

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:02 p.m. Tuesday, January 28, 2025, by Mayor Robert Simison.

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

Other Present: Chris Johnson, Bill Nary, Bill Parsons, Sonya Allen, Linda Ritter, Jeff Brown, Steve Taulbee and Dean Willis.

ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE

☒ Liz Strader	☒ Brian Whitlock
☒ Anne Little Roberts	☒ John Overton
☒ Doug Taylor	☒ Luke Cavener
☒ Mayor Robert E. Simison	

Simison: Council, we will call this meeting to order. For the record it is January 28th, 2025. It's 6:02 p.m. We will begin tonight's regular City Council meeting with roll call attendance.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

COMMUNITY INVOCATION

Simison: Tonight's community invocation will be delivered by Pastor Troy Drake. If you would, please, join us in the community invitation or I take this as a moment of silence and reflection. And, Pastor, thank you for being here, because it would have been really awkward if I would have called up the first applicant if you weren't here to -- to lead us, so --

Drake: Okay. My pleasure, Mr. Mayor and Council Members. Would you join me in a word of prayer. Well, Lord God, we just thank you that you can be here this evening, that you have given us life and we have the freedom here in our country and in this city, the state we appreciate those things so much. God, before I forget I just want to lift up the Plimmer family. I know that there has been a death in the family and -- and they came before the Council just recently to have something approved and so we just pray that you would comfort the family. You are the great comforter and so you know what they need and I just pray that they would seek you and that you would come alongside them and, God, of course we are also just praying for our community here this evening.

Our -- the first responders. We appreciate them keeping us safe and -- and -- and -- and helping in those areas of trouble. So, we pray for them, that they would just have the -- you know, the ability to protect the citizens and, God, we also lift up those who are homeless and that they can find shelter, that -- that someone would open their heart and home to them, so that they wouldn't be on the street. They can be fed. Lord, it's freezing out, we just pray -- and our heart breaks for those who are fearful in that kind of a place and, of course, God, we are here for the Council meeting and so I just pray for everything that goes on in this building. God, you just reminded me in Romans where it says that, you know, the governing authorities are -- are appointed by you and they are for good and so I just thank you for the people in this building that are doing good for the citizens and -- and I just lastly, God, pray for our Mayor and our Council Members that they would just have an extra measure of wisdom, so that they could make the right decisions for the -- for the -- for the citizens here in Meridian and so we just give that all to you, God, and it's in your name we pray, amen. Thanks for the opportunity.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Simison: Thank you. Council, we are at the adoption of the agenda.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: No changes this evening, so I move we adopt tonight's agenda as presented.

Strader: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

PUBLIC FORUM – Future Meeting Topics

Simison: Mr. Clerk, anyone signed up under public forum?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, nobody signed up.

Simison: Okay. Councilman Overton.

Overton: Take just a second. Mayor, Council, Members of the public, a week ago in this very room it was full. It was not full of people for a development, it was not full of people for or against, it was for people supporting a project. An addition that was a ninja course that was going to be added to Discovery Park. The whole reason that course came to be and be in front of us was a young girl and her name was Eva

Plimmer and she sat right here in this front row. Just a few days later she passed. A young girl passed way before her time. I just want to take just a couple minutes to recognize the fact that there is no age limit on being a champion in your community and she will forever be remembered as a champion in this community, even if we have had to lose her at such a short time. So, thank you for letting me have a minute and that I could get through those words. But every day is a gift and we need to remember that as we go through life. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you, Councilman Overton.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I appreciate that from Councilman Overton. I think those of us who have children are -- we are kind of impacted a lot more than maybe we thought it would with that news. First, I just want to appreciate your leadership, Mayor and Councilman Cavener, for making sure that we could have the opportunity to weigh in on a project and to see a little girl's dream, what she envisioned kind of come to fruition not long before she passed away and it made me reflect a little bit on when we have tender mercies from God in our life that allow us a moment to pause and reflect and to feel a little bit uplifted and to feel a little bit encouraged that the world's not a bad place, that there is a lot of -- a lot of really good things and I just want to share a brief passage from Psalms. Withhold not thou thy tender mercies from me, O Lord, Let thy loving kindness and thy truth continually preserve me. And I think about that and I think that we witnessed a small tender mercy for all those of us on City Council, in the city, those that came, but I think the project will be a tender mercy and a continual reminder of a very very good thing and so I just really appreciate the opportunity we had to do that and extend our condolences to the family.

Simison: Thank you.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: I echo Councilman Taylor's appreciation for you taking a lead on this and for the Council stepping up and -- and doing what needed to be done. I went home after last Tuesday's meeting and I googled Ninja Warrior and, you know, it says it's a reality show and it's where athletes tackle America's most challenging obstacles. I think what we witnessed last week was a little girl in her family tackling life's most difficult obstacles and we saw family and a little girl that did it with faith and perseverance and togetherness. The room was packed with supporters and, honestly, as I watched Eva and went home that night and contemplated what this Council had done, I wanted to -- I had a desire to become a person more like Eva, somebody who looks outwardly, rather than inwardly, despite all the pain that she experienced. So, I'm proud of the way that

the community responded and stepped up to help this amazing young woman's dream come true and I think when that Ninja Warrior course is built it will be a legacy and a testament to the little girl and her family who dreamed a dream that became reality. So, thank you, Mayor.

Simison: Well, I appreciate the meeting giving Council an opportunity to say a few words and I just want to extend condolences to the family. Services will be held this week and -- and, honestly -- but I know we are here and talking about this, but we lost two great and Eva was this last year. You know, what -- what -- one -- one much -- much in her age, but devotion to the community was nonetheless in that context and so maybe there is something in that name that just rings true, but both big losses, but this one is especially here and now for many and I know it will be a packed house on Friday as people come together to celebrate this young girl's life and so to the family on behalf of the city our condolences are with you and may she rest in peace.

ACTION ITEMS

- 1. Final Plat for Stonehill Crossing Subdivision (FP-2024-0020) by David Evans and Associates, Inc., located near the South side of W. Amity Rd., midway between S. Meridian Rd. and S. Linder Rd.**

Simison: With that we will move on to our Action Items for this evening. First item up is final plat for Stonehill Crossing Subdivision, FP-2024-0020, and we will open this public hearing -- I know that's what -- we will hear from staff on this item.

Allen: Council continued this item from last Tuesday's meeting in order to receive testimony from ACHD on the proposed private access to the existing residents on Lot 2 through the church property on Lot 1. Since the last meeting the applicant submitted concept plans showing how temporary access is proposed to the existing home through the church property and that is the upper left-hand drawing there and how future access could be provided upon redevelopment of the lot through the property to the east once it redevelops and that is on the drawing on the left-hand side on the bottom. The applicant is requesting a revised change from that that they were proposing last week to Condition No. 10, which requires the ingress-egress easement on the church property on Lot 1 for the benefit of the existing home on Lot 2 to be temporary until such time as the adjacent property to the east redevelops and an alternate access is available. At that time the access easement would terminate and the driveway on the church property would be removed. The applicant's proposed change would allow the existing home to retain access through the church property until such time as the lot redevelops in the future. At such time the easement would terminate and access would be provided from the alternate accesses shown on the right. So, the drawings on the right show how access could be provided to that lot and how future development of that lot could occur. It doesn't mean it will, it's just some concept drawings of how it could. Staff has included the verbiage that the applicant is requesting changes to that condition on your hearing outline tonight. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions for staff? Assuming we want to hear from applicant. Okay. Would the applicant like to come forward to make any comments?

Connelly: All right. Well, thank you guys for allowing us the opportunity to present. I also just really quickly want to say I'm friends with the Plimmers and I just appreciate what you guys did. That's huge. I wasn't able to be here last week, but it meant a lot. So, thank you for that as well. Just real quick, we have -- we have been -- worked hard to be compliant. I'm sorry. Doug Connelly. And Bryan Appleby, who is our civil engineer. So, as Sonya had already expressed it, you know, we have been working hard to try to figure this out and get it -- get it going and she did a great job of explaining kind of where we are at right now, where we are at. I just want to make sure that there is clarity in this and so Exhibit 1 I think that's on the screen right now shows the realign -- Mills driveway and -- was already proposed and recommended for temporary approval for the city planning and, then, the second slide is the one where the alternative future driveway access based on the city's current recommendations Condition No. 10, for change of location upon development of the property to the east. So, what we are doing is we are recommending that this change not be required as long as the Mills' residence remains unchanged or not redeveloped and the reasons why, just real quick, the topography is challenging, six and a half foot elevation difference and the slope is nine percent. The driveway would be less direct route to the -- the existing garage that you see there and, then, the driveway pavement would be excessively wide with the transition from the road stub to the existing circular driveway and so it's just not ideal for them currently and so our proposal, as she said before, is allowed temporary access to the property until redevelopment happens and that would give us access for the Mills, the current residents. And so, again, she already showed the possibilities. I don't know if we need to go over that again, unless you want to, but just what it could be once it's redeveloped. It's really, ultimately, just the current wording just to make sure it's clear -- it's clear on what we are asking. The current No. 10 condition wording is the ingress-egress easement depicted on Lot 1, Block 1, for the benefit of lot 2, Block 1, shall be temporary until time that the alternate access is available for Lot 2, with development of the adjacent property. At such time the access easement shall terminate and the driveway on Lot 2, via Lot 1, shall be removed. So, what I want to do -- do you have the slide of the -- of the change that we want to make? The proposed Condition No. 10 wording, then, would basically be the same, but we would add: So, the ingress-egress easement depicted on Lot 1, Block 1, for the benefit of Lot 2, Block 1, shall be temporary -- temporary until such time as an alternate access is available for Lot 2 with the development of the adjacent property and here is where the change is. To the east of Lot 2, Block 1, and Lot 2, Block 1, is redeveloped, E.G. residence is torn down, replaced by a new single family residence or further subdivided. At such time the access easement shall terminate and the driveway on Lot 2 via Lot 1 shall be removed. And so really that's what we are asking for tonight in that change, so --

Simison: Thank you. Council, questions? Okay. Thank you very much.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I know we don't have a public hearing, I -- some of my questions and confusion was about, again, some of the testimony we heard last night. It was uncertain if the temporary would go away with redevelopment and -- and so I think getting some clarity on that immediately satisfied what my concerns were. Unless there is any deliberation, I'm happy to make a motion for Council. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I move that we approve Item No. 1, the final plat for Stonehill Crossing Subdivision, Application FP-2024-0020 as presented this evening.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second. Is there discussion on the motion?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I just wanted to check if the Condition 10 had been updated by staff or does the motion need to reflect the additional language that the applicant just presented?

Allen: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, yes, the motion should include the requested language by the applicant if you are in agreement with that.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Strader: Apologies. My -- my intention was is that is because it was presented this evening that that was inclusive of -- of the changes from the applicant. But happy to let my record reflect that my motion was to be inclusive of that as well. Thank you, Council Member Strader, for flagging that.

Little Robert: Second concurs.

Simison: And the second concurs. So, I think we at least have a path. Everyone understands what we are considering. Is there discussion? If not, clerk call the roll.

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

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries and the item is agreed to. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

2. Public Hearing continued from January 14, 2025 for 3970 E. Overland Rd. (H-2024-0053) by Dominic Pera, JGT Architecture, located at 3970 E. Overland Rd.

- A. Request: Annexation and Zoning of 1.120 acres of land from the R-1 zone in Ada County to the General Retail and Service Commercial District (C-G) zoning district for the construction of a 4,950 sq. ft. multi-tenant building with one side being used for a restaurant.

Simison: I did see a lot of green pipe out there around that property. Anything to do with your project? Okay. Okay. Fair enough. With that we will move on to Item 2, which is public hearing continued from January 14th, 2025, for 3970 East Overland Road, H-2024-0053. Continue this public hearing with staff comments.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Before staff gives their comments I just want to say I was not here for the January 14th hearing, but I have been able to review the entire event and I'm prepared to make comments this evening.

Simison: Thank you very much.

Ritter: Good evening, Mayor and Council. So, this application was asked to be continued for additional input from all Council Members. Staff hasn't changed anything regarding their presentation for this annexation of this property into the city, but the applicant did put together some information that they would like to share with you prior to your deliberation. They would like to provide some additional clarity for you.

Simison: Council, any questions for staff before we bring up the applicant? Okay. If the applicant would like to come forward.

Wallgren: Good evening, Mr. Mayor, Council. My name is Jerrod Wallgren with JGT Architecture at 1135 12th Avenue Road in Nampa. Linda has that presentation available. All right. Is that something I can control from here? Perfect. So, I'm representing the applicant for this request that is to annex a -- an existing parcel on Overland and Topaz into the city as a C-G zone. We are also requesting a waiver on the required buffer from 25 feet down to 15 feet. It's proposed to be a 4,900 square foot building. Most of it will be for a Vietnamese restaurant that will be owned and operated by the applicant. Last time there was some potential opposition expressed by a few members and from what I could tell nobody really had an issue with the use or the design per se or the buffer, it was just really more of the process by which, you know,

you would approve such a small parcel into an area and so we really haven't changed anything about the site, other than we have formalized this potential future access to the north, which we had as a garbage truck backup area. We have widened that out to be a future access to the north. We thought that was a good idea and I guess I'm hoping that we can kind of talk about the context of the area to illustrate how this property could develop in the future to be cohesive with its surroundings. The elevations remained unchanged. It will be a nice, attractive building that we will work with staff in design review and CZC to ensure that it meets city requirements. On this slide you can see how the area is developed. We have got an aerial photograph from 1992 contrasted against the present day and so you can see the -- the nice developments that have occurred in El Dorado and Silverstone and Eagle View Landing were able to be accomplished by the acquisition of these large parcels of land where they could master plan all of that with streets and infrastructure and stratified uses that really make sense and, unfortunately, that's left this, you know, enclave area here of these old rural residential parcels that they are big enough to develop commercially, but kind of too small to really plan all together, but we think this -- this site right along Overland works well to be annexed in as is and -- and work well with the area. You can see that enclaved area consists of 49 parcels that are currently R-1 zone in the county. The city has previously annexed three of those properties, Zamzow's being one, which is a C-G zone. There is kind of a peculiar sliver here that's an R-2 zone annexed into the -- the city and, then, the property immediately adjacent to our east is also a C-G zone. So, this position where we are bounded on one side by Topaz, Overland on the south and an already annexed parcel really makes a lot of sense to continue this commercial development along the road. You know, if we were talking about one of these parcels further to the north that was deep into the -- the neighborhood it certainly wouldn't make as much sense to have a restaurant, but in this position we think it makes perfect sense. It's just another reiteration of the -- the mixed-use regional zone future land use for the -- the area, which is intended to provide a mix of employment, retail, residential dwellings and public uses near major arterial intersections. We feel our project meets those requirements. This is a depiction of the roadways in the area. In discussion with ACHD they have no specific plans in the immediate future. They -- they intend Overland to be widened in like the 2036 Capital Improvement Plan and they did indicate that the city has a request in for a -- a vision of this View Circle Street to extend to Topaz down around the corner back to Overland and have a traffic signal at Movado. That would provide some good interconnectivity in the area and another potential option would be this new intersection where Rolling Hills meets Flatiron, which is currently restricted at those new Aren Apartments due to us presumably limiting large amounts of traffic through this residential street, that one could envision in the future if this were to develop commercially that that could be a good access point for interconnectivity. One other piece of background information to note in the area is that Five Mile Creek does subject a lot of the area to floodplain issues. Our property at the very northeastern corner has a little bit of floodplain in it, but it is out of our development area, so it doesn't really impact the project, but any, you know, future development to the north will be adversely impacted by floodway, which -- which could create challenges. With that being said, we kind of took a stab at a quick sketch of how these immediately surrounding parcels might develop. We provide that access both to the north and to the

east. If that property were to ever develop commercially, instead of the contractor's yard, one can envision how each of these parcels could be developed one by one, whether it's, you know, some residential townhouses along the creek, some office buildings, you could see how this -- this area could be connected and -- and provide access to different roads and future roads. You know, even if you were designing this whole area as a whole it would be a natural fit to put a commercial restaurant use right along the corner, so we think it's -- it's very appropriate. A few background images of the site we can refer to if we need to. There is various uses surrounding and across the street. This image here in the center left is the -- the existing site and so I guess in conclusion we are left with the -- the choice of, you know, if we don't annex this -- this parcel it remains a site with dilapidated buildings, weeds, dying landscape and as -- as an R-1 zone in the county the only possible development would be for a single family home, which I think we would probably agree that doesn't make any sense along a five lane gateway corridor, but if we approve this this evening be a way to redevelop that property with a nice restaurant to provide a service for the community. I think we can provide some connectivity to surrounding sites that will develop well in the future and the applicant, you know, everybody he has spoken with is supportive, you know, from his customers to neighbors to his -- his bank, they all think it's a great idea and I know I live about a mile from here and my wife and I are always commenting how we could use some more restaurant options. So, we would be excited about this and think it would be a great fit for the area and, hopefully, you know, some of the opposition expressed last time, maybe we provided some background information that helps sway you a little bit and with that I would ask for approval of this project and stand for any questions.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. If you could go back to the -- the slide where you showed your road network.

Wallgren: This wheel is kind of slow.

Strader: Thank you. This one. Perfect. Thank you. Yeah. And I -- I will just say like this one for me has been tough. I lost more sleep over this one since our last meeting, so I have been really thinking about it. This is helpful. What is the status of this Circle -- View Circle extension with ACHD? I'm not understanding where we are at as a city with that. You mentioned it was a request from the city. Is it a request to amend the master street map? Maybe this is a question for staff, actually, I think that you could chime in in a second, Mr. Mayor, if that's all right with you.

Parsons: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, I think you hit it right on the head. It is a request from the city working in conjunction with ACHD to put a dashed line on a piece of property with a vision of a future collector somewhere in this general location. So, it's

just highlighted on their map and so when developers come in and ask us about what's required to develop my property, it starts that discussion, well, we have a dashed line going across your property, so we envision a collector road somewhere in this area as you pursue development of this property and typically anything on the master street -- this type of roadway, the way it's predicted -- presented on the map is all developer driven. So, it's nothing that ACHD builds or the city builds, it's, again, the developer coming forward with their development application and constructing that in accordance with both the city's and ACHD's adopted plans.

Strader: Mr. Mayor, follow up?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: And so how do we -- because usually we don't see a lot of applications where we are having this kind of back and forth about whether the street -- master street map will be actually updated. Is there any kind of process -- like if we used -- if we put a condition in would you recommend that to try to get ACHD to adopt it or is there any other action needed on the city's part to try to move that plan forward?

Parsons: Mayor, Members of the Council, not really. Again, ACHD's policies don't require it and, then, like anything roadways are widened and constructed based on trips, the volume, so it -- there is mechanisms to warrant certain things under their policies and something like this would not trigger anything as -- as the applicant has alluded to. So, again, with this application the best thing that we could hope for is there is a plan for the area, we have a mixed-use designated on it -- mixed-use designation on the property, so that means we envision a broad mix of uses on it. We do have some future plans for the extensions of roadways and reclassification of roadways, but, again, that will occur as development occurs and as trips and traffic warrants those upgrades or classifications changing, including the signal to Overland Road.

Simison: And maybe to piggyback just a little bit -- and correct me if I'm wrong, but the project that Council recently denied, would it have extended to where View Circle would have started to be constructed or not?

Parsons: Mayor, Members of the Council, correct. That -- so, if we head a little bit to the east on the other side of Rolling Hills Drive, that east-west portion where it's labeled View Circle, a portion of that would have been constructed with that project.

Simison: Thank you.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: This is helpful and, you know, it's funny to focus on this connection to the north is sort of my attempt at trying to future proof everything, because I felt like, okay, if we

created more connectivity, even if this is a small parcel, it creates the potential that there can be a connection as needed. This -- I actually want to compliment you for providing this context, because I think it's -- it's very helpful. At least it paints a picture for me that there is a path forward at some point in the future for this area, as opposed to just like an enclave that -- that will always be isolated from the roadway network. That was kind of my fear in our last meeting. So, I will be open -- I think I may actually change the direction that I will vote on this once I have a chance to think about it for a bit. Thank you.

Simison: Council, additional questions for the applicant? Okay. Thank you very much.

Wallgren: Thank you.

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

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, yes. Anita Gallagher.

Simison: Good evening. If you could give your name and address for the record.

Gallagher: Thank you. My name is Anita Gallagher. I'm at 3825 Onyx Street, which is in the subdivision that he says is depleted houses. Thank you for letting me speak, Mr. Mayor and Council. The first question I have is at that site that he is talking about is showing everything for the Council, 1.12 acres. The for sale sign is .78. I don't know where the extra acreage is coming from. But I do have pictures of the for sale sign if you want to see. My second question is there is a project that's going to be coming up across the street on Topaz of the two acres and they want to turn it into 21 apartments, plus commercial space. If that's approved it would affect the access and traffic to Topaz, Onyx, Jade and Overland with the restaurant and the commercial space. Would this be a similar problem that you brought up at the last meeting over on Eagle and Ustick? That's a big question.

Simison: Council, any questions or comments?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Thank you. It's kind of a quick question. I -- my understanding from years past previous council has attempted to kind of engage some of the -- you and your neighbors on what's the future look like here? You are, obviously, in a very rapidly developing part of the city. It kind of feels like this -- you know, the -- the center of the valley in -- in many ways. Have you -- could you describe what conversations maybe you have had with any of your -- your neighbors? Like what do you -- what do you envision sort of happening here? Or is it just leave us alone for a little bit, which I certainly can respect, but I'm just kind of curious what some of your -- if you could contextualize a little bit of your conversations about what does the future of this part of the city look like?

Gallagher: We really don't know for sure. I know there have been some people that just have bought the property probably within the last ten years and they are really happy with their property. I have been there for 20 -- almost 26 years. I have an acre. My yard looks like a park. I don't want it to go back -- you know, go away. I'm not ready to move. If I have to I guess I will have to, if I can get a good price for my property, but I really don't want to. And I have great fantastic neighbors. We are a nice little quiet neighborhood and I like living in Rolling Hills. You know, everybody knows everybody.

Simison: All right. Thank you very much. Is there anybody else who would like to provide testimony on this item, either in the room or if you are online you can use the raise your hand function? Seeing no one raising their hand or coming forward, would the applicant like to make any final comments at this time?

Wallgren: Mr. Mayor, Council, in response to the -- the last testimony I certainly didn't intend to refer to anybody's property as dilapidated other than this specific site. It -- it has a -- you know, what appears to be maybe an old auto service building and really buildings that are completely uninhabitable and unusable and so without an annexation that -- it -- it -- it's a property that just sits there and it really can't have any use that can be done with it. So, that's what I meant with that comment. As -- as far as traffic, the one item we did discuss with ACHD -- I mean they do have the ability to paint some lines along Overland that, you know, do not block this intersection lines, which don't exist now. That could be one way to alleviate some of the concerns with the traffic congestion of that intersection and it's -- it's kind of with the -- a little bit of hesitancy that I even master plan property like that that's not even part of the project, knowing that there are people that live there and, you know, it's -- it's awfully presumptuous to plan on developing something on someone's property that, you know, they could want to live there for the next 40 years and so that's why it's difficult to envision how this area will -- will develop and I think this -- our one little corner that's tucked up right along Overland works -- works pretty well, so -- if you have any other questions for me I would -- I would be glad to take them.

Simison: Council? Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Mr. Wallgren, appreciate the update and the presentation. Does your client currently own that land?

Wallgren: Not yet, no. He is under contract to purchase.

Cavener: I do think it is important certainly what -- I think I have got a sense about where this one is headed, but it would be my hope that when your client takes possession that he moves rapidly to -- to clean up that area. Certainly it's not your applicant's fault of the current condition, but an annexation into Meridian, we take pride in our community, would hope that he would move expeditiously. I know sometimes it can be hard and I know we were kind of at a -- at a deadlock when you were here last before us. So, I appreciate your request for a continuance and giving you guys an opportunity to come back and give us a bit more flavor. I was -- I didn't recall that the --

your -- your neighbor next to you had already annexed into the city. To me that's a big difference maker. That, plus the -- the connectivity that you have kind of provided with relocating kind of your truck turnaround I think solves some of the -- the bigger concerns that I had about, okay, what is the future of this and recognizing I -- I commend you for taking some creativity, saying this is what it could be. You don't want to tell anybody that's what's happening, I -- I appreciate that, but I at least applaud your -- your willingness to say they are demonstrating how this could potentially work with future development. So, as a big piece is that -- if your client takes ownership that he moves expeditiously to get that lot cleaned up. But I don't have any additional questions. Thank you.

Wallgren: Thank you.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Mr. Wallgren, can you -- I think this was described as a multi-tenant building with one side being used as a restaurant. Are there plans for the other side or what use that might be?

Wallgren: No specific plans at this point. That would be vacant shell that he would lease out to a potential tenant that would be applicable and complimentary to his business and he would be able to select who that was and -- and if we were --

Whitlock: Follow up?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Can you just confirm for me again -- you have addressed the cross-access to the north, but you have also included cross-access to the east; is that correct?

Wallgren: That is correct. The annexation on the parcel to the east in their development agreement it did have a condition that if the site were to ever develop into something other than a contractor's yard that cross-access was to be provided to the neighboring parcels. So, we are connecting with that location.

Whitlock: Okay. Thank you.

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

Wallgren: Thank you.

Parsons: Mr. Mayor, Council, just for the record I want to provide some clarification to the resident that asked why the acreage was different than the -- the parcel size. Just for the record, just to clarify that, when applicants request to annex into the property we

have them go to the center line of the adjacent roadways. So, therefore, the annexation boundary is greater than the actual property they are going to develop. So, that's why you see that discrepancy and, then, also to Councilman Whitlock's question about uses, in the development agreement that we have proposed in the staff report we are limiting the site to develop with specific uses to try to minimize those impacts to adjacent residents and, then, one last piece of business tonight, if you decide to move forward with the -- the approval, keep in mind that the applicant did request a waiver to reduce that buffer along the north boundary.

Simison: So, in this case the property boundary goes to center line of Overland and the center line of Topaz, which is what's giving it that extra dimensional size.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Maybe just a quick question for Linda or Bill. Would -- I -- I like the idea of the do not block this intersection. That seems like it could only help the situation. Is that just a staff level communication? Do we need a -- would we need a provision around that to try to highlight it? Help me understand how we would navigate that component.

Ritter: Mayor, Council Woman Strader, we would reach out to ACHD and try to see if we can make that happen. So, it would be staff communicating with ACHD on that issue.

Strader: Perfect. Thank you.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I know we have got a resident who wanted to ask maybe a question that perhaps maybe staff could follow up with them and get any of the questions they want have answered, unless it's pertaining to the application and they just -- ma'am, if you come up and testify the applicant will also get another opportunity to provide the last word and if it pertains to the application that's before us we are happy to hear it, but if you have got more of a structural question our staff can -- okay. Mr. Mayor -- because we have got our -- a good -- for holding us accountable tonight on all things on the record, what I heard was that there is signage there, but the lines don't exist and I know that we have got our good colleagues from ACHD that are also on the call hearing this and so I have great faith that between great staff at the highway district and our great staff here at the city that will get those -- this request in to get those lines painted at the highway district's early ability. With that, Mr. Mayor, I move that we close the public hearing on Item No. 2. This is an annexation, H-2024-0053.

Little Roberts: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: As the only one who didn't get to testify two weeks ago, if you would permit me a few minutes and a little history. I actually watched this twice, because it really resonated me a lot on a lot of the comments that were made by my fellow Councilmen. But I -- I got to go back in history a little bit. It was about 15 years ago I was at training in Canyon county and I was approached on a break by two members -- two elected officials, a city councilman and a commissioner over in Canyon county and they were commending the City of Meridian, that we -- our previous councils had done a fantastic job of preserving areas of our city for future development and how we did some of our larger developments, because they had not done such a good job and they had allowed some pockets to be developed that, then, prevented some of the developers from coming in and putting these master plans together and it made me pretty proud to know that we had some pretty forward thinking folks ten, 15 years ago on our city council as we were deciding what our master plan was and I can't help but worry about some of the projects like this that if this was an in-fill, if this was the end of the development and we already had everything else developed and I was looking at this project coming in I wouldn't have a problem with it. It would be a perfect in-fill project. But the problem I have is it's all open still. You know, when Eagle and Franklin, the southeast corner, developed it took years, but they bought every single house and if they hadn't done a master plan project we wouldn't have St. Luke's Hospital and all the buildings and restaurants that surround that. It was time consuming. It was well laid out. It was well designed and as a city we benefited from a great product. The same things happened at Silverstone Plaza. We master planned this into a great commercial corner. We have done this multiple times throughout our city. But if we would have had some of these projects that almost become speed bumps or handicaps to us doing some of those larger products, they wouldn't have happened and what worries me with this one, because now we have heard there is already another one in the pipeline and we have already approved and annexed land next to it, is we are starting to possibly limit what someone could come in and do as a master plan for this area that would give us that collector street and bring it out to Movado, because you can put that yellow line on the screen for everybody to see, but it's an imaginary line to me until we get some sort of master plan that comes forward that says this is what we want to do. That's all it is. And I'm really having a tough time supporting, mind you, successful restaurant, great restaurant, I have no doubt. It's not personal, it's how we preserve some of these areas. This is our one shot on whether we want to try to preserve this corridor for something larger or if we want to let this establish lot by lot by lot, because the discussion that happened two weeks ago there was quite a bit that had to do with we

need to have connectivity to the north. We have already got connectivity to the east. But the problem is lot by lot we have no idea what's going to happen on those lots. So, it's impossible for us as a Council to say where that connectivity should be and what it's going to go to, where when we master plan something on a much larger scale there is an idea of what type of buildings, restaurants, retail, residential that's going to go into those spots and I just -- I just caution all of us as we look at this, this is a pretty unique opportunity for this section of land. We know there is quite a few people here, because we have already had one application, that are already willing to sell, because we have already had an application before us. We turned it down, because not everybody was willing to sell and we created more problems than we fixed with that one. We weren't there yet, but we were darn close and I'm just afraid that if we approve this as we continue to approve we are just handicapping ourselves on how this could eventually redevelop in the future. Just my thoughts.

Simison: Seeing no one else jumping in right away, I will weigh in just briefly on this, because I -- I think there is a lot of wisdom in that one, but I also think that there is another side to this equation. I mean this is -- this property is in a -- nothing can exist on this property but through redevelopment. Yeah. I don't see how you could do anything here. And the one thing I don't want to do is be in a situation where we tell a property owner they -- they can never do anything with this property, because let's say they want to come in and put a house on it. Well, is that what we want? We want a house next to a seven lane road and they want to hook up to water and sewer, because that's going to be a requirement for any -- any development on this property is going to -- we are going to tell everyone you got to come to the city for water and sewer. If this was an inhabitable property that had, you know, some current -- what I would say in my opinion current value, waiting may be the right decision, but to say that nothing could ever happen here, if that's what the outcome is I don't know that I personally think that's the best option to tell a property owner or a future property owner you just have to leave it the way it is, because we are not going to let you develop it in the county and you are going to come to the city and when you come in the city we are going to want you to develop the way the city wants you to develop it, but you can't do it, because everything else is ready to develop. I see a little bit of a circle or challenge with this, because of the current state of the property and I just want to get -- make sure that the property owners have an opportunity to have a little property because I think it's the best interest of all of us to have a livable property in this location, not a -- no one's going to do anything with this property scenario.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: There is one thing I have learned and that's Councilman Overton's got a lot of wisdom and -- and perspective he brings to a lot of discussion. I really appreciate that. One of my concerns tonight with -- with this is if we decide that it's not appropriate to annex this property, we are effectively setting a precedent where we are going to be saying to be consistent and fair this whole property that we are looking at right here it

will not develop until there is a better more comprehensive plan and I have gone back and forth on that, because I -- you know, we have had a couple of property -- or projects here in this area and I think there is a -- I think that resonates with me on a level, but I also -- you know, the plan is a mixed-use development here, so what we are missing is the specifics of what it looks like. Specifically how each parcel might be connected together. And I recall not too long ago, just a few weeks ago, we looked at a very large development where we had sort of bubble -- I think the phrase was a bubble plan with the details to come in later and unanimously approved that, because we -- again, we had a single developer who was -- we had confidence would come back with a lot of the specifics. We are missing that here and I acknowledge that. We are missing that -- the specifics of interconnecting the parcels. But in my mind we have a plan. The plan is mixed-use. We don't have the details of the plan. So, again, it's circular. It's chicken or the egg. What comes first. If this parcel were maybe a quarter of a mile off Overland, if it was tucked back in with the homes, it's a nonstarter. I think we clearly know what that would look like. If this was a development much larger with much higher traffic count with maybe a multi-family use, I -- I -- I think we -- our discussion is different. I wish we had a master plan that we could be looking at, but we don't and that -- I kind of was asking, you know, what -- what do the neighbors want. You know, next year neighbor to the east may decide it's time to sell and move on, you know, sell their property. Someone wants to stick around for a while. Others want to leave. You just -- you never know and this is a really -- really really challenging. But to me I think it's fundamentally unfair to tell someone who has the property that is following the guidance provided with a mixed-use development, the type of uses that are allowed there, I think it's fundamentally unfair to say you can't do it, especially if you own the property and I think, Mayor, you bring a good point. If we don't do this what are we going to put here? A home? That was my first thought. They could build a home. But that's a bad idea. So, this property sits essentially landlocked almost in a way of what we have here. So, I -- I -- I appreciate that the -- you -- you have provided cross-access, you know, with your updated design with connecting to the northern parcel. We don't know what that would look like. Again, last week I would remind this Council we had a long discussion about these in-fill projects and -- and -- and putting those projects together and we approved it, even though we didn't know what the cross-access would look like, but we did it. At some level in order to build out our city we require developers and property owners to work with the city in a way that achieves our vision. May not be exactly how we envision it up here today, but as long as they are following some guidelines that we have laid out pretty clear, then, we should allow them to move ahead and I think what we have here is -- they have done what we have asked, they have provided the cross-access, they are going to build the stub street essentially to -- whatever that parcel to the north is. I don't see the traffic count being a noticeable problem. Yes, traffic is not great there, but that -- adding this -- annexing this in is not going to add to that. So, I did go back and forth, but I think I'm going to come down where I would like to see this project go forward, because if we don't, then, I would say that it should be incumbent on anyone who is listening tonight don't bring us a project here, because it would be fundamentally unfair to say no to this person and yes to the next one.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I'm happy to weigh in. I was not supportive of this request last week and like Council Member Strader, it's kind of caused some sleepless nights and when a meeting ends we don't stop thinking about these projects and -- and this one has certainly sat with me and it came up a lot quicker than I -- I anticipated. Council Member Overton, you bring up a really valid point about, you know, kind of catalyst projects that change and you look at certainly The Village and what's happened at, you know, Overland where there was -- you know, big -- big and small pieces of dirt coming together to do something unique. I -- I see some similarities in this, but I -- I also kind of tend to look at this like this is a very large in-fill area and it kind of tracks, because it's complicated and frustrating as a lot of our in-fill projects are. I think where I have landed is that, you know, certain types of use along Overland I do think makes sense. I guess what I'm saying is developing east and west right now makes sense in that kind of piecemeal fashion for me. How does each, you know, have that frontage piece play out, because that can help also invite what a gateway would look like in this area. Developing north and south without even a bubble plan would be really really difficult. The cross-access pieces to me I think gives good flexibility for when the north and south does start to develop. I guess the -- the north ones start to develop that it will give -- I think it preserves the opportunity to do some master planning around it that is complimentary to some of the existing businesses that you are not -- and just around this area, but also to the north along Flatiron. That's going to be a critical piece as well. So, this is a case where I think it continues for me -- allowed me to think a little bit more about this, look at it a little bit more holistically, really focus on east to west makes more sense than the north and south and so I think I will likely be in favor of -- of this project this evening.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Since my good colleague to the right shared an experience from the past that he is proud of, I will share one that I'm not proud of. I got -- I got thrown out of a softball game once on a -- on a called third strike, because I told the umpire the only thing he was consistent at was being inconsistent. What I see here is some consistency. I see a business developed to the east. I see Zamzow's to the west. If I go farther to the west up to Eagle and, then, past Eagle I see some consistency and I mentioned this at the last hearing on this -- this -- the frontage along Overland. I think that's consistent. When you look to the south of Overland you see apartment buildings and -- and I think you will see consistency to the south moving to the east on Overland as well, so that there is some consistency. I don't know what will be built to the north, but I was sympathetic to the -- to the arguments that we -- we need to be able to provide some cross-access. We need that access if and when that area to the north develops. So, in my mind I think this project is consistent with what we already have annexed and what is consistent with a frontage along a very busy roadway and I think the -- the applicant has come back and addressed the concerns that were raised at the last hearing about still maintaining and preserving an opportunity to have access in the future for whatever

is developed and that maybe 20 years, 40 years down the road. I don't know. But I -- again, I -- I support consistency and I -- I think that this project is consistent with what already has been approved and what is appropriate along the frontage there of Overland. So, I will be supportive of this project tonight.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor, thank you to the applicant tonight for really taking to heart our concerns and coming back with the stub streets and things. I think that's been a big help. The traffic at that corner, that's a pretty regular route for me. I am concerned there, but I think that this -- hopefully that there is signage and with the painting will help let people know to not block that intersection, because I also think that that's a great spot for a restaurant. There is not a ton of restaurants right there in that area and I think that that's definitely got potential to maybe be a gateway if and when this -- or when the rest of this area does develop, because it could be a very long time. So, with those changes I will be supporting the project.

Cavener: All right. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Good deliberation, Council, but I'm prepared to make a motion. After reviewing all staff, applicant testimony I move that we approve application H-2024-0053 as presented this evening, which is -- the day earlier today -- the 28th of January and note the reduction of the north boundary as requested by the applicant.

Whitlock: Second.

Parsons: Councilman Cavener, would you --

Simison: Have a motion and a second.

Parsons: -- want to include cross-access to the north as shown on the concept plan?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, I -- I probably should be more clear. Because that was presented this evening by the applicant I -- I tried to reference that as their part of their testimony. Yeah. That was inclusive within my motion, the exhibit that's before us.

Whitlock: Second agrees.

Simison: And the second agrees and that is the case. Is there discussion on the motion? If not, clerk call the roll.

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

Simison: Five ayes. One nay. And the item is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE NAY.

3. Public Hearing for Fairview Drive-through (H-2024-0049) by Ethan Mansfield, Hawkins Company, located at 4300 E. Fairview Ave.

- A. Request: Conditional Use Permit for a drive-through facility for a coffee shop that is within three hundred (300) feet of another drive-through facility and an existing residence.
- B. Request: Modified Development Agreement to create a new Development Agreement to establish the hours of operations to begin service of the coffee shop at 5:00am and approve new concept plans.

Simison: With that we will move on to Item 3, public hearing for Fairview drive-thru, H-2024-0049. We will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Ritter: So, this application is for a conditional use permit and a development agreement modification. It's a -- the property is located at 4300 East Fairview Avenue. The conditional use permit for the development of a 18,143 square foot quick lube oil change facility and drive-thru coffee shop within the CUP is because it's within 300 feet of another drive-thru, which is a bank that is next door and the existing residence to the north and the development agreement modification is to establish new hours of operations for the coffee shop to begin service at 5:00 a.m. The current development agreement states that businesses cannot begin until 7:00 a.m. and they end at 7:00 p.m., but they are only asking for the coffee shop to begin at 5:00 a.m., because Human Bean that is their business operations at all their locations begin operation at 5:00 a.m. The quick lube shop will begin operation at 8:00 a.m. and end at 7:00 a.m. We had a previous -- we have a condition in the staff report that states that the applicant previously had parking spaces -- back here seven parking spaces and we felt that those parking spaces interfered with the flow of traffic for the lube shop and the coffee shop drive-thru, so we asked that those spaces be relocated to the south side of the property or that the application -- the applicant will provide a site plan that both staff and the applicant agreed upon and we also were asking -- the applicant was asking for a waiver from City Council to add a -- the trash enclosure within the existing landscape buffer, since there was already -- the trash enclosure for the bank was already located in it and they were just going to expand on it, the trash enclosure, but the applicant is placing the trash enclosure outside of the landscape buffer now, so that waiver is no longer necessary and, then, based on the site plan that was provided staff and the applicant felt that the flow of this new site plan that is here meets the intent and it does not -- it still provides cross-access on the north side of the building -- on the north side of the

property and on the south side of the property. Access to the property is from Fairview Avenue. So, there is good queuing for the drive-thru and it's great flow for cars that go into the lube place. They meet the required parking standards for this building and the type of businesses that are in here. These are the building elevations that were provided. They are just conceptual building elevations. They have not been approved. They still have to go through design review. Showing the lube location and the coffee shop. This portion is the coffee shop and this is the -- the base for the lube business. So, the conceptual building elevations consist of stucco, stone, wood and metal accent. Again, the final design is required to comply with our design standards in our architectural standard manual on anything that is recorded with a development agreement. So, again, asking for a development agreement modification just to change the business hours of the coffee shop from 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 a.m. The current development agreement says that business begins at 7:00 a.m. and ends at 7:00 p.m. So, these are the pictures of the current site and with that I will stand for any questions that you may have on this particular application. But there -- excuse me. There were some comments which are listed in the document that you have. The last comment was received today or yesterday regarding the hours of operations for the proposed coffee shop and mentioned Ada county's noise ordinance. So, with that I will stand for any questions you may have.

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

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton?

Overton: Just a quick education question. The coffee shop is, obviously, a drive-thru.

Ritter: It is. Not the lube oil.

Overton: The lube oil is not a drive-thru even though it's got two lanes and they are driving through?

Ritter: That is accurate.

Overton: Correct? Just making sure I understand.

Ritter: Absolutely.

Overton: Thank you.

Ritter: Not a drive-thru.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Linda, thanks for the -- the report. I -- I want to make sure I -- my recollection is correct. This is -- part of this borders the city of Boise; right?

Ritter: It does. Boise is right next door.

Cavener: So, Mr. Mayor, Linda, I don't know how to do this, it's been a month since we have had an application that kind of touches, you know, another city's border. Do we do any kind of proactive engagement with the city of Boise about, hey, we share a border. I know it's in Meridian, but in terms of -- I guess maybe I call good neighbor engagement, do we communicate with them? Do we solicit any feedback or comments? Is that something that we don't do by policy, but do sometimes in practice? I feel like in the past we have had a few applications where Boise's provided some commentary. I just didn't see any this time around.

Parsons: Mayor, Members of the Council, it depends on the application. So, if it's -- say, for example, there -- there is a property owner that's in the city -- the Boise city area of impact and they want to be part of Meridian, we send them to Boise to say are you okay if we amend our map and they join us and -- because we can provide services and vice-versa. It goes back and forth. But in this typical situation, no, we would not transmit a conditional use or DA modification to the city of Boise for comment.

Cavener: Thank you, Bill. Thanks, Linda. Appreciate it.

Simison: Okay. Would the applicant like to come forward?

Mansfield: Good evening, Mr. Mayor, Council Members. Lovely to see you all tonight. I will just wait for Linda to pull up my presentation and, then, I will introduce myself. I'm Ethan Mansfield representing Hawkins Companies, 855 West Broad Street, Boise, Idaho. 83702. We are the developer on this project on behalf of Oil Changers and Human Bean. I guess my presentation is a little too meaty for the computer, but I promise I won't talk about every single slide. Thanks, Linda. So, I don't have too much to add above what Linda talked about. I think she covered it really well. We worked after the Planning and Zoning Commission recommendation of approval to get a site plan that worked for both staff and our users. I'm having a little bit of a challenge changing slides. I'm just pressing the arrow. Great. So, here is the overall location. You can see primary access is going to be taken off of Fairview Avenue, with secondary access being off of Venture Street, which, as Linda noted, has cross-access provisions on the south side and the north side of the property. Here is an improved site plan. We are providing 12 parking spaces. That's a 6.5 per thousand square foot ratio. It's over double what is provided. We are really happy that we were able to pull the trash enclosure outside of the landscape buffer, so that we can provide additional screening for the residential properties to the north and, you know, that's pretty much it. I'm happy to answer any questions. It's relatively straightforward. We are noting -- Human Bean is requesting a 5:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. hours of operations. This is consistent with every other Human Bean in Meridian and also across the valley. So, it's very standard. If you would like to -- you know, here is an overview of each of the locations in Meridian and

so we respectfully request your approval of both the conditional use permit and the development agreement modification. Thank you very much and I will stand for any questions.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Thank you, Ethan. Council, questions? Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor and Ethan, thanks for being in front of us tonight. So, how close is the house and do they have any issues with it starting at 5:00 a.m? I live really close to a Human Bean, not close enough to hear them, though, but I know that when I'm out walking the dog they have got a pretty decent line at 5:00 a.m.

Mansfield: Sure. Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Little Roberts, that is a great question. We are about 280 feet from the nearest residential property. So, they are pushed very far forward on their lot. There is a big backyard and, then, there is that 25 foot landscape buffer and, then, our development. So, there is -- there is quite a bit of space and there is a -- actually a requirement in the city code, if I'm not mistaken, to limit the noise from the drive-thru to the property boundary. So, that is a requirement of your code already, as well as there is a noise ordinance for the City of Meridian that also controls noise. So, amplified noise isn't supposed to be heard in anybody's house and we can make sure that's -- we follow that.

Little Roberts: Thank you.

Simison: And just to clarify, you said 250 feet from the property boundary. You mean from the house structure?

Mansfield: Mr. Mayor, that's correct. From our structure to the house structure --

Simison: Okay.

Mansfield: -- just about 280 feet.

Simison: Okay. Just want to make sure we are hearing the same thing.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Mr. Mansfield, you will have to forgive me, I'm -- I'm not a -- I'm not a patron of Human Bean. I hope you don't hold it against me. Do they -- do they use a -- you said -- you used the term amplified. Do they use like a speaker to -- I speak into a speaker to take the order and they speak in a speaker to report back to me like a Starbucks or other -- other similar type of industries?

Mansfield: You know, I'm going to just check in with our development partner Bronson, who actually speaks frequently with Human Bean. I, too, do not frequent Human Bean, so you are not alone. Bronson, is it correct that they do not use amplification? Mr. Mayor, Council Member Cavener, we can absolutely get clarity, but we don't think that there is actually any amplification involved in this.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: To me that's an important element. So, if you can get that answer to us by the conclusion of the public hearing maybe in your closing comments that would be helpful.

Mansfield: Absolutely.

Simison: So -- so, I guess that -- for clarification are -- are you suggesting that they have someone out talking directly to the person? Is that what you are -- I can say I have been through Human Bean enough with my wife, but I don't recall someone ever coming out and taking our order as we are waiting, especially if there is no other cars there. I -- I just want to make sure we understand -- we are talking the same -- the same thing. Is that what you are talking about? If that's your model?

Mansfield: Mr. Mayor, yeah, we will get clarification on exactly how it works. I know that sometimes at the busy periods a shop like Dutch Bros obviously will have some folks, you know, walking outside. I have -- haven't seen that at Human Bean. But, again, Mr. Cavener, I'm not a Human Bean patron very frequently. So, I will get clarification on exactly like how much amplification -- you know, is it amplified. Is it in person.

Simison: And through a kiosk or if you are talking directly face to face to a person. I think -- is that the basic --

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, I think what -- I'm what I'm trying to confirm is that my opinion one person talking to another to take a coffee order creates a certain amount of sound, much less than if somebody's, you know, repeating something back in an amplified speaker and a -- so, that -- that's what I'm trying to get to understanding is how the orders are taken and how that impact -- and how that process would impact the residents that surround it.

Simison: And I'm really trying to remember personally, just like -- I know we -- I know we have driven up enough when it's not busy that we talk directly to them, but I know I have also sat in line for a while and I can't imagine that we didn't order until we got up there.

Cavener: Yeah. Thanks, Mr. Mayor.

Simison: That meant nothing coming from me, so -- Council, any other questions at this time? Okay. Thank you.

Mansfield: Thanks very much everyone.

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

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, yes. I apologize for mispronouncing, but Marlene Aspiazu.

Simison: Good evening, Marlene. If you can speak into the microphone and state your name and address for the record.

Aspiazu: My name is Marlene Aspiazu and I live at 4285 East Venture Place and I am directly behind everything that's going on and my only thing is -- I don't have a problem with, you know, any of that coming in at all. What my problem is I would -- I would like to have like a barrier wall, because where I live in my backyard it faces Venture. It faces Fairview. So, I can see all the -- the cars and the lights going by, which is okay. But when I notice that when people -- cars come into the parking lot -- into the lot and our glass or -- or where we live our back -- our house is basically all glass, so we can see all the lights when they -- when anyone comes into the parking lot. So, if they had the coffee shop I'm -- I'm assuming I would probably see the car lights and the brake lights, you know, like early in the morning, because it would be dark, you know. But that was my -- and that's why I would like to have like a -- a sound barrier, because we are directly right behind and I can -- because even now when they pulled into where those -- where that little -- where he is selling all those little shed things, you can see all the car lights and -- and everything. So, I would just like to have a barrier wall, because right now we do it -- there is a fence there, but it's kind of like -- it's kind of like -- it has like little like cracks in it and apparently maybe our ground is a little bit lower than up there, because it's -- because we can see everything when the -- when the -- when the cars come in, so I'm pretty sure in the coffee shop we are going to be seeing them going in this way, going out that way and that's the only thing that I was concerned about.

Simison: Thank you. Council, questions?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: It's Marlene?

Aspiazu: Yes.

Cavener: Thank you for being here tonight. I'm always curious -- you know, there is lots of steps that happened before something lands before the City Council.

Aspiazu: Uh-huh.

Cavener: Have you had an opportunity to speak with the applicant about that request?

Aspiazu: Yes, I did. And he said that it would be too expensive -- it would be too much money to put a barrier wall.

Cavener: Thank you very much. I appreciate that.

Aspiazu: You are welcome. Thank you.

Simison: Council, any additional questions? Okay. Thank you.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, that was everyone.

Simison: Okay. Is there anybody else present that would like to provide testimony on the item, either in the room or online? If you are online you can use the raise your hand feature or if you are in the room please come forward. Seeing none, would you like to come forward to close.

Mansfield: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I would just first like to address the question of amplified noise from Council Member Cavener. We just spoke with the franchisee for Human Bean. She has 12 locations across the Treasure Valley. Only one has amplified noise and she would prefer not to have amplified noise at this location. What happens is they -- the customers will order at the window and if it gets busy they will send a runner out to take orders. So, to clarify, there will be no amplified noise. Secondly, I would like to address our neighbor's concerns about impacts to her property. I one hundred percent understand that and, actually, we had plans to construct a closed vision fence along the northern boundary. We are -- you know, probably something like vinyl, so it didn't have gaps in it. We are more than happy to do that. We did see -- it wasn't a condition of approval, because there is a fence already there, but, you know, understanding that fence may be in slightly less than new condition, we are more than happy to install a new closed vision fence on our -- and -- and we can even make sure that it's far enough into our property that it doesn't experience that grade loss that she was explaining, because I do think that's an important element; right? Because you have got -- obviously, if the headlights are three feet above the ground. So, we are -- we can absolutely commit to installing a closed vision fence.

Simison: Council, any questions?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Just a comment, Mr. Mansfield. I appreciate that. I got to be real up front with you, I was not supportive of this conditional use permit for those very reasons and knowing that you have got an applicant or a client that is not going to be using any amplification and are doing your part to address the -- the -- the headlights that are

going to be entering her -- enter her home in the mornings, those satisfied my -- my main concerns, so I appreciate your productive work on that.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Just a clarification from staff while the applicant is still up here. If they install a fence under our current city code we can't have two fences back to back, they have to be a certain distance apart if I'm not mistaken.

Parsons: Mayor, Members on the Council, you can. You can't have double fencing when it's common lot to common a lot. So, this wouldn't be that -- that instance. But if the property owner is amenable maybe they can tear down the old fence and put up a new fence in the same spot, depending on how their construction plans come out and what the development of the site looks like. So, I -- I think there is some flexibility for the applicant, but I also want to assure that -- the neighbor and the Council that the code does require fencing. Applicant was correct, existing fencing, so we didn't require them to put in fencing, so --

Overton: Totally get that.

Simison: And it's a minor thing, but the property lines don't match up that -- there is a portion of the -- at least according to this -- portion of the -- Mary's property that would not have the same fence line, because it goes on to some of this. So, I think it's working together to determine what's the most appropriate way or place to figure out what makes sense, so it doesn't extend to the property to the east. Okay.

Cavener: I don't have any other questions.

Simison: Okay. Thank you.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Move that we close the public hearing on Item No. 3.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to close the public hearing on Item H-2024-0049. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the public hearing is closed.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Council, on a conditional use permit, very narrow pathway for kind of us weighing in. Certainly the development agreement gives us a little bit more latitude. Again, appreciate the neighbor kind of flagging that concern and the applicant moving quickly to make sure that those concerns were addressed. I voiced what I thought were my concerns earlier. I think they have largely been adhered to and so unless there is any deliberation, I'm -- I'm prepared to make a motion. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Move that we approve Item No. 3, application H-2024-0049, include all staff and applicant and -- and public testimony, noting a couple of important pieces, which is that in the development agreement that this site will not use any form of electronic amplification to communicate and the applicant will construct -- the applicant will work with the area neighbors to construct a fence that would block the light from the -- the vehicles that are entering the property. And, Linda, I know I -- I really kind of stumbled through that and so if there is any concern I expect you to set me straight.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second. Is there discussion on the motion? If not, Clerk call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

4. Public Hearing for Werre (SHP-2024-0004) by Benjamin Semple, Rodney Evans and Partners, LLC., located at 2945 W. Ustick Rd.

- A. Request: Short Plat to subdivide an existing parcel consisting of 3.123 acres of land into two (2) building lots in the R-4 zoning district.

Simison: Next item up is Item 4, a public hearing for SHP-2024-0004. We will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Ritter: Okay. Our next application is for a short plat to divide 3.123 acres of land into two lots. It's an existing parcel. The property was annexed in 1992 as part of the Candlelight Subdivision development. It wasn't part of that plat. It was on only annexed

and received the R-4 zoning. There is an existing single family home that will remain on Lot 1 and it will be accessed via a shared driveway off of North Morello Avenue. The proposed driveway to the existing house shall be paved with the capability of supporting fire vehicles and equipment. The applicant is not proposing any new fencing as there is fencing along the perimeter of the property. The applicant will be closing off the -- this access to Ustick Road and they will be removing the fencing from Morello Drive -- Morello Avenue, so that they can take access to the property. They are required to provide a 25 foot wide street buffer along Ustick and the landscaping has to meet the requirements of our UDC. They will be required to provide a multi -- a ten foot multi-use pathway. The landscaping shall be measured from the back of the curb and the ACHD is anticipated widening Ustick Road. So, currently this is a landscaping that is along Ustick Road, but that does not meet city standards and we have talked to the applicant about this, but this is proposed widening for Ustick along the -- this is the property here. So, the applicant will have to work with ACHD, because we did put in a condition, Condition No. 8, that if the landscape buffer has not been installed prior to ACHD widening of Ustick and the installation of the multi-use pathway, the applicant shall submit a surety for the landscape buffer prior to engineer -- city engineer's signature. So, the applicant stated that ACHD is in the process of purchasing the right of way along the front of the property, so that property will be ACHD soon. The applicant -- so, according to the applicant ACHD plans for the frontage to include a four foot wide planter area that they typically install with gravel. The applicant states that the property owner will work with ACHD to determine what has been planned so they can develop the surety number for the future installation of the planned materials. So, we do want the applicant to work with ACHD to enter into a license agreement for any landscaping placed within the right of way. This is a continuation of the widening of Ustick Road going all the way to Linder. And these are pictures of the current property. There were no comments -- written comments received on this project. I did talk to one of the neighbors that was at the end of the dead end road who inquired about the property. Don't know if they are online or in here tonight, but did have a conversation about that. Pretty straightforward project. Still keeping some nice lots along there. According to the applicant they will be building a home for their parents on that additional lot. So, with that I'm happy to answer any questions that you may have.

Simison: Thank you, Linda. Council, any questions for staff? Okay. Would the applicant like to come forward. Good evening.

Semple: Good evening, Mr. Mayor, Members of City Council. Ben Semple with Rodney Evans and Partners, 1450 West Bannock Street, Boise, Idaho. 83702. I'm here representing Jason Werre. He is the property owner and he -- I want to first thank Linda for her presentation and working with us on the staff report. We are in agreement with all conditions of approval contained within, as well as any of the agency comments. We have been in conversation or coordination with ACHD regarding that frontage there. They have indicated that they -- it sounds like their plan is to get that thing installed within a year and so we were working with them to figure out what does that improvement look like, how much is that surety. My client is going to provide that surety to ACHD for the installation of that material, whatever it may be, and so we are really

looking forward to this project moving forward. He does live on the property in the existing single family home right now. He is -- his parents live in another part of Meridian, but he is splitting this to build them a home there. We will run all utilities in from Morello Avenue and, then, close the entrance off Ustick just to make that a consistent frontage along there. I want to note that because we are not entirely sure where ACHD's curb line is falling, we have measured our landscape buffer from the back of sidewalk. So, there is 25 feet of landscaping, plus about another hundred feet of landscaping between that and the existing home. The future home will fall on the lot somewhere where we are not cutting down any trees and we will provide some additional landscaping as you can see typical for residential within Meridian. I did get a phone call from -- I believe the same neighbor at the end of the street there. They were wondering about the use of the property upon the split. So, it's another single family home and, then, some of the condition of that fence at the end of Morello is a little questionable shall we say. So, the -- my client's looking to replace what he needs to to make sure everybody is whole, so that dogs don't go in the yards where they don't belong. I guess I would stand for any other questions you may have.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions for the applicant? All right. Thank you very much.

Semple: Thank you.

Simison: Do we anyone signed up on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, nobody marked that they wanted to speak.

Simison: Okay. Well, if you would like to speak go ahead and come -- I know there is several people, so just come on up and sit in the front row and everyone will take their turn. Could you state your name and address for the record, be recognized for three minutes.

Brown: So, I am Jeff Brown. I live -- I am the president of the HOA for Candlelight and I'm a little bit concerned about extending Morello and what that looks like, whether we are going to have sidewalk, whether we are going to have curbing. I envisioned a cul-de-sac. It -- it appears that it's something different, but if we are going to have sidewalk and curbing and it's going to be wide enough, then, the HOA doesn't have a problem.

Simison: Okay. Council, any questions? Can staff answer that question or --

Ritter: Mayor, Council, so Morello is not extending. It's just the driveway coming off of there. So, the roadway will not be extended. As you can see on the plan here there is just a driveway going into the property to serve both blocks. There is no extension of the roadway.

Brown: Okay. Well, that's kind of a problem. I mean it would be good if we had -- if we continued the sidewalk, if we continued the look of the street.

Ritter: So, it's a dead end street that just has a driveway coming off of it going onto someone's property at the end of that roadway. So, it's this property at the end of the roadway that does not have a road that is continuing through there, it's just a driveway.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Mr. Brown, I think what I -- what I'm hearing is you are -- you are asking for is you want -- you actually want a pedestrian connection to go from Morello to Ustick, is that what I'm kind of inquiring? Maybe you can give Council a little bit more understanding as to what -- what the concern is of the homeowners association.

Brown: Well, as it stands now we have a roadblock and what they are proposing is a driveway. What -- where -- what we would like to see is the continuation of the sidewalk and the curb and gutter to a certain extent.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Mr. Brown, where -- where -- where was the -- I just need to understand.

Brown: Well, because -- because they are going to continue Morello into a driveway and what we are suggesting is that they continue the curb and gutter to -- to a certain extent at least into the T and in -- and in continuing the curb and gutter that they continue the sidewalk as well at least into the T and, then, create the driveway after that.

Cavener: Thank you, Mr. Brown. I appreciate it.

Simison: Okay. Next?

Springer: Hi. My name is -- my name is Connie Springer. 3072 North Carlo Avenue. This mostly affects me. My house is right there on that corner. I'm the one who made all the phone calls. It's my dogs I'm worried about. The owner walked over. We walked through the whole thing. I'm perfectly fine with it. He -- he did a great job stabilizing my concerns. So, I'm fine with it. It's going to be my front yard just so you know.

Simison: Thank you. Appreciate it.

Fletcher: Mr. Mayor, Council persons, appreciate you hearing us out on this. My name is Devin Fletcher. Address is 2891 West Joust Street, which happens to be in the Candlelight neighborhood. I would love to see this project, especially feeling for the owner that wants to have his parents live next door to him and split the lot. The only concern I would have is -- if we could go back to the collage of five pictures. The owner -- right there. Go back if you could. Right there. The picture -- two pictures. My

apologies. On the right is what the current owner has put up for a fence as a buffer zone for Ustick. My -- my opinion on that is -- is although it's actually a pretty cool fence, it doesn't aesthetically match the surroundings. That -- along that Ustick Road that ACHD is going to widen, of course we have the sidewalk, but all the other subdivisions have community vinyl fencing that's white, fairly common thing. It tends to be an oddball lot aesthetically. It just doesn't quite match. I would love to see something that looks similar to what the other subdivisions -- since this is going to be the back of their property now, this will be the north side of the property if you are looking at the plat. You know, I would hate to see them have to tear this fence out and do something different, but it's just not aesthetically pleasing, doesn't match the area. That would be my only concern. Otherwise, I think it's a good lot split. Thank you.

Simison: Thank you. Come on up.

Wenger: Hi there. I'm Heather Wenger. I live on North Morello Avenue as well and I'm sorry I didn't -- if there was a pre-hearing or other meeting about this and, I'm sorry, I didn't see the -- see it until the sign was up and it seems like there has been things going on maybe. Can somebody clarify what the R-4 zoning designation means to split?

Ritter: It just means that it's a residential lot and it's -- the lot size is 8,000 square feet.

Wenger: Okay. And how many residences can go on that, please?

Ritter: He could put as many that could fit as long as it worked with the road network. So -- but he only chose to split it in half.

Wenger: Okay. So, he is choosing to split it in half. So, there will be two lots. One and two. And how many homes could go on each of those lots, either now or in the future, please?

Ritter: Well, as of right now, because it's just two lots, it will be one home on each -- unless they want to do an accessory -- a secondary dwelling on one of -- or both of the lots.

Wenger: Okay. So, R-4 does not mean that they could have four units per in the future?

Ritter: If they came in in the future to subdivide the property after a certain period of time they would have to meet the minimum lot requirements in order to do that, but at this time they have not proposed that.

Wenger: Whole separate --

Ritter: It would be a whole different thing and the roadways would look a whole lot different.

Wenger: Okay. All right. Yeah. That's -- that's fine. And, then, this is the picture I was curious about. I wanted to clarify what I think maybe the HOA president was asking for and maybe he can clarify, but now -- the number at the left side is pulled up, I'm wondering if he is meaning he wants the sidewalks to go around, so that it looks more like the rest of the neighborhood. Like maybe that would be sufficient, so that it's not -- or -- or just a prettier fence. But I think they said they were going to do a prettier fence, so -- okay. Thank you very much.

Simison: Thank you. Anybody else that would like to provide testimony on this item at this time? Then would the applicant like to come forward and make any final comments?

Semple: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of Council. Again Ben Semple. So, to address a couple of these. So, yeah, Linda is correct, we are not extending Morello Avenue. It will be just a private driveway. But we do have to meet fire department access requirements. Right now that segment of Morello is about 150 feet long, which is the maximum extent that a fire department would back up. So, because we are extending a driveway into the site we have to build a fire department hammerhead turn around on the site. So, it will be publicly accessible for a turnaround in terms of its in an easement, but it's not an extension of the public roadway, it's still technically on private property. I was talking with my client, also the owner there, and I think we can figure out a way to work with the HOA here by creating a concrete driveway approach at the end of Morello Avenue effectively, because I believe it's rolled curb all through here. So, doing a rolled curb that would cut across the end of Morello right now with a sidewalk on it, so that it would basically be a rolled curb that led up into his property, but there would be a continuous public sidewalk that was within the ACHD right of way, so that if you are walking down Morello you could cross Morello on a sidewalk, rather than just cross through asphalt or someone's private driveway. So, I think that that's something that we could easily accommodate with this plan. And, hopefully, that would kind of make this -- it would close off this end of the street, make it look a little bit more consistent. The fencing along Ustick was permitted by the owner, so it was reviewed by the building department as it is right now. I know that fencing styles is like design, everybody, you know, has their own opinion of what they like. This is what the owner chose and it would be how he continues and closes the -- the current driveway. R-4 zoning here in the future -- I know there was concern about redevelopment. In the future this could -- both of these lots could redevelop and as Linda stated at that point the public street would be extended into this site. Public utility mains would be drug in and there would be a much more impactful development. But for the foreseeable future this is going to be two single family homes for my client and his parents to live on one. I would stand for any additional questions you might have .

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

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Just a comment, Ben. We don't see you very often and --

Semple: You don't. Maybe more often, though.

Cavener: Well, that's -- I -- I'm -- I'm looking forward to that, because I -- I find you bring us these kind of small projects and you really take them on like this is going to be your home and you engage with the neighbors like they are going to be your neighbors and I just don't get often to say appreciate what you do. But truly every time you are before us trying to anticipate what the questions are going to be from the neighbors and work with them to resolve it and, again, maybe that feedback -- we all knew those answers, but I appreciate you coming up and walking it through, so the neighbors here could hear it as well. We don't see that very often. I just want you to know how much I appreciate it.

Semple: I appreciate that.

Simison: All right. Thank you very much.

Semple: Thank you.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Move that we close the public hearing on Item No. 4.

Whitlock: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Council, I think this is a pretty straightforward application. Appreciate kind of closing off that access off of Ustick. That helps a lot. I see no areas of concern. Appreciate the applicant responding to the neighbors. So, I'm prepared to make a motion, unless there is any further testimony. Mr. Mayor, considering all applicant, staff and public testimony, I move we approve Item No. 4, Application SHP-2024-0004, include all staff, applicant and public testimony.

Strader: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Item SHP-2024-0004. Is there a discussion on the motion? If not, Clerk call the roll.

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

Simison: All ayes. Motion carries and the item is agreed to. Thank you very much. Have a good night.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

5. Election of City Council Officers and Liaison Assignments

Simison: Final item is Item 5, election of City Council officers and liaison assignments.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. Just maybe to kick off the discussion, I think that Council President Cavener has done a great job as our leader in the last year and just really appreciate all that he is doing and I -- I would support kind of continuing as we are, if it's okay with everybody else.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: In opposition to the motion -- I would like to nominate -- no. I appreciate it. I think both Councilman Cavener and Vice-President Strader have done a good job with the new guys. I'm going to speak for Councilman Whitlock, too. Appreciate their guidance, their -- their care, their -- their tutoring and they have done a good job. I think we are in a good place as a Council, so I wholeheartedly support the continuation of what we have got.

Simison: Okay. So, are we going to do a motion officially tonight? Was that the intention of anybody?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, I would look to our legal to tell us what we -- we need to do.

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, you don't have a specific requirement. Generally on the record we have had at least a motion for either retaining the same or nominating the same folks or whatever you want to do, just so it's clear in the record what the intent of the Council was.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Can we -- can we do that in one motion for everybody or do we need to do two separate ones for --

Nary: You can do it together if you wish.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Make a motion that we retain current City Council leadership and liaison assignments as currently constituted.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second and I'm going to interject for discussion on the liaison assignments, because there were some changes that were proposed to the liaison assignments, because they had people that were no longer on City Council.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I did have an opportunity late in the day, apologies, to connect with some of our legal staff and for the vacancies that were made by Council Member Borton and I have -- I have placed my name there and as is always the case if as the year progresses and there is a liaison assignment that a Council Member is itching to be a part of or itching to be less of, we can continue to have that conversation and reevaluate as needed.

Simison: Does the motion maker support the adjustment of replacing one name for the other?

Taylor: I do.

Simison: Second agree?

Little Roberts: Yes.

Simison: Okay. With that do I have -- someone call the question.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor, I call the question.

Simison: The question has been called. All in favor of the call the question say aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it. The question has been called. All those in favor?

Signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the election of officers is official, as well as liaison assignments.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Simison: I will just point out MYAC went through parliamentary procedure, the last two meetings, and so I'm -- I'm just continuing to borrow from the -- yeah, the educational opportunities in that, so we can apply it to these meetings if necessary, so --

Cavener: It will make us all better.

ORDINANCES [Action Item]

- 6. Ordinance No. 25-2071: An ordinance (Black Cat East – H-2024-0047) annexing a parcel of land located in the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter Section 16, Township 3 North, Range 1 West, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit “A”; rezoning 3.62 acres of such real property from RUT (Rural Urban Transition) to the I-L (Light Industrial) zoning district; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; repealing conflicting ordinances; and providing an effective date.**

Simison: All right. With that we will move on to Item 6, which is Ordinance No. 25-2071. Ask the Clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. It's an ordinance related to Black Cat East, H-2024-0047, annexing a parcel of land located in the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter Section 16, Township 3 North, Range 1 West, Boise meridian, Ada county, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit “A”; rezoning 3.62 acres of such real property from RUT to the I-L zoning district; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; repealing conflicting ordinances; and providing an effective date.

Simison: Thank you. Council, you have heard this ordinance read by title. Was there anybody that would like it read in its entirety? If not, Clerk call the roll.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, motions.

Simison: Oh. Sorry. Is there a motion?

Taylor: I move that we approve Ordinance No. 25-207.

Little Roberts: Second.

Overton: Second.

Simison: Motion and second and third to approve Ordinance No. 25-2071. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, clerk call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

- 7. Ordinance No. 25-2072: An ordinance (Pivot Pointe Subdivision – H-2024-0029) annexing a parcel of land located in the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of Section 10, Township 3 North, Range 1 West, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit “A”; rezoning 7.64 acres of such real property from RUT (Rural Urban Transition) to the R-8 (Medium-Density Residential) zoning district; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax Commission, as required by law; repealing conflicting ordinances; and providing an effective date.**

Simison: Next item up is Ordinance No. 25-2072. Ask the Clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. It's an ordinance related to Pivot Point Subdivision, H-2024-0029, annexing a parcel of land located in the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of Section 10, Township 3 North, Range 1 West, Boise meridian, Ada county, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit “A”; rezoning 7.64 acres of such real property from RUT to the R-8 zoning district; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all official maps depicting the boundaries and the zoning districts of the City of Meridian in accordance with this ordinance; providing that copies of this ordinance shall be filed with the Ada County Assessor, the Ada County Treasurer, the Ada County Recorder, and the Idaho State Tax

Commission, as required by law; repealing conflicting ordinances; and providing an effective date.

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

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Move that we approve Ordinance No. 25-2072.

Overton: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Ordinance No. 25-2072. Is there discussion on the motion? If not, clerk call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

FUTURE MEETING TOPICS

Simison: Council, anything under future meeting topics or a motion to adjourn?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Move we adjourn the meeting.

Strader: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:58 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

_____ MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON ATTEST:	_____ DATE APPROVED
--	------------------------

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK