

Meridian Planning and Zoning Meeting

September 3, 2026.

Meeting of the Meridian Planning and Zoning Commission of September 3, 2026, was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chairman Maria Lorcher.

Members Present: Commissioner Maria Lorcher, Commissioner Jared Smith, Commissioner Matthew Stoll, Commissioner Dom Gelsomino and Commissioner Robert Shappee.

Members Absent: Commissioner Matthew Sandoval and Commissioner Jessica Perreault.

Others Present: Tina Lomeli, Emily Kane, Caleb Hood, Brian McClure, Sonya Allen, Nick Napoli and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

☒ Dom Gelsomino	☐ Jessica Perreault
☐ Matthew Sandoval	☒ Matthew Stoll
☒ Robert Shappee	☒ Jared Smith
☒ Maria Lorcher - Chairman	

Lorcher: All right. Good evening. Welcome to the Planning Zoning Commission meeting for September 3rd. At this time I would like to call the meeting to order. The commissioners who are present for this evening's meeting are here at City Hall. We also have staff from the City Attorney's and the City Clerk's office, as well as the City Planning Department. If you are joining us on Zoom this evening we can see that you are here. However, you may -- you may observe the meeting, however your ability to be seen on screen and talk will be muted. During the public testimony portion of the meeting you will be unmuted and, then, be able to comment. Please note that we cannot take questions until the public testimony portion of the meeting. If you have a process question during the meeting please e-mail cityclerk@meridiancity.org and they will reply as quickly as possible. If you simply want to watch the meeting we encourage you to watch it streaming on the city's YouTube channel. You can access it at meridiancity.org/live. With that let us begin with roll call. Madam Clerk.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Lorcher: The first item on the agenda is the adoption of the agenda and there are no changes to tonight's agenda. May I get a motion to adopt tonight's agenda as presented?

Stoll: Move to adopt.

Gelsomino: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

1. Approve Minutes of the August 20, 2026 Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting

Lorcher: The next item on the agenda is the Consent Agenda, which include to approve the meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission from August 20th. May I get a motion to approve the Consent Agenda?

Stoll: Move to approve as presented.

Gelsomino: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

ITEMS MOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA [Action Item]

Lorcher: At this time I would briefly like to explain the public hearing process. We will open each item individually and begin with the staff report. Staff will report their findings on how the item adheres to our Comprehensive Plan and our Unified Development Code. After staff has made their presentation the applicant will come forward to present their case and respond to staff questions or comments and they will have 15 minutes to do so. After the applicant is finished we will open the floor to public testimony. Each person will be called only once during the public testimony portion of the meeting. The clerk will call the names individually of those who have signed up on our website or in advance to testify. You may come to the microphones in Chambers or you will be unmuted in Zoom. Please state your name and address for the record and you will have three minutes to address the commission. If you have previously sent pictures or a presentation of the meeting it will be displayed on the screen and our clerk will help you run that presentation. If you establish that you are speaking on behalf of a larger group, like an HOA, where others from that group will allow you to speak on their behalf you will have up to ten minutes. After all those who have signed up in advance have spoken we will invite any others who wish to testify. If you wish to speak on a topic you may come forward in Chambers or if on Zoom press the raise hand button on the Zoom app or if you are listening on a telephone please press star nine and wait for your name to be called. If you are listening on multiple devices, such as a computer and a telephone, please, be sure to mute those extra devices so we don't experience feedback and we can hear you clearly. When you have finished if the commission does

not have any questions for you you will return to your seat in the Chambers or be muted on Zoom and no longer have the ability to speak. And please remember we will not call on you a second time. After all testimony has been heard the applicant will be given another ten minutes to come back and respond. When the applicant is finished responding to questions and concerns we will close the public hearing so that the commissioners will have the opportunity to discuss, hopefully make final decisions or recommendations to City Council as needed.

ACTION ITEMS

2. Public Hearing for Black Creek Legal Office (H-2026-0048) by Brio Architecture, located at 195 S. Touchmark Way

- A. Request: Conditional Use Permit to construct and operate a 4,833 Sq.ft office building and leave an empty pad site for an approximate 3,500 sq. ft office building on 1.06 acres in the L-O zoning.

Lorcher: With that we will start with Item No. 2, H-2026-0048 is a request for a conditional use permit for Black Creek Legal Office at 195 South Touchmark Way and we will begin with the staff report.

Napoli: Good evening, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. Next item on the agenda is the conditional use permit for Black Creek Legal Office. So, the applicant is requesting a conditional use permit to construct and operate a 4,833 square foot office building and leave an empty pad site for an approximate 3,500 square foot office building on 1.0 acres in the L-O zoning district. The site is located at 195 South Touchmark Way. As shown on the screen the existing zoning is L-O, Limited Office, and the FLUM designation is mixed-use community. So, the proposed use of a medical office aligns well with the mixed-use community designation, which supports a blend of residential, commercial and recreational uses. Office buildings are typically a permitted use in the L-O zoning district. However, a development agreement from 2005 requires a detailed conditional use permit approval for any development on any property within this -- that's under the development agreement. So, site plan, landscape plan and elevations for you guys tonight. Staff is recommending approval and has not received any written testimony on this and I will stand for any questions that you have.

Lorcher: Would the applicant like to come forward? Good evening. If you can state your name and address for the record, please.

Romani: Good evening. My name is Daphne Romani. Address is 3313 West Cherry Lane, Meridian. 83642.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Romani: I think the city staff did a good job at summarizing the scope of the project. I don't have anything to add, but I'm available for questions if anybody has questions.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you. Commissioners, do we have any questions for the applicant? Thank you very much.

Romani: Thank you.

Lorcher: Madam Clerk, do we have anyone up -- signed up to testify?

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. No one has signed up.

Lorcher: And there is nobody on Zoom -- I don't see anybody on Zoom. Any other further comments or you are good? May I get a motion to close the public hearing.

Smith: So moved.

Stoll: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and second to close the public hearing on H-2026-0048, Black Creek Legal Office. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Lorcher: For this Touchmark site plan conditional use permits are required for any new building that's going to go up. Nick pointed out we only have two more left, so we will do this two more times. But it -- it fits all the requirements that the city is looking for for connectivity and flow and building requirements and elevations. So, I don't see any problem with this application. Any other comments?

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to approve File No. H-2026-0048 as presented in the staff report.

Gelsomino: Seconded.

Lorcher: It's been moved and second to approve the Black Creek Legal Office. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

3. Public Hearing for Findley Cove (H-2026-0028) by Bonnie Layton, located at 115 S. Linder Rd.

- A. Request: Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map Amendment to change the Land Use designation of approximately 4.38 acres of land from Commercial to Medium Density Residential.
- B. Request: Annexation of 4.73 acres of land with the R-15 zoning district.

Lorcher: The next item on the agenda is H-2026-0028, Findley Cove requests a comprehensive land use amendment from commercial to medium density residential at 115 South Linder Road and we will begin with the staff report.

Allen: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. The next application before you is a request for a Comprehensive Plan map amendment and annexation and zoning. The site consists of 4.46 acres of land. It's mostly zoned R-1 in Ada county with some R-4 in the city, located at 115 South Linder Road. A little history on this property. It was previously platted as Lot 6 in Drain Ditch Van Hess Subdivision. In 2020 an application was submitted for a modification to the development agreement approved for the abutting property to the west, which was the Villas at 12 Oaks, to include the subject property and development plan for a 64 unit multi-family residential development in the agreement. The city council denied this application based on their finding that it wasn't in the best interest of the city to annex the property with the multi-family development plan and found commercial and office development to be more appropriate use for this property, consistent with the commercial future land use map designation in the comprehensive plan for this property. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation is mostly commercial, which is 4.36 acres of the site, with some medium density residential consisting of 0.39 of an acre along the southern boundary of the site. Here is some site photos. The first one on the top is looking northwest and, then, the bottom one on the right is looking west from Linder Road. An amendment to the Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation to change the land use designation on approximately 4.38 acres of land from commercial to medium density residential is proposed to match that along the southern boundary of the property. The medium density residential designation allows residential development at a gross density of three to eight dwelling units per acre. The subject property is an infield piece of land in the county surrounded by city annexed and developed property. Commercial development consisting of a fuel sales facility, a vehicle -- facility, vehicle washing facility, restaurant with a drive-through and other multi-tenant retail and restaurant uses exist to the north. A minor vehicle repair and multi-family residential exist to the west. Single-family residential detached homes to the south and an ACHD storm drainage facility and residential common area to the east across Linder Road. The site is triangular in configuration as you can see there on the annexation exhibit, with only about 110 feet of frontage along Linder Road at the narrowest part of the property. The topography of the land in this area slopes down from the north to the south making the subject property quite a bit lower than the adjacent commercial property to the north. Annexation of 4.73 acres of land with an R-15 zoning district is also proposed with a conceptual development plan for 19 townhome dwellings at a gross density of seven units per acre. The concept plan is shown there on the left along

with concept elevations of the proposed townhomes on the right. The concept plan depicts public street access via Linder Road in alignment with West Barrett Drive on the east side of Linder, terminating in a cul-de-sac at the project's west boundary with common open space area along the Ten Mile Creek that runs along the southern boundary of the property. A common driveway is proposed for access to the lots at the west end of the development. The property is not proposed to be subdivided at this time. Linder Road is in the process of being widened to five lanes in this area with improvements to the Linder-Franklin Road intersection and an overpass over I-84, which are anticipated to be complete in the fall of 2027. Public transit and a bus stop is available near this site at the Franklin and Linder intersection. There is a cross-access easement that exists between the subject property and the commercial development to the north that was intended to provide cross-access with commercial development of this property. Because commercial development is not proposed and an access drive is not proposed or required. An eight-foot-tall concrete wall exists along the northern boundary of this site. A cross-access easement was not provided to this property from the west because of the commercial designation and the cross-access easement from the property to the north and because private drive aisles, rather than public streets, exist in the development to the west. With development a ten foot wide detached sidewalk and multi-use pathway is required on this site along South Linder Road and along the north side of the Ten Mile Creek on the subject property per the Pathways Master Plan. Conceptual building elevations were submitted as I mentioned before shown there on the right for the proposed townhomes. Final design is required to comply with the single-family residential design standards in the architectural standards manual. The townhomes are proposed to be clustered in four groups of four and one group of three as shown on the concept plan. Staff finds the proposed amendment to medium density residential is consistent with key elements of the Comprehensive Plan pertaining to compatibility and transition of land uses, infill development, the provision of a variety of housing types and other elements is noted in the staff report. Therefore staff recommends approval of the proposed future land use map amendment and annexation as requested with the requirement of a development agreement that ties future development to this concept plan. Several letters of written testimony have been received on this application. Twenty-two are in opposition and one is in support of the request. Some of the reasons cited for denial of the request include the following: Many letters were submitted against an apartment complex -- and just to be clear, an apartment complex is not proposed. Townhome single-family dwellings are proposed and many letters were requesting a community park with recreational amenities instead. I think there was a rumor floating around that the city was looking to possibly purchase this property and develop a city park. However, that is not true. City Parks Department is not planning a park in -- on this property or anywhere in the immediate vicinity. So, just for clarification. And, then, many of the letters were against the traffic additional homes would generate, requests for the Linder Road expansion and overpass to be finalized prior to approving additional dwellings on this -- in this area. Negative impact on wildlife habitat in the area, negative impact on quality of life for those in the area if the request is approved and concern pertaining to destruction of shared groundwater resources and threat to well owners. The letter in support states the residential designation for this property makes more sense than commercial as a business would

be unable to have signage sufficient to attract businesses from Franklin Road. This property is essentially located in a residential area. Concerned that noise from a commercial property would be disruptive to the immediate area and in favor of the affordable housing option with townhomes. An appreciation the plan isn't overdeveloped with excessive residential housing, but makes good use of the property. Staff will stand for any questions. The applicant is here to present tonight.

Lorcher: Would the applicant like to come forward, please.

Layton: Thank you for that, Sonya, and for your help on this application. Good evening, Members of the Commission. My name is Bonnie Layton. I am with Layton Planning, 3324 West Catalina Drive or Lane in Boise, Idaho. 83705. I'm here tonight on behalf of the development team requesting your recommendation for approval of a Comprehensive Plan map amendment, as well as annexation and zoning of the parcel. I think Sonya did a fantastic job of covering the details of the project. However, I do have a power --

Allen: I'm trying to bring it up here. Oh, I see why it was -- it's in PDF rather than PowerPoint format. It must have saved weird. Let me -- just one moment here. There we go.

Layton: Then how do I click through the slide?

Allen: You can use the mouse up there or the arrows.

Layton: Okay.

Allen: And if that doesn't work I can advance them for you.

Layton: Thank you. Again I'm here this evening to request your recommendation for approval of our request for this Comprehensive Plan map amendment, annexation and zoning of the property. See if I can get this going.

Lomeli: It might be easier to use the arrows.

Layton: Okay. The mouse is jumping. Okay. Yeah. There we go. So, just a brief overview. This is a vicinity map I like to provide for folks both decision makers and folks in the audience to see where we are located, so just in the south -- just adjacent to the southwest corner Franklin Road and Linder Road. As Sonya mentioned there is some residential development to our west. Those are rental units. There is commercial to the north and, then, to the south there are single-family detached homes, as well as to the east, generally speaking. As Sonya had -- had covered, the future land use map currently designates this as commercial. You can see that in the -- the black circle. There is quite a bit of mix of uses around here. We are not too far from Ten Mile and I-84 where there has been some significant development happening in the area and especially -- even in the last five years I would say with commercial development.

Again here is a map of the surrounding zoning. So, we believe our request is in line with an annexation and zoning to medium density residential. That it would fit nicely into the surrounding community. As you can see on the east side of Linder Road that designation goes all the way up to Franklin, so -- and, then, also, as I mentioned, you can see the Ten Mile area is really becoming heavily developed and commercial, much more visible and much more attractive location for commercial businesses. This is kind of an interesting comparison. The development pattern over the last ten years when we look at how this area has evolved and that's part of what the Comprehensive Plan talks about in sort of acknowledging and reviewing how areas of the city evolve. So, back in 2015, just over ten years ago, there was nothing out at Ten Mile. Then we can see the progression in 2020 and, then, of course, in 2025 was the last aerial that I could pull from the internet showing that there has been a lot of commercial development, all while this parcel has remained vacant. So, again, as I mentioned, the adjacent development we do have a mix of commercial. We have got some higher density for rent and we have a lot of single family detached for sale homes. We believe what's missing in this component and what moves towards the intent of the Comprehensive Plan is to provide a variety of housing types. Just in the southwest corner of this image below the subdivision that's to the south of us is Peregrine Elementary School as well. So, there is pathways from the adjacent subdivisions to that school that lead into that school site. So again -- and you probably saw this in your staff report and part of our project narrative is really looking at the Comprehensive Plan and in the text to see where the support is for a request like that -- like we are doing. So, Chapter Two, a premier community that needs a cross-section of housing. I have listed the points. For time's sake I won't go through all of them and, then, again, in Chapter Three just again reinventing key areas. Again this parcel has sat vacant for at least ten years as commercial development has gone on in other places and we believe that some single-family attached for-sale homes is really appropriate and helps to provide that transition between the commercial uses to the north and, then, the single-family detached to the south. Here is an image of how our plan would fit into the community. Here is a -- here is a little bit bigger view of that. We -- in this process staff had asked us -- initially we had requested a Comprehensive Plan map amendment. They asked us to add the addition of a request for annexation and zoning. So, we added that and with that as part of the development agreement we were told that we needed to submit a conceptual site plan, so that could be tied to the development agreement. So, there wouldn't be any bait and switch, we would come in with something later. This is really what we are intending on building, even to the conceptual architecture, which, again, we are in the very beginning stages. As -- as you know, comprehensive plan map amendment, annexation and zoning and, then, we would anticipate coming back in through the process for a subdivision plat. Again I want to thank you for your time. We have reviewed the staff report. We are in agreement with the recommendations from staff and with that I'm happy to stand for any questions.

Lorcher: Sonya, I have a question. Since there is residential directly to the west of this, why is there a cul-de-sac and no connectivity? Because right now there is only one way in and one way out.

Allen: Yeah. Two reasons. This property was designated commercial on the future land use map and they have internal drive aisles rather than public streets.

Lorcher: And the fire chief is okay with the one way in, one way out?

Allen: Yes. For the number of units proposed.

Lorcher: Okay. And you did mention these are for sale not for rent. And, then, would you say a typical townhouse is, what, a family of four?

Layton: That is correct, Commissioner Lorcher. We would develop these to be a standard just single-family, but attached two-car garage with a two-car driveway. This is a typical type of home that we build throughout the Treasure Valley and so it is set up to be developed that way.

Lorcher: Okay. Commissioners, do we have any other questions for Bonnie? All right. Thank you very much.

Layton: Thank you.

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

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. We have Norma Herron.

Lorcher: You may come up. If you could state your name and address for the record. You can state your question and we may not be able to answer, but the applicant will answer when she comes back up at the end.

Herron: Okay. My name is Norma Herron and I live at 1767 West Greenhead Drive, which is just south of this proposed development and I -- my biggest question is the access to Linder Road. As you know, they are developing that and it's going to be a five lane and right now the residential -- the commercial area that is just north of this they have access to Linder and they are only going to be able to -- to make a right-hand turn coming out of that development. So, the -- the proposed residential area will probably have to also make a right-hand turn and the development where I live, which is Whitestone Estates, we have a one-way in and one-way out, just one street that accesses all of this and we may also have to turn to the right and I'm wondering where are people going to be turning around for this to access Linder Road and my concern is that people are going to be turning to the south on Linder Road and, then, making a right-hand turn into the Whitestone Estates and, then, doing a U-turn there and, then, trying to make another right-hand -- a left-hand turn. So, my biggest question is access and congestion in that area.

Lorcher: All right. We will ask the applicant. Does your subdivision say dead end street?

Herron: It says no outlet.

Lorcher: No outlet. Well, same thing. Okay.

Herron: Okay.

Lorcher: Okay. We will ask the applicant when she comes back up. Thank you.

Lomeli: Madam Chair, we have Chad Herron next.

Lorcher: Hi. If you can state your name and address for the record, please.

C.Herron: My name is Chad Herron. I also live in Whitestone Estates, 1767 West Greenhead Drive.

Lorcher: Thank you.

C.Herron: And, additionally, there is a question there about the access in and out. You know, the -- the fire department is going to have a heck of a time with two dead end streets and, again, if there could be a simple answer for a roundabout or something in that area this might be of no consequence, but there are quite a few kids in our neighborhood, a lot of new people moving in and they are all over in those streets these days. We have seen quite a turnover in housing. We have been there for about eight years and it was very quiet when we first moved in. A lot of retired people and as they age it's been turning over. A lot of younger people are moving in and, again, we only have the one exit. There is a proposed road that goes out towards Ten Mile, but it's -- it's basically an alfalfa field now. If -- if that could be remedied we -- this -- this could be a good thing. I don't have any problems with the -- the proposed project. It's just the access in and out. I worked for a fire department when I was a forestry student. I have been to residential fires. It's not really good. That's -- that's my only comment.

Lorcher: Okay. We will discuss it with the applicant. We might not have all the answers today, because the roads are -- ACHD are in charge of that, especially the cross-access.

C.Herron: I understand that, but I did want to --

Lorcher: But we will bring it up and see what we can come up with.

C.Herron: Yeah. Yeah. I think it's pretty pertinent. Thank you.

Lorcher: Thank you.

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

Lorcher: Is there anybody in Chambers that would like to address this application? Come on up. Hi, if you can state your name and address for the record.

Harp: My name is Paige Harp and I am in the Whitestone Estates as well, at 1735 West Calcite Court.

Lorcher: Thanks.

Harp: Strongly opposed to rezoning this plot of land. It's kind of a wonky little shape. I understand that. Nobody in our subdivision really wants to have a lot of traffic coming in and out of there. The two speakers prior to me are exactly right. There is one way in and out of our subdivision. We are right next to an elementary school. From the last or the latest plans that I have seen from ACHD the five lane is actually going to have a median -- cement median from Franklin all the way up to just prior to Greenhead. That was the last of the plans that I saw and that was just a few weeks ago posted on their -- on their development in the website. This raises some big concerns for accessibility, but also the gentleman behind me was completely right as far as access with fire trucks being able to get in and out. We do have a lot of elderly residents in our neighborhood. A lot of times we see ambulances. We see fire trucks. With this particular addition to even more families trying to enter and exit from Linder Road, everybody is going to be pushed to go right to go south and we have a hard enough time just getting out of our neighborhood to go, you know, north when it's a normal summer day now and that's without the overpass already being there. Not necessarily opposed to the overpass, but I feel like all of these things all combined rolled into one make residents' lives pretty difficult in the affected areas. I would really like to see some confirmation on what that median looks like, the applicant's plan on how to mitigate the influx of traffic. I'm also pretty disheartened with the -- you know, destruction of our green space in that whole area. We lost a hundred trees. They took a hundred trees off of Linder. It looks like a ghost town. It's very depressing to drive by. People are losing parts of their lots. Their yards. Easements are taking over everything. This is not in what I thought the development and city plan was for residents that have been there for quite some time. I have personally lived in that subdivision for 15 years. None of this was ever brought to our attention. There was a house -- a residential house in that lot when we moved there and chose to start raising a family. I really feel that these concerns need to be taken into consideration. I'm at the point -- and multiple neighbors that I have spoken with, we would like more green space. I propose a park there. There wasn't a rumor of the city trying to buy a park. It was -- we have lost so much of our green space and our buffer for the traffic and we have a lot of really cool wildlife that live in that wonky little plot. If that's gone that's going to take away even more from the residents that live there. It's going to take away from the safety of the kids. There is going to be so much more traffic. I just don't feel like it's a safe fit and if you look at the construction of the apartments that are, you know, onto the west of that proposal, okay, fair enough, that's a good transition. When you look at the proposed plans for the townhomes they look nice, but they definitely don't fit into the motif of the residents that have lived there and the ones even further south that are still on wells. Those people have been there for a

very long time and we are all not very happy about all this massive expansion all at one time.

Lorcher: Thank you very much. Anyone else that would like to speak? Come on up. Oh, she's --

Smock-Hill: Sorry, I'm not on the list.

Lorcher: You are fine.

Smock-Hill: I just found out about this a couple days ago.

Lorcher: That's fine.

Smock-Hill: My name is Lori --

Lorcher: If you can give us your address --

Smock-Hill: -- Lori Smock-Hill.

Lorcher: Okay.

Smock-Hill: 1961 West Franklin Road, Apartment D103, which is right near that field.

Lorcher: Okay.

Smock-Hill: That field has been -- I have been there for six years and that field has been a fire hazard since I moved in. We worry this summer that there would be a fire and we wouldn't be able to, you know, get out with the fireworks and the lightning and it now has become a trash dump. A tire dump. I mean nobody's taken care of that field since we have been there. But my main concern is for the wildlife. We have a neighbor behind us who is fighting terminal cancer. His only thing he does is sit out on that deck and feed the quail, the ducks -- even a rabbit that we had this year and the birds and we do the same where we live in front of him. To the other side of us across the road there is a townhome that also is right off that field. They have noxious weeds right next to their yard. They can't let their kid go out and play, because they are afraid that he will touch those weeds. Nothing's ever been done. They have reported it. We have had people come out. Nobody does anything. I am 65 years old. I have lived here for all my life. My dad was a representative when -- in his time and he took care of the city, the county, he did things that improved it. To me a park, as was just mentioned, is the perfect solution for this spot. We don't need any more townhomes, apartments, anything in this area. We have enough. Some of them are ugly. Some of them I don't like to look at and the fear is that this will just be -- maybe townhomes are better. They probably look better. But a park would preserve the wildlife that does live in that area. I mean we have ducks. There is a subdivision right across the street from us on Linder that is named after ducks and where are the ducks going to go if that is -- we have a

pond right beside us. Part of the apartment. It's Olympia Apartments if I didn't mention and the ducks swim in that pond. They walk across the backyard. They go to the creek. Where are they going to go? I mean, yes, they will go somewhere else, but we don't want them to. We love the quail. There is a lot of them, so we go through food pretty steadily. Our neighbor goes through food. He feeds them in his backyard, too. But I think they are important to save in that area and a park would just be perfect. I mean for the kids, for the elderly to go just walk around the park, have some place to go. I mean it's -- I lived on Maple Grove and Franklin where my father was raised and I lived there for 11 years. He lived there since 1923 and everybody moved in around us. All the businesses, so we had to sell and they tore it down. I mean it was the saddest thing I have ever seen and to watch some of these people that have lived there, which I know they have, because I have been in that area, to lose another spot that maybe they could go and relax and walk and feed the ducks, you know, would be so beneficial in that area. I -- I mean, obviously, I'm disabled, I need a place to go walk. I don't have it where I'm at. I mean we have a bridge that comes across our apartment from the subdivision. Everybody comes across there. I just feel -- and there is a creek, you know, that people walk along every day with their dogs. Some people let their dogs out in that field, which is scary, because I know there is a lot of goat heads and things that can harm those dogs.

Lorcher: Okay. You need to wrap up.

Smock-Hill: Okay. I'm sorry. But my opinion is it just needs to stay green and take care of the wildlife in that area that we all appreciate and want to survive.

Lorcher: All right.

Smock-Hill: Thank you.

Lorcher: Thank you. Would anybody else like to testify? All right. Bonnie, would you like to come up?

Layton: Thank you again for your time this evening. Appreciate everybody's time here this evening and coming to testify. In looking at this project there are a couple things that are going on as I mentioned. As commercial development has happened in the area this parcel has remained vacant and, unfortunately, it has become -- at times folks trespass. They dump garbage on there and it's become a problem for the owner, who would like to develop this parcel in a manner that we believe is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. We have reviewed the city's parks and recreation plans, the long-term development of parks in the area. As Sonya mentioned, there is not any plan to develop a park in this area. There is some improvements to existing parks to the east going on and although we are at the beginning stages of this project we will have to come back, as I mentioned, for a preliminary plat application. Staff has already communicated to us that part of that -- and you will -- you have seen it in the staff report as well. We will be required to put a pathway along the southern portion of our project and, then, try to make an effort to connect to the pathway that is to the west where there

is a pedestrian bridge that goes across the Ten Mile Creek into the subdivision. I think the pathways plan even shows that there is that connection and, then, when you go through the neighborhood to the south of us, then, you get, as I mentioned, there is pathway directly leading to the school district to the school property. It looks like there is a pathway around that. There is also a neighborhood to the -- on the east boundary that also connects into that school site. Also along with what our development would include is improvements along Linder Road for a pathway along there. So, again, trying to add amenities in that become part of the greater connectivity for the city in this area. It would be landscaped with -- according to city standards. Again kind of getting ahead of ourselves, but we would anticipate that we would develop this property per the code. There is certain open space requirements that we are required to provide when we bring that development plan forward. Let's see. And, then, again, if I can just -- you know, we really believe -- last time we had come in with a much denser project. This is significantly less number of units and residents. We do understand that Linder Road is being redeveloped at this time. I'm -- I'm not sure what ACHD would have planned at the Greenhead intersection as -- as Mr. and Mrs. Herron had mentioned. I would anticipate that that would be covered when we come forward with our preliminary plat application. Same would be the case if this were to come forward as a commercial application. You will also find in your staff report that staff noted that our proposed development would -- is likely to generate less traffic than if this were to be a commercial site. And, again, just looking at the Comprehensive Plan and some of those goals in providing a mix of housing here, we believe that we are -- we are fitting in nicely. We are creating that buffer. The development of this will eliminate some of the problems that currently exist on the site with maybe noxious weeds, trespassing where people are -- are dumping things that we are having to manage. So, overall we, again, agree with the comments in the staff report and respectfully request your recommendation of approval this evening.

Lorcher: Commissioners, do we have any questions for Bonnie?

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: I guess my question is actually probably for -- for staff, if they have any comment on kind of the anticipated traffic flow out onto Linder. If you know anything about ACHD's plans regarding circulation. You know, if I'm trying to get out and get on the freeway in the morning or something, what does that kind of -- what does that look like?

Allen: I do believe ACHD intends to put a center median in there, so this site would be restricted to right-in, right-out.

Smith: Okay.

Layton: And if I may add, that as Sonya had mentioned in her staff report, the site sits quite a bit lower. It slopes from the north end down, so visibility of this for a commercial development is tough and, then, having that right-in, right-out restriction as well just makes that further difficult to develop as a viable commercial site, so -- and, again, that's -- it's an in-fill piece. It's surrounded by city services and utilities, which we would be connecting into as identified in the staff report.

Lorcher: This is a question for staff as well. If -- if the neighbors wanted to know what the long-term plans for ACHD for collector roads and -- and connectivity is -- can they -- is that on their website do you know?

Allen: Yes, it is. Yes. It's the master street map --

Lorcher: Yes.

Allen: -- that shows the future collector streets.

Lorcher: So, Mr. Herron, if you go to that website you could probably see if there is going to be an extension of your road. We already know that this particular road is going to have a cul-de-sac, so there will be one way in and one way out for connectivity and so you will be able to get more information there. They may or may not -- until this gets approved by city council and all the -- the appropriate agencies, the ACHD -- Linder won't look any different until this application comes forward a little bit further. So, we anticipate the Linder overpass to be open probably within a year. If you were to get your entitlements what is your time frame to actually bring a product to market?

Layton: Commissioner Lorcher, we -- gosh.

Lorcher: I mean do you anticipate even -- even start building before the road's even done?

Layton: No. Right now we are coordinating with ACHD to make sure that there is utilities stubbed at our entrance where they need to be, sewer, water or, you know, things like that. But we would anticipate if we got to council next month or the month after, I'm not sure what your agendas are looking like these days --

Lorcher: Right.

Layton: -- we still have to submit our construction documents. You know, best case would be maybe midsummer next year to -- to start the groundwork.

Lorcher: Okay. And, then, the road -- the overpass will be complete at that point.

Layton: Yeah. And, of course, I would anticipate that any preliminary plat application that we submit -- well, actually, it's going to be definitely midsummer, because we will have to -- we would have to go through the plat application process after this and I

would anticipate that any comments that ACHD has for that would require some sort of coordination or timing potentially with what their improvements are doing there and that's very common for what happens in some of the other jurisdictions that I work in.

Lorcher: Okay. Any other questions for Bonnie? All right. Thank you very much.

Layton: Thank you.

Lorcher: May I get a motion to close the public hearing for Findley Cove?

Smith: So moved.

Gelsomino: Seconded.

Lorcher: It's been moved and second to close the public hearing for H-2026-0028, Findley Cove. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Lorcher: I knew the gentleman who used to live at this property. We called him Carburetor Tom. He had a mechanic business in the back of his property. I think he had a total of ten acres, not the four that are already there, because a storm drain and -- and a road was anticipated to connect the western parcels to Linder Road at that point in time and when the county or -- at that point the county didn't need that anymore. They have a right to sell to another person and that person is a developer and that developer has a right to be able to create a project of their own and in this particular case it was deemed commercial, but only having a hundred feet of actual visibility for a business it's very hard to get your people to come in when you can't see that business is there. This was a personal residence. This was a home that spanned a good portion of this and having a residential community on this acreage makes sense. Now, there is not going to be a park, so that's -- that -- the city is not planning on purchasing this land, but the developer is going to be planning a multi-pathway with green space that everyone will be able to access on the outside of this particular community. So, the wildlife will still have a place to go and it will have a green space that not only does this small community have, but everybody else can use as well and safe walking paths for children to be able to get to school. With less than 20 units on a parcel of land -- if these were apartments there could be three times as many. But townhomes in my opinion make sense. There is some topography issues with the -- the way that there is a slope, so there is going to be some challenges. There needs to be coordination with utilities and ACHD for right-in, right-out and if you look at ACHD's website you will be able to see how things can connect and looking at the overall square mile of this project it makes sense to have homes in this area and since there was a home there previously it still makes sense, at least for me in my perspective. So, I am going to go ahead and recommend that this go forward to be considered. What else does everybody think?

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: I'm inclined to agree with you. I understand a lot of the concern about traffic turning around and -- and about kind of some of these -- these flow and congestion things. I think at the end of the day just being residential instead of commercial -- a commercial property would face the same exact problems, but on a larger scale and so I think -- I do -- I don't love how ACHD has flow set up here. I just took a peek at the master street map and -- and kind of the integrated five-year work plan and I don't love that, but that's -- I think this change and this -- this amendment actually lessens the impact that this spot would have on that. I agree that the city's -- you know, the city's made no indication and desire and committed no budget to acquiring the property and -- and creating a park here, so I think the -- the best way is to -- you know, to provide increased access to that green space and things like that is to increase that connectivity along the creek into the surrounding neighborhoods for pedestrian connectivity. I fully understand the concern about wildlife. I am a -- my wife and I are huge fans of the World Center for Birds of Prey. You know, I highly encourage you to go check out their fall flights coming up. But the thing is I think if we want to ensure that we are taking care of our wildlife in the Treasure Valley, not in just one parcel, but in the Treasure Valley at large, we need to try to fight against kind of that sprawl. Coming from the land of sprawl myself of southern California, I have seen it and, you know, I have lived going across seven cities and not seeing, you know, a super wide open property or wide open stretch of land in that -- in that space and the way that you get against you -- you get the advantage against urban sprawl is finding these pockets to -- to put density along corridors, density where there already is a lot of -- a lot of existing residential and things like that and so I -- I understand the concerns, but the way that we address these I think -- I think all of those concerns are valid, but changing this to a residential property and this plan that has been presented to us help us address those concerns better than if it stays commercial.

Gelsomino: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Gelsomino.

Gelsomino: I would like to, of course, begin always by thanking the public for coming up and speaking your voice and speaking your mind on these projects and these applications. Those are always important. I -- I always encourage and am enthused. It was one of the exciting parts of why I applied to the Planning and Zoning Commission and moved from the Parks and Recreation Commission, because I would have -- I yearned for that engagement from the public. That being said, of course, you know, as yourself and Commissioner Smith both, you know, read my notes prior to -- prior to speaking, I echo both of your sentiments. You know, the role of our commission is to, you know, determine each application and, you know, does it meet the conditions, does it meet the guidelines, is it in the best interest of the city. As a former parks and recreation commissioner I love my parks. I would put a dog park in every corner of the city. The fact that as you correctly mentioned, Madam Chair, that there is going to be green space that the app -- that it's going to be that balance and that, you know, we are

going from it being a residence to -- to what it will be going forward. It makes sense. It's a good balance and while I, of course, validate and -- and sympathize with the sentiments of the public testimony today, this application does make sense and I will be voting in favor.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Shappee: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Shappee.

Shappee: I, in a former life 20 something years ago, lived across the street from this property in Mallard Landing. So, that was my -- my children attended Peregrine Elementary and so I, too, am concerned about the traffic flow. I think that's an issue that we need to deal with ACHD on and -- and to -- to look at that. I was encouraged when I read the application, because I do agree that I think with the pathway and the Ten Mile Canal there we will get a significant amount of green space in there and especially with -- if the pathway, as the applicant said, will connect to the bridge that goes across to Whitestone Estates I think that's great, because I know that's the way the kids go to school in the morning. So, I will also support this. Thank you

Stoll: Well, Madam Chair, not to repeat what everybody said, I will just say I'm supportive of the application as is, adding in residential, as opposed to what we could have had as far as commercial. I know folks are frustrated regarding the traffic flow. Certainly in our valley as we continue to grow we will continue to have increased traffic congestion. The purpose of right-in, right-out access is to provide safe access to people on these projects. So, ACHD is trying to address safety within the scope of the existing design of Linder Road and what they have. So, I'm going to vote in support of it.

Lorcher: Okay. Well, with that in mind, after considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to City Council for file H-2026-0028 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of September 3rd.

Stoll: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and second to approve Findley Cove as a recommendation to comprehensive land use amendment from commercial to medium density to city council. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Person: Madam Commissioner?

Lorcher: Yes.

Person: Permission to speak.

Lorcher: What would you like? This -- this application is closed. So, if you are speaking on Findley Cove we are no longer taking testimony.

Person: Understood. Thank you.

4. Public Hearing for Nola (H-2026-0025) by ALC Architecture, located at 120 N. Nola Rd.

- A. Request: Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map Amendment to change the land use designation on 1.61 acres of land from Commercial to Industrial.

Lorcher: All right. Thank you. All right. Item No. 4 is Nola, requests a comprehensive land use amendment from commercial to industrial at 120 Nola Road and we will begin with the staff report.

Allen: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. The next applications before you are a request for Comprehensive Plan map amendment and annexation and zoning. This site consists of 1.61 acres of land. It's zoned RUT in Ada county and is located at 120 North Nola Road, just north of East Franklin Road on the east side of Nola. The comprehensive plan future land use map designation is commercial. The applicant is requesting an amendment to the comprehensive plan future land use map to change the land use designation on 1.61 acres of land from commercial to industrial and annexation of 1.61 acres of land with I-L, light industrial zoning. The subject property is an in-field piece of land in the county, surrounded by city annex land. The area to the north and to the west across Nola Road is zoned I-L and developed with industrial uses and the property to the south and east is zoned C-G. The property to the east is developed with a mix of commercial uses and the property to the south is developed with a minor vehicle repair shop, which is more industrial in nature. A conceptual development plan and building elevations were submitted as shown demonstrating how the site is proposed to develop with an 18,750 square foot flex warehouse building, drive aisles and parking, with yard space behind the building. The proposed use is principally permitted in the I-L zoning district subject to specific use standards. The concept plan depicts access via Nola Road. Because of the difference in elevation in this area. The terrain slopes approximately ten feet from the east to the west property line and because the existing abutting developments did not provide cross access to this site, staff is not recommending cross access drives or easements are provided to those properties. Staff is of the opinion the proposed amendment -- map amendment from commercial to industrial and proposed development plan will be more compatible with adjacent predominantly industrial uses than commercial use would be and supports the request. There has been no written testimony received on this application and staff is recommending approval with the requirement of a development agreement that requires future development to be generally consistent with the conceptual development plan and building elevations proposed with this application. Staff will stand for any questions.

Lorcher: Would the applicant like to come forward? Hi. If you can state your name and address for the record, please

Jones: Absolutely. Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, my name is Chad Jones. 1119 East State, Eagle, Idaho. Representing ALC Architecture.

Lorcher: Okay.

Jones: Sonya did an awesome job with this and I don't -- I'm not sure exactly what else to add. I have a presentation and I may not have you put it up, Sonya. Is it already up? Fine. I will use it. Cool.

Lorcher: The mouse is a little squirrely. You might want to use arrows.

Jones: Oh. Got you. I'm going to skip all this. All the other stuff that -- that she so -- so very well explained. This parcel of land is -- has -- has been here since I was a kid. I grew up in -- in Meridian. I used to run by here training for cross country. So, I know it well. Anyways, I'm going to skip through this. I'm going to get back to this -- this last slide just to kind of explain in visual perspective of what's really there. To the north we have Advanced, they are kind of an industrial supply store. To the south is Driven Automotive. It's very much, as Sonya had mentioned, a very industrial in use type of a structure. And, of course, Cope Collision across the street and Sensco just to the north and to the west. So, the uses surrounding this piece of property are very much industrial in use. Gaining access to the -- I guess would be the east would be -- it would be quite a challenge and if this were commercial it would be quite a challenge also just to even get anybody off of Franklin Road -- you can go there. So, I don't have anything more to say. I will stand for any questions you might have.

Lorcher: Commissioners, do we have any questions for Chad? I think we are good for right now. Thank you. Madam Clerk, do we have anyone signed up for testimony?

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. No one has signed up and no one is attending online.

Lorcher: Is there anybody in Chambers that would like to speak on this application? Chad, are you good? All right. May I get a motion to close the public hearing?

Gelsomino: So moved.

Smith: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and second to close the public hearing at 120 North Nola for a comprehensive land use amendment from commercial industrial. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Lorcher: I think the businesses that are currently there are destination businesses. I don't think anybody is -- I mean Driven promotes some purchasing, but, you know, you go to Cope Collision, because you got a problem with your car. So, you know, having this as -- as flex space to support whether these businesses or others to be a destination for something specific use makes sense to me for this in-fill project. Any other comments? Motion?

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the city council of File No. H-2026-0005 as presented in the staff report.

Stoll: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and second to approve Nola land use amendment. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Gelsomino: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Gelsomino.

Gelsomino: Just a quick point of -- I guess you could call a parliamentary point. Sonya. Sonya, just a quick item. The -- on the agenda the public -- the H-2026 for Nola is 0025 and on the report it's 005. Just for the record want to make sure --

Allen: 0025.

Gelsomino: Okay.

Allen: Sorry about that.

Gelsomino: That's all right.

Allen: Thank you for the clarification.

Gelsomino: Thank you.

5. Public Hearing for Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment (CPAT) (H-2026-0038) by City of Meridian Planning Division, located Citywide

- A. Request: Comprehensive Plan Text Amendment for the purpose of adding new text to align with two new sections to Idaho State Code

Section 67-65 Local Land Use Planning Act, specific to: Starter Home Subdivisions (67-6542) and Accessory Dwelling Units (67-6541); including a minor amendment to the "List of Adopted Plans and Studies by Reference" updating the reference to the City's recently adopted 2026 Historic Preservation Plan.

Lorcher: All right. Next on our agenda is the City of Meridian's Planning Department requests a comprehensive plan amendment to align with Idaho State Code and we will begin with staff report.

Anderson: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. Just one moment while we pull up my presentation. All right. Good evening, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. My name is Carl Anderson, I'm a long-range associate planner here with the City of Meridian. Tonight I'm here to present hearing case H-2026-0038, the city initiated comprehensive plan text amendment and the purpose of this amendment to the comprehensive plan is to update the plan in compliance with the amended Idaho State Land -- or amendments to Idaho State Local Land Use Planning Act, specifically Idaho State Code 67-6542 and 67-6541 related to starter home subdivisions and accessory dwelling units. Both new sections of Idaho Code were recently adopted by the state legislature in the spring of this year, 2026, under House Bill HB1352 and HB1354 and with an additional amendment to be proposed with this application being to update the list of adopted plans and studies of the city's comprehensive plan. The first proposed amendment is related to the starter home element of this amendment. The state legislature required that by February 1st, 2027, cities with a population of 10,000 or more amend their comprehensive plan and land use regulations to allow started home subdivisions in all residential zoning districts. A concurrent amendment to the UDC has also been submitted to align with the state statute requirement, which is scheduled -- scheduled for the commission at a hearing later this evening. The proposed language to be adopted within the comprehensive plan is under Policy 2.01.01.0 support starter home subdivisions in all residential areas of the city and, additionally, starter home subdivisions as defined by Idaho Code 67-6541 are allowed in all residential zoning districts. The intention of a starter home subdivision is to reduce barriers of entry to home ownership. This would be found on page 311 of the plan. The second amendment -- tonight's text amendment is similar to the previously mentioned to relate to accessory dwelling units. By February 1st, 2027, cities with a population of 10,000 or more may amend their comprehensive plan and local land use regulations to allow for accessory dwelling units in all residential zoning areas and, similarly, a concurrent amendment to the city's UDC has been proposed tonight. This would -- the proposed text would be located in Chapter 2.01.01P, support accessory dwelling units in all residential areas of the city. This would be located on page 2-4 of the plan moving forward. And just one quick point of clarification. Both, rather than House bills, both were actually Senate bills and I just want to clarify that for the record. And, finally, an amendment to the list of adopted plans and studies. This is a housekeeping item. The city recently updated and adopted a new historic preservation plan, which was adopted I believe in April of 2026. The -- this would strike out the 2014 version of the plan and update the plan with the 2026 version. The link and the associated table would also be

updated. All public notification requirements have been met. No written public comment has been received. Agency comments have been provided and are included in the packet for your review. Staff recommends approval of H-2026-0038 proposed comprehensive plan text amendment. The next -- with next steps being a recommendation to city council. And with that I'm happy to stand for any questions the commission may have.

Lorcher: Okay. Madam Clerk, do we have anybody signed up to testify?

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. No one has signed up.

Lorcher: Commissioners, do we have any questions -- questions for Carl? I have one question. When it -- when you define a starter home subdivision is that like a full-on parcel community or are we just talking about starter homes to be defined as a certain thing?

Anderson: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. As we have written it we haven't included a separate definition within the comprehensive plan for starter home subdivisions. We would be referring back to Idaho State statute as it's included in there. That is included in the packet and if you would like I can pull that up for you as well.

Lorcher: No. But I mean -- but there is a definition of what it is. So, as developers start looking at parcels within our community they can use the designation of starter home subdivision if they wanted to develop a piece of land.

Anderson: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. I -- I believe there is a definition within state statute. It has been a little bit since I have reviewed it myself, but I would be happy to verify that. But I would refer it to state statute for what would constitute a starter home subdivision, as well as what the city's updated unified development code would include as -- as eventually adopted.

Lorcher: I'm guessing that might be a question from council as well, so just to define that within your presentation to be helpful. I mean I read it, but that was a few hours ago and -- just to clarify. Any other questions?

Gelsomino: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Gelsomino.

Gelsomino: Carl, on page 82 of the staff report, proposed addition to Chapter Three evolving community new text quote: Starter home subdivisions as defined by Idaho Code 67-6541 are allowed in all residential zoning districts, so on and so forth. Should that read 67-6542? And, if so, do we need to have a vote on amending that?

Anderson: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. One moment if you would.

Kane: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Yes.

Kane: I can answer that question. So, it is 67-6541 is the starter home statute. Does that line up with what is in the --

Gelsomino: I think the --

Kane: -- staff report?

Gelsomino: -- starter homes was showing as 67 dash -- so, in staff analysis A-1, amend the text of the plan to align with Idaho State Code Section 67-6542, starter home subdivisions as amended by Idaho Senate Bill 1352. But, then, below in the proposed new text it says starter home subdivisions as defined by Idaho Code 67-6541.

Kane: Madam Chair, Commissioner, it's 6541. So, if it says 42 that's -- I think that's a typo.

Anderson: And, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, the green underline text looks to include 6541. That's correct. 6542 is referenced in the paragraph above, but the proposed text itself would be 6541 for starter home subdivisions.

Gelsomino: Okay.

Lorcher: Good catch, but he got it right.

Gelsomino: Thank you.

Lorcher: All right. Any other comments?

Stoll: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Stoll.

Stoll: Carl, I won't ask the question that will put you on the spot on your personal -- whether this will do any good or not -- but do you know if any of our legislators reached out to the city or to the Association of Idaho Cities to see whether -- asking their opinion about whether this was a good piece of -- good pieces of legislation and of value?

Anderson: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission. Assistant Director Hood may be able to answer a portion of this. I do believe the Idaho APA, Association American Planning Association Chapter of Idaho was engaged. I don't know for

certainty if the Association Idaho Cities was engaged. But, again, Caleb may -- may be able to speak to that as related to the city's element.

Hood: Madam Chair, Commissioners, Commissioner Stoll. Yeah. The city's pretty large and there were -- they did reach out. A lot of the language in a couple of statutes that we are talking about this evening, though some of the language that we preferred didn't make it into the final draft of the bills, but we were consulted to some degree. There was also a subcommittee of legislators that met several times this last summer and -- and drafted some of what you read in -- in the code. Again -- and we can talk about this in a couple of applications. I got kind of -- Carl and I are kind of tag teaming this. He has got the comp plan side and I have got the code side here in a little bit. But we can talk about some of the things. I'm hopeful that maybe this next session can get cleaned up, so it can be used a little bit more. The way that some of the text reads isn't very clear and -- and, again, isn't very usable for the development community, including even the definition of starter home. There is nothing about it being for first time home buyers or anything like that. So, the effectiveness of this bill is still to be determined, but I think there is some work that can be done. Again, I think some of the city's collective thoughts and hopes, dreams, wishes of what this maybe could be at the state level made it, you know, landed on the -- the cutting room floor, but I think maybe some of that will come back for discussion this next session.

Stoll: Thank you. Appreciate that.

Lorcher: Carl.

Anderson: Yes. Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, I would like to revisit one point of order as brought up by Commissioner Gelsomino. So, this is something that actually came up during the review of the Senate bills related to starter home subdivisions and accessory dwelling units. I believe this was why we have the scrivener's error in the text. I -- it's possible -- and bear with me -- that it's 6542. I believe both Senate bills reference the same section of Idaho Code, if I'm remembering correctly. I could be mistaken. I believe both were referencing 6541. When -- on the state legislator's website it's 6541, in parentheses 6542.

Lorcher: Okay.

Anderson: And so I believe it's actually 6542 for the starter home subdivisions and accessory dwelling unit would be 6541.

Lorcher: Okay.

Anderson: You may want to include a condition to just ensure that that's corrected for the final there, but that -- this came up during the review.

Lorcher: Okay. Do we need to have any words for a motion to verify the -- the actual numbers or is it more of a typo type thing?

Kane: Madam Chair, it's -- it's 67-6541.

Lorcher: Okay.

Kane: That's simply the way it is. So, if -- if it's wrong somewhere it's okay to call it a typo I think and just --

Lorcher: Move on.

Kane: -- move on.

Lorcher: Okay.

Kane: If that works for you.

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

Stoll: So moved.

Gelsomino: Seconded.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing on H-2026-0038, the planning division's request for a comprehensive plan text amendments to align with Idaho State Code and new language for the 2026 historic preservation plan. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Lorcher: We are -- we are following the -- the rules of the legislature to incorporate this into our language in our city and I am encouraged that the city will hopefully work with the legislature this session coming up in 2027 to kind of define some of these things a little bit better, so that we can have some clear direction going forward with starter homes, ADUs and -- and, then, to update the historic preservation plan. I'm excited about it, because I would love to see more of our historical buildings and communities in our city being acknowledged. Any other comments?

Stoll: Well, Madam Chair, if I may.

Lorcher: Commissioner Stoll.

Stoll: I would just like to say I'm pleased to hear that there was some effort of outreach and I'm not surprised that there was -- some of the comments were on the cutting room floor. It's a messy process and, hopefully, things are fixed. I do wish that the legislature would allow the cities to determine their own destiny instead of trying to micromanage them, but with that I will make a motion --

Lorcher: Thank you.

Stoll: -- to -- on this proposal. After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to the City Council of File No. H-2026-0038 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of September 3rd, 2026.

Gelsomino: Seconded.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to approve file H-2026-0038. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

6. Public Hearing for Ten Mile Interchange Specific Area Plan (H-2026-0037) by City of Meridian Planning Division, located Citywide

- A. Request: Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment to change various land use designations over multiple parcels scattered throughout the Ten Mile Interchange Specific Area Plan (TMISAP), amending 850.22 acres (more or less), from Mixed Use Commercial, Mixed Use Residential, Mixed Employment, Low Density Employment and High Density Residential to Mixed Use Neighborhood, Mixed Use Community, Mixed Use Non Residential, Medium High Density Residential, Commercial and General Industrial.

Lorcher: Our next application is also a comprehensive text amendment to address the Ten Mile Interchange Specific Area Plan and that item number is H-2026-0037 and we will start with the staff report.

Anderson: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. Carl Anderson again. Tonight I'm here to present hearing case 2026 -- H-2026-0037, city initiated future land use map amendment to the Ten Mile Interchange Specific Area Plan. Brief overview of tonight's comprehensive plan map amendment, so I will probably be referring to this as a CPAM for short moving forward. The City of Meridian Planning Division is applying for the amendment following discussion by City Council on April 14th, 2026, where Council heard a land use application located south of Franklin Road and west of Black Cat Road, during which council expressed a desire for further evaluation of the FLUM designation within the general vicinity, after which staff initiated a review of the land use designations within the Ten -- Ten Mile Interchange Specific Area Plan and evaluated options to improve alignment of land use designations with the comprehensive plan as a whole. Consideration for the future land use map amendment was given to designations where there is existing zoning or land use entitlements. It was most similar to existing designations. That is future land use map designations is adopted by the Ten Mile Interchange Specific Area Plan and development trends, as well as prior council discussion. The proposed amendment is to the future land use map only and does not propose to modify the text of the Ten Mile Plan, nor existing

zoning designations or established entitlements in the area. The request does involve multiple parcels scattered throughout the plan area amending 847 acres, more or less. This request amends the FLUM from mixed-use commercial, mixed-use residential, mixed employment, low-density employment and high-density residential to mixed-use neighborhood, mixed-use community, mixed-use non-residential, medium high density residential commercial and industrial and I will go through more -- these areas in a little bit more detail further and of note this amendment is intended to wholly -- just to amend those uses within the Ten Mile Plan that are wholly unique to the Ten Mile Plan, aligning them with comparable citywide designations. So, the image you have before you is the Ten Mile Interchange Plan that was adopted in 2027 and the land uses that were envisioned at that time. Here you should see some of these elements highlighted, which indicate areas where there have been changes or deviations from the plan in general. It's not application specifics, but general areas for them. This plan was adopted in 2027 and since that time there have been several modifications to the plan area. Staff did further evaluate land uses of the Ten Mile Plan as a whole and we -- staff did explore whether or not to retire the plan or -- and -- in its entirety or include potential text of the plan into the Comprehensive Plan itself. Staff are proposing an amendment to the future land use map only at this time, though have noted that a future change may need -- may be considered by the city moving forward at some point in the future. The image you have here is the existing future land use map designations within the Ten Mile area as they are currently adopted. You will see some of those areas that were called out on the prior slide where those areas have deviated somewhat from what was originally envisioned for the plan. One thing I would like to note is that the symbology or color scheme that was used for some of these areas is different, though the designation is the same. For example, mixed employment has gray and some highlighted dots on it, whereas prior it was more of a light blue. Just to identify a few of these areas, for example, the Lifestyle Center as originally adopted north of the Ten Mile interchange and I-84 was envisioned for a lifestyle center and heavy employment along 84 in alignment with the vision of the Ten Mile Plan, which was envisioned to accommodate future job generation, predominantly along the interstate, upwards of 20 -- 20,000 jobs to, I believe, 10,000 residents at the high future build out for the plan area. Many of the proposed designations that you will see are proposed to align again most similarly with those uses there and intended to preserve the employment that was envisioned with the plan. Today approximately 71.5 percent of the land use area of the Ten Mile Plan has been annexed into City Meridian city limits. This image here is slightly updated from the version you had within your report, which now includes the project that was south and west of Franklin and Black Cat, depicting the zoning and land use designations, though there are two applications that are called out here -- hearing case applications that are still under review and forthcoming. More than 90 percent of the residential areas -- mixed use and special areas of the plan have been brought into city limits and have received some form of zoning and with many of those receiving entitlements as well. Approximately 55 percent of the employment areas that were envisioned have been annexed, with the majority of the remaining areas being employment areas. The plan originally as indicated envisioned employment generation occurring along I-84 and future State Highway 16. You will note in Attachment B2 to your staff report there was a review of the Ten Mile Plan done in 2022 or -- 2022, which

evaluated the entitlements to date and future -- potential future build out of the plan. The envisioned jobs to housing ratio of the plan at the high level was 2.5 job -- jobs to dwelling units. The high range actually was all the way up to 3.3. The medium was 2.5 and the low was 2.0. The analysis that was done in 2022 it was then 0.6 of jobs-to-dwelling unit ratio and estimated that if potential future max buildout, then, would be 1.7 jobs-to-housing ratio. So, still short of the low end of what was originally envisioned and I think that's just important to note as we are looking at this and for some of the land use designations that we are proposing to preserve some of those areas. That being said, there are some areas of deviation and we will -- we will talk through that. So, again, when proposing a land use designation staff generally applied a land use that accomplishes one or more of the following: Is most similar to the existing land use designation, aligns with development trends in a given area or aligns with existing conditions on a given property, including developed and as entitled. The map you have here are the areas that have changed. There are approximately nine areas that I have separated out in the report for user review. You will note there are Ten -- four Ten Mile specific area designations that are currently applied. The lifestyle center and high density employment are no longer designated currently, though the text remains in the plan. The low-density employment, mixed employment, mixed-use residential and mixed-use commercial are shown here. The -- the -- the mixed employment area accounts for the largest portion of the land area included within this request. Mixed employment areas were intended to provide a diversity of compatible land uses, inclusive office, research, specialized employment areas, as well as light industrial, such as manufacturing and assembly. The intention of the mixed employment areas was to provide a variety of flexible sites for small start-up businesses, as well as sites for large national regional enterprises. Low density employment was originally envisioned as low rise offices in specialized employment areas and would not generally include retail and consumer services. Land uses would be comprised of corporate business offices, as well as research facilities and laboratories. Mixed use commercial MU COM just for clarity, there is some similarity between abbreviations that you will see in the report. The purpose of the mixed use commercial designation is to encourage the development of a mixture -- of office, retail, recreational, employment and other miscellaneous uses with supporting multi-family or single-family attached residential uses and, finally, mixed-use residential was intended to encourage a diversity of compatible land uses that may include a mixture of residential, office, retail, recreational, employment and other miscellaneous uses. One additional designation that I would like to note here is a high-density residential located east of Ten Mile and north of Franklin. This area, while it has a designation of high-density residential, has built in a more industrial manner is where you will find Amazon shipping services, I believe a FedEx facility and so forth as noted in the staff report. The proposed amendments here -- you will note staff are proposing to remove the areas that are for those Ten Mile specific designations for low density employment, mixed employment, mixed use residential and mixed use commercial and designate those areas as low density -- or, excuse me, industrial, mixed use non-residential, mixed use community and mixed use neighborhood, as well as a commercial area as well. For the area located west of Black Cat staff are proposing a general industrial or industrial future land use designation consistent with the development trends that we are seeing south of Franklin on several of the pre-

applications that we have seen coming in moving forward to the north of Franklin and consistent with the low-density employment and mixed employment elements of the plan and preserving the employment vision of the plan. Mixed-use community is proposed just north and east of Franklin and Black Cat, intended to serve as somewhat of a buffer between the school site there and the neighborhood as well and while maintaining some of the employment opportunity as envisioned by the mixed employment designation there. Mixed use non-residential is proposed further to the south on Black Cat, consistent with the mixed employment as well and also consistent with the zoning designation there and the zoning for that site is also consistent with the sample zoning for the mixed-use non-residential. Mixed-use community is where you would find mixed-use commercial from the plan for several areas, specifically the Ten Mile and Franklin intersection area. You will note the industrial where the high-density residential had been originally and the general and the industrial where the mixed employment was previously and also consistent with much of the zoning in that area. A medium high density designation is proposed here where there are existing apartment use, as well as a portion of it that is some retail style commercial, which is consistent with the text of the designation for the Ten Mile Plan as well and I will touch on that here in just a moment. And, then, looking south of I-84 along Overland, much of this area has been designated as mixed employment. Staff are proposing mixed use non-residential for much of this area as well and, again, consistent with the employment vision for this area. Commercial is proposed over the Kendall Ford Auto service area consistent with their use that's established. Should be noted that should additional uses be proposed for this site there is an existing DA that would need to be addressed with the site as well and, then, mixed use commercial south of Overland -- community south of Overland consistent with the existing mixed use commercial and one thing I would like to note just moving forward as well as staff are not proposing again to amend the text of the plan, so the design elements and transportation elements of the plan are still in place currently. So, as development moves forward, especially for those areas where there is text with the plan, those areas will still need to follow the transportation and design elements of the plan. Public notification requirements have been met. Courtesy notice was sent to all property -- affected property owners whose properties were included in this request. Written public comments have not been received. The staff has received several phone calls inquiring about the proposed plan map amendment. Agency comments are -- have been received and are included in the packet. Staff recommends approval of the comprehensive plan future land use map amendment and are happy to stand for any questions that the commission may have.

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

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. No one -- oh, I'm sorry. Richard Ellis is signed up.

Lorcher: Good evening.

Ellis: 225 North Black Cat Road, Meridian.

Lorcher: Thank you.

Ellis: I urge you to reject this proposed amendment to the Ten Mile interchange area for a couple of reasons and can I read from the official document itself on the Ten Mile interchange?

Lorcher: Sure.

Ellis: The final suggestions or recommendations given to the city on this was to maximize employment. That sounds good. However, when you look at what it says about industrial, it says they have a relatively smaller workforce. Now this was written 20 years ago before automation and robotics started. So, it's possible now to build an industrial plant, a fabrication plant with no employees. Everything's run by machinery. That's low employment. So, I think that they are missing the boat on that in those two areas west of Linder and west of Black Cat Road, adding that in. I think that flies in the face of the recommendations. And, secondly, the plan calls for best use and I did hear Craig talking about this, best use of each area in concert with the others. Now, this area that they -- on Black Cat that I'm familiar with here, there is a school there now. There is a -- a subdivision. There is a subdivision being built as we speak there and there is a spot in the past that was for a school. I don't know if they have changed that or not, but there was another school there and the plan calls for a buffering zone between residential and industrial. So, we need to do that buffering in there. So, for those reasons I ask you to reject this plan and have planning department redo it and go back. Thank you.

Lorcher: All right. Thank you very much. Madam Clerk, any one else to testify?

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. I have Doug Bloomberg. Julie Carl. I don't know if they signed up for a different hearing, but --

Lorcher: Okay. Did you have something to say? Yes. Please come up. If you can state your name and address for the record.

Aberasturi: Kathy Aberasturi and I'm at 88 North Black Cat Road

Lorcher: Okay.

Aberasturi: And the -- the place that most concerns me is on Black Cat north of Franklin, because I live right there and the school is right directly behind me and I'm sure that eventually I will get swallowed up, but currently the traffic during school time is crazy there. It's absolutely crazy, because they park all along Black Cat Road to get into the main entrance of the school right directly across where it proposes to change it to commercial and so I just think that area needs to be a buffer area, one for the community, because there is residents right there and nobody wants to look across the street at a warehouse from your front porch and I just think it's -- it makes it more -- it feels dangerous for the kids for the traffic situation that's already there. I mean today at 4:00 o'clock there was two accidents on Black Cat Road. It was so crazy. It was incredible. And to add delivery vans and semi-trucks going in and out of a commercial

property directly across the street from the main entrance of the school I think is a disservice to the community and I would like that portion that of land north of Franklin to be rejected on this plan.

Lorcher: Okay. Do we know when Black Cat between Cherry Lane and Franklin is supposed to be widened? It's probably 20 -- what is it 2026 right now. So, I'm guessing 2030 to 2035 that that's going to go to five lanes. So, two in each direction with a center divider. Just like Ten Mile is between Cherry and Ustick. You know, they are all going to be very similar. I just don't know the time frame off the top of my head. And the other thing that -- and I can't speak to this and maybe Carl can, is that if there is going to be commercial across the street from Compass and where you live, the way ACHD has been developing Ustick -- I live in the impact area of Highway 16 -- is that there is going to be one central entrance to access that commercial. So, you are not going to have like a storefront right in front of your house with neon lights O'Reilly's blinking out. It's more going to be a drive aisle, a berm, a setback, possibly if it's retail it's going to be parking or the building's going to be set back and -- and so there is going to be a buffer between -- not only the road to be widened, but for you to have that commercial pushed back almost to that house with the playground in front of it. It's going to be further back. Now, it all depends on who purchases it and how it goes, but we will just have to kind of wait and see. But the text amendment that they are proposing now is to be able to encourage employment and, you know, put the -- the comprehensive plan more in line of what the long-term vision of the city is in regard to not only the school area, but Highway 16 and how they are going to handle that with the flow.

Aberasturi: They want to change that to general industrial and I just -- I don't know, I don't want a warehouse across the street.

Lorcher: I agree. I agree. And we will have to get a better definition of what that actually means. Okay. Thank you.

Aberasturi: Thank you. Anyone else? Sir, did you have anything else to say? You are good. Carl, did you want to make any comments to her -- to her statement?

Anderson: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. Just a few additional items. So, Brian McClure confirmed for me Black Cat widening between Cherry Lane and Franklin's timeline would be 2041.

Lorcher: Oh. '41. Oh, my gosh. Okay.

Anderson: So -- and related to the area just to focus west of Black Cat, so, the -- the current designation for the area just west or -- excuse me -- east of Black Cat, north of Franklin, is currently designated mixed employment. Looking west of Black Cat would be low density employment generation. The proposal currently for the area moving forward -- so, east of Black Cat would be mixed-use community. Again, recognizing the school site located there and serving as a buffer between future industrial development and residential uses at that location. The general industrial, again, is somewhat

following development patterns that we have seen in the area with the industrial just west of where it is currently proposed existing on the plan today.

Lorcher: Right.

Anderson: The definition of the comp plan for industrial designations is uses that would support industrial and commercial activities. Industrial uses might include warehousing, storage units, light manufacturing, flex, incidental and retail office uses. It's still envisioned, again, with the text of the plan remaining that the text of the plan related to industrial uses would also apply. So, those uses as development occurs would be subject to development within that area.

Lorcher: Right. Does that give you a little bit better definition of what that means? It could be like a storage facility. It could be a low-rise. It would be a building for employment, but it wouldn't be high retail with multiple trips per day. I mean if a developer buys it they have a right to be able to develop it; right? I mean -- so -- but they also need to have access, as well as -- you know, it has to make sense so they can make money. They are not going to do it otherwise. Unfortunately for those of us that are holdouts, because I am a holdout on Ustick as well, we are getting squeezed out by -- by other -- by other things, because we choose to stay and so it's -- it's challenging. I lost my whole front yard to ITD and ACHD is going to take the rest -- you know, a good portion of my alfalfa field, so I feel you, because we choose to stay and yet the city continues to grow around us, so -- but without Black Cat being developed until 2041 to a five lane, it may be a long time before those uses come to fruition, so -- may I have a motion to close -- oh, do you have a question?

Smith: Yeah. I was just wondering if you could speak to a little bit of the concern around industrial near residential. I think especially is kind of near that high density residential is what I was seeing. If you could speak to that and kind of how the city plans on still ensuring that there is still some buffer space.

Anderson: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. So, a portion of this was -- as called out here -- designated as mixed-use community to provide further buffer space there. Looking back at the history for the plan area, looking at a 2022 element of the plan, some of this area was -- looks to be envisioned to be industrial prior to the adoption of the Ten Mile Plan. When the 2019 comprehensive plan was adopted looking north of the -- the railroad tracks, some of that low density area was also proposed to be industrial and some of that area was reduced to -- from that industrial to be low density employment as well. As the plan -- as development occurs the development would need to meet the elements of the Ten Mile Plan and so forth. It's possible that another designation may be proposed for that area. However, it would be preferred that it -- you know, be either the industrial or mixed-use non-residential. Again, consistent with the employment elements of the plan.

Smith: Thank you.

Lorcher: Any other questions? May I get a motion to close the public hearing?

Stoll: So moved.

Smith: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and second to close the public hearing for H-2026-0037, comprehensive text amendment for the Ten Mile Interchange Specific Area Plan. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Lorcher: It's hard. I mean this is a crystal ball; right? We are -- we are assuming if -- if you -- if you let it they will come, but -- you know. And I sympathize with the family that lives off a Black Cat and that as we choose to stay it -- it -- it becomes challenging, because you feel like the Stuart Little House among skyscrapers; right? So -- but as our city grows and progresses and we want people to live, work and play in -- in our community, creating employment opportunities continues to be imperative for our community as well. We are always going to play catch up. It's never going to be the roads are built first and, then, the businesses come. The businesses will come and the -- and the road improvements will happen unfortunately. And so we will just have to kind of see how this plays out. As far as creating a -- a text amendment to the comprehensive plan, I'm in support of this and as we -- as commission and city council decide on each individual application, we can address those as they come forward. Any other comments?

Gelsomino: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Gelsomino.

Gelsomino: If there are no further comments, after considering all staff, applicant and public testimony I move to recommend approval to the City Council of file H -- File No. H-2026-0037 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of -- excuse me -- hearing date of September 3rd, 2026.

Smith: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to approve file 2026-0037. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

7. Public Hearing for 2026 Legislative UDC Text Amendment (ZOA-2026-0001) by City of Meridian Planning Division, located Citywide

- A. Request: UDC Text Amendment to update the code to be compliant with recently passed Idaho Codes (IC); primary topics include manufacturing dwelling units (homes), accessory dwelling units and starter home subdivisions. The proposed amendments include modifications, additions and clarifications within Chapter 1,2,3 5 and 6 of the UDC.

Lorcher: All right. We got one more. Everybody ready to go? Does anyone need a break? We are good? All right. Item No. ZOA-2026-0001, City of Meridian Planning Division requests a UDC text amendment to update the code in regard to manufacturing homes, ADUs and starter home subdivisions and we will begin with the staff report.

Hood: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. Give me just one second here to share this. Apologize at the beginning of this presentation. It's not as -- no pretty pictures like Carl has. It's -- it's just the -- the text from the staff report, because this is a text amendment to the code, so I'm going to scroll through the staff report. If you want to follow along on your computers. This should look familiar to you. Hopefully you had a chance to review this before my presentation. But, again, this is in your packet and I'm just going to kind of scroll through. As we kind of talked about a little bit before, two -- two projects -- or two applications ago, Mr. Anderson had kind of the companion application that addresses the comprehensive plan and a couple of policies within the text address two of the three topics that this agenda item addresses. So, accessory dwelling units or ADUs. I will probably say ADU a few times. So, accessory dwelling units and, then, starter home subdivisions and I will just say starter home subdivisions. So, this is, again, the code that, then, enables the comp plan policies going forward. So, we will go through the text that we have proposed. I will also say we have Ms. Kane here. She was very active I know in presenting to council and I have -- I have coordinated with her and others in legal and other departments of the city to have some of these proposals. So, there could still be errors, I just wanted to let you know this just isn't my brainchild, that it has been vetted through others at the city, too, so -- so, I think the first thing on this one we will start kind of going easiest to hardest I guess a little bit. Manufactured homes. I won't read this to you, but there is the -- the -- the house bill number, the two sections of code that address manufactured dwellings. City code already actually addresses this, but only for single family dwellings. So, pretty simple fix within the definitions of multi-family, While I'm proposing to amend the code to just address -- and this is not quite verbatim, but it's very very similar to the legislation noted above about multi-family dwelling units that are manufactured and constructed in accordance with HUD. They actually use some other words in there, like cited and things like that within the definition, but I think this portrays kind of that, yes, you can pre-manufacture a unit, bring it on site and it still counts as a dwelling unit. You don't have to stick build them. So, maybe I will pause. That one, again, I think is low-hanging fruit. Get us warmed up a little bit. That's the first proposed change to the UDC. Pretty straightforward. And, quite honestly, even if the legislature didn't change it's probably just a good thing for us to do. So, this one no real issues with.

Lorcher: No. I mean there is a trend where people are building houses out of Legos, right? So, they are building them off site and, then, they are just snapping them all together. So, that trend is going to continue and, in fact, isn't it -- what's the name of the company off of Robinson? Auto Wall that they make the -- the apartments in pieces and, then, they just stick them together?

Hood: Yeah. Modular -- modular construction is becoming more and more popular.

Lorcher: Right. And so the fact that the city is addressing that and that becomes -- could be part of the conversation is a good thing.

Hood: Okay. If there is no other comments I will jump to the second one and maybe just, again, to pick up kind of where you all left off with the comp plan sections. I think what we got hung up on a little bit is these bills we are tracking at the same time to the legislature, so they actually both did propose 67-6541, but you can't have two different 6541s, so ADUs, one out and they are 6541 and starter homes is 6542. But at the time they were actually going through the process they were both 6541.

Lorcher: Right.

Hood: So, yeah. So, I think -- I think it's correct in the comp plan and -- and what you see here. But that was some of what was going on there. So, the legislature did require cities of 10,000 or more -- again, in Idaho, so, obviously, Meridian is subject to this legislation. These changes -- again they are not all new. We do already have addressed accessory dwelling units, also known as secondary dwelling units in our code. I just put the definition here just for background. There is no change to our current definition. We are good there consistent with state law. The first one I think I want to highlight is -- and this is all under specific use standards for accessory dwelling units is Section E and I'm sorry for the -- the spacing here. There should be a line break here. This is Subsection E and the maximum size. So, you can see today code limits an ADU maximum size to be 900 square feet and the legislation has been amended to prohibit a city from prohibiting an ADU smaller than 1,000 square feet or more than 75 percent of the primary dwelling size and this is important, whichever is greater. It doesn't say that in the code, but that's been the interpretation and that's how we are going to apply this. So, in theory you could have a 4,000 square foot home, which isn't uncommon in Meridian, there are more 2,200, 25, 2,700 square foot homes. But a 4,000 square foot home, just for simple math gives you a 3,000 square foot ADU. Very large ADU. Most ADUs are more in the 900 to 1,000 square feet size, but in theory you could have a pretty large ADU with this. But, again, I think this is one of those things that they will clean up, hopefully, fingers crossed, this next session and clarify the intent of this based on some of the sponsors of the bill and some of the discussion. We understand this was the intent of the legislation, but it -- again, it doesn't read exactly this way, but that's how we are going to put it into effect and we can't prohibit the number of bedrooms. So, if you had a bunch of eight by eight bedrooms, you -- you probably could get a three or four bedroom maybe even out of an ADU. Don't see that happening probably a ton or, again, the 3,000 square foot example. We just don't have

a whole -- very many lots in Meridian that you could fit that and still meet setbacks to put a really large ADU on. I'm not too worried about us being inundated with extra large ADUs, but that's the first change there. Not a whole lot we can do. Again, this sort of mandated to us. Kind of Commissioner Stoll's comment last time. The state's telling us what's in our best interest. So, we really can't change that. Parking. This is one where we have a little more discretion. Again, my -- my opinion, not necessarily that of the city, so a little disclaimer there. I think the -- the language in the bill is just -- it's just bad regarding parking. It's very confusing and wonky. They talk about proximity to -- to transit and -- and -- and business opportunities and it's just very difficult to measure and -- and bus routes can change over time and things like that. So, I just don't know how we would manage that. So, at the end of the day -- and -- and we have talked to council a little bit about this and I think at this point anyways they are comfortable with not having a parking requirement for ADUs. You would still have a parking requirement for the primary dwelling, so you can't -- you can't convert that and, again, depending on how many bedrooms you have in the primary dwelling would dictate how many parking stalls -- garage covered stalls and surface pad sites. But for the ADU itself we are not looking to require a parking spot. So, that is a change today. We do require one -- or if you have got enough -- and overparked for your single-family primary dwelling you can count that. But no parking requirements. The next point I wanted to touch on is just design real quick and this is a really -- just -- they can't be taller than the primary dwelling, so we are putting that in our code. Certainly can't exceed the height of the zone, but it can be taller than the principal dwelling unit and I think the last one I wanted to highlight for you is -- and this probably doesn't even need to be said, but we are, again, just matching some of the language in the code before or currently we already have a vehicle or tent doesn't count as an ADU. We just added to that laundry list of things that you can't call a dwelling unit. So, motorhome, a camper, an RV, tiny home on wheels, none of those constitute an ADU, so --

Lorcher: Can we go back to design for a second?

Hood: Uh-huh.

Lorcher: So, say -- I will give a hypothetical. You know, example. So, I'm in an old Craftsman downtown Meridian on a big extended lot, but I'm -- I'm barely one story, because I was built in 1940 and I -- and my house is, you know, 1,500 square feet, so I can build a thousand square foot ADU, but what you are telling me is that it has to be one story, it can't be taller than the building that's in front of it.

Hood: That's correct. That is what -- how this would -- would read. If your existing primary dwelling is 20 feet tall, that's -- that's the maximum height that your ADU could be. That's correct. It cannot be taller than. At least how it's worded here. This is one where we do have some discretion. The bill did not actually say -- it was silent on this more. It does -- it does have some allowances for design, so the city can pick and choose what they want to put in their code as far as fit and feel of an ADU. This is something -- and, again, in conversations with staff and even in council making it clear that, nope, the ADU can't be three stories if you have got a single story.

Lorcher: No. I agree with that. But is it -- is it too limiting to say that it can't -- can't be that tall or just -- what did you call it? A design in -- in kind or -- what did you --

Hood: I don't -- I don't remember.

Lorcher: What did you say two seconds ago?

Hood: Design standards. I mean -- yeah. Yeah. I mean -- so, we do have some discretion. And, again, you are -- you are recommending to the council, so if you don't like the way this reads we can amend it and we do have some latitude here to -- to say if you want to say, you know, no taller than ten percent over the primary dwelling or something like that. You -- you know, that -- you could do something like that. Again, I think the concern was if we don't address height and it made sense just to say no taller than, at least in previous conversations, but there is nothing -- we wouldn't be prohibited, per se, in saying, yep, it can be 20 percent taller -- no more than 20 percent taller than the primary dwelling when it's a single story or even two story.

Lorcher: Okay.

Hood: There is -- there is other -- many ways you could skin this cat. It was just meant, again, where someone doesn't say context of the neighborhood --

Lorcher: Right.

Hood: -- 35 foot maximum tall building when most of the -- the dwellings are 17 foot to the peak --

Lorcher: Right.

Hood: -- doesn't fit the neighborhood character. So, we are just -- let's just head that off before it becomes a problem.

Lorcher: Okay.

Hood: But, yes, you could -- you could change that. And I think -- again, I think that's -- most of the rest of it is existing code. This is just the cleanup to what I was talking about before in secondary dwellings or accessory dwellings we require one for them in conjunction with the number of bedrooms for -- so, that table will need to be amended accordingly. But I will pause again for any more comments or questions on -- on the changes for ADUs.

Stoll: Just -- Madam Chair, if I may?

Lorcher: Uh-huh. Commissioner Stoll.

Stoll: Caleb, do we have any limitations on how close to the lot line they can build the ADU or -- I mean do we have any discretion on that? And another one, not any particular reason I'm asking this, but what -- what happens if somebody wanted to put an ADU on their property over the irrigation pipe for the subdivision?

Hood: Uh-huh. Yeah.

Stoll: Specific --

Hood: Madam Chair, Commissioner Stoll, Commissioners, yeah, any encumbrance for easements like that would still need to be adhered to. We wouldn't be able to issue a building permit for something that encroached on an existing easement. Regarding setbacks, it's the base zone. So, the legislature -- and we will talk about this a little bit when we talk about starter home subdivisions. They did tell cities what -- how far starter home subdivision dwellings can be from the various property lines. For ADUs they didn't address that and I'm not proposing to either. It's just whatever your base zone is. So, if you have a 20 foot front your ADU can't be any closer than 20 foot. It's ten, 12, 15 is pretty typical rear setback and five on the sides. R-15 we do allow a three foot side. So, in theory you could build an ADU in an R-15 zone up to three feet within -- of the side property line. But, again, it's whatever the base zone setbacks are. So, your home, if you want to do an addition on your home, it would be the same distance as an ADU. So, it's the same building envelope if you will. City standard.

Stoll: And not overridden by.

Hood: That's correct. Not for ADUs. Correct.

Stoll: All right.

Gelsomino: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Gelsomino.

Gelsomino: Caleb, quick question and it kind of touches on a little bit of things that Madam Chair spoke of a moment ago and what you were discussing a little bit ago when it comes to clarifying some of the practical reach of the -- of the state mandate. So, because the city can't impose standards that are more -- more restrictive standards than the new starter home minimums, could, for example, a four plus acre parcel in a low density district like R-2 or R-4 see a 1,500 square foot starter home lots, which effectively much -- is a much higher density than that zone's underlying character with the commission unable to stop it on density and character rounds alone.

Hood: Madam Chair, Commissioner Gelsomino, yeah, we are jumping right into it. That is the -- the crux of the starter home subdivision legislation and I'm going to talk about that a little bit. Can I -- can we put a pin in that just for a second, just make sure we are good -- we are good here and I have some findings even that we will talk about

that I want to propose and I think gives the city a little more discretion in approving these where it's not just, yep, you have to irregardless of, you know -- any residential district you have to approve a starter home subdivision. I think there is some -- some things we can consider in that, but -- let's put a pin in that just for a second if you don't mind and I just want to make sure we are ready to go there. I wasn't ready to go there just yet, but -- but almost ready.

Lorcher: Do the commissioners have any other questions about ADUs? All right.

Hood: Okay. And so maybe just a little bit. I get -- again, maybe some editorial before we jump into starter home subdivisions even more. I mean there was quite a bit of talk with ADUs and starter home subdivisions about housing affordability in Idaho. That's been a topic, but the legislature really did spend quite a bit of time on that this last session. This bill I'm going to talk to you about the code that's associated with it. You know, again, in my opinion there is a lot of good things in it. What it doesn't have is anything that has anything to do, though, with it being a starter home for anybody and so that's one of the shortcomings I think is there is some loopholes that could be played here that -- I'm a little cautious about how it's currently written. We have got to enact it, but I -- I am a little bit concerned about just saying, yep, just do starter home subdivisions as it reads now. So, we will have to do it, again, consistent with state law, but it doesn't really address the cost or that these projects are for first-time homebuyers or seniors or veterans or low to moderate-income families or anything like that. So, it doesn't have anything to do with housing affordability really, it just has to do with lot size.

Lorcher: Yeah.

Hood: So, I'm -- I'm -- I am concerned that -- we -- to your question, an R-2 zone now, if I claim starter home subdivision 4.01 acres, I'm eligible to strip that out at 1,500 square foot lots, I can build them 35 feet tall, sell them for half a million dollars still or whatever. Like -- so, there is nothing here that really gets to the heart of what I think the legislature was really trying to address that says, okay, if you do these subdivisions something that gears it towards, you know, first-time homebuyers or people that need some help getting in -- into a home. So -- or rentals for that matter. I mean -- so, it doesn't -- again, it only really talks about a subdivision and stripping out lots. So, that being said we will comply, but I am hopeful that some changes can -- can be made to this in the coming session and probably even the coming sessions. I don't know that we will even get it right after some amendments this year. But, hopefully, it would take some solid strides. So, I will point out I have the same typographical error here, 6541, because at the time this was 6541, but it is, in fact, 6542. So, again, only applies to cities over 10,000 people and, again, this one has a pretty substantial impact on our zoning ordinance, our comprehensive plan, our codes. We can't ban starter home subdivisions, so they can't be outright banned, but we still do have a little discretion. Again, we will put a pen in that, again, for the second time, but talk about that a little bit more as we move on to this. But, if -- again, if you are essentially -- I'm paraphrasing -- if you have four acres or more it's zoned residential, you are doing detached single-

family homes on 1,500 square foot lots, you are entitled. Doesn't matter if you are R-2, R-4, R-8, R-15 or R-40. It doesn't matter what your comp plan says if your zoning -- if you have the zoning -- residential zoning you can do a starter home subdivision. So 1,500 square foot lots. So, forget that we were planning for it to be low density and -- and have roads and sewer lines and schools that anticipated those densities, you -- and there you could have, you know, an 80 acre parcel come in and strip out 1,500 square foot lots and it's really not a whole lot we can say. Although those things I just mentioned are things we can say, hey, we weren't -- our sewer capacity isn't there. We weren't -- we don't have line sized -- you know, this is eight times the density we were planning on. We can't service that at this density. So, multiple -- multiple sections of the UDC will need to be amended. I have got them listed here on the screen. I will try to be pretty brief in running through them. Question kind of even previously in the comp plan, we are adding a definition and this isn't the exact same words, but it's pretty darn close to the -- to the bill's language. Again, we -- we are trying to mirror it as best we can. So, residential dwelling district at least four acres of land, lot size for single family detached dwellings. The one thing here I want to point out is this -- we are putting a maximum -- I'm proposing a maximum square footage of 1,500. Again, I think we kind of talked about it before anyways, but there is nothing to prohibit someone from doing 8,000 square foot lots and saying I'm a starter home subdivision. Your typical lot. They are just bypassing the whole process and saying I'm a starter home subdivision. So, this is one of the things I really, really, really want to talk to the legislation -- legislators about this next session. Let's put -- let's put a minimum-maximum to it or something like that as far as lot sizes go. So, it's just not every subdivision claiming starter home and, then, not selling or developing for first time home buyers or others that maybe need these. So, this is pretty key. This is different than the legislation doesn't address a maximum lot size, but I am proposing that we do and so you can't have lots any bigger than 1,500 square feet.

Lorcher: And there is no way to put in the language, something to the effect that until the definition of starter home is defined we will refer back to our city's code enforcement or something of that nature. Because what you are suggesting is is that if we put -- so, say October 1st this goes on the books and some developer comes up here and says, okay, I have got, you know, 40 acres and I'm going to put 10,000. 1,500 lots with 15 foot setbacks. We wouldn't be able to stop -- well, I mean there is other mechanisms in regard to like you said utilities and city services and that type of thing, but, you know, I -- I'm uncomfortable with the fact that starter home is not officially defined.

Hood: So, again, I'm sorry if I wasn't clear. It isn't currently, but I am proposing that we define it. So, if you don't meet this definition you would not be a starter home subdivision. So, you would not --

Lorcher: I agree. But I mean -- I guess what I'm saying is like -- so, then, they are 800,000 each. You know, they are not entry level homes. They are not -- starter homes to me is inferred that it's your first one; right?

Hood: Yeah.

Lorcher: But it's not defined as that based on the legislation and that's -- that's the -- that's the loophole.

Hood: It is. And I guess, Madam Chair, I'm a little concerned. I think that's probably a little bit what they struggled with as well is how do you, then, police that? How do you -- who verifies that? How do you -- I mean, you know, I don't want to put that in there and we are not checking, you know, W-2s and, you know, have you owned a home before and checking with, you know, mortgage companies and --

Lorcher: Right. I don't know.

Hood: So, it is -- it is a tricky topic, but there is not -- it doesn't -- there is -- I think there is still some other levers you can pull that kind of at least gear towards people that have -- you know, that are having difficulty entering the market.

Lorcher: Right.

Hood: If, in fact, that's the intent for this.

Lorcher: We have developers who push the envelope now.

Hood: Yeah.

Lorcher: So, this is just another mechanism to push a little harder. So, that's my concern. Okay. Carry on.

Hood: Okay. So, moving on, then, a little bit -- and, again, this is the caveat I guess to all the other residentials, you know, districts. This is at the very bottom of the code, which, you know, talks about all this other stuff and, then, we have to say, however, a starter home subdivision principally permitted everywhere. You can put them -- you know, you can do that subdivision -- as long as you are four acres or more --

Lorcher: Right.

Hood: -- you can do a starter home subdivision anywhere you want in Meridian, so --

Lorcher: That means I could.

Hood: This was a cleanup. I'm sorry we didn't -- we have -- we over the years have changed minimum dwelling size and we no longer have a minimum dwelling size in any district. So, there is a couple of these hanging out there that we are still cross-referencing -- referencing a minimum dwelling size and I think that's even the next thing that I have in the staff report. So, it doesn't really have anything to do with starter home subdivisions. This living space. It's just -- it's just old code that we need to clean up. So, I apologize for that. Okay. Some more asterisks and notes to our tables for the standards for everyone else. So, setbacks. We are a little bit different. The legislature

said 50. This was one of the ones that was on the cutting room floor. I tried to get it in front of them saying if you have a garage you are going to park in front of your garage and most cars aren't 15 feet long, if you only have a 15 foot front setback to your garage cars are going to be parked in the street or in the sidewalk? Why are you putting a 15 foot front setback? So -- but whatever. They say we can't prohibit front setbacks from being any more than 15 feet. So, we are going to get likely a lot of garages that are right up to 15 feet and you are going to park your truck in front of your garage and it's going to be in the middle of the street, so -- the other setbacks don't have a problem with, but that one was very confusing. I didn't really understand -- understand that. So, this is -- I think we have already talked about, but they did preempt our standards for front setbacks.

Gelsomino: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Gelsomino.

Gelsomino: Quick question on that particular item, Caleb, being that, you know, on the side I serve on my subdivision's HOA board. When it comes to that particular detail have HOAs been engaged with in discussions -- you know, especially with them having specific guidelines and things in their CC&Rs, are they -- do they have any concerns about the flexibility and the preparedness of updating those CC&Rs depending on which direction the things go?

Hood: Madam Chair, Commissioner Gelsomino, it's a tough question for me to answer. I do know that more HOAs were involved in the ADU discussions than the starter home subdivisions and there was quite a bit of legislation talking about, you know, preempting even HOA bylaws. So, this -- on this one, though, I don't recall -- I didn't watch every single committee meeting on this, but I don't recall there being, you know, overly active HOA presence, but, again, I didn't watch all of them and don't know all the communications that may or may not have been had. So, yeah, I'm sorry, I really can't directly answer that question. I haven't talked to any HOA presidents or any other HOAs that brought this to my attention or had concerns because of conflict with CC&Rs, so -- and, then, the final thing I guess -- and I alluded to this earlier, what I would propose and this -- this isn't just for starter home subdivisions, but this is for all subdivisions and all subdivision findings. So, 11-6-B6. So, I have just -- I have added starter home subdivision to the beginning of the list, but all preliminary plats, combined preliminary/final plats, short plats, the commission or the council will need to make the -- the following findings -- and all these other ones are the same. But this, G, the plat is compatible with surrounding neighborhoods. I think that's one that gives us a little discretion here to say, you know, if you are going to do 1,500 square foot lots and you have got 8,000 square foot lots and that last lot is turned, you know, perpendicular and you got eight backyards, not appropriate. So, if it doesn't meet the -- the neighborhood intent and -- and is compatible with -- and you get to decide that through public hearings and -- and other fact finding that happens throughout the public hearing process, but just a finding that we should make for all subdivisions in my opinion that whatever subdivision we are approving is generally compatible with the surrounding

neighborhoods. I will also call to your attention -- it's, you know, already on the books; right? But public services are available and accommodate the proposed development. So, that's another one that as we are going through this process we talked about sewer. If we have a one-inch sewer line, which those don't really exist, but just to make a point and you have got this high-density project, hey, we can't serve that at that density, that's not what our capital improvements plans or our utility plan shows. So, we do have some things here that -- you know. But it would be short of public works saying we can't serve this project at this density or ACHD saying we are really concerned you are throwing a whole bunch more traffic on Ten Mile at this location and we can't widen it anymore or whatever the case may be. But there are some outs if you will there, but I would caution us and we are going to have to, you know, really take those on a case-by-case -- you know, coordinate with legal when we are starting to go that way, because state law basically says you are in a residential district you are doing 1,500 square foot lots, cities have to approve them basically so -- all right. With that let's start our own subdivisions and I will stand for any questions.

Lorcher: Any other questions for Caleb before we close the public hearing? May I get a motion to close the public hearing, please?

Smith: So moved.

Gelsomino: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and second to close the public hearing on ZOA-2026-0001. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

Lorcher: Well, this is packed with a lot of stuff, too. The only -- the only -- I see many challenges for us as planning and zoning commissioners as this comes through. We -- we already have developers who push the -- like I had mentioned before push the envelope for density. I have concerns that, you know, this is just one more push. The height thing kind of bugs me, but not enough to do anything really about it. I -- I live in an old house that is very short and if I ever wanted an ADU, you know, I -- I don't know if -- I probably would want it a little bit taller, but I'm not making one, so I guess it doesn't really matter. But I mean to limit ourselves for that -- I like the idea of fitting the neighborhood character and compatible with the surrounding neighborhoods and maybe not having that language specifically saying the height has to be equal or less than the building that's in front of it, but I'm not going to hold it up for that. I just put it on the record so you know how I feel about it, so --

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: Yeah. I think -- I mean I'm supportive of these changes. I think there are some things that I don't love much like you, but I think that is an issue with more how the legislature has set this up, rather than how Caleb has tried to make -- make it work. I just -- I -- look, I'm -- I'm kind of a fan of buy right development in some -- some areas. I think -- I think Austin, Texas. I think Minneapolis has done it pretty well. Right next door in Montana it seems like they are doing a pretty good job of that and they have made some reforms. I know the National Conference of State Legislatures, I know NCSL offers free research for -- or it's paid, but each legislature can access -- each legislator can access that and -- and figure out what works in other states and how to -- how to write good legislation that works and I -- I don't see anything that's going to really move the needle the same way on our housing issues, the same way that it has in some of those other municipalities. So, I'm -- I'm a little frustrated with some of that. Part of me wants to say 1,500 square feet is too small, can we up the lot? But, then, you know, as Caleb mentioned you are opening the door to, well, 2,000 square foot anywhere. You know, that's -- that's a risk, too. And so there is this -- there are a lot of things that I would change about this, but none of them we can really change in a way that's satisfactory --

Lorcher: Right.

Smith: -- that doesn't create some larger issue down the line and so I think -- you know, I hope that we can revisit this in -- in a year or so with -- you know, with the legislature coming with a clean-up bill or some -- maybe hopefully even better legislation. But I think for what -- what we have and the cards we are dealt I think this is -- this is good.

Gelsomino: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Gelsomino:

Gelsomino: I will keep it short. I echo Commissioner Smith's sentiments. Caleb, you know, is trying to make amazing lemonade out of not great tasting lemons. So, as always the legislature puts the onus on the local municipalities to clean up their messes. So, Caleb, thank you for all your efforts and your work that you have done so far. And as well as the rest of the planning department. I apologize. It's late.

Lorcher: Commissioner Shappee, Commissioner Stoll, do you have any other -- anything else to add?

Stoll: Madam Chair, I will echo Commissioner Gelsomino's statements regarding appreciation of staff's work on this. It's still lipstick on a pig and I struggle with -- I don't really have a problem with the ADUs. It's fine. It is a starter home thing. Because I'm looking at -- it's really setting us up to deal with some bad actors in the development community that are going to -- as you said push the envelope and I don't understand how we are guaranteed this is going to help the housing affordability issue where a townhome can fit on a 1,500 square foot lot already. So, what is the problem that they are solving by forcing this down the city's throats?

Lorcher: Yeah. I mean in that regard we need to look beyond Meridian. I mean if you take a highly dense community like, you know, Boise or even like some of the downtown Coeur d'Alene, I mean we are looking at the entire state, not just our community, which we have had the pleasure of being able to go wide; right? But -- yeah. So --

Stoll: Yep. Well -- but today --

Lorcher: Right.

Stoll: -- we are dealing with Meridian.

Lorcher: We are dealing with Meridian.

Stoll: From a protest standpoint I'm going to vote no.

Lorcher: Okay. Commissioner Shappee?

Shappee: Madam Chair, I concur with my fellow commissioners wholeheartedly. I do like the maximum lot size. I mean I don't have any problem with ADUs, but I -- I do think that that is -- I think the -- the maximum gives us some -- some help there and, then, additionally, like I just can't imagine the services ACHD -- I mean it's just problems all the way around. So, I think that that gives us the ability, but I will concur with -- with the others that will vote for the amendment.

Lorcher: Well, hopefully it's just stuff on paper.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend to the approval -- or approval to the city council File No. ZOA-2026-0001 as presented in the staff report.

Gelsomino: Seconded.

Lorcher: It's been moved and second to recommend the UDC text amendments for ZOA- 2026-0001. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed?

Stoll: Nay.

Lorcher: The ayes have it.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. ONE NAY. TWO ABSENT.

Gelsomino: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Gelsomino.

Gelsomino: If there is no other business I would like to make a motion to adjourn tonight's meeting.

Lorcher: One second before you do that. Just as a reminder for the commissioners, our next meeting is the 17th. I think. The planners would like to offer us an appreciation dinner before the meeting next time. So, we will be gathering probably around 5:00 o'clock, if you can make it, and, then, the -- the meeting will start usually at 6:00. So, with that I will take a motion -- or take a second to your motion to adjourn.

Stoll: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. TWO ABSENT.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:23 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS.)

APPROVED

MARIA LORCHER - CHAIRMAN

_____|_____|_____
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK