on this and not contribute -- not compound and contribute to the problem. Thank you.

Simison: Mr. Clerk, anyone else sign up?

Johnson: Yes, Mr. Mayor. Bill Newhouse.

Simison: Are you Bill?

Newhouse: Yes.

Simison: State your name and address for the record.

Newhouse: I'm Bill Newhouse. I own the house at 1665 West Pine. About an acre. She's right, they widened that road and your school is over there now, it's terrible. It is just plain terrible. But I agree with her about being proactive, that would you want to take my property back. I want to build another house back there for me. I want to tear down the house I got now and I want to live there until I die. I used to live there years ago and there was horses walking up and down the street. Obviously, that's not happening no more. It's just horsepower. That's it. So, I believe the gentleman that owns this property should be able to do what he wants with this property, but I don't know how to do it. That's your job. So, that's all I got to say. Whenever it comes to the point where -- one of the rules is that he has to black top. He has to furnish a road. He has got to pay for all that to -- for these new accesses for everybody to use later on. I can't get -- I can't figure that out. Ada county is going to take it over; right? I see that I

have read here that's all commercial property you guys are planning on down the future. That's where I live. That's my home.

Simison: Council, any questions? Thank you.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, that was everyone that signed up.

Simison: Okay. Any questions or would you like to have the applicant come back up?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Maybe just to kick off some discussion. I just like to be up front before you do your final comments and everything and there could be more questions. I don't know where the rest of the Council is at. I'm a big believer in cross-access. I don't think that we are solving for the existing conditions today. I think we are making 50 year decisions into the future and without a development agreement -- or, sorry, a development proposal I think it would be really hard to get comfortable with removing the cross-access agreement. I also think just generally we -- we will need cross-access eventually, whether it's ten years from now, 20 years from now, that interconnectivity is important. It's hard to know what will happen in the future. No one has a crystal ball. But certainly there could be creative land assemblage here. There could be a variety of iterations that there could be a cross-access road that could run, you know, just barely north of the daycare at some point. We don't really know. So, just based on what I have seen on the Council in -- when we have -- in the rare occasions where we have eliminated a cross-access, we have been very careful when we have done that, very thoughtful, and I -- I just think that's a decision we don't normally take. I have never seen it in this kind of a circumstance without a specific development proposal. So, for me it's a non-starter. I don't know where the rest of the Council is at. I would encourage you to withdraw the application as opposed to getting a denial if that's where the Council is going to go, but that -- that's just initial feedback. I just wanted you to have that before you, you know, do your closing comments. I -- I would just really struggle to eliminate the cross-access requirement. I think the councils were wise in including it in the past.

Simison: So, I have got a question for Linda, Bill or Mindy. Can -- is this a static picture that's up? Are you able to move at all or -- because, really, my question is about the property to the south. There is a road extension that goes into the south property on the east and -- and there is a curb cut on Linder. Do we know -- is that a planned future road extension? Yeah, I have no idea when -- when that property to the south was developed, if it will redevelop, if that was the intention, if a road would ever be required. Any -- any thoughts, input, understanding? Phone -- phone Mindy and ask her to speak in?

Parsons: Mayor and Council, I think you are -- you are -- one -- first of all, I want to commend the applicant. I think he has done a great job articulating kind of what he is -- his desire is for his property and I -- I -- I'm happy to see that he was well prepared tonight. But ultimately, as you all know, that storage facility I would imagine will redevelop at some point in the future. We won't have all of those vacant land on the outskirts of Meridian forever and in-fill will be -- will be more and more valuable and -- and we will be dealing with that in the future. I don't know if it's ten years, 15 years, 20 years, to Council Woman Strader's point, but that's some -- some of the conversation I had with the applicant when we pre-apped with them is I could see that storage facility redeveloping in the future and potentially that road being extended. But we don't know that until it happens. They get -- that storage facility's been there since -- I would -- I'm guessing the '70s. So, it hasn't done anything since then. So, I don't know when the right time will be, but I think as Council Woman Strader, mentioned cross-access is a premium these days. I know Council is getting more and more concerned and that's the conversation we had with the applicant, if you throw too many different scenarios at us, then, in our opinion it may not be the right time to do anything with your contract or amend your DA. So, we were very forthright with the applicant and informed him that, that if you come with a lot of information, it's -- it's hard for us to say whether or not that's the right decision without having more of those pieces. So, going back to your comment, Mayor, I could see that getting extended. Again, the intent for cross-access is to -- to minimize access points to arterials. We are not trying to preserve Linder or get an access out to Linder through cross-access. We all know Linder Road will be another Ten Mile. It will have an overpass. It will -- it -- it connects Eagle all the way down to Kuna. So, we know it will be heavily traveled, like Locust Grove, and so going forward this stub street may be that -- that road that we need to provide that backage road for this commercial development. But, again, we don't know, because we don't have any development applications in front of you to say that will happen. But I can tell you if someone came in and talked to us about redeveloping that that's probably a conversation we are having with them is what are you going to do with that stub road, because it needs to terminate some way, either in a cul-de-sac or you need to punch it through to Linder and you need to work with the highway district on where that -- where that connects into Linder Road.

Simison: Yeah. That -- and that was just kind of -- you know, without a development application to know the -- what you want to do is prohibited by that cross-access currently, you know, eventually you see the cross-access want to just go to the south, because I agree, I mean unless someone comes in and buys up everything at the east-west cross-access at -- the ROI value and where you are going to connect and how and why -- it's all so close. You -- you -- you want to push that further back if you can, but -- yeah. I will leave it at that.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Linda or Bill, do you know what the plans for Pine Avenue is in this segment? Because it is a very congested segment of road. I -- I have taken my kids, dropped them off at school, they go to Meridian High. It's -- it's awful to go in -- and it's dark -- in the morning it's dark and I worry -- I worry more that my 17 year old son is trying to get out of the parking lot in the afternoon and pretty sure one of these days it's going to -- he is going to get in a wreck. But what's the -- the -- the plan with Pine for widening it? Is it on the -- the list for ACHD? Is it -- what -- what are the plans?

Parsons: Mayor, Council, I would probably defer that to Mindy, if she's on the -- on the line with us -- or ACHD rep.

Simison: And she's unmuted, so, Mindy, do you want to give the official answer?

Wallace: Yes, I will give an official answer. So, unfortunately, I can't pull up my master street map while I'm doing this to look at what we are preserving right of way for along Pine. But I did look and we don't have any projects programmed in either the five year plan or the CIP for that section of Pine and I made a note to check to see if the West Ada School District's made any requests for additional illumination or enhanced pedestrian crossings in that vicinity. So, that's definitely something that we can look into and, then, get back to Bill with that information.

Simison: And I'm 99.9 percent positive on the master street map it's only designed for a three lane --

Wallace: Three -- that's kind of what I was thinking. Yeah. So, I mean that's something else you may want to consider as requesting an increase as part of the update.

Simison: Okay. Any other questions from Mindy while she is unmuted? Okay.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Not for Mindy, but maybe Linda or Bill. Just give me some perspective on the fact that it appears that both to the east and the west of this subject property there are commercial entities. An auto body and, then, I don't know if you -- consider the -- the Launch Ministry is a commercial entity or not. Was there cross-access agreements required on either of those residential parcels that turned into commercial parcels?

Parsons: Yeah. Mayor, Members of the Council, Councilman Whitlock, I looked into those for you before I came to the hearing, because I anticipated that question coming from Council. So, certainly anything R-2, R-4, which is along the east, we are not going to get cross-access. There is -- there is -- there are no records of those being converted. They are residential -- it's residential zoning. We are not going to require that. As Linda mentioned, the property to the east -- or, excuse me, to the west we did do a development agreement with that property owner in 2018. Looking at the staff

report, staff said -- indicated in that staff report that there were no change of use at the time, because currently the owner was operating a -- the auto body shop. It's not your traditional auto body shop. He does it as a side business and he lives in the home. So, it's not like people bringing a bunch of wrecked cars there for him to do a lot of work on the site. So, at that time staff made a note in the staff report that there was no change of use and so there was no requirement for cross-access at the time. So, what that means is we won't be able to reciprocate cross-access to anybody in the future until they do a change of use or expand the site. So, currently there is no other cross-access to this property and that's why staff is -- why we have recommended denial. We think we need to stay with the current contract, hold it at east and west until we know what others are doing in the future. I think Mr. Nary could probably correct me, but this is a DA mod. It's a contract between the property owner and the city. So, even if Council -- if he was going to withdraw it or deny it, he could come back at any time and process another application. It's -- it doesn't follow the -- the traditional rules like a -- like a land use application where they have to come back with a substantial change. So, I just wanted Council to be aware of that as well.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thanks, Mr. Mayor. Bill, just maybe a quick maybe a follow-up question. I recognize where it's located. Recognize its current zoning. If this fell into the Old Town zoning, would we be requiring the same cross-access agreement?

Parsons: Madam Mayor -- Madam Mayor -- Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, Mr. Cavener -- Councilman Cavener, yes, I mean that regulation applies to any property that's on our arterial collector roadway. So, a lot of times, though, we also will defer to ACHD on how they approach. What we can't do is close off anyone's access, but we have the authority in the UDC to say consolidate access and currently he has an existing curb cut for the home and, then, if he goes to redevelop he is going to have to abandon that one and develop a new curb cut that others can share, including the existing home. So, there is some work he has to do. That's the difficulty with in-fill, when you try to keep existing properties, it gets -- mucky's the water a little bit, too, trying to make -- trying to figure out how that piece of the puzzle fits in with all of it as well and that's why when this application came back to you -- before you in 2008 they had a very specific development plan. They were going to put another building on the site, so it made sense to require that cross-access. Again, as Linda mentioned, that concept plan was removed to allow this property have more flexibility to redevelop. But, again, tonight we are talking about -- I want to change a contract, but I don't have a plan on how to do that. So, that -- that's -- again, that's why staff is saying let's pause, let's not approve this and, then, when you are ready to do something or you have another property owner adjacent to you, let's have a conversation and see if we can figure that out together moving forward, because it is a long-term solution. It's something that we don't want to make a short-term decision on.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: So, I sympathize with the traffic concerns. I was part of those traffic concerns back in the late '70s and early '80s. That was a four way stop and it's just as busy now. The road's improved. It was two lanes. Now it's three lanes. And these were all residential. And I know our job as City Council members is to look and try to -- look into the future on what the safest routes and decisions are going to be for what this land use will become and I'm sure that I'm looking at this different than a few others, but I'm not sure why this stub street isn't required to the south considering we have one coming from Tall Pine out of the next subdivision coming to the east. That seems like a whole lot more likely to have that one major lot redeveloped than it is to have all of those other lots redeveloped that much closer to the intersection of Linder and Pine. I'm just -- we are trying to make the right decision for how this land looks in the future, but I got to believe that that one -- and, of course, it is, I think, the oldest storage in the city. It's -- I mean that's how you get called Meridian Storage, you were the first. It's been there as long as I can recall being in this city. I'm not apt to approve this request tonight. I think more work needs to go into this and more planning needs to go into this for what the smartest decision is in the future. I think it has to have some cross-access that would eventually get it out to Linder Road, but I'm not convinced that making it go east from this parcel is the smartest decision. I think if it went south into that other parcel and hooked up with whatever Tall Pine becomes, that might eventually be the smartest decision moving forward, putting it farther away from the intersection at Pine Street.

Simison: Council, before we invite the applicant up any further comments or questions? Okay. Would the applicant like to come up and close. Comment. Respond. You choose however you want to do that.

Veloso: Sounds great. Thank you so much. I just want to say thank you to everyone for the amount of discussion that's gone into this. Realistically I'm incredibly aligned with the goal to make sure that this is safe and really future planning and -- and looking toward the future to make sure that this -- it becomes a nonhazard for everything from traffic to the kids that are nearby. I live here currently, this is my home, and I know, just as well as anyone, exactly how much traffic occurs and at what time of day. I don't leave my house between 7:16 in the morning and 8:04. It just doesn't happen. And I don't do it from 2:35 to about 3:15. I make sure that I do other stuff and if I'm out and about I find something else to do. It's just not worth it. I have to back out onto Pine as it currently exists and it's not particularly fun and so I just want to say that I think at this point the most likely situation that I'm hearing is that I need to come back with a development proposal and that this needs to be evaluated in context for a future development plan and that is my intention at this point. I do want to just remind everyone, including the concerns that have come up tonight, that realistically the goal here is there are existing commercial properties period. This is a commercially zoned property and there is a development plan -- an agreement in place for it that currently allows development with cross-access provided to the east and west. My goal is to

make sure that we find something that's initially compatible for everyone and that's really looking 50 to a hundred years down the line, but I think that we have to compare to what's currently being asked for the property and ask ourselves if the proposed modifications are better or worse or how they compare to that, not to the other hypotheticals that are coming up. I know that there is a lot of other traffic, if you had 500 feet to the west and I'm sure that they are concerned -- like everyone could benefit from a couple more sidewalks and at least a signalized sidewalk somewhere here. So, there is a lot I think going on here and I look forward to addressing it in the future with you guys. Thank you for your consideration tonight.

Simison: Question for you. So, are you -- would you like this to be continued for six months to give you a time to come up with the development plan? Are you looking for an up or down vote tonight and, then, you come back in two years with a development plan? What -- what's kind of your time and thought process?

Veloso: That's a really good question. I think the six month continuation seems the wisest. That would give me ample time to bring materials and work with the Planning Department pretty thoroughly on this to figure out what the future of access looks like for this area and what's best.

Simison: Well-- and I will just -- you know, I brought it up, but I -- I think that there would be some good talking with your neighbors and even if it was determined where you -- where a stub to the south would be -- you know, I mean I look at this and I think -- if you look at the -- kind of where the storage units are, you got a row right there, it seems like you would -- come split your property and connect up to the others and just have a little access point for three of the properties right there into that future north Tall Pine. But maybe work with your neighbors and say what would -- what do we think this would look like long term for your individual -- the best outcomes. They don't ever change. Build a new home. But you want to get out -- you don't want to go out Pine. What does that look like if there is another opportunity for each property. That's what I would encourage you to at least have some of those basic conversations with those immediately that might be impacted or want to help solve their own property in the next few years if they were given the opportunity.

Veloso: Just a quick clarifying question on that. We have had quite a few discussions with every property owner on this block and several of them weren't able to attend tonight unfortunately to present their voices on it. How would -- how would their support look to Council in the future? Is that something that you would like to see a petition in writing signed that kind of says everyone's in agreement on X plan with Y contingencies or is that something that you would like to hear from them in person during the next hearing?

Simison: Council, do you have a preference?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I mean for sure if you were able to get the neighbors in this immediate area aligned on a plan in writing that would be really over -- I mean that would be phenomenal. That would give us something solid that I think, then, our planners could really work with the highway district and try to marry that up -- that vision for this kind of fledgling commercial and residential area and -- and figure out how that would all work together. I mean that would be amazing if you could do that I would say. More powerful for sure to have a plan in writing that people have kind of signed on to. We would also -- we always love to hear from people in person. So, I would say all the above is great. Whatever you can get is phenomenal.

Veloso: Thank you. And one other follow-up question on that, just so that we are kind of all on the same page for the context of the neighbors. Those who are developed -- at least as it's been presented to me -- have no interest in redeveloping anywhere in the near future. Those who are not developed enjoy the current lifestyle that they are living and have no interest in continuing development in the future. However, they are interested in ensuring that their properties have the ability to develop in a favorable way for them and so I would not be able to get everyone on the same page to say, hey, we are willing to all build a road through this part or this is exactly what I would want. I can get them on the same page with regard to what cross-access looks like to them and what benefits them the most that they would be willing to put their name behind. Is that something that you think Council would find useful still?

Nary: Mr. Mayor? Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, maybe before you get too far afield -- I mean I'm a little concerned on the record that you are making for this project and this application on a future project, which is exactly what Planning had already asked the applicant to do, which is bring forward a project. Follow our process. Do the neighborhood meetings. Have the process go through our normal review as we normally would and I think you would get the answers -- or at least the input that you are seeking and what I'm concerned is if you leave this open you have open application that's still pending and now you are going to have him do a new application on top of it, pay a different fee, no fee for this, fee for that, trying to keep both records open and if we don't have a satisfactory result of the end it's very confusing for a court to address it. So, it really would be cleaner if you did get to a final decision on this application and, then, if the applicant would do what has been suggested by the Planning staff, as well as what the Council is saying, is bring forward this application, go through the process, submit the required documentation that's needed, contact ACHD, contact the neighbors -- do all of the process. I think you would have a cleaner record going forward for court if there isn't a consensus ultimately with your neighbors. I think if you try to piece it between this current one and something in the future it's going to get very difficult for a District Court to determine which one are we deciding on. So, I'm afraid it's going to get too far afield, because I think everything he is asking, everything the Council has been suggesting all makes complete sense, but they don't think it's going to make complete sense in two different applications.

Simison: Thank you.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Just to ask Bill. So, are you recommending that we vote on the project or are you recommending the applicant withdraw the application?

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, Council Member, I think either one is -- is certainly preferable for going forward. I mean if he wants to withdraw this application today we can then -- again, I don't think it impacts him one way or the other to deny it, but it's certainly not going to impact if he wants to withdraw it and, then, go through the process and bring it back with all of it, because I think it's going to need a development -- or modification of the development agreement. It's going to need whatever the -- the application is. All of that's got to be done. But either those outcomes -- either a resolution to this from the Council or withdrawal by this to, then, bring forward another would be cleaner for the future.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Bill, I appreciate that, because I started -- started to feel like we were having a meeting that should be had in community development about the feedback back and forth instead of a public record hearing like this. So, I think -- I think we are all aligned. I -- I was also in agreement with not thinking that this was a project that I could support at this time and we had a -- just down the road of a little project where we had the same discussion, kind of a residential turning commercial and cross-access and if we don't have cross-access we have real problems down the road with how we might want to develop that. So, I -- I actually think we should -- you should just let us know if you want to withdraw it or if we should make a motion just to deny it, because I think that's where the majority of Council is tonight and, then, a lot of these questions seem like they could be answered more informally with staff as you are working on this without having a six month date certain on it and I -- I really appreciate Bill kind of flagging sort of the -- the challenge we have with this being on the public record and this being part of the record for this application. So, I guess I would maybe suggest to you if -- we should do one of two, which would be either you just withdraw your application and, then, start over or we will take an action on this tonight officially. It has the same net effect.

Veloso: Thank you. Just to clarify. So, the two options would be to make the vote tonight and that would be final and, theoretically, I would resubmit another application either way or withdraw and resubmit another application; is that correct? If we are all aligned on this being premature without a development proposal in place.

Nary: Correct. Yeah.

Veloso: Okay. Then, I would like to formally withdraw my application. I appreciate your time. Thank you for clarifying that.

Taylor: Mr. Nary, do we -- anything we have to officially do or is that sufficient?

Nary: We need to accept that on the --

Simison: Do you want to make a motion to accept?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Do we need to close the public hearing first?

Simison: Yes.

Taylor: Okay. Mr. Mayor, I move that we close the public hearing on -- let me get my file number. File H-2025-0050.

Strader: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor, I --

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Thank you. I move that we accept the applicant's withdrawal of file H-2025-0050.

Strader: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Simison: Thank you. Look forward to seeing what you can work with staff and come up with to solve your issue and, hopefully, even your neighbors' long-term needs, so --

Veloso: Thank you so much.

4. Public Hearing: Meridian Police Department and Legal Department Report: Proposed updates to Meridian City Code sections 6-3-2(A)(2) (public camping or sleeping); 6-3-2(A)(4) (loitering); and 6-3-6 (noise)

Simison: Okay. With that we will move on to Item 4, which was a -- from our Meridian Police Department, Legal Department report on proposed updates to Meridian City Code Section 63-282, public camping or sleeping. 63-284, loitering, and 636 noise and I think we have Tishra online.

Murray: Yes. I'm here.

Simison: All right. We will turn this open for your staff comments.

Nary: Mr. Mayor, I will just put a comment on the record that these have been previously presented. We put them on the record in case there was any public feedback or -- or if the Council had any additional questions prior to approval. They are on your agenda as 5, 6 and 7 that can be approved tonight if the Council wishes and, again, I don't know if anybody else was wanting to testify and, then, Tishra was here if she had any -- or if you had any questions for her specifically.

Simison: Okay. Thank you. Council, any questions for staff? Okay. Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone signed up to provide testimony in the sign item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we did not.

Simison: Is there anybody present who would like to provide comments on this item? Be either in the room or online you can raise your hand. Seeing no one raising their hand, just staff online or in their room coming forward. Do I have a motion to close the public hearing?

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Move that we close the public hearing on Meridian Police Department, Legal Department report proposed updates to Meridian City Code Sections 6-3-2(a)(2), 6-3-2(a)(4) and 6-3-6.

Whitlock: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

ORDINANCES [Action Item]

- 5. Ordinance No. 26-2115: An ordinance amending Meridian City Code Section 6-3-2(A)(4), regarding qualifying behavior for disorderly conduct (loitering); and providing an effective date.**

Simison: Okay. So, with that we will move on to Item 5, which is Ordinance No. 26-2115. Ask the clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. It's an ordinance amending Meridian City Code Section 6-3-2(A)(4), regarding qualifying behavior for disorderly conduct (loitering); and providing an effective date.

Simison: Thank you. Council, you have heard this ordinance read by title. Is there anybody that would like it read in its entirety? If not do I have a motion?

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 26-2115.

Overton: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Ordinance No. 26-2115. Is there any discussion? If not, clerk call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

- 6. Ordinance No. 26-2116: An ordinance adding Meridian City Code Section 6-3-1, regarding public camping sleeping; amending Meridian City Code Section 6-3-2(A)(2), regarding disorderly conduct; repealing any conflicting ordinances; and providing an effective date.**

Simison: Next item up is Ordinance No. 26-2116. Ask the clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. It's an ordinance adding Meridian City Code Section 6-3-1, regarding public camping and sleeping; amending Meridian City Code Section 6-3-2(A)(2), regarding disorderly conduct; repealing any conflicting ordinances; and providing an effective date.

Simison: Thank you. Council, you have heard this ordinance read by title. Is there anybody that would like it read in its entirety? If not, do I have a motion?

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor, I move that we approve Ordinance No. 26-2116.

Overton: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Ordinance No. 26-2116. Is there any discussion? If not, clerk call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

7. Ordinance No. 26-2117: An ordinance repealing and replacing Meridian City Code Section 6-3-6, regarding noise creating public disturbance, and providing effective date.

Simison: Next item up is Item 7, which is Ordinance No. 26-2117. Ask the clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. It's an ordinance repealing and replacing Meridian City Code Section 6-3-6, regarding noise creating public disturbance, and providing effective date.

Simison: Thank you. Council, you have heard this ordinance read by title. Is there anybody that would like it read in its entirety? If not, do I have a motion?

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 26-2117.

Overton: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Ordinance No 26-2117. Is there any discussion? If not, clerk call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Simison: Those may be the three shortest ordinance readings that Chris has ever had to do in his life. With that, Council, we are at the end of our agenda. Do have a motion?

Overton: Mr. Mayor, I move that we adjourn.

Little Roberts: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:07 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON

_____/_____/_____
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK