

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:00 p.m. Tuesday, August 13, 2024, 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, Shawn Harper, Kris Blume and Dean Willis.

**ROLL-CALL ATTENDANCE**

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

Simison: Council, we will call this meeting to order. For the record it is August 13, 2024, at 6:00 p.m. We will begin tonight's Meridian 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 the invocation will be delivered by Nate Wheeler. Mr. Wheeler, if you want to go ahead and come forward and for those in the audience if you would like to join us in the community invocation please do so or take this as a moment of silence and reflection. Nate, nice to see you.

Wheeler: Nice to see you, too, Mayor, Council Members and, Mr. Parsons, good to see you here again. So, thank you very much for this opportunity. Let's pray. God, I want to thank you for this day. I want to thank you for this time. I want to thank you for these servants here in this town. I want to pray that you can continue to bless them and guide them and direct them and to continue to make our town and the community that people want to be in. Lord, thank you for the ways that they have been taking care, not only in the growth, but also in the safety. Continue to give them wisdom, continue to protect their families, give them insights, help them be able to foresee beyond their own. Be able to allow them to see the needs of this community in a deeper way and be able to

continue to build the city up in a way that makes a long-term commitment and an opportunity for people to want to come to for years to come in. In Jesus' name, amen.

## **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

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

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I see no changes to tonight's agenda, so I move we adopt the agenda as presented.

Strader: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to adopt the agenda. 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.

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

- 1. Approve Minutes of the July 16, 2024 City Council Work Session**
- 2. Approve Minutes of the July 23, 2024 City Council Work Session**
- 3. 425 Watertower Commercial Flex Water Main Easement (ESMT-2024-0100)**
- 4. Amity Rd. Storage Water Main Easement No. 2 (ESMT-2024-0104)**
- 5. Bank of America: Village at Meridian Partial Release of Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement (ESMT-2024-0102)**
- 6. Blue Horizon Flex Water Main Easement (ESMT-2024-0101)**
- 7. Franklin Industrial Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement No. 1 (ESMT-2024-0066)**
- 8. Franklin Industrial Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement No. 2 (ESMT-2024-0067)**
- 9. Matador Estates Subdivision Water Main Easement No. 1 (ESMT-2024-0094)**

10. **Oaks North Phase 12 Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement (ESMT-2024-0099)**
11. **Prescott Ridge Subdivision No. 3 Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement No. 1 (ESMT-2024-0095)**
12. **Sulamita Evangelical Church Sanitary Sewer and Water Main Easement (ESMT-2024-0103)**
13. **Final Plat for Lavender Place (FP-2024-0011), located at 2160 E. Lake Hazel Rd., approximately 1/4 mile east of S. Locust Grove on the north side of Lake Hazel Rd., by Breckon Land Design on behalf of LH Development, LLC.**
14. **Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law (corrected) for Pebblebrook Subdivision (H-2024-0005), located at 5725 N. Meridian Rd., by Rodney Evans + Partners, LLC.**
15. **Landscaping and Maintenance Agreement between the City of Meridian and Ten Mile Crossing Inc. (Brighton) for the I-84 and Ten Mile Road Interchange**
16. **Interagency Agreement between Ada County Highway District and the City of Meridian for Water and Sewer Construction/Roadway Construction - FY 22 - Residential Capital Maintenance**
17. **Interagency Agreement between Ada County Highway District and the City of Meridian for Water and Sewer Construction/Roadway Construction - Ustick - Black Cat to Ten Mile**
18. **School Resource Officer Agreement between City of Meridian and West Ada School District: 2024-2025 School Year**
19. **Agreement to approve acceptance of Hidden in Plain Sight Drug Awareness trailer donation for the Meridian Police Department and Meridian Anti-Drug Coalition**
20. **Development Agreement (Pebblebrook Subdivision H-2024-0005) Between City of Meridian and Te Amo Despacio, LLC for Property Located at 5725 N. Meridian Rd.**
21. **Resolution No. 24-2465: A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Meridian to Adopt 2025 Initial Point Gallery Schedule; and Providing an Effective Date**

- 22. Resolution No. 24-2467: A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Meridian Revising the Public Works Design Standards for the City of Meridian; and Providing an Effective Date**
- 23. Approval of Construction Contract and succeeding PO to Challenger Companies, Inc. for Well #17 and Well #25 - Construction of Water Blending Line (Phase 2) for the Not-To-Exceed amount of \$476,04**

Simison: Next item up is the Consent Agenda.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Move we approve the Consent Agenda as presented, for the Mayor to sign and the Clerk to attest.

Strader: Second.

Simison: I have a motion and a second to approve the Consent Agenda. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the Consent Agenda is agreed to.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

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

Simison: There were no items moved from the Consent Agenda.

#### **PUBLIC FORUM – Future Meeting Topics**

Simison: So, Mr. Clerk, did we have anyone signed up under public forum?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we did not.

#### **ACTION ITEMS**

- 24. Public Hearing for Luna Hospice (H-2024-0012) by CivilSphere Engineering, Located at 525 E. Overland Rd.**
  - A. Request: Annexation of 1.03 acres of land with a proposed R-8 zoning district.
  - B. Request: Conditional Use Permit to operate a nursing or residential care facility consisting of a 14-bed hospice facility.

Simison: Okay. Then with that we will move right into our Action Items for this evening. First item up is Item 24, which is a public hearing for Luna Hospice -- Hospice, H-2024-0012. We will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Parsons: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, first item on the agenda tonight is a request for annexation and conditional use permit for the Luna Hospice application. The site consists of 1.03 acres of land, currently zoned R-1 in Ada county and is located at 525 East Overland Road. Future land designation on this property is medium density residential. However, this project before you tonight is not -- is residential in nature. It is a nonresidential use on this site and as such in the Comprehensive Plan you are given the authority to allow a commercial or office use on this property, even though it has a residential designation on it. So, that's something that we have asked as part of the request tonight, the applicant's asked for the Council to grant that nonresidential use. So, the applicant is here again to annex in the property with the R-8 zoning district and because of the R-8 zoning the nursing care facility does require conditional use in that residential zoning district and they want to operate a 14 bed hospice care facility. So, in the UDC that is defined as a nursing or residential care facility. You can see here the differences in the site plan. So, when we were before Planning and Zoning Commission the applicant submitted the plan on the left-hand side of your screen labeled as previous site plan and since the Planning and Zoning Commission the applicant has revised that site plan based on the conversations that were held at -- based on the conditions in the staff report and conversations held at the Planning and Zoning Commission here. Access to this development is currently -- the only access to this site will be from Overland Road, which is an arterial roadway, and on the left-hand graphic here you can see the existing driveway approach, which is U-shaped. That will be replaced and per the recommendation of staff, Commission and ACHD the applicant has shifted their driveway location to the eastern most portion of the site, which allows access to this property -- one access to this property. So, we are consolidating accesses, which is consistent with the code, but it also sets up the adjacent properties to the east and the adjacent property to the west that are also in the county that may redevelop at some point in the future. So, we are getting that cross-access, which is also envisioned by the UDC. So, again, I think they -- compliment the applicant for making those changes, so that we can share those with you this evening. Go ahead and transition to the landscape plan here, so you can see how that would relate in -- in accordance to UDC standards. So, because this is an R-8 zoning district the applicant doesn't necessarily need to provide a landscape buffer to the surrounding residential uses, but you can see in this exhibit that they are proposing a 20 foot buffer along the southern boundary and the eastern boundary to provide that buffer, but as I mentioned in the hearing outline and in the staff report, on the west side of the site there is an existing garage that will remain and be part -- be used for storage for the proposed use and there is also a driveway that provides access to that. So, that's why you see a lesser buffer on that side as well. And, again, the Commission was comfortable with that and also in the staff report and in your hearing outline this evening. I would mention to the Council that the actual structure itself, the existing garage, does encroach within the -- within the R-8 setback if this property is annexed and zoned. So, typically, in an R-8 zone we require a five foot setback and you can see here in the graphic here may be encroaching about

a foot within that setback. Again, considered a nonconforming structure, which is allowed in our code, it just any future expansion would just -- any nonconforming structure would just have to meet the current setback standards for that addition, not necessarily remove the whole entire building. So, again, because it was being used as a storage, the Commission was comfortable with it remaining as a nonconforming structure on the site and I will also point out to the Council that the existing home, as well is far away -- is outside of the setback, so it's really just the detached structure, not any part of the structure or the addition. So, the existing home on the site is about 2,000 -- little over 2,000 square feet and, then, the applicant is also proposing as part of the condition of use to build on another 2,000 square feet, so that you are looking at over 4,000 square feet of structure on this property and, then, putting in the associated parking with that. So, all of that does meet UDC standards as well. Here is some sample elevations of the addition. Again, the applicant will have to come back once annexed, go through the certificate of zoning compliance process, design review process with the staff and we will make sure that the addition matches in with the surrounding properties and looks residential in nature. Planning and Zoning Commission did recommend approval at the June 20th hearing and, then, really any items of discussion -- discussed at the hearing, so -- and the only outstanding issue for the Council this evening is what we had hoped and -- hoped for was when we looked at the legal description for the annexation request there are certain requirements that the State Tax Commission requires and the documentation that was provided with the application didn't quite meet those standards, so we didn't want the applicant to get hung up at the Tax Commission if this is approved for annexation. We had hoped to get the revised documents before the City Council hearing and that did not happen. So, in tonight's -- tonight I'm asking you to add a condition to this project as part of the annexation comments that they get that exhibit to us prior to the city adopting the ordinance. We really need to get that buttoned up, so that if this moves forward and they get forward -- submitted to the Tax Commission for approval for annexation that they meet those requirements. So, I would ask that the Council add that to the -- to your motion this evening. I have had a chance to look at the public record. There is no public testimony on this application. So, again, should be pretty straightforward. Both the Planning and Zoning Commission and staff have recommended approval to you and I will conclude my presentation and stand for any questions you may have.

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

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Just a quick question, Bill. The -- on the revised landscape plan with that cross-access, is that like a -- going to be like a driveway or more like a -- kind of a road? What is that actually going to look like?

Parsons: Mayor, Members of the Council, yes, that will actually be black asphalt to provide the drive aisle to the parking and, then, also stubbed to the adjacent property for

a future cross-access and, then, along Overland is a 20 foot wide landscape buffer. Code requires 25 feet, but if they use water conserving design concepts they can reduce that buffer by half, but they have only elected to go down to 20 feet. So, their buffer will still meet UDC standards.

Simison: Council, an additional questions for staff? Would the applicant like to come forward?

Weber: Hi. I'm Carmen Weber -- I am Carmen Weber. I'm representing Weber Design Studio. I'm the landscape architect on the project.

Simison: Can you get closer to the mic, so we have our remote listeners hear.

Weber: So, I'm Carmen Weber. I'm representing Weber Design Studio. I'm the landscape architect on the project and Claire Smarda is the civil engineer. She couldn't be here today. She's with CivilSphere Engineering and --

Lieu: My name is Albert Lieu. I'm one of the co-owners of Luna Hospice. We currently have a hospice home in Nampa right now and trying to expand into Meridian. So, if you have any questions for me, please, let me know.

Simison: Council, any questions for the applicant?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thank you for being here tonight. I did have just a -- a quick question. This may be a little bit out of right field, but do you prohibit your employees to smoke at work? Are you a nonsmoke facility or --

Lieu: If -- on our agreement for the staff if they smoke it would be outside -- 20 feet to -- I think it was 25 feet away from the building.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Okay. So, that's -- at least that's where at least my hesitation is. We have got kind of residential use and I guess where I somewhat worry about is that, again, people make their own decisions about tobacco usage, but would want to be really sensitive about us not impacting the residential sides that are kind of a -- on both sides of you with having somebody who is using tobacco. So, I don't know where you have got the -- we have got the -- kind of the storage garage that's already outside the setback area. That's the part that I -- I kind of look at. That would be the natural maybe spot where somebody would be on a break, would hang out, and that puts it in pretty

close to the neighbors and so I don't know -- I don't think that's something you have considered. I just don't know what you guys think is the best remedy around that.

Lieu: I think we will look at the location. I think there will be like a smoking area and it would be away from any of the setback areas.

Cavener: Okay. We may talk about this a little bit more, but I appreciate your willingness to try and solve that, so thank you.

Lieu: No problem.

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

Weber: Thank you.

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

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, just Robert Sperry.

Simison: Robert Sperry. If you would like to come forward. Please come forward and if you would state your name and address the record, please.

Brody: Rodney Brody. 58 East Dominica Drive, Meridian Greens and we have an irrigation pipe under this and we are obligated to provide water to this and the house east of there and our pipe can't be covered up. We have to have access to it and if they want to move it they couldn't move it until after the irrigation season. But it's very difficult. We have a thrust block right under that neighborhood, so it has to -- the whole thing would have to be moved and I don't think there is room to move it back any further. We have a four inch pipe coming in at that lot. It is divided into two one inch pipes, but one is going to the other one and that first one and that lot gets one inch of water.

Simison: Okay. Council -- okay. All right. Thank you. Appreciate it.

Brody: Thank you.

Simison: Is there anybody else who would like to provide testimony on this application, either here in chambers or anybody online? If you are online you can use the Zoom function -- or use the raise your hand feature. Seeing no one coming forward or raising their hand, would you like the applicant to come up now to see if they can answer those questions? It doesn't sound like we have the subject matter expert from the applicant here that could answer that, unless they think they can. So, if the applicant would like to come forward to close and --

Weber: I couldn't quite hear him very clearly back there. Would you mind reiterating what he had mentioned in his comments, please?

Simison: He mentioned irrigation facilities that are located on the property and the challenges with what could or couldn't be done with them due to how they provide to neighboring properties.

Weber: Okay. Yeah. We have looked into it and we are working with the adjacent HOA that is contributing with the pressurized irrigation that's currently on site right now. We are aware of the different sizes of pipes on site and we plan to not exceed any of our rights that we are allowed. Additionally, we understand that construction has to happen within the irrigation -- like non-irrigated period of the year, so that we don't prevent irrigation for adjacent uses. So, we are planning on accommodating all neighbors and not disrupting any of their current water service.

Simison: Council, clarifying comments, questions?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: To kind of clarify, so is the current irrigation already underground?

Weber: Yes.

Taylor: And the previous testimony said that can't be covered. I'm not sure what that means. Does that mean by -- like black top? By a facility? I mean what -- what exactly are we talking about by the irrigation can't be covered?

Weber: Access to it. So -- so that would provide -- that would be like -- like a box, a gate that you could service it. So, wherever the connection points are it's not completely covered. So, for future maintenance you would be able to get in there and access it.

Lieu: So, actually, I think six or seven months ago somebody did come to dig out the main and replace it. So, where the main is we will not be building on top of that. That would still be the area that you see behind there. It -- it would be within the setback. So, the access -- which should not be an issue, since, you know, they already came and dug up and replaced the main.

Weber: Just for so everyone knows it runs along the south side of the property within that setback.

Lieu: Parallel to the fence.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I have a question for planning staff. Hi, Bill. Do we not usually receive like a letter from the irrigation district just kind of formalizing their review? Where are we at with that and how -- how would you expect this issue to be resolved? Would you expect this issue to be resolved before approving it. Help me understand what we would normally do with this.

Parsons: Certainly. I can certainly look in the public record and see if we received anything, but just for context of this conversation, Mayor, Council Woman Strader, it depends on the size of the facility. A lot of times Nampa-Meridian, Settler's Irrigation, the New York Canal Company, they -- they have a broader area they overlook, but they don't deal with all the individual lateral users associations. So, sometimes when you get to those small minute singular properties it's hard to identify which group controls what and that's why we appreciate a gentlemen like this coming and saying hey -- and it does throw -- it does throw a wrench in the conversation, because we don't expect that to occur. But if it was a larger facility, absolutely, we would have something from Nampa-Meridian that says provide a land use application change with us and go through the change. I think in this particular case it sounds like the facility's already built, the water rights are associated with this property, so it really is more of a private matter than a public matter, but there are state laws that tries to protect that for each individual. So, as long -- the positive thing that I heard about the conversation is that they are working with the HOA and as long as they don't build over it and they have a ways to maintain it and access it and there is an agreement to that effect and everyone agrees to it, I think staff is still comfortable with them moving forward with developing the site. But let me look at the public record and see if we got any official comments from any of the irrigation providers.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: For what it's worth, I'm generally supportive of the -- of the request. I do always worry whether certain -- to our planning staff's point, certain state laws that -- that direct you can't impede or get in the way of the flow of water from a previous water right. I would feel more comfortable in voting in approval once that -- those T's have been crossed and the I's have been dotted on that particular piece. While this would eventually become a civil matter, I wouldn't want to necessarily have a Council action that, then, has to, then, result in a civil disagreement between a homeowners association and a property owner. So, I was trying to see if I could get our packet opened up tonight, so I'm hoping that our planning staff may have much more magical approach at getting that and we can get some of these things, just so that I have got good confidence for our existing residents that they are going to be able to have what they need, you guys are going to be able to go forth and develop your property the way that you want and this is nothing that everyone ever has to worry about down the road.

Parsons: So, Mayor, Members of the Council, it sounds like our laserfiche system is having some issues this evening, but Chris was able to pick -- pull up the letter. We did

get some from Nampa-Meridian. It's their typical comment. So, nothing to this granular level of what's occurring on the site to give us any insight what's happening there. So, again, it seems like it's more of them working something out and determining a path forward.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Bill, to that point, again, I know sometimes we get in the weeds on these little things and we kind of have the -- we make them maybe larger than they need to be, but I guess from -- from planning staff's perspective if Council is supportive of the annexation with a condition that occupancy is not granted until any of the water issues have been resolved, that's something planning is supportive of or do you have a better mechanism, so that our homeowners association representative feels like, hey, they have got good confidence that their water is not going to be impeded. The applicant has great confidence that they go on and develop their project and it isn't something that we have to worry about.

Parsons: Mayor, Members of the Council, I think that's -- that's a great solution. Let's come up with a condition and say provide us written documentation that it's been satisfied and everyone agrees to it and maintain it and we can hold them up at occupancy or even building permits, whatever -- whatever level you want to do that is -- there is -- there is many steps to go still before they get under construction, but it's certainly within your purview to do that with a conditional use permit or even the annexation.

Simison: Council, any additional questions, comments?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Back to -- I know it's kind of a weird thing that -- a no smoking within 20 feet on the barrier -- I mean it sounds like you are going to kind of voluntarily impart on yourselves. I don't know if that would be something I would be comfortable setting as a condition for annexation. I think it would be hard for us to enforce. It just -- I think it's in line with what I think your business model is about is being a good neighbor. I think this compliments the area. I just want to make sure we are doing all of our part to not impact both your -- the residents that are going to be staying there that are going through their own health challenges, as well as the existing.

Simison: Any additional questions? All right. Thank you very much.

Weber: Thank you.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I move that we close the public hearing on Item No. 24, H-2024-0012.

Strader: 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: I think this is a fairly straight forward application. There is some unique nuances, but I -- I want to make sure that at least I'm -- I'm prepared to make a motion, unless there is any deliberation that I'm seeing from anybody, but, Mr. Mayor, I move that we approve Item No. 24, application H-2024-0012 for a request for annexation and a condition use permit with two conditions. One is that planning staff be provided documentation from the Idaho Tax Commission prior to being -- issuing building permits. That -- Mr. Mayor, sorry, looking for direction on anything I forgot.

Parsons: Mayor and Council, that's part of the ordinance adoption, because it has to be part of the ordinance.

Cavener: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, I will revise my -- my motion that conditions that the applicant provide the exhibits from the Tax Commission prior to ordinance issuance and a second condition that they will provide a satisfactory letter of acceptance from the Meridian Greens Homeowner's Association about the usage of irrigation water to meet the needs of the homeowner's association.

Taylor: Second.

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

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Maybe I didn't catch it, but was the letter of acceptance from the HOA prior to any particular milestone?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor -- thank you, Council Member Strader. I think prior to issuance of occupancy.

Simison: Second agree?

Taylor: Agree.

Simison: Okay. Is there further discussion, clarification?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I guess a question -- kind of a question for planning staff. I don't know what's causing that, but -- so, we could set prior building permits or occupancy would be a good milestone for that. If there was conflict about this or an issue that could take some time, right, to play out. Is there a milestone that you would think would make sense that would be sooner than that? Just my -- maybe what I'm worried about something that is kind of farfetched, but let's say that there is disagreement between the homeowners association and the owner of this property and they start building something and they were to cover up somehow the irrigation facilities or impact it in some way, how would that get resolved sooner? Because I -- I would hate to have that go on all the way up until building permits at the end of the process; right?

Parsons: Madam Mayor, Members of the Council, Council Woman Strader, certainly as I mentioned step one is to get annexed and that's going to take -- you know, there is going to be a development agreement, let's get the ordinance done, that's going to be several weeks down the road. We are nearing the end of the irrigation season, so we know that's going to end in October, so once annexation occurs they still have to come back for a certificate of zoning compliance and design review. So, again, your staff -- staff's stop gap can be prior to CZC submittal. You provide it. Or it can be prior to building permit. You provide it. Because, then, they are not getting permitted to go vertical on construction until we have that issue resolved. So, if we get to occupancy and all of a sudden they are wanting to open the doors and this has not been resolved, it's going to look bad for the city to hold up them opening when it's -- it is a needed -- it's a need in the community and I don't want to put that burden on the applicant. So, that's why I said you have many different points in the -- in the process where you can do that. Now, if you do it prior to -- with CZC submittal, then, again, that kind of delays them from getting to building permit and getting under construction. So, there is -- there is consequences of each phase for them, but if it's -- I'm -- I'm not hearing from the settlement that it seems like it's -- it's a difficult conversation to have. I didn't get that impression, but just wanted you to be aware that they need access to that and that there is some things they should be aware of as they approach development on the site that they have to maintain during this --

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Maybe just at least to kind of speak to kind of where I was headed on that is I don't -- I don't foresee this as being an issue, but I think it's a -- it's a pretty good carrot to say, hey, you can't actually start -- get inside your building and doing the things that you want to do until this issue is resolved, but it gives the applicant a lot of flexibility and time to slow the project down so they can be working on this in parallel with all the other elements of their project, because I think the neighbors good assurances, hey, they are not going to start operating their facility until this issue has been resolved.

Parsons: Mayor and Council, they may have to upgrade the system in order to irrigate their site, too. So, it is going to take coordination and collaboration with everybody to make sure that they can irrigate their site as well.

Strader: Thank you.

Simison: We good? That's what I'm trying to figure out, if we are --

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. My only hesitation or concern was I just would have been more comfortable with an earlier milestone, so that we would have known that this is sort of resolved and not -- it seems like a very remote risk, end up in a place where something's been built over the existing pipes and, then, we have to provide a waiver or the neighbors have somehow been impacted, but, then, we can't take action. So, I would feel more comfortable if it was prior to the CZC. I'm not sure it rises to the level of me voting against it, but that's kind of where I was coming from.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I would agree with Council Woman Strader's decision. If we can -- you chose to change the motion to an earlier point in this process, instead of at the very end.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: That's why I love our team. I'm going to withdraw the motion and present a new motion, if the second --

Simison: Have a request to withdraw, with the second agreeing, I don't know in my world if that requires a unanimous consent agreement. Think it does, but we won't go

there in this case. I'm going back to my parliamentary days. I'm pretty sure it does, but we will call it good. Go ahead, Mr. Cavener.

Cavener: There is -- we need some government students here tonight to watch this play out. Mr. Mayor, new motion. I move that we approve Item 24, Luna Hospice, H-2024-0012 that is the annexation and the CUP with the following conditions: That the applicant provide the exhibits from the Idaho Tax Commission prior to ordinance issuance and that the applicant also provide a letter of acceptance and support from the homeowners association -- the Meridian Greens Homeowners Association as it pertains to the pressurized irrigation prior to issuance of CZC.

Little Roberts: Second.

Strader: Second.

Simison: Got a motion and a second to approve Item H-2024-0012. Is there any discussion on the motion? If not, Clerk will 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 and good luck.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

**25. Public Hearing for UDC Text Amendment 2024 (ZOA-2024-0001) by City of Meridian Planning Division**

- A. Request: Text Amendment to amend certain regulations and add new definitions, uses, figures and specific use standards throughout Chapters 1-5 of the City's Unified Development Code (UDC).

Simison: All right. Next item up is Item 25, a public hearing for UDC Text Amendments 2024, ZOA-2024-0001. We will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Parsons: Thank you, Mayor, Members of the Council. Main event for the night -- for this evening. UDC Text Amendment. So, interesting, I looked at the -- when I was in front of you last year at this -- and I just realized it was about a year ago from last year that I was in front of you talking about code amendments and it's interesting how you kick off these meetings, you meet with the UDC focus group and, then, things kind of morph and you end up with more changes than you planned on bringing forward. So, I know we have a new Council and some new Council Members and some of them haven't been here through some -- some recent code updates. So, I at least want to give you some background in how -- what we do and how we get here and how we vet this information, so you understand that it's not done in a vacuum, we are not sitting in a

room just talking with staff, it is -- it is meant to be a transparent and open process. So, back in about 2014, 2015 the Council at the time directed staff to form what was called the UDC focus group and it's made up of design professionals, various city staff. I have heard from last UDC focus -- last time I was in front of you Council wanted me to have some citizen representation and I have made that happen as well. So, we have broadened our group a little bit, although we have shrunk, we still have some new individuals as well, but, again, I -- about every six months I go ahead and we keep track of some code changes and, then, as we develop these changes and draft some proposed language. I go ahead and send out a meeting invite to this focus group and we have a series of meetings and we sit down and discuss what we want on the docket. We also open it up to the group for them to provide any -- share any changes they would like to see. So, it's not only staff initiated, but we also encourage them to bring things forward and also we meet with all of you, Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council, and we are like are there things that you want us to look at in the upcoming year? So, it's kind of a hodgepodge. It's well thought -- I think it's a well oiled machine. We have been doing it for, like I said, several years now and I think it's important, because, again, when we are changing code it's serious, it's not -- it's not just one piece of property we are affecting, we are affecting the entire city when we make these changes. So, I know city staff takes it very serious and I know the stakeholders do, too. And so anytime that we are in front of you proposing these changes I want the Council to feel confident that we have vetted these things, we have looked at these things and although we may not always get consensus on things, again, it's city staff's job to really make sure that we are looking out for the best interest of the citizens and the city. So, keeping that in context, what I typically do is we meet with the group, we vet these in, we make changes, we circulate these changes to the focus group and, then, it comes back and, then, I schedule it for hearing. So, this particular project was in front of the Planning and Zoning Commission on June 20. So, it has been in play for quite some time and so, again, I looked at the public record this evening, no public comment on this application, which is interesting, because usually we do get some citizens that -- that do want to participate and give you feedback on it. So, I look at that as a positive thing. I think whenever I come forward with changes and I don't see anyone commenting, I think we probably got it right or close to it, but like anything codes can change and I'm here looking for feedback from the Council and also anyone that's participating in tonight's hearing. So, like anything, when we come with code changes, again, we kind of give you what -- what section of code we are changing and the reason for the change and we put that in a table format. So, this doesn't have to be a formal meeting. Please feel free to chime in on any questions, any part of the code. I'm not going to go through all the changes on this particular graphic. There is just too many to go through tonight. But I do want to highlight a few things and that's what we try to do, we try to highlight the bigger things or any new code changes that we are bringing forward to you. So, I will go -- with that I will go ahead and get -- get right into tonight's presentation and share some of the heavy changes or at least some of the heavy lifts this year that I think should be some new additions to the City of Meridian and, again, a lot of it is based from either our stakeholders, you, as public officials or even just business owners that want to establish a certain business, but maybe the code doesn't align with what they want to do. So, really, a couple new ones for you to look at on this

first page. A really definition section. So, I don't know -- Council's aware of this, but a lot of times parking always is an issue for the City of Meridian. We are very proud of that, our parking ratios, and so as you know as homes become -- increasingly get more and more expensive, it's harder to make them more and more attainable for people and so some -- what we are -- a lot of times what we are seeing from home builders is they are coming in with a two bedroom home with maybe an office or a flex space and -- but in our code we don't necessarily have a definition of a bedroom, so we can't -- we can't determine whether or not it's a three bedroom home or two bedroom home or it's left to interpretation and so, again, we have the home builder saying it's two bedroom, we should only have to provide two parking spaces per your code and, then, we have staff saying we see it as a three bedroom, you need to provide four parking spaces. So, what we have tried to do here is add a definition of a bedroom in our code, so that we can reinforce what that is and so, then, when we are looking at home plans we can be supported by the code and also be supported -- supporting our representatives -- our team members in the building department. So, it's a little bit dicey here, but, again, this is something -- this is consistent with the definition in the building code, so it -- we are adding that to our zoning code.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Just a question. I think it's probably covered already in like the building code or the fire code, but I saw the one means of egress. I just wanted to make sure that somewhere else we are independently requiring like a window or something for someone to escape if there is a fire.

Parsons: Yes.

Strader: Or a bedroom --

Parsons: That's what that is. Yes. They have to have a certain bedroom -- an egress into the room. So, it would be a certain size window to get in and out. Correct.

Strader: Uh-huh. Okay. So, maybe just a general comment. I looked through the changes. I'm kind of still digesting them. I was hoping we would hear feedback from members of the public, but, you are right, I mean sometimes it's a good sign if we don't, Maybe we will hear some tonight. I did kind of just want to add maybe a potential issue that could be a future code change to this list. I don't know when it would be the right time to discuss it, but it came to my attention that there is kind of a gap in allowing home occupation accessory uses when it comes to pools. So, we have had some cases come up -- I don't want to get into any particular cases, but we have had it -- maybe just -- I will talk about it generally without singling anyone out, but we have had a person who is operating a neighborhood pool who has been teaching swimming lessons for decades and there was a code enforcement issue around that and that could not be resolved and that person might have to close their business. I grew up taking, you

know, neighborhood swimming lessons. I think a lot of kids do. It's very valuable for the community. So, I was kind of hoping maybe staff could take a look at that and try to come up with some solutions around that, you know, similar to how we look at daycares; right? Daycares can be approved by the Council as a permitted use after a public hearing and hearing from everybody. So, I just felt like maybe we could do something around residential pools if they are providing seasonal, you know, swimming lessons.

Parsons: Mayor, Council, Council Woman Strader, I think that's a valid point. I will get through my changes and, then, that way at the end of the conversation maybe we can have that and see if there is anything else that the Council wants us to investigate or look at as we transition through the hearing tonight and, then, I will make that list. But, yeah, typically if you give me that feedback, then, I go ahead and update our list so that when we kick off the next round of changes we can vet that through the UDC focus group and add that as one of those items that we can discuss, so -- we always have a running tab of code changes going. I wish there wasn't --

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Parsons: -- I wish it would end at some point, but, unfortunately, it never does. I'm always here every year talking with you about -- yeah, it's -- it's job security for sure.

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. When it comes to -- to that one specifically, because it -- to me the UDC focus group is helpful in the sense that we have building professionals, we have citizens that are concerned. I think it's good that they are vetting things like this specific instance I'm not sure it would need to go through the UDC focus group. I would just hate for us to lose one or more Meridian businesses, you know, that have been operating successfully while we have the machinery of government take like another six months or a year. It would be great if we could look at that sooner just from my perspective. But, I'm sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt your discussion.

Parsons: I'm aware of the issue and I thank you for bringing it up.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: On the definition of a bedroom, curious how closet is defined and curious why that kind of really matters and I'm just thinking I have a -- walk into my house on the right-hand side I have a room that's very much a bedroom. It doesn't have a closet. I don't use it as a bedroom. It's my wife's -- it's our music room. We have pianos and bunch of music instruments, but it could certainly be a bedroom. So, what is our current definition of a bedroom? Or maybe we don't have one, but I want to know like why we would insist on a closet as defined by International Residential Code. If you could just give me some more background on that.

Parsons: Mayor, Council, so we don't -- the zoning ordinance does not have a definition of a bedroom. This definition aligns with the International Residential Code. So, this is the definition that we worked and took right out of code and the reason why the closet is important is because, again, if a home builder is coming to the city and they want to call it a flex space, but they show these items, are they really going to convert it to a bedroom later and, then, all of a sudden we have a parking issue and, then, someone's going to come to us and say, hey, I bought a three bedroom home and we are going to be like, no, we stamped your plans as a two bedroom home and we don't recognize it as a three bedroom home and we can't approve you as a three bedroom home, because you -- you were -- your builder or your home plan showed this as an office. So, that's why we have to be very specific and the closet is what kind of signifies that that's what you are going to use it for. I have the same -- I have a -- an office in my home, but I did not put a closet in it, I built a desk inside the cubby area where the closet would have been, but I could definitely take that out and convert it back to a closet very easily. There is -- I can't -- you can't create a code to solve all of those issues, but what we can do is try to stop it at the very end and try to make it clear that if this is how you have it, then, remove that from your plan and we can approve you as a two -- two bedroom home versus a three bedroom. That's what we are trying to do with this code change.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor, a quick follow up.

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: And I don't have any concern with that. I mean my brother and I just bought a home recently and they advertised sort of a landing space that it was a big -- and it was a hallway, so I get it. That said, I would be -- you know, maybe you don't have the answer for this now. I would be kind of curious to know has that been a big problem in the city as a building -- or a room that says it's a bedroom, it's not, you know, parking, how we have approved that, I would be kind of curious to know if that's -- what kind of an issue that has been. It would seem to me -- and maybe this is more about parking. So, correct me if I'm wrong, but it would seem to me that if someone is advertising a home as having four bedrooms, but really it's three bedrooms with an office space, that's a consumer protection type of issue if you are fraudulently advertising when you are selling a home what it might be. So, I'm wondering -- I think I understand and probably generally agree on being specific here, but I -- I'm having a hard time connecting -- connecting the dots on why it's needed and maybe I would like to hear from the development community, too, on -- on some of that, but I'm just kind of -- this is an exercise, it's the first time I'm engaging with and I'm kind of wondering out loud some of these questions. It just seems strange and I would also like to know why would we -- you know, I'm not familiar with the International Residential Code. Is that something that we use regularly or -- if that's the case that's -- I didn't know that, but -- so, just kind of wondering out loud -- thinking out loud here.

Simison: And, Bill, I'm going to pile on top of this one, because it's -- it is unique in this context, because by eliminating our minimum size home standards, which I think is a

good move, I'm going to go build a 450 square foot tiny home on a piece of property and I have zero bedrooms that qualify, because -- I mean I just look at tiny homes, they don't have 70 square feet of bedroom space that would be defined in our code. So, could they build that home? Can they not build that home? What do you do for parking in a space that doesn't have a defined bedroom, but you know you are going to have people sleeping in a space which is not a defined space. Throwing that out there for additional -- since we are talking -- since this is about a parking issue --

Parsons: It's not necessarily about parking. It's about defining a bedroom. Because, again, in the code we have a definition of a dwelling and it says you have to have sanitation and a place for sleeping, sanitation and living. So, that's what we are going to lean on. Whether they show a one bedroom or studio, we are still going to say you need to do something and we are going to lean on the one bedroom and you are going to do a one-car garage and a parking pad, which is probably going to be bigger than the home, which seems to be counter protective, but as a city that's where we landed on our parking. We would like a lot of parking and until we are willing to say, you know what, let the community dictate the parking -- or the developer do that or let the market drive the parking, we just have high parking ratios in our city and that's the reality and that's why I'm here every year talking to you about parking. But in this particular case, going back to your point, Council Member, is we are starting to get more and more of this and my staff has been coming to me saying I need help, what do I do in these situations, and I'm like you stamp their plan approved as two bedroom. You verify that their application says two bedroom and when you are done approving it that you have approved it for a two bedroom. That's all you can do. You can't predict what's -- how it's going to be used in the future. That's not our role. Our role is does it meet the code and if it does we need to sign the permit and approve it. That's -- that's what our job is.

Simison: So, does any -- any dwelling that doesn't have a defined bedroom qualify just only as a studio then? So, if you don't have a -- anything that is defined under here, is a studio your default --

Parsons: Mayor and Council, the only place we define a studio is in our multi-family. We don't have a home -- a single family dwelling -- detached dwelling that's defined as a studio. We do define tiny homes and it's a tiny home on a foundation, so it would be in our new permit and as soon as it gets routed to us, regardless of the size, we are going to analyze it and see if it meets the setbacks, the parking requirements, whatever it may be based on their floor plan and what they are submitting for. They have to tell us that as part of the application submittal. So, I imagine they are going to have a bedroom or sleep -- an area to sleep in. But I don't even think there is an option to say a studio for it, but if it's an accessory dwelling unit, a secondary dwelling unit, then, again, we are going to access the parking based on the bedroom of the addition of the either one bedroom dwelling unit or the parking of the single family home that's currently built on the -- on the site. So, you are -- I see your point there. It does kind of get convoluted a little bit. But, again, it's -- it's not trying to combat an issue, it's just trying to say, hey, we have a code that says this is a bedroom and you need to change your plan. That's all it is. But it does somewhat go back to parking. We just want to make sure that whatever

we are approving is what they are proposing. If it's a two bedroom home, then, we are just verifying that it meets the standards or parking standards for a two bedroom home or the setbacks or anything else that we would -- because we look at parking pads, too. So, there is a whole mix of things that we look at, it's not just parking. It's setback. Making sure the driveways are wide enough. The setbacks are right. It's deep enough to fit a car. So, it's more than just that. But, again, it's just giving us more code to say we think you are this and we can't approve your permit, unless they prove otherwise or modify their plans.

Simison: Bill, you want to go through this actually?

Parsons: Eventually, yes. So, the next two definitions are really something that -- I know historically this hasn't been too open to, but just opening up to allow food trucks and food truck courts as an allowed use -- a permanent use in this the city of Meridian. This has come up quite a few -- the last couple years we have been seeing more and more of this and I'm sure Council has probably seen more and more food -- food trucks in our communities as well. So, I thought it was time for us to address that. We meant to do it last year and just couldn't get to it, because of the number of changes, but, again, this is the definition that we have come up with and this will align with other sections of code as we transition through the various pages. So, I won't spend a lot of time on this, but what I wanted to make clear to the Council tonight is that a permanent use is completely different than a food truck approved under a temporary use. It's going to be -- it's almost like what we did last year when we did vertically integrated live-work units and home occupations. There is a tiered approach to getting you to what a temporary use is. You need to meet this threshold. If you want to just be a food truck on a permanent site you have to be accessory to a primary business and if you want a food truck court, then, you are developing a site and you are creating the utilities for that and building structures and creating an ambience, if you will, like you see in the larger cities with the -- a shared structure, restroom facilities, maybe out -- outdoor seating area, some parking to go with it. So, again, there is going to be some improvements required with that, but I will put a pin in that topic until we get to the specific use standards, but at least just want to set the foundation for that, so you understand why we added a definition section here and we have worked closely with Emily in legal to make sure that our definition of a food truck aligns with the temporary use standard so there is no conflict or discrepancy between the two codes. We want them to align for sure. So, you can see here another odd change in this particular -- this first page is the Table 282 where we allow manufactured homes. So, there is a state code that requires cities to allow those on residential lots if they can meet all the other residential standards. So, we have a conflict in our code with state code. So, we got to -- it's a clean-up item. We have to -- we have to make sure that we can allow that as part of our community and, then, as -- as the Mayor mentioned, here is the one where we are removing the minimum home sizes from our R-2 and R-4 districts to help with some of that -- some of the conversations Caleb was having with our Housing Task Force. This is kind of step one and, then, there will be other changes probably next year to massage that and allow -- particularly our AUP standards or temporary -- or, essentially, ADU standards. We are going to change that to mimic that, make it a little easier for folks as

well. These next couple of changes, again, go back to us allowing food truck court and food truck, so, again, you can see here that we are allowing food trucks in all of our commercial districts as allowed uses and, then, food trucks would be an accessory. So, example, I think everyone's aware of Loose Screw Brewery coming into downtown. So, their site plan when they came through the city for their conditional use permit showed a food truck out on one of -- a parking pad in front of their business. Well, the TUP allows them to do that, but it doesn't allow it to remain permanently. So, the food truck would have to come and go and, then, leave at the end of the night. Well, under this scenario if they were to do a CZC they could have a food truck there permanent, because they have a dedicated space, but it would need to be, you know, a nice food truck, integrate with the building and all those things. So, again, I don't want to get in too much into it, because I will later on, but that's kind of the difference here is you can have one food truck, but not multiple. If you have more than one, then, you are a food truck court and you need to do other things. So, again, we are also allowing that in our downtown, our traditional neighborhood districts as well. So, some of the feedback that I have -- I have heard from -- throughout the years. Next item on this list is -- again I try not to bring up parking too much, but recently it came to my attention that industry standards for carports is nine by 18 for a multi-family development and our parking standards are nine by 19, so -- and if they want to increase the size of a carport it's extra money, extra engineering and, really, the intent of the code is to have covered parking, not necessarily meaning -- and it covers the majority of the parking anyway. So, I thought it was best that we clean up code, so we don't have any more discrepancies out there with all the multi-family we have added over the recent years. Next item is -- one is a challenging topic. It's -- it's one that came to me from one of our stakeholders, one of our developers that we work closely with. They have some property that's adjacent to state highways and they said, hey, what do we do when we -- when our -- when our overpass is taller than our -- higher than our property and how do we mitigate for noise moving forward and it's like that's a good point. We -- we don't think about that and in our code I think the Council is aware that we do have alternative compliance to allow for these situations. It's difficult to write code for every situation you are going to run into, but that's why we -- we created alternative compliance to help with that. The other thing that came out of it and not necessarily with the focus group, but more internal with staff is just air quality issues. I think a lot of us understand that when you are adjacent to roadways you are adjacent to high congested traffic areas, particularly Ten Mile now with Ten Mile having a lot of traffic congestion and longer wait times at stop lights. Do we want that -- do we want that type of residential next to these facilities or what standard do we need to get in place to make sure that we combat the air pollution as those residents live next to those types of facilities? It is a philosophical issue. It's hard to fix that with code and I'm respectful of that, but there is -- there are ways and I have done a lot of research on that topic. So, when this topic was approached and we brought it up with the UDC focus group, I think staff's opinion was the easiest way we can handle it was through the tools that we already have, which is alternative compliance. All right. We understand we can't meet full compliance, but there has to be other ways to do it and so that's where staff came up with this particular sentence. When it's not feasible, then, let's do alternative compliance and, then, there is other ways to do that. So, you can either have deeper setbacks, have bigger buffers, have

roads adjacent to the highway, so you have greater separation. You can design the building with better AC or ventilation systems to filter the air. There is -- there is more -- you can add more landscaping. There is ways to mitigate that based on a lot of the research that I did and so in order -- in order to kind of inspire people to come up with the alternative compliance process, we also provided some graphics to go along with that to help -- just these aren't thou shalt. They are really examples. They are meant to -- hey, these are ways you can achieve mitigation if you have that situation. Planning and Zoning Commission did support that -- that approach. I know in discussions with Laren -- he is in the audience and the group, it's -- they would like more expressed standards. I don't know how to -- I don't know how to do that. I -- if I were to -- in a perfect role I would say -- I would look at McDermott Village, that apartment complex that you did off -- right next to the interchange. Ustick interchange. They actually had the landscape buffer, a road, another landscape buffer and, then, the multi-family. So, they had that separation from the freeway and I know that takes up a lot of real estate and that takes -- that costs developers money and I realize that. But if you were to ask staff to come up with those explicit standards like that, that would be the example that I would look at. I would say orient your open space and your roadway and don't put buildable lots right up against the interchange, pull it back and create that buffer zone, so you don't have that situation. But we know that isn't always the right solution in a perfect world and I recognize that and that's why these graphics that you see here are ways to -- to spur that conversation with that and I realize that sometimes the development community or our applicants get gun shy to come forward with alternative compliance, because sometimes when there is a contested project and there is an alternative compliance it seems misleading to the public that they are trying to get out of something. That alternative compliance is a variance to get out of code compliance. Yes, it is a staff level variance. But, again, it's -- it's a means to do something equal to or better than. It's not a means to get out of code. So, again, I will let you kind of digest that or open up with questions. But, again, this wasn't meant to be -- add anything more difficult to code, it was actually to make it easier or at least allow us to combat that issue and have that discussion and have the -- and try to understand what that may be. Again, alternative compliance is a case-by-case basis and I know if I -- Council drives down Chinden Boulevard, I know if you have seen what happened to some of those subdivisions with the lighting in that road, that's what we are trying to prevent here. This is an entryway corridor and we have to make sure that it's heavily scrutinized. We want a certain amount of landscaping there. We want beautification of our streets in our city and that's the intent and we want to make sure that we don't contribute to that moving forward. But, again, open to having some -- fielding some questions at least on this topic, because I know it's -- it is a big deal and, again, if Council feels like we need to look at this more or vet it more, please, feel free to say pull it off and we can look at it and study it even more and bring it back at a later date. But just at least want to have that conversation with -- tonight, at least get feedback on how you -- how the Council feels on this particular topic.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I'm just curious about if you -- if you looked at it through the lens of like a public health standpoint and I think one of the biggest issues being next to a roadway, like particulate matter, especially for young children it's really bad if they are breathing in a lot of that stuff. Has any other city tackled it from more of a public health perspective and found a recommendation from -- from that viewpoint? I'm just curious. I -- I have never really thought about this in depth.

Parsons: I know it is eye opening and it's -- I have read studies and that's why I wanted to get these examples in the UDC, because, again, it's -- it's one to mitigate noise, but it's also, two, the denser landscaping and the -- the -- that is what's going to purify the air. It's going to help with that and it's -- the studies that I read have shown that, but, like I said, it's like -- is that where Meridian wants to go at this time, because we are taking it from a public health safety issue, because we know there is particulate and the tires are kicking up dust, it is -- it's a proven fact. There is a lot of science on it and I'm not an expert on it by any means and I -- I got overwhelmed researching it, to be honest with you, because there is so much data on it -- even from the highway -- the Federal Highway Administration has pamphlets and all kinds of things -- all kinds of studies and you are right, we lean on ITD to do these studies and try to -- and make sure they are looking out for us, but they are in the business of moving cars. They are not in the business of beautifying roadways. All they are going to do is -- if the Fed say with this type of facility you got to put up a block wall or you got to -- or mitigate it this way, it's -- and they can do it many different ways, too. There is not one -- one size fits all. But in my mind when I had seen -- so, the other thing for the Council to consider is when we also approved those residential developments by Owyhee High School, the developer also -- the Council actually required a higher berm and a taller wall. So, it was a 12 foot berm wall combination there, with some dense landscaping.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Parsons: So, again, just want to at least give you that context and that.

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Bill, just a quick question on the alternative compliance. So, if I were to understand it correctly, what we currently have alternative compliances and is -- when -- essentially when they can't comply with what we are asking because of -- for various reasons, so we allow them to come up with a way to comply. We are not giving them some guidance? That's currently it; right? That would be how you would describe it? And you are suggesting here is some examples -- not that we want to say how you have to do it, because trying to understand if we are going to allow them to propose alternative compliance, is it just wide open currently -- the current system, is it just wide open to say you give us your plan and what you are suggesting here is here is some guidance, but we are still not being overly prescriptive about how to meet that. Am my understanding and following that correctly?

Parsons: Mayor and Council, somewhat. I mean the piece that you are missing here is the alternative compliance section of code and it says -- kind of the purpose of it and the

findings you have to make for alternative compliance. So, it's not you bring us your proposal and you are good, it's like you said, it's do you meet this criteria to even apply for it, which in this particular case I think it's understandable how you mitigate noise. When it's -- the roadway is higher than your buildable lots. You are not going to mitigate noise, other than -- or there is some -- you are never going to mitigate one hundred percent of it. You are going to manage the noise in this particular situation. But alternative compliance, yes, we meet with the applicants during a pre-application meeting and we say, hey, here is some suggestions you can do, but, you are right, this code is not prescriptive and nor do I want it to be, because, again, you have to look at it on a case-by-case basis on what is the best interest of the city. Does this work? Does it meet the findings where we can support that or not? So, to me if we can give people examples, like you -- like just like when we were in front of you with the staff report, it's like give me more pictures, give me more graphics, give me it bulletized, because I can understand that easier than paragraph -- paragraph of technical review. No one in this room wants to get -- can understand what that means. It's -- so, we have to try to explain it to you in layman's terms and even the public and that's what we are trying to do here. It's like do this or attempt this or look at a combination of these things and, then, propose something and we will let you know if we like it or not.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Following up on what Councilman Taylor was saying -- Bill, on several of these things I'm assuming what -- what I'm interested in is when we see that application come before us, are we saying, then, that the applicant is requesting alternative compliance and this is why? So, what we are giving them is a window of how to do alternative compliance, but we are still going to see that as a request from the applicant on these different projects coming in for us.

Parsons: Yeah. Mayor, Members of the Council, absolutely. Yeah. There -- we always -- you know, even though it may be a director's decision, we still like to note it on the agenda, so the public is aware of what -- what's coming before you and we have -- I even have staff say this is a director decision, so try to avoid some of that confusion that we have heard over the years with the alternative compliance request. Well, we have recently last year or last round or the previous round, if you recall, certain alternative requirements -- compliance requests that are concurrent with their CUP. It becomes a Commission's decision. Or if it has an MDA, then, it becomes the CUP, the MDA and the alternative compliance comes to you guys for review and approval. So, you become the decision making body. So, we have even added that extra level of review, just to make sure that people don't misunderstand what it is or that it's somebody trying to get out of code, because that's the last thing that we want to do.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: So, Bill, when you were creating these examples for alternative compliance was that based on the studies you read and you felt like this amount of landscaping or berms or whatever accomplished certain things? I'm kind of curious what the principles were that you used.

Strader: And, actually you know what, I don't want to take too much time. I would be totally fine after this meeting if you wanted to send me a lot of that information, just so I could kind of understand. It's a very fascinating topic and, to be honest, I have not thought that much about it. I did like that example project that you mentioned, though. I felt like it struck the right balance, but it was a bit heavy handed frankly. But it maybe needed to be I think because the dynamic of being right next to the -- right next to the highway, so --

Parsons: So, Council Woman Strader, there is no scientific method to these graphics here.

Strader: Okay.

Parsons: It's what's currently -- it's taking what code requires and, then, showing you how you can work within that. So, it's, essentially, along a corridor -- or along a state highway we require a 35 foot landscape buffer. So, this is showing you that you could do it with a 35 foot buffer. This way you could do it with a 45 foot buffer. But, really, the only code minimum is the ten foot berm and wall combination and a 35 foot landscape buffer. And, then, the entryway corridor requirements are in the landscape ordinance.

Strader: Okay.

Parsons: So, again, in this situation when we -- when you try to mitigate noise and even air quality, those standards may not be good enough to do that, so --

Strader: Okay.

[  
Parsons: -- that's what I said, it's just done -- all I can tell you is all the scientific studies that I read it says the more landscaping it ends up better. It protects the noise and you clean the air better and it gives you certain separations for that, how to achieve that. But, no, we have not gone to that level here to do that, but I'm certainly happy to send you the information that I researched, along with some of these schematics, you know, so you can blow them up on your screen and kind of read the text a little bit more. But a lot of places will have backage roads or frontage roads, whatever you call them, and, then, separate the homes from state or the freeway or --

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. Well, that's very helpful if you could. And I think just every time we have ever done code changes it is kind of an iterative process, like I think we have always

found that sort of rushing through code changes never works out and so I personally would need time to sort of digest -- digest these, kind of ask some more questions to hopefully solicit feedback from, you know, more Meridian residents. Get their feedback. I think it's great, though. It's off to a great start. I think it's creative how you tried to show some examples. The food truck thing clearly was a blind spot that we needed to come up with a solution for, so I think that's awesome.

Parsons: All right. Perfect. Well, let's get to those standards and, then, we can get to some more deliberations here. So, I won't go over this next one. It's just a clean-up item. This is an interesting one for the Council is our drive throughs. I think with the pandemic -- it's hard to believe we are still talking about it. It's four years later and we are still talking about it. But we have seen an increase in drive throughs and they can be a good thing and they can be a bad thing sometimes, depending on how quickly you want to get through them and who the user is or who that the business is. But this is one where we did spend quite a bit of time with the stakeholders and we wanted to make sure that got some more express standards and a lot of times the last, you know, couple of years we have had multiple -- you know, just CUPs for drive-throughs over and over and over and so, you know, staff came -- approached us -- what can we do to make some of these things easier for ourselves and so that's what I tried to do. So, I looked at other city codes and kind of married up what we had, kind of took my experience with the city, so I think Council is aware a lot of times when annexations come in they will have a concept plan that has drive throughs on it and so it's like aren't we really looking at it or vetting it at that point? Do we really need another level of scrutiny on it if we know that's what they want? So, that's what I tried to do with -- with number one it's really make it clear that, you know, if you have an overall master development, a site plan for a development, like a Ten Mile area, you know, why do we need to go through a CUP if that's already baked into this. As long as we have analyzed that and share that with you as part of the annexation or concept plan, I think we could get there just doing that at a staff level and then --

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Parsons: Go ahead.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thanks, Mr. Mayor. Bill, when it comes to drive throughs -- and you will have to forgive me, because I don't know -- do we delineate between a drive through at a bank versus a drive through at a coffee shop versus a drive through at a California restaurant; right? Because I mean the uses are really different; right? And I -- I appreciate you bringing this. This is something I really have been thinking about the last few months. Just like we looked at the difference in type of housing, there is a different type of use when it comes to drive throughs and how do we capture that, so that when the public sees there is a restaurant with a drive through proposed, that they have a better understanding as to what the intensity of that drive through can be.

Parsons: Yeah. Mayor and Council, I can't -- I think we all understand we can't create a code to combat all the other coffee shops or In-N-Outs. I mean it's -- it's just an anomaly in itself and over time those things will fade, because we will add more and more stores in the valley and, hopefully, that traffic will slow down, because there will be other options, not just Meridian. But that's what I tried to do here. So, no, in our code a drive through is a drive through. Any kind of business you conduct within your vehicle is considered a drive through under our code. But if you go down to the very last bullet point of this number six, we do, we tried to say that differently. But it may not be to the -- to the way that the community thinks it's the right number. Again, I took this from the neighbor to the -- to the east, had some very specific standards on their drive throughs and they did define things a little bit different and that's why they said food and beverages you have a little bit more stacking requirements and, then, all others would only be the two -- two vehicles per service. So, that's kind of what spearheaded the -- or that idea. That's where we landed on. Is that the right number? I'm -- I don't know. But for the most part a lot of times when we meet with the applicant we say -- on drive throughs we say, please, tell us how your operation -- how do you operate your drive through, because I know some businesses have people out in the drive through lane taking orders trying to move cars. Some of them have -- pull in these pickup spots and we will walk your food out to you. So, not all drive throughs are created equal and I think those business owners -- those operators know their business better than we do, but that's what I'm trying to do here is differentiate between some of those. Because a bank is completely different.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Bill, we look at it differently from a pickup; right? So, I -- my family got pizza this weekend. We went to the pizza place and you hit a little button on your phone and they bring it out to you. That's not a drive through. That's a -- that's a pickup. That's different than driving through a lane and somebody handing us something. We have drive through pizza places here in Meridian, too. Mayor and Council, this is something that I -- I think that the enthusiasm for drive throughs we are going to continue just to see more and more of. People want to conduct more commerce in their car and I think that we have got an opportunity -- we are looking at this. I do think there is a different use between banking in my car and the time that I sit there and the stacking that occurs there versus getting dinner from my family in a drive through and with 40 other vehicles and a bank usage makes sense kind of in a -- you know, in a neighborhood collector. But I -- again, a very popular California restaurant probably doesn't make sense on those same roadways and so I -- I do think that maybe we have got to take a look at this and make sure that we are aligning that -- again, there is a difference between housing products. I do think there is a difference. And there is -- listen we have a difference in in business uses. We may need to challenge ourselves and certainly the UDC committee -- committee, the Planning and Zoning Commission, our staff, to say are we -- are we meeting our community's expectations for when we say it's a drive through that they are going to fully understand what that use is. We have seen in the last five,

ten years I don't -- I don't think everyone does understand. So, just my two cents on that particular piece. I'm uniquely interested. I know as new locations have popped up, as we have, you know, approved, you know, a fast food restaurant, we have all received e-mails and calls with concerns about that particular business and a lesson in civics, so we don't regulate specific types of business, the use, but there is a different type of use that is coming from drive throughs depending on the type of business.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Is there any other limitation or maximum saturation of the number of drive throughs that can be in one development? Just curious about that, because we -- I'm thinking of -- we have had a couple of projects recently where we had like -- like four being proposed in one parcel and it can become very cumbersome with that many in one place. I don't know. Maybe we will just deal with it case by case. I do agree there may be some differentiation that would be worth looking at. Like there is a great dry cleaner in the Orchard Park that it's a drive through dry cleaner. It's like the most convenient thing I have ever seen and there is no stacking, you know, so -- no one's lining up. It's fine. So, I -- I do feel like there may be a way to put a finer point on it. I appreciate you trying to tackle this one.

Parsons: So, Mayor and Council, on that -- on that specific topic, you are correct, there is no limitation on the number of drive throughs on a particular property. That is actually getting removed from this code section. So, it says here before if -- if a drive through's within 300 feet of another drive through, then, they would trigger a CUP, because we wanted to see that site circulation and how they would -- if there were any conflicts that could occur or too many on the site. But when you look at an Orchard Park and even the Costco site, I would argue there is probably too many. It was -- but they seem to be functioning and operating and haven't seen any -- anymore complaints on that, but that was the reason why the code was this way for so many years is because we were -- like the example over on -- where Taco Bell is and the Kentucky Fried Chicken is on Main Street and Meridian Road, yeah, they had conflicts over there until we created this code to have separation between them. But it's -- again, it's based on what I received from the feedback, again, if we -- if we do our job at the front end at the annexation, I think we could probably capture it pretty well. But like you said, if it's a small in-fill and they want three drive throughs on it, it's going to be a little tough. They may not be able to meet -- there is still going to be specific use standards you have to comply with as far as escape lanes and site circulation. You can't stack on public streets. So, we can still analyze those things. But, again, if it's in staff's hands and we are approving it at staff level, the only recourse is to appeal staff's decision and come to City Council. At least with a CUP you can scrutinize things a little bit more, so just add appropriate conditions if -- if need be. So, something to consider. But I will go ahead and transition from this topic. I think I have captured your thoughts and we can deliberate up more on this as well. So, here is the two new specific use standards that will be -- are proposed to be added to code. One you can see here is the food truck court. So, again, this is pretty

well researched, so looked and saw what other communities did. Kind of looked at our code and kind of blended the two to align with a lot of our similar language. So, you can see here if the food truck court does about a residential district you are capping the hours at 6:00 to 11:00, which is our noise ordinance. Again, I want to want to make sure that food trucks are, you know, picking up trash. It's clean. It's not just a rundown trailer on the site. You know, we have, again, required to be -- they do require inspection by the central -- central district health department and fire department. So, that was added at the recommendation of both fire and legal. Want to make sure that -- again, they will have to install utility, so they are going to have to have access to power and, you know, gas or anything else they need to operate. Don't want generators running at night and disrupting people. I think they will still -- or whatever it may be. I think all of us have been to an RV park, so we understand what you need -- the hookups and everything you need to run those things. Would like have, again, requirement to have some outdoor seating -- indoor-outdoor seating. So, whether there is a -- some of the examples that I saw where they would have even like a tap room, like a bar inside of it and, then, everyone backs their food trucks up to the covered parking and, then, you could go in and get your drink, but still get food and sit out and recreate. So, I think a good opportunity there to kind of have some -- build a little community -- food truck community in the boundaries of our city and, then, want to make sure there is trash receptacles and waste removal on the site and, then, don't want to have any portable sheds or porta pots ending up on a permanent site and that's what we are trying to avoid here when we say permanent structures or access to restroom facilities, we don't -- you know, it's meant to look -- it's a permanent use, not a temporary use. And, then, a lot of these same things carry over. The interesting part about the food truck and the conversation that I had with the Planning and Zoning Commission was just the parking, the number of parking spaces that I required with this change. So, you can see here, G. two parking spaces for each food truck and they were like why require parking? And it's like a lot of our commercial uses require parking and, again, it's -- the intent here is you have some level of commitment. What if it gets redeveloped or doesn't make it or -- you know, you got to have something in place for -- so, a lot of landscaping and things that were required for commercial development will be required as well. And parking. But at the same time the discussion -- or at Planning and Zoning Commission is what if we are in downtown? You know, we don't have -- what do you do then? So, again, they didn't propose any language or any changes, but they -- they did ask me to kind of look into that a little bit more and I said I would bring it up with all of you. But it's certainly something to consider. A lot of in our code we do allow alternative compliance if you have shared parking. So, that's one way to get -- get around that and, then, in downtown it's a completely different animal. You go to MDC and ask for them to analyze your parking and they can make a recommendation to the director and he can approve it or not approve it. So, again, there is -- there is ways to get there, but at least keep that in mind. I'm kind of curious how the Council feels about us requiring parking for food trucks, but it's not technically a structure. It is a mobile vending unit. But, again, if they built a permanent structure on the site, then, we would apply those commercial standards, which was based on the zoning district. So, again, is that the better way to proceed, then, if there are permanent structures you comply with the commercial parking standards or leave it the way staff has it proposed and see how it

works -- see where it may fall? See how it impacts maybe future food courts. And, then, the next item, the food truck itself, again, a few minor changes, but probably the bigger noticed -- noted one is we don't want them to lose parking on the site. We want them to have a dedicated space for it on a site plan. We want them to meet the -- work within the hours of operation for the primary business because they are being approved as an accessory use. Again, all the same inspections required. Central district health. Fire department. And, then, they have to have access to the trash enclosure on the site. They can't park in any required landscaping on the property. And, then, really no parking standards, because we are -- we are -- with an accessory we are going to -- they should add parking to allow this type of use. But, again, you can see they are pretty similar, but, overall, I think that the UDC focus group and staff felt pretty comfortable with these -- these changes, like anything -- that particular topic. I won't hit on the last one, because it's just more -- the last item is just clean-up, but it really just -- land on these two topics and see where the -- how the Council feels about them.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: A couple questions and some comments. Bill, appreciate you bringing this. So, I want to start first and just reference the example that you started about Loose Screw. It sounds like Loose Screw, right, they are proposing to have a food truck that is permanent and 11.4.3.52 guides that. But towards the end of your description you made a comment that if another food truck showed up -- well, now we have got a food truck court. Are you meaning another permanent food truck showed up? Okay. Because that's the part that I was concerned about is Loose Screw sets up, they got a food truck and -- and now Luke -- Luke's food truck wants to co-op that business, so I bring my food truck over there and now we have created a burden on Loose Screw. So, it doesn't prevent somebody else from being able to set up a food truck and following code as -- as written about that and forcing another business to try and file as a food truck court.

Parsons: Mayor and Council, that's the same discussion I had with Planning and Zoning, because they were getting the T -- again, if -- if he wants -- if that business owner wants to have an event there they can file for TUP for an event and have those -- those activities there for the day or whatever the event may be and, then, they go home for the night. It's not permanent. It's approved under a different permit.

Cavener: Perfect. And two comments about the food truck court and what is your criteria about that it's -- it's clean. Certainly we all want things to be clean and presentable, but, boy, I have got a teenager. Hey, is your room clean? Yes. Believe that it is. I poke my head and I say, no. It's very subjective. So, how do we -- I always get a little antsy about code that can be more subjective. So, how -- how do we -- how do we manage that and -- and it's in there because we think it's important, so how -- how do you enforce that and what's the criteria?

Parsons: Yeah. Mayor and Council, there is -- you are right, it's subjective. I think the intent is you don't have food dripping off the sides of it; right? You are sanitary. You are keeping it cleaned up. You don't have trash all around it. You don't have generators and cords going everywhere. You don't have -- whatever you need to operate. It's meant to be orderly and maintained and right appearance. That's -- that's the intent. And no one's going to say, oh, your paint is flaking off of your windows cracked, but, obviously, they should fix those things.

Cavener: So, some -- Mr. Mayor? Sorry.

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Some suggestions might be right is to provide waste receptacles and free, you know, electronic encumbrances that pose a safety issue, something like that. I'm sure the fire department can maybe help with some language. That would just be my -- my suggestion. And, then, my second piece of comment is about the parking requirements and some of these -- some of these make sense and, again, in a residential use you are doing a -- into a food truck court, you know, and kind of more residential. I think parking sometimes is the antithesis of a food truck; right? It's that convenient thing that's right there in front of you. Did you -- did Planning and Zoning have any conversations about maybe a different set of standards within the Old Town region? And does that make more sense to have maybe one set of -- of guidance outside of Old Town and a separate set within Old Town and is that something that was discussed? Was there any input that you want to share with us?

Parsons: Yeah. Mayor, Members of the Council, we did. That's something that when we talked about it we said, one, again, it was the parking. Certainly there could be a standard added here that's within the downtown. You don't -- you don't require parking -- or Old Town zone. There is -- parking is required. That's one way to get there, too. And, yeah, that's something that the Commission and I did discuss. But, again, they didn't propose any of that language for changes this evening. But certainly that's within the Council's purview tonight to say that parking wouldn't be allowed if this was established in the Old Town zone. We could wordsmith that or something to that effect. But, yeah, we -- I think even looking at our -- some of our specific use standards that we recently changed, we have kind of required more parking in Old Town, which it wasn't necessarily intense or maybe a good opportunity for us to go back and look at that as well, those other specific use standards. But to your point we want to incentivize business downtown and we all know parking can be a challenge on some of these in-fill pieces and you may not get parking.

Simison: Just so I'm clear, so I'm not confusing, we have a food truck court, which is multiple food trucks. We have a food truck, which is at a permanent location and, then, we have food trucks under TUP, which don't have any of these requirements to begin with. So, I think that there is a -- you may want -- you know, you may want parking, because it -- you know, I think about other communities you go to where they technically have food trucks which are replacing buildings. So, do you want them in that location to

have the same parking standards as other businesses or not? And that's -- that's the question that they are a permanent fixture in our downtown. That would be my question. Are you going to treat them differently or not? Because that's different than someone pulling up on the street and taking over a parking spot for an hour or two hours during the day.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Just to kind of follow a little bit on that. The idea with -- what are we calling it, the food truck court. The idea, though, is it's a permanent parking lot essentially for food trucks, but the idea is not that the food truck itself is a permanent facility. It could rotate. It could be a different kind. But we are just creating a specified standardized location that everyone complies with, but it would be rotating. That's the idea here. Right?

Simison: Yeah, just add on -- and that's why I think this is actually not necessary for a food truck operator, this is more for a landowner even in a lot of ways more so, which kind of makes some of these questions -- even makes food truck -- going back to the clean appearance. Well, this -- the land -- this is a landowners responsibility I think more so -- or less so than the owner of a food truck responsibility who is coming in and out every day.

Taylor: Yeah. I mean it would seem like it's almost like a trailer park in some sense that someone owns the land and someone owns a facility and they can come and go in some regard. But I mean there -- I would think there would be some really good business opportunities for people who provide a food truck court as a way to attract a lot of people.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Just an off comment on the parking requirement. As I was just thinking through it, if we didn't have a parking requirement or a food truck court per food truck, I could see where we are almost creating a situation that brick and mortar sits in front of us and we require quite a bit of parking from them for a restaurant and we need some level of fairness and what we do in a food court -- food court depending on how big it is, so they provide that same level of service and availability for parking, because if they are not going to provide it, you know, they are going to be dumping somewhere else for that parking request.

Simison: It seems like it details back to parking for another day.

Parsons: So, Council, I don't -- I don't have anything else to add to the discussion tonight. So, if you want to open it up to a public testimony, then, maybe come back to some of these topics certainly we can do that. Thank you.

Simison: Okay. Well, with that, since this is a public hearing, do we have anybody from the public that would like to come forward and provide testimony on this item based on what was presented or what they have heard tonight? Like to come forward, please. State your name and address for the record.

Chiles: Yes. My name is Kelli Chiles. My address is 1100 West Idaho Street. Mr. Mayor, Members of Council, thank you for having me tonight. I come here to speak in support of the code text changes, specifically the Section 11-4-311, which we have talked about a little already and that is the changes to the conditional use permit requirements as it relates to drive throughs. Thank you. I'm a professional engineer at Kimley Horn, so my colleagues and I deal with projects that would apply to this section of code every day. We believe this is a good change in the code, because it would require less conditional use permits and take a burden off of the planning staff and you guys from having to go through these as much as you need to. We believe that drive throughs -- specifically the code of this -- this -- that we are -- like the best to see changed is that a drive through within 300 feet of another drive through could be changed, because when you have a drive through next to another drive through that those uses kind of already go together. So, having a conditional use permit is kind of redundant. Lastly, the stacking lane and dimensional requirements for the drive through standards that are included in the bottom of that tech section we believe adequately address -- enforce a drive through operator to plan for their drive through operations in a way that won't make their neighbors negatively impacted. So, thank you so much for your time tonight. I'm happy to answer any questions if you have them, but thank you.

Simison: Council, any questions?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thanks for being here.

Chiles: Yeah.

Cavener: Appreciate your expertise. So, you heard a little of the discussion I had with staff about variety of uses for drive throughs. I'm just curious from a professional capacity what's -- what's your response to something like that?

Chiles: So, two things. I would say that the majority of drive through providers that I would work with have much higher standards for their own selves than what any typical code would require. I guess the second part to that would be -- I had something else.

Cavener: That's okay. Put you on the spot.

Chiles: Yeah. No. I guess -- thank you.

Simison: And may be to follow up on that component, what in -- in the professional world what is a drive through lane? What -- what kind of -- because we have some drivers that stack around a corner -- of a hard corner on a building.

Chiles: Yeah.

Simison: The other pre-existing. And, then, also, you know, not all bank makes it, but they have drive throughs and, then, they can get repurposed, like Marcos Pizza in south Meridian or --

Chiles: Yes.

Simison: -- other things. Thoughts on having the different standards of drive throughs compared to a building that may not -- that may not be the ultimate purpose long term.

Chiles: Yeah. I think it definitely makes sense to have like the five separated from the two for -- for uses, like as a bank. That makes sense that they would have a lot less stacking spaces than -- than something like a McDonald's would, so I think that that makes sense. I don't know that there is specific standards for what constitutes a drive through. I think that's something that we would look for to be defined by a code in any given city.

Simison: Do you have any experiences or challenges where you have an existing drive through of one use and someone comes in for a different use and there becomes challenge because there is not an adequate -- that's really where I would go through, something that's inadequate or adequate for one type of use, but won't be adequate for a future use, therefore, the building maybe is hard to repurpose.

Chiles: Yeah. I have never seen that specifically, but that's something that we would have to look at when you were going through like an entitlement process or looking at a site for future improvements. Anything else?

Simison: Thank you.

Chiles: Thank you, guys.

Simison: Just out of your curiosity -- and Laren -- come on up, Laren. What -- do we have at that -- like I think of -- it's over there in El Dorado where you just have some hard corners coming in for the Jimmy John's, for example. There is some stacking, but it also goes around the corner. If you have a five and a two, what qualifies? Does it have to be separated? This is just paint on the ground that goes back to hard case. Any guidance? Thoughts? Do we get into that level of detail?

Parsons: Mayor, Members of the Council, I am familiar with that Jimmy John's. It does wrap around kind of weird. I don't know --

Simison: I don't know if it's intentional, but you -- sometimes you have to, but they actually may -- yeah, they don't have -- I don't think they have the -- I don't use it. My wife goes there, but I don't know where they have the speaker, if it's on the back or if it's on the side.

Parsons: I think you order on the app. That's -- that's the thing. A lot of people have apps now. They don't even have speakers and so like going to tonight's discussion is -- yeah. So, in those instances when we have gone through a conditional use, we are like you are not approved for a speaker and if you have a speaker in the future you come back and see the city. That's how detailed we have gotten in these CUPs and it could just make a lot of extra work for all of us that we are trying not to do, but we realize things change. Like you said, the Marcos Pizza, that was a bank and now we have got a pizza place there. But, again, when they come to us we are like you have a drive through, we have to approve them. It's because they have an entitlement for a drive through. But going back to your point, Mayor, it depends on how much stacking they need to provide. So, in this particular scenario if they have an escape lane -- or if they have a stacking lane that's over 150 feet -- or 100 feet, they have to provide an exit lane. So, that's why we were specific that if they have to do that, then, the minimum dimension is going to be ten feet for each lane. So, if they want -- their stacking lane is over 100 feet, one of those lanes has to be ten feet and, then, be able to get out of the drive through has to be the additional ten feet. So, in that case it wouldn't be striped, but it would be 20 feet wide, so that a car could conceivably go around another vehicle and exit if there was an emergency or they forgot their wallet or something. But that was the -- that's why we specifically added that. So, there is no specific requirement as how to -- but in instances -- I'm thinking of Chipotle on Meridian Road where we actually had them change the configuration of the drive out to one way, because of the conflicts of coming off of Meridian Road and turning into that site and we had them reorient the traffic going one way north out of that site, so they would not have that conflict with cars entering. So, those are instances where a conditional use can give you that latitude to require that, whereas maybe when we get to CZC and design review, you know, staff level, it's like meet the code. We got to approve it. So, again, a lot to think about here. But as you just heard, a lot of these standards are consistent throughout the nation for these drive throughs. They really do -- a lot of them say the same thing. Make sure you don't block roads. Make sure you don't block access. Make sure you have -- you know, the window is away from residential. I -- there is nothing new here, I should say, that's different than any other code. It's just trying to define it a little bit better and at least just make it clear that if your site plan shows it on your -- your overall annexation or your big mixed use development or employment area, Just make it staff level. We have already analyzed it through a concept plan. That's -- that's really the goal here, the intent of the change.

Simison: I want to take this home, solve it all for us.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, Council, hopefully this will be --

Parsons: I'm sorry, Laren, do you want me to pull up your presentation?

Bailey: Well, let's just wait, because I don't -- I don't think we need to get to it. So, again, my name is Laren Bailey. My work address is 4824 West Fairview Avenue, Boise, Idaho, and I'm here representing a lot of hats. Unger Management Group, Blackrock Homes, and, then, also I just came from a BCA meeting before this meeting, the Building Contractors Association, and we discussed this in depth and they had a few comments they asked me to pass along as well. I really only have one -- well, I want to start out by saying that I'm also a member on the focus group with Bill and I appreciate -- we all appreciate being allowed to be involved and to put our two cents in and to work towards a common goal and Bill's done a great job with a lot of these issues and a lot of them are difficult and he spends a lot of time researching them and bringing them to the group and, then, we send him in another direction and I'm sure he's frustrated with us. I think 99 percent of what you heard tonight is amazing and is ready for prime time. Just got the one issue -- the one area that I think Commissioner Strader talked about a little bit -- or, excuse me, Council Woman Strader talked about a little bit and that is just the 11-3H-1 that we talked about, the highway and the mitigation next to that, the berm, the wall, the plantings. I think Bill has done a great job, but there is two issues we have and I don't want to go into all the details, but I think we just need more time and I'm just asking you to kind of send this back to staff a little bit, let us go through this with them and come to a better conclusion on a few of these items and I think that there is -- there is still a lot of issues with it that need to be resolved. I don't think it's insurmountable. I think it can be done. We just need to work through it. But part of it was -- and, again, I'm not trying to -- Bill's got a lot on his plate. He's doing a lot. But some of this we didn't see until last Wednesday and that's even those cross sections -- I mean those weren't presented at Planning and Zoning. We didn't see those until last Wednesday. So, we don't feel like we have really had time to comment on those. I think that they are close. I think there is some issues that need to be resolved. So, that's all we are asking for is just a little more time to work on that with staff. I think the rest of it's great. I did prepare a PowerPoint if we really want to go in the weeds, but I would rather just give us a little time. We will -- we will get it juiced up and bring it back before you if that works for -- for the Mayor and Council.

Simison: Okay. I had a suspicion this was not going to be approved tonight one way or the other, so I think there is time for conversations with Council -- or with the staff to explore items without any issues. Council, any questions specifically on --

Bailey: Thank you.

Simison: All right. Is there anybody else that would like to come up this evening? Okay.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: A couple just may be other quick comments on 115A-64, just about proof of posting. I know that's kind of a clean-up piece, but it did spark at least a thought for me that I want to just plant for you, Bill and staff, is if we have the ability in our sign posting to include a QR code, so that people can -- when they are -- when they see the sign -- I have had some feedback from some folks that, hey, I see something on Ten Mile or, you know, Highway 55 and I -- I'm driving past, I can't -- I can't pull over, it would be good to know if there is either a way like when I'm at a stoplight I can try and zoom in and -- and snag it, so that I can learn more information about it. Again, not something that I think needs to be included with this next round, but just we will get to some comments here a little bit later about forecasting some of this. But just something that I saw that we had that one, I wanted to at least just pose for you and staff.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I think it would be great to -- I would like to hear from fellow Council Members on this, but if there is interest from -- from us as a collective group I think it would be great just to hear a suggestion from planning staff on how to try to tackle this home occupation accessory use issue regarding pools that are being used for swimming lessons in neighborhoods. I just I think it is really going to impact a lot of people to wait to address that. So, if it's possible -- it sounds like this might get continued -- if it's possible to hear from staff on that that would be great.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I agree with -- with Council Member Strader talking earlier tonight and we said, you know what, if I'm a -- if I'm a daycare that does swimming lessons as part of my curriculum, right, that would probably fly under our code. I don't know. I'm not the expert. But there certainly are some intentions and maybe code is getting in the way of what we want. I know we are getting close to kind of -- right -- school starts tomorrow, unofficial end of summer, but I don't want what is written in code to maybe get in the way of how, you know, some individuals have been operating their little side business this summer. So, I don't know if it's something we can bring back with -- if we are going to continue this or if it's something that we have to prolong until the next time you come back, but I hope it would be that if we can find a more simple solution on this sooner rather than later probably.

Simison: Would you like to make it this time?

Parsons: Mayor and Council, I would. I know I was copied on that e-mail chain last week. My heart goes out to that woman, because certainly, again, we don't know until

we -- we get the e-mail or the phone call, as you guys know we are complaint driven, we don't go out seeking code violations and my staff said she's a very -- she's a wonderful woman. Very kind. Polite. She just -- she's been doing it for a while and just wants to know what rules she needs to follow and, unfortunately, the rules don't work in her favor currently and that occurs sometimes, but like I mentioned in my opening statement with the Council, this topic was five or six years ago and it was -- at the time city was dealing with a lot of code complaints with people running businesses outside of their home, using those outdoor sheds or doing things in their driveways and bringing -- people were dropping off vehicles get repaired and get their vehicles detailed and we put together a whole group and got all the experts together and we came back with a code change and that group all said that, you know what, we need to keep it inside the home and I certainly want to respect what the Council wants me to do, but I just at least think it's important to know that history of how we got to where we got, because some of you don't know that and weren't part of that and I'm a big believer of that. You know, we got to know where we came from before we go forward and so I just want to at least give you that context and I -- that I -- yes, swim lessons, I like the creativity. Maybe get your daycare license and, then, let the kids swim in your pool. Teach them preschool. Whatever it is, yes, that certainly can fit under that umbrella if they can meet all the requirements she needs to. She will have to get licensed through -- get her fire department inspection. Get her certifications. There is -- there is always going to be something that you have to need to comply with. It's not just going to be, yes, you can do that and move on. We know government isn't that way, unfortunately. It's job security, unfortunately. That's -- we got to -- we got to prevent bad things from happening. As you know sometimes government does that. So, again, yes, I'm willing to at least entertain that and look at that, if that's something that you are passionate about adding to this round, just push me out farther -- or direct me to come back with something different and move these forward. I mean it's -- you have a lot of options this evening. If you want to digest these more you can certainly continue it, digest what we have on the table today, come back in two weeks, close this one out, open the other one and look at home occupations. Or I don't -- if you want staff to study the -- the highway standard some more, you know, vacate that one and move forward with the rest of them if you like those and we at least get that ordinance done and, again, we can -- we did that with the building height discussion we had last year. You asked me to remove that hundred foot height exception from the UDC changes. It's still -- it's parked for now, but certainly we can park these and study them a little bit more, too. So, again, it's really what -- what -- what do you want staff to look at? Again, if you want me to add AUPs, then, push me out a month, I mean give me some time to do some research and -- because I don't want to just open it up to outdoor usage, because, again, you just don't know what you are going to get. Someone can say I want to teach batting lessons in my backyard and they will have five batting cages and pretty soon you are just hearing balls getting hit all night long. It's -- again, I know it seems a little ridiculous, but you would be very surprised -- I have been in those rooms with code enforcement and you would be surprised what -- the creativity some people will come up with and it can be challenging and I feel for -- for our team members that -- that are in code enforcement. It is not an easy -- easy job.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. I think what -- with regard to your potential CUP perhaps around pool -- you know, pools that teach seasonal swimming lessons specifically in their outdoor pool or something like, I was envisioning something pretty narrowly tailored. You know, I think it could assume certain hours of operation similar to a daycare. I kind of look at it a lot like a daycare in a way and I think there should still be some sort of a process for someone who is seeking that approval to do that, to come before us and we can hear from neighbors if neighbors are really concerned that they are going to be impacted. So, I was sort of envisioning a similar kind of a process to what we do with a daycare. I guess the bottom line is from your perspective, though, you feel like in two weeks that's just not enough time to try to tackle -- okay. Yeah. I think with regard to feedback on these, like I need two weeks on these myself just to digest these and kind of ask questions and kind of noodle on them. I would ask that you start working on that issue when you have capacity. Again, I think in a narrowly tailored context I respect the background on the issue and that, you know, we don't necessarily -- we don't want to end up with a big circus, but at the same time, you know, I -- I do think that, you know, freedom for people to make a living is important and -- but this is the one that sort of occurred to me like we should look at -- or something around this type of use specifically. I don't know. That's the feedback I have at this point.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I'm with Council Woman Strader. I would like -- kind of wanted to hear the presentation tonight and kind of digest it, this being the first time I'm tackling this kind of a topic, so I would like a couple weeks to kind of contemplate this. I think with Laren's request that they would like some more time to work with it, I think that would be reasonable as well. A lot of these seem like they make some sense, but it's also the first time I'm kind of grappling with food trucks and size of the bedroom and things like that. So, I would like some time to kind of consider that and think about that a little bit as well. With respect to occupation in the home, I appreciate that history that you provided. I mean I'm a big advocate, too, of allowing people freedom to work out of their homes. I think it's a lot more -- with COVID I think more and more people are looking at doing that. But I do think -- my perspective would be I would -- how do you accommodate a specific type of use, which I like that, but I also would like some uniformity for everyone. I would like to see -- my instinct would be fewer regulations to allow more uses, but I have not been in those rooms with code enforcement. I can only imagine some of the stories being heard. So, I'm not particularly opposed to considering a specific use on the circumstance we are discussing, but I would be hesitant to create a specific -- UDC changes for just one small narrow use, without -- because I don't think that's fair to others who may have a similar argument and yet we are not considering those uses. So, I would like to consider that a little bit, too, and that's a longer conversation I think. I

don't know if that's something we should re -- maybe that's a future topic that, Council, we should consider our -- is our code aligned with -- currently where we are with people having a greater desire to work from home, a greater desire to be creative in how they can earn a living -- I mean five years ago the world was very different in terms of the -- the opportunities you had to work from anywhere and so I actually think it might be something that we dive into as a broader topic and get it all right, as opposed to a specific use. That would be my feedback.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: So, I agree, I think the consensus is we at least want a couple weeks before we take another look at this and I agree with that. I'm going to kind of give you a little flip on the pool incident. I have done law enforcement and for every one person that you have that might say that this is bad and I can't do my use, they might have a hundred complaints that they are dealing with across the city which is one of the reasons why these meetings took place and these solutions had to be found and had to be done in such a way that it only allowed uses inside the house. I'm sure Lieutenant Harper can talk about things more currently than I can, but you -- you really have to be careful we don't create a slippery slope by trying to allow one use in, because you have to set up a set of rules at some point, unless we want to invite Lacy to come in and speak from code enforcements and give you the background and all the things that they see and do in this city and what they try to do to prevent, because while we are talking about one person that lives in that home, we may be talking about the impact and quality of life of lots of people that live around these things that we work to prevent all the time. So, there is a -- there is a flip side to this whole story we need to be aware of as we progress.

Simison: And that was one of the -- again, what I was going to suggest is it might make sense to have Lacy or someone from the police department identify what code complaints we are receiving about home occupations as a general update on things. That being said if there was a way to grant -- I'm going to call it a temporary restraining order to allow the work to continue until we go through our process -- and, again, I have no idea about this person. Do they have a heated pool that they do this year around? Do they stop tomorrow when school goes back into session? What are we potentially able to allow for a brief time period while this issue is addressed? Is it a 30 day component for this person? You know, I could be supportive of something limited that's not against the law while we research a larger component, if possible. So, that's at least -- but I do think the comment -- because, yeah, I remember the conversations that people were selling clothing out of their garages, you know, basically permanent -- I don't want to call them yard sales, because they -- I think they were off the rack, yeah, type stuff, but they were just coming in, home occupation out of the garage, you know, which, then, gets into what parking because people aren't using their garage for parking, you know. I mean it's -- so, anyways, Mr. Nary, any feedback on my dumb statements?

Nary: Mr. Mayor, no. No. Those are -- those are spot on. The answer is yes, but -- so, yes, we can work with the -- with the individual and the circumstance that's occurring, but -- but as was stated earlier, code enforcement is all complaint driven. So, there is a complainant that is concerned about how this is being done. So, again, our code enforcement are masters of working with our neighbors and neighborhoods and individuals and we can work on that and we have had the same conversation with planning and internally on how to apply a daycare sort of standard, because as Council has pointed out tonight -- I mean daycares operate similarly. Some have pools. Maybe they aren't doing lessons, but they have pools and they have other uses outside. So, we can thread that needle and I'm sure we can work with code and the complainant, this individual -- again, this being potentially a seasonal activity. This season is going to be over here fairly soon as well. So, I think we can work through it. I think we can come up with a solution with -- with planning and bringing something forward in the code change in the future. But I'm not concerned that we are going to put somebody out of business today. We can work through those issues and come up with a solution that we can work with the complainant and figure this out.

Harper: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Lieutenant Harper.

Harper: Mayor, Members of Council, are you guys wanting something via e-mail with educating you guys on kind of the complaints we are dealing with home occupancy businesses or you want Lacy to come in because she's definitely the person to share that information. She's very knowledgeable.

Simison: Maybe plan on her coming, unless there are -- unless it's like we have gotten one complaint in two years. Maybe -- maybe evaluate it and you could just reach out to -- have her or yourself or someone provide me the information and, then, we can determine what's the appropriate way.

Harper: Perfect. Thank you.

Simison: So, with that, Council, do we have a time frame that we would like to continue this public hearing?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: While were deliberating I had a chance to connect with the clerk. Mr. Clerk is maybe suggesting September the 10th. So, a little bit longer than two weeks, but with -- we have got a couple of agendas in front of us with some budget deliberations, some other larger applications, and so rather than asking our great staff to come and, then, maybe we continue it because the meeting runs long, let's just plan and plan right. So,

Mr. Mayor, we can continue deliberation -- I would move that we continue Item 25, the 2024 UDC Text Amendment proposed changes to September 10th.

Strader: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to continue Item 25 to September 10th. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the item is continued.

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

### **ORDINANCES [Action Item]**

- 26. Ordinance No. 24-2056: An Ordinance (Two Mustard Seeds Women's Resale Shop H-2024-0009) for rezone of a parcel of land being a portion of Lot 2, Block 1 of West View Addition to Meridian Subdivision as filed in Book 2 of Plats at Page 68, records of Ada County, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit "A," rezoning 0.63 acres of land from the R-8 (Medium-Density Residential) zoning district to the O-T (Old Town) zoning district in the Meridian City Code; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all applicable 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; and providing an effective date.**

Simison: With that we will move on to Item 26, which is Ordinance No. 24-2056 -- and for the record, Councilman Whitlock had technology issues and had to drop off earlier. So, ask the Clerk to read Ordinance No. 24-2056 by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. It's an ordinance related to Two Mustard Seeds Women's Resale Shop, H-2024-0009, for rezone of a parcel of land being a portion of Lot 2, Block 1 of West View Addition to Meridian Subdivision as filed in Book 2 of Plats at Page 68, records of Ada County, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit "A," rezoning 0.63 acres of land from the R-8 zoning district to the O-T zoning district in the Meridian City Code; directing city staff to alter all applicable use and area maps as well as the official zoning maps and all applicable 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; 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? Hearing none, do I have a motion?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: I move we approve Ordinance No. 24-2056.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Ordinance No. 24-2056. Is there any discussion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

- 27. Ordinance No. 24-2057: An ordinance (Rosalyn Subdivision – H-2023-0056) annexing a parcel of land located in the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of Section 19, Township 3 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit “A”; rezoning 0.014 acres of such real property from RUT (Rural Urban Transition) 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: Next item up is Item 27, which is Ordinance No. 24-2057. Ask the Clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. This is an ordinance related to Rosalyn Subdivision, H-2023-0056, annexing a parcel of land located in the northwest quarter of the southwest quarter of Section 19, Township 3 North, Range 1 East, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit “A”; rezoning 0.014 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? Seeing none, do I have a motion?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Move we approve Ordinance No. 24-2057.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Ordinance No. 24-2057. Is there any discussion? If not, Clerk will call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: FIVE AYES. ONE ABSENT.

- 28. Ordinance No. 24-2058: An ordinance (Pebblebrook Subdivision – H-2024-0005) annexing a parcel of land located in the northeast quarter of Section 25, Township 4 North, Range 1 West, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit “A”; rezoning 13.94 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 Item 28, Ordinance No. 24-2058. Ask the Clerk to read this ordinance by title.

Johnson: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. It's an ordinance related to Pebblebrook Subdivision, H-2024-0005, annexing a parcel of land located in the northeast quarter of Section 25, Township 4 North, Range 1 West, Boise Meridian, Ada County, Idaho, more particularly described in Exhibit “A”; rezoning 13.94 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

