

## **ACTION ITEMS**

- 3. Public Hearing continued from December 4, 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: With that we are going to open Item No. H-2025-0016 to continue the Farrington Hills Heights Subdivision at Pine and Adkins for a rezone, preliminary plat and a development agreement modification and we will begin with the staff report.

Napoli: Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, good evening. So, yes, this item was continued -- here, let me get that pulled up first. This item was continued from the December 4th hearing date and during that December 4th hearing date you guys gave the applicant direction to remove the open space to allow for larger building lots to accommodate some single story homes within the development. The applicant did revise their plan to lose an additional lot. This is a comparison of the two. Previous one on the left is the one that you guys heard on the December 4th and the right is the current proposal that they have. So, they did lose an additional lot. They did remove the majority of the open space that was in the development and as well as rerouting the road to actually be on that north boundary, so there is not going to be any homes abutting those northern neighbors to the north. In addition to this I did talk with the applicant and in my staff report I did recommend a DA provision that all the homes -- so, Lots 2 through 8 -- so, this whole lot -- this whole side will be restricted to single story homes. So, that is in the DA. The applicant -- I did briefly talk with them on that and seems to be in agreement with that, you know, so that -- I will go over what they are requesting again just so you guys have that on the record. The applicant is requesting -- their updated request is a rezone still of the 2.9 acres of the 4.68 acres of land from the R-4 zoning district to the R-15 zoning district, leaving the remaining 1.78 acres of land as R-4. A preliminary plat consisting of 24 building lots -- so, 21 new lots and three existing. So, the three existing homes will remain on the southern portion of the site. And seven common lots on the 4.68 acres of land and a new development agreement to replace the current one. So, that is really where we are at tonight. If there is anything else you guys would like me to highlight I would be happy to do so, but, you know, this is their revision to your guys' direction from the last hearing and I will stand for any questions.

Lorcher: Would the applicant like to come forward?

Durtschi: Hello. Had a PowerPoint presentation real quick. I figured since you already heard me do my spiel last month we just will keep it really quick and abbreviated and just stress the changes --

Lorcher: Okay.

Durtschi: -- that we made. So, on that note, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, hello and good evening. For the record my name is Sabrina Durtschi. I am here on behalf of the applicant. My business address is 5179 South Boven Avenue, Boise, Idaho. 83716. And this evening I am representing our layout of Farrington Heights that Nick so kindly went over with us. So, first, let's go back in time. I just want to tell you -- go back and remind us how we all got here. So, originally our August 7th hearing -- you can see that we had 30 lots and during that hearing we were asked to prepare and revise the layout, so that we provide a little more usable open space. Now on the other side of the slide you can see our December 4th hearing that I presented in front of you and we had revised the layout. We had reduced the lot count to 24 -- or 25, excuse me, and, then, we included the open space. So, the plan, drum roll as you have already seen -- you took out my drum roll and excitement for the new -- to the sign. But here are our changes that we made. We have 24 single family homes. Seven common lots. We actually removed one of the additional lots and, then, our net density has reduced to 5.12 units per acre and really quickly. So, the changes we made we -- we relocated the northern road alignment to create a stronger buffer between the project and the northern abutting properties. Two. We removed the previously proposed open space and, then, redistributed those all on those western side lots. Three. We increased the lot sizes of the western side lots to better accommodate the single story homes and improve the compatibility and, then, finally, I did a follow up and contacted all the neighbors and they were very pleased with the changes. So, with that we feel like, in closing, we are excited about the revisions. We appreciate the time to come back one more time to work with the neighbors to address the changes and I just want to kind of give applause and acknowledgement to the applicant for their willingness to listen, come back a third time, all these changes that, you know, as an extra expense to have a layout and so I just was very impressed with them and their willingness to make a great project that works for everyone. So, with that I will end my presentation. Thank you all for your time and consideration and respectfully ask for an approval to City Council so we can get to that next step. So, thank you.

Simison: Thanks. Do we have any questions for Sabrina before we start public testimony? Thank you very much.

Durtschi: Thank you.

Simison: Madam Clerk, do we have anybody signed up to testify?

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. Yes, we do. The first person is Donald Flaten. And he does have a presentation, too.

Flaten: I should have one or two attached files. And, of course, one of those is duplicate to what Sabrina just submitted also.

Simison: While she is getting that if you can state your name and address for the record.

Flaten: Yeah. Don Flaten. 1111 North Adkins Avenue. It adjoins the property.

Simison: Thank you.

Flatten: Thank you. The illustration is a PDF, so we don't see the full image of it. If we can actually -- that's great. This is what I submitted after the December 4th meeting and it does coincide largely with some improvements, of course, by the developer. I just did a quick evaluation, but a suggestion based on the irrigation easement and so forth. Within the context of an R-15 zoning this is a good plan. What I'm addressing today is I just think R-15 is inappropriate. It's an R-4 neighborhood on all borders. There are problems with R-15 that I numerated. We could go to another picture -- image there. I think I have a text image here indicating where -- the problem is increased congestion. Parking impact was brought up by three people who testified last time. It was never addressed after that and that hasn't changed. If we look at the site plan there isn't room really to park on the street within the U-shape there. I'm presuming these will be two car garages with two parking spaces on a driveway in front. If it's like most people, like myself, one of those garage spaces will be used for storing our stuff. The problem is it doesn't leave any room for guests or -- to guests park when they come to visit and with 20 or 21 residences numerous people, it is an issue related to that and directly to the R-15 zoning to which I object. Increased congestion. Generally noise level in the neighborhood will be higher. We have animals. Other people have animals. Start adding together a circus of animals from different buildings. It just adds up. The overall volume level becomes kind of intolerable -- intolerable and distracting. Increased traffic load on North Adkins Avenue and there is a decreased privacy inherent with number of structures. So, if we were to continue with an R-4 zoning and appropriate development that way that would -- all those things would be under control. That's basically what I had to cover. The other thing I just want to be sure of -- the one story structures be limited in height to appropriate in matching the neighborhood and I haven't measured those -- were 16 six. I think some of the neighbors are 18 feet at center line. That's something to consider. And also for the people on the west border where they are one stories, external structures, place -- they have -- they really must be enforced in HOA, keep those at legally set distances from the fence and height restrictions on those storage buildings and things. People will tend to build them and they do take up space and people tend to jam up against them. So, those considerations are the main ones. I do appreciate the effort and expertise of the developer in revising plans based on our suggestions and requests last time. Very noteworthy and it obviously is -- they put a lot of work into it. But my objection is the R-15 itself. Thank you.

Lorcher: Thank you. Madam Clerk.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, the next person is Stephanie John.

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

John: Sure. My name is Stephanie John. I live at 1111 North Adkins Avenue. I will first say I appreciate the developer and his changes. He is, obviously, willing to play and listen. That is great. We appreciate it. A lot of stress has been taken off. I do agree with the plan they have presented. The only thing I am going to ask for is doing that development agreement modification that we cap the building sizes. I went around and collected the heights of all the surrounding homes that immediately are affected by this build and found their sizes. They are smaller homes. They were built a long time ago. 2001. Things like that. So, I understand that. I would like to see the single homes be capped from ground to highest peak at 20 feet and the two stories capped at 26 feet. I do feel like that is generous. They are still taller than the homes around them, but they are new builds and, like I said, I really appreciate the modifications they have made. I think we will hear testimony about parking, which will be an issue, and I do think that there are some heights. I think capping them would help eliminate some of the other concerns that the residents may have. I also collected signatures from people in the area that surround the field that they were going for single family -- or single story homes throughout the whole thing. You have to give and take. I understand that. They have clearly listened and they are giving and taking and, thus, that's why if they do get two -- those two story homes in the middle I'm just asking for a cap that would include not just the homes, but also any sheds or any extra things that they might want to put on the houses and things like that. So, if we can consider that, like I said, single stories to the 20 feet, double stories to the 26 feet to the highest peak, so ground highest peak, trying to keep it compatible going around, but also understanding it's a new build. That's all I really have to say.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, the next person is Jack Harp.

Harp: Jack Harp. 1038 North Adkins in Meridian. Appreciate the developer redoing this, but my major concern is you are about to stick about 80 plus people in that small area. You take that 80 people plus most generally two automobiles. Now you have got about 80 automobiles in there. Then you have people who come and visit, come and stay. Infrastructure just won't handle that. And I haven't seen any plans for garages, speed bumps. I see one way -- basically one way in and one way out. Pine Street, they are already having more wrecks than they can handle at Locust Grove and Pine. You put all this in there it's just going to -- it will be a nightmare. But I believe that's on Ada county. That isn't on Meridian. I get that. But like she said, my concern is is the height. I have been there for a little over 22 years now. Been pretty much used to looking at the geese and the view and everything. To put two story apartments in there or call them houses, whatever, but it could be kind of a cultural shock. But like she said, if you can keep the height down and not build them like those ones that are this close together right along the canal there on Pine Street, that's -- that's a travesty. My gosh, you can hand your neighbor a cup of sugar and never leave the house. That's -- they do all my life that's a

poor way to live. A poor way to live. All you folks on this board -- bear with me. How many of you own your own house? Raise your hands, please.

Lorcher: We all live in Meridian.

Harp: Okay. You know what blood, sweat and tears to owning your own home. Most of these will end up being rentals, because no one can afford to buy houses anymore. So, with that being said, a rental, they don't care if the grass is green or if it's brown. They make a call, they complain to whoever is going to be running this outfit. They don't care. And what it's going to do it's just going to move our property value and basically our way of life across the street. So, yes, I'm complaining a little bit -- actually a whole lot, but you got to understand people live across the street. We will be looking at this less than 50 yards away. Plus all the construction, the dirt and everything that goes with all this. We will not be compensated for now, but -- that must be my bell. But, anyway, folks, yeah, thanks for your time.

Lorcher: All right. Thanks for coming tonight.

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

Salladay: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Rick Salladay. I live at 992 North Stonehenge, Meridian, Idaho. This is directly behind the proposed development. I brought in a couple pictures of my backyard and all my decorations on my fence. You guys can enjoy. But this shows the elevation difference from my backyard to that field. That is the retaining wall I put in shortly after I moved in to stop the drainage ditch from pouring into my yard. They used to irrigate that field at one time. You will go to the next -- next shot there, please. This is a -- kind of a shot of the trailers that are parked behind my house. I don't have an objection to that. That's their property. They can put whatever they want to on that property. I have always had a good relationship with the Brocks. I just barely put that fence up three years ago, in fact. So, I have always enjoyed an open fence to that field. The next photo. That just shows that -- the height difference there. That's -- that's sitting again showing the difference there. That is approximately eight to ten feet off my back fence. So, that is approximately what I'm thinking these new houses will be. But a lot higher. So, there again, that just shows you the height difference from my house to their field. Here again this shows -- again the fence to people on Adkins Lane. Without my fence you see the rooftops right there across that fence. That's Adkins Lane. Before that I had a clear view of the mountains. So, speaking of view is being destroyed. But that's all right. That is development. I'm good with that and I again will go with everybody else. I appreciate what the developer has done to adjust his plans to address our issues. I don't know if I had another photo or not. This is the Brocks' home. I don't know if you have ever seen the Brocks' home. It's not a home. It's a -- it's a huge house. But that just shows -- that's probably 50 yards from my backyard and, then, in the summertime they did put some trees there to block the view, because they did add a pool recently. Unfortunately they built the elevation of that right there where you see those trees, that is where they build an elevation. So, when we walk around I can see that it's basically their fence and they are walking around here. So, that's -- I can see over there.

But, anyhow, again, elevation issues. I think that's the last of my -- my pictures there show my complaint of elevation, but with the new changes they made -- I noticed that they moved the open space that was behind my house. It would have kind of eliminated the buildings behind my house. They have now moved all over my house -- or my side. It looks like they put the biggest lot right behind me and I'm kind of concerned about the elevation of that house, because I think it might -- it looks like the biggest lot on their plan. So, anyway, that's all I have to say. I would like somebody to look at the -- you can't tell by just looking at lot sizes how big the houses are going to be, how the parking is going to be addressed. So, that's some issues that are also brought up. Parking. Traffic. That's nothing. So, anyhow, thank you, people. Appreciate all your time.

Lorcher: All right. Thank you very much.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, the next person signed up is Todd Lakey.

Lorcher: Okay.

Lomeli: The next person is Maralee Turner.

Turner: Hello. My name is Maralee Turner. I reside at 1345 East Shellbrook Drive, Meridian, Idaho. 83642. My home borders the proposed subdivision of Farrington Heights. The developers have restructured their plans over the course of several months in order to find solutions that would be beneficial and respectful to us as long standing property owners. We have lived in our home over 20 years. As a development of such proportions will impact many families for decades, including existing homeowners, I truly appreciate the accommodations the developers have made to incorporate their plans and the neighbors' concerns into the existing space. I'm very grateful that a proposed compromise currently has the potential to be reached. If we go forward with the plans a green space will buffer -- will -- a green space buffer will now separate our homes -- my home from the planned house bordering our property, which will allow us to continue using our garden space. A portion of the road will also provide a small amount of separation between our property and the planned lots. The larger lot sizes will now accommodate single story homes along the proposed boundary, which we have been very concerned about in past hearings. I continue to be concerned about the insufficient intersection at Pine and Locust Grove and that that will continue to be a safety concern and that concern will expand with time. Also I would still express hesitation if garages are allowed on the single story homes, which would put that -- the garage level or a bonus room at a proposed height difference that would impact our privacy and the use of our yard. If indeed the building lots on the outskirts -- outskirts bordering the existing homes are limited to a single story and single level height restrictions are put in place that concern would be alleviated. This plan has, indeed, addressed multiple concerns in a respectful way and I am very appreciative and supportive of most aspects of the plan.

Lorcher: Thank you.

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

Lorcher: Good evening.

B.Turner: Good evening. Brian Turner. 1345 East Shellbrook Drive. And I really want to express my appreciation to the applicant and that team and hearing feedback and working with us. I wish that was done more often than it -- than it feels like it is. I currently think the proposed plan is a good one and I'm in support of it. It would be made great in my eyes if the west side, those homes there is some of the ambiguity about whether they are two story or what height they are, was removed. It would become a great plan. And -- or the use of the clear story or highlight windows in appropriate places and that's it.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, we have Bob Flaten, Senior.

Flaten: It's junior. My apologies. Hello. My name is Bob Flaten, Jr. I live at 1111 Adkins Avenue. You guys have heard us speak many times. Me in particular I guess. With that being said I want to start by saying Mr. Etheridge and his team are a lot more likable and realistically they listen a lot better than I would have anticipated at the beginning of this process. With that being said I mean our interaction with him has improved. I can't say for anybody else, because I'm not them. Anyways, diving right into this. A lot of the absolutely earth shattering things that we were concerned about in our household have been addressed and I am extremely thankful for that. With that being said I made a point a long time ago of saying that it wasn't just about us, but it was about all of our neighbors and I do still hold true to that. So, to give you my God's honest take on it, where we are, I think everything they have done is very beneficial to us and to a lot of the other neighbors. Not all of them. There are still concerns of -- primarily I'm hearing with just congestion and all. You know, the rezoning and how many people can get into that space. Personally I agree with that part of it and also the fact that not all could be single story. And, again, realistically, we don't have the crystal ball that makes everything work great for everybody. I wish we did. I would love to make everyone happy. But to reiterate, I think they have done a really good job of helping me, my family and some of the other families. Ideally I would love for that to be even across the board. If there was any way that all the neighbors could be pleased and we could keep it in -- to where it's basically fair for all of them that would be my ideal take. But, anyways, thank you very much for listening. I appreciate it immensely.

Lorcher: Thank you.

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

Lorcher: Is there anybody on Zoom tonight?

Lomeli: Madam Chair, no one is on Zoom.

Lorcher: Is there anybody else in Chambers that would like to speak before we ask the applicant? Would you like to come up? If you can state your name and address for the record.

Bradley: Yeah. My name is Rick Bradley. I'm at 1321 East Shellbrook Drive here in Meridian.

Lorcher: Okay.

Bradley: I just want to start to say -- reiterating the building team did a fantastic job in listening to our concerns. Last time we were here with this meeting we made ten times more progress talking to them out in the lobby than we did anywhere here in the Chambers. So, I really appreciate the willingness to sit and talk to us. The two things that are really consistent here is maybe the height and the traffic. Last time I was here I asked you guys if you ever been to Adkins and Pine intersection and nobody had been. Has that changed? You guys aware of how that -- small that intersection is? And we are adding all this extra traffic to it.

Lorcher: We are aware of the intersection. It's -- typically in a public meeting situation to go to the site is -- is inappropriate for the commission, so --

Bradley: Yeah. I just thinking off hours; right.

Lorcher: Right. But as community members of Meridian I think we are all familiar with the area.

Bradley: Okay. Great. So, obviously, that is concern -- should probably concern you guys a little bit as well. As far as the heights going, I know that they can put into the CC&Rs and ACC stuff about restricting two story, restricting height, restricting with roof and I think they were willing to add that into that. But when the plan checkers check the plans they are going to have to be pretty thorough about that to make sure that they are actually following all the guidelines for the ACCs and I think if it was implemented it would be public notice and we will be able to see as residents that they are withholding to what the developer said, because the builders are going to do their own thing. They don't really have control over how the sticks go up. But if it's put it into the rules I think that could solve a lot of the issues most likely and so I guess that was pretty much my main point is it can be controlled. These -- the concerns of all the residents around can be relieved if we take steps in that direction.

Lorcher: Okay.

Bradley: That's kind of what I wanted to say. Thank you.

Lorcher: Thank you very much. Anybody else in Chambers before we ask the applicant to come back up? Would you like to come back up to -- oh, Todd, you are going to follow up.

Lakey: Madam Chair, Commissioners, good evening. My name is Todd Lakey. Lakey Villegas Law, 141 East Carlton Avenue here in Meridian and appreciate the opportunity. I will -- I will be brief. If you have some more technical questions on some of the plat design we have some of our other team members here. Start out always by thanking staff for their work and their recommendation of approval. Commissioners, as you know, these are often an effort to achieve balance and has -- as has been described, my clients really have gone the extra mile in this case. I think it started with about 32 lots and, you know, they -- they removed 12 lots. They are relocating things on the property. They are -- they are getting rid of the two stories that they could have done on the edge in accordance with code. They moved the road, so there is a road to the north along with that green space that goes between 15 and 25 feet. So, there is no houses immediately on that boundary to the north. You have got Adkins to the east that they are bringing up to code, widening it, including the sidewalk and, then, again, Commissioners, they are tucking those two stories back into the middle of the project. Your future land use map calls for five to eight dwelling units per acre and we are at 5.12, so we are well within that range that's provided for in -- in the Comprehensive Plan. So, Commissioners, with the changes we are -- we not only meet code, but we are doing better than code and that's, again, part of the balance, some give and take, but the R-15 -- there were comments about the R-15 zoning. Yes, we are doing R-15 zoning on a portion of the property, but our density is not R-15. We have 3,000 to 7,000 square foot lots and in R-15 you can get two. So, it's really not R-15, other than it allows us to utilize different setbacks and lot sizes and, then, with the development agreement that limits us to what we can do. That's -- that's really consistent with that R-8 that you have in the area. As was stated, my clients met with the neighbors multiple times. Last time they met with them it was as described by several of them here. Thank you so much for the changes. We are good. And my clients went forward. The -- we do have a concern with the new building height restrictions that are proposed. Commissioners, we are surrounded by R-8 and we have R-4 and R-15 on this property. There isn't really a nexus. We are complying with code. We are willing to say, okay, we will do the R-15 height restrictions -- excuse me -- take the R-15 height restrictions and take those R-4 height restrictions and spread it across the whole property. So, we will be subject to R-4 height restrictions on the whole thing and we got -- we are surrounded again by R-8. Commissioners, we also meet the ACHD requirements. There were no issues there. There was some traffic concerns and questions, but, as you know, that's their jurisdiction, their expertise and we are meeting their requirements. So, Commissioners, as I said we have gone the extra mile. We are going above and beyond code. We ask that the height restrictions be simply the R-4 height restrictions across the property and we ask that you approve our revised plan that does help provide that balance with the neighbors. With that I would ask for your approval. Happy to answer questions myself or if you have some technical ones for other experts that are here.

Lorcher: Commissioners, do we have questions for Todd? One of the residents asked about will there be an HOA for this community. Yes --

Lakey: I'm sure -- I get a thumbs up. Yes.

Lorcher: Okay.

Lahey: There will be an HOA.

Lorcher: And so will there be language in there that addresses out buildings, like if somebody wanted to build a shed? Yes. I'm hearing --

Lahey: So, yes, Madam Chair, for the record.

Lorcher: So, it will be respectful as far as height and so it won't -- oh. Okay. And then -- that's all I had. Commissioners, do you have questions?

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Just for clarity, so you indicate you would be comfortable with, you know, R-4, R-8, that height limitation. Is that already in the staff recommendation or staff report or do we need to amend that?

Napoli: Madam Chair, Commissioner Smith, so Lots 2 through -- here, let me pull it up so we can show you. So, on that west boundary Lots 2 through 8 are restricted to single story. So, R-15 allows for structures up to 40 feet measured from the property line. So, we actually are changing that. We are measuring -- measure from the property line to the peak of the roof. R-4 would have it -- 35 feet would be the maximum height. So, that would be something that would be definitely your guys' purview and I would recommend you include that in your motion tonight if that is a way that you guys want to go. That is correct.

Lahey: Thank you, Commissioner.

Lorcher: Any questions?

Stoll: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Stoll.

Stoll: So, I'm not sure if this is a question for Mr. Lahey or for Nick. Was -- did the applicant propose on the west -- the homes on the western side would be one story or was that --

Lahey: Madam Chair and Commissioner Stoll, we are willing to have that restriction, yes. Those Lots 2 through 8 would be limited to single story.

Stoll: Okay.

Lorcher: What do you anticipate the average square foot of the homes that you are proposing?

Lakey: Madam Chair, I might have to ask my client for that.

Lorcher: Okay.

Lakey: If you could give me just a moment.

Lorcher: Can you come up briefly? Hi. If you could just state your name and address for the record.

Ethridge: My name is Brandon Ethridge and it's 5175 South Missoula Way, Boise, Idaho.

Lorcher: Thanks.

Ethridge: And to answer your question, Madam Chair, for the average square feet we are -- we want it to be around 1,500, maybe higher to 2,000 square feet if we can get it in there -- if we can fit those in the lots.

Lorcher: Now you are looking at typically two car garages on these?

Ethridge: We are -- we have two car garages with the driveway that can support another two cars.

Lorcher: Okay. So, four cars in all. And, then, your HOA would either limit or allow like a shed in the backyard for lawnmowers and that type of thing?

Ethridge: Absolutely. And we are willing to do a height restriction on that as well.

Lorcher: Okay. And one final question and it doesn't have to be exact. What kind of price point are you looking at for these homes?

Ethridge: We want to be -- our price points -- we want to be in the five hundred thousands and maybe creep it up if we can. We just know that that helps retain the value in the area as well if we can maintain those price points.

Lorcher: Okay. Any other questions for the developer?

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: So, on the single stories what is -- what is the height estimate that you expect? I mean we know what the maximum is, but --

Ethridge: I think the -- on those single stories we can be in the 20s, you know, depends on the pitch of the roof, but we are going to be respectful of that to plan it for the lots, because we understand. We had a meeting with the neighbors last week and it was all about height and we -- we would make -- we would limit that as much as we can, but it needs to be a nice looking product as well so it maintains its value, so --

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much.

Ethridge: Appreciate it.

Lorcher: Appreciate it.

Lakey: Any other questions Madam Chair?

Lorcher: I think we are good.

Lakey: All right. Thank you very much.

Lorcher: Thank you, Todd. 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.**

Rust: Madam Chair?

Simison: Commissioner Rust.

Rust: Appreciate the rework that's gone into this. I don't know in my time as a Commissioner that I have heard this much positive testimony. So, appreciate the engagement of the community and coming out and sharing your opinion. After reconvening with the developer we often get a lot of negative and not a lot of positive. So, it was great to see that tonight. I'm in full support of this plan. I really like what they did. If I remember right at the December 4th meeting we were trying to haggle over some height restrictions on specific lots and I think what we have come to here is a really good development. It is going to lead to some increased density. That's the nature of in-fill. We talk about this with every single in-fill project. I appreciate the applicant working with the community, with the Commission, with City Council. I think we have got to a really good product here. I'm in full support.

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: We already closed the public hearing, didn't we? I was hoping the applicant can come back up and address the issues that were presented. Was -- is that not something we were planning on doing?

Lorcher: We closed the public hearing.

Perreault: Right.

Lorcher: So, did you want me to reopen it or --

Perreault: Well, typically the applicant comes back up and my one concern would be whether or not we should hear more about -- well, let me put it this way. Should we hear more about street parking or parking in general or does the Commission feel like that that's been addressed?

Lorcher: Todd was representing the applicant on the second part of it. So, if you really wanted to hear from Sabrina we can reopen the public hearing for her to address it.

Perreault: No. That's okay.

Lorcher: Okay. Any other comments?

Sandoval: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Yes.

Sandoval: As far as the parking I think with the two car garage and the driveway that supports an additional two, I think it's appropriate, so I don't think we need to discuss it more. Open to conversation, obviously, but I think it's adequate.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Well, there is some times a year where parking, you know, in -- in my neighborhood there is some -- you know, there is some two, some three car garages and there is still parking issues every once in a while when we have Super Bowl Sunday or, you know, during the holiday sometimes that happens, but I think broadly speaking on a day-to-day standpoint I'm not overly concerned with the parking. I think to a larger issue -- or to a larger kind of discussion I think these are -- is a really good project. I think the only thing that I would probably add to the staff report -- and I was mulling this over, but since the applicant kind of suggested it, maybe to give some peace of mind is restricting the height to be consistent with R-4 on all the properties. I know some applicant -- or

some of the public were hoping for a 20 foot height restriction or things like that. I think that's a bit too -- too restrictive, a bit arbitrary. I think I was seeing some numbers on -- on some of the documents of 22 foot, 24 foot. I think I saw a 29 foot. So, I don't know that that's the right way to go, but I think as a show of goodwill and something that the developer seems content with doing is restricting it to R-4. Yeah. I think these are going to be great properties.

Lorcher: Yeah. I agree as well. They are taking on the responsibility of improving Adkins Way and they are putting in the street that will be, you know, a U-shape. So, they are listening. Is it perfect? No. But a homeowner has a right to sell their property and a developer has a right to develop those properties within the zone and I will say of my six years on this I haven't seen many developers listen to the community as much as they have listened to you. They have a right to build and a homeowner has a right to sell. So, is it perfect? No. But I think when this goes to Council -- and it will -- they will engage more with height -- height restrictions and the development, you know, design that they will present to Council. Anybody want to give me a motion?

Rust: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Rust.

Rust: After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council File No. H-2025-0016 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of January 15th, 2026, with one modification to -- in addition to the single story lot height restrict -- or single story restriction on the west boundary, to restrict the entire parcel to R-4 heights as outlined by the applicant.

Stoll: Second.

Napoli: Madam Chair, if I may chime in.

Lorcher: Yes.

Napoli: Can we put that at 35 feet, instead of R-4, just so it's clear on the record. Would that be okay?

Rust: Yes. Works for me.

Lorcher: Okay. Do I have a second?

Stoll: Yep. I second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to approve file 2025-0016, Farrington Hills. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much.

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

