

individually of those who signed up on our website in advance to testify. You will, then, be unmuted in Zoom or you can come to the microphones here in chambers. You will need to state your name and address for the record and you will have three minutes to address the Commission. If you have previously sent pictures or a presentation for the meeting it will be displayed on the screen and our Clerk will run the presentation. If you have established that you are speaking on behalf of a larger group, like an HOA, where others from that group will allow you to speak on their behalf conceding their time, you will have up to ten minutes. After all those who have signed up in advance have spoken we will invite any others who may wish to testify. If you wish to speak on the topic you may come forward in chambers or if on Zoom press the raise hand button in the Zoom app. Or if you are only listening on -- on the phone, please, press star nine and wait for your name to be called. If you are listening on multiple devices, a computer and a phone, for example, please, sure -- please be sure to mute the extra devices, so we do not experience feedback and we can hear you clearly. When you are finished if the Commission does not have questions for you you will return to your seat in Chambers or be muted on Zoom and no longer have the ability to speak. And, please, remember we will not call on you a second time. After all testimony has been heard by the applicant will be given another -- the applicant will be given another ten minutes to come back and respond. When the applicant has finished responding to questions and concerns, we will close the public hearing and the Commissioners will have the opportunity to discuss and, hopefully, be able to make final decisions or recommend -- recommendations to City Council as needed.

## **ACTION ITEMS**

- 5. Public Hearing Continued from August 12, 2021 for Centerville Subdivision (H2021-0046) by Engineering Solutions, LLP, Located at 4111 E. Amity Rd. (Including the Outparcel to the South) and 5200 S. Hillsdale Ave., at the Southeast Corner of S. Hillsdale and E. Amity Rd.**
  - A. Request: Annexation and Zoning of 40.49 acres of land from RUT to the R-8 (13.35 acres) and R-15 (27.14) zoning districts.
  - B. Request: A Preliminary Plat consisting of 190 total lots (124 single-family residential lots, 35 townhome lots, 2 multi-family lots, 1 commercial lot, 1 clubhouse house, and 27 common lots) on 38.95 acres of land.

Seal: Okay. At this time I would like to open the public hearing for Item No. H-2021-0046, Centerville Subdivision, which was continued from 8/12/2021. We will begin with the staff report.

Dodson: Thank you, Mr. Chair. You stole some of my thunder there, the continuance, but thank you. Jump into this here. As noted this is for Centerville Subdivision. On the screen here we have the view of the land use maps associated with the site. Because it's been almost two months I will go briefly over the entire project and, then, I will come

back and hit on what has been revised since the last Commission hearing. In general, the site consists of 40 and a half acres of land, currently zoned RUT, near the intersection of Eagle and Amity, about a half mile to the east. It includes three existing parcels, as you can see by the three different shapes. I will just wait there. There is no history with the City of Meridian with this site, so no zoning history or anything like that. It is -- has two future land use designations on the site, mixed use neighborhood and medium density residential, with medium density residential being the vast majority, about 31 acres, versus eight acres on the site. The original request was for annexation and zoning of all 40 and a half acres from RUT to the R-8 zoning district, the R-15 -- and the R-15 zoning district. It showed 159 single family units and 168 multi-family units with a plat consisting of 190 total lots, which included 124 single family lots, 35 townhome lots, two multi-family lots, one commercial and one clubhouse a lot, with 27 common lots. There was no CUP and still is no CUP, which is a conditional use permit, proposed for any multi-family. The project is still proposed in four phases. I have not been told otherwise. With a majority of the detached single family in the first and second phases. The access is to Hillsdale and Amity and the large center open space is proposed with the first phase of development. Again, that has not changed from my understanding. Let me just -- access to the site -- I will go to this one here. Access to the site has not changed either. The main access point is from South Hillsdale, which is here, and to East Amity up here. The applicant is also extending two local stub streets from the southeast, one from the south, one from the east, with a pedestrian connection in between. There was a TIS required with this, because it has more than a hundred units, with -- well, not to spoil it, but the applicant has reduced the number of units, so the anticipated trips will be reduced as well. Originally it estimated to be about 2,600 additional vehicle trips per day and the TIS recommended some requirements. Those are still being recommended from both city and ACHD. Those improvements are to include an interim signal at the Hillsdale and Amity Road intersection, which is planned for a future roundabout at some point and where the Amity Road entrance is to what is shown Amorita Avenue. ACHD is requiring a dedicated eastbound right-turn lane and a dedicated westbound left-turn lane. Staff is recommending that both of these, the interim signal as well as the turn lanes, be constructed with the first phase, which is consistent with ACHD's recommendation. In addition, safe access to Hillsdale Elementary is imperative. ACHD recommends and the applicant has agreed to install a rapid rectangular flashing beacon, which most people just say RFB beacon or RFB crossing at the Hillsdale and Hill Park Street intersection. There is an existing RFB beacon, in my understanding, further south directly in front of the school. The school district, the city, and ACHD believe that this is the best location for an additional one, especially with the addition of more units -- more homes in the area. The project area as noted does have two different land use designations on the site. The relatively small area of mixed use neighborhood allows six to 12 units per acre and medium density residential allows three to eight dwelling units per acre. The mixed use neighborhood area is part of a larger area that encompasses most of the area to the west, as you can see here. So, it's about eight acres of -- more than 70 acres of mixed use neighborhood. Approximately half of this area is already residential -- was already approved for residential development, which is the Hill Century Farms North. The remaining area is comprised of commercial zoning that includes self storage, an urgent care, medical and dental offices, assisted living facility and some vacant commercial lots.

Within the overall site -- and this has not changed with any revisions. The applicant is proposing transition a lot sizes and density within the project. This is done by -- around the perimeter and matches the lot sizes to the existing development of the east and the south and it has the higher density along Amity and further to the west, further away from the existing development. Staff does find that the proposed project is compatible with the surrounding uses because of this transitional density. Now, for the changes that have occurred since the Commission hearing, this is probably the best way to see it. On the left is the original plan that shows the apartment units. On the right is their new revised rendering. They have removed all of the apartment units and included more of these attached townhomes, which is about three-plexus here. The only multi-family remaining are four four-plex buildings here, which are new to the site -- a new use to the site. In addition, the applicant has added three additional commercial lots to basically comply with some of the mixed use neighborhood regulations. This is still proposed to be a daycare and these propose to be flex space lots. Flex space can have a number of uses, but there are certain specific use requirements that would be -- have to be complied with in the future as those sites develop. This has required the applicant request some commercial zoning, which was not previously requested. The applicant did provide revised legals with that and that was in the record. Overall, as I noted, all the apartments were removed. The total unit count is now 219, which is down from originally 327. So, it's a loss of 108 units. The only remaining portion of the site, as I noted, is multi-family and will require a future CUP for those four-plex units along Amity. This is specifically placed along Amity near the commercial, because of the higher density. That is -- that's Planning 101. So, staff does support the location of the proposed flex -- or both the proposed flex space and the four-plexes. The multi-family was replaced by more townhomes as noted and all of those previous drive aisles, which are all these, were replaced by 28 foot wide private streets, that, essentially, function as alleys for the townhome units. The applicant is required to submit for private streets -- for these private streets prior to the City Council meeting, which, to be clear, private street application is an administrative level only. There is no need for Commission or Council to act on that. They did add three additional commercial lots and removed two and a half acres of the existing residential zoning because of that new commercial zoning as I noted. Therefore, the overall area of the residential portion is now 36 and a half acres, give or take. The gross density is now six dwelling units per acre, which -- and originally it was 8.4. So, again, that's about two and a half units per acre difference that they have done. Because of this -- and they have lost, again, 108 units, staff does find that the applicant has made significant adjustments to the site to mitigate the Commission's concerns over the density and that general impact to the schools, as well as the transportation element. For the additional commercial properties, the applicant did also include and is proposing a right-in, right-out access to Hillsdale, which would be this access here, that was not previously proposed. That would be a new access. It is directly across from the existing access on the west side and ACHD has approved this with their latest revision to their staff report. The applicant also moved the pool amenity, which was previously here, to the central open space, which was also discussed at the previous Commission hearing as wanting to provide equal access for everybody in the development and have that centralized in the site. The initial review of the landscape plan does show continued compliance with all open space requirements. I would like to note that there has been new additions of

linear open space for these townhome units to front on, which staff does appreciate, which is these -- this large area here, as well as this open space here and the -- it is, essentially, a parkway, but a larger width area than just a parkway along here and the previously proposed parkway here is also remaining. Since the Commission hearing there were -- at least as of about 3:00 o'clock this afternoon there were eight pieces of testimony since the previous Commission hearing. They noted the same issues as before, which was a discussion of traffic, school impact, and overall density. Staff does recommend approval of the subject applications, especially with the revisions that have been in place and I have noted that in a memo dated last week at some point -- I don't remember. I apologize. The specific provisions that I'm recommending to be changed. So, if you do make any motion tonight you could just say per the memo -- or the staff memo. After that I will stand for any questions.

Seal: All right. Thank you very much. Would the applicant like to come forward? Name and address and away we go.

McKay: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission. I'm Becky McKay with Engineering Solutions. Business address 1029 North Rosario in Meridian. I'm representing Challenger Development on this particular application. Just to kind of give the Commissioners kind of a brief summary of where we left off in our August hearing, we appreciate the Commission provided us the opportunity to go back and rework our plan, rethink it, work with the staff and come up with some new ideas and I just kind of wanted to go through the instructions that the Commission provided us. One, we were asked to eliminate the high density apartments that they were -- that you were convinced that this area was not appropriate for like three story apartments and based on the impact on traffic and schools, that you wanted to see an incorporation of more townhomes and that providing a larger commercial component would be preferred, so that we could meet the mixed use integrity that's talked about in the Comprehensive Plan. One of the other statements was -- you just need to reduce the overall density of the development. One of the other comments was the primary amenity should be centrally located and available to all residents and not located kind of in the south sector of the multi-family area and that we should limit all residential structures to more than -- no more than two stories. We also talked about transitioning from the commercial component to the townhomes and providing a more blended and integrated site plan, which better fits the definition of a true mixed use development and to improve the diversity of the residential uses with less impact on the adjoining neighborhood, the schools, and the transportation network and so what -- what we brought before you today we believe meets those -- those requirements that you -- or that guidance that you gave us to go back to the drawing board. So, I will skip that and go to the preliminary plat. So, we revised our preliminary plat. As -- as Joseph indicated we incorporated a community business district and added that C-C zone -- is this going to work for me? Joe, is it not working? Oh, there it is. I think. Maybe the battery's dead. It should work? Is it me? Okay. Moving on. Here we go. So, this is -- this is the new colored site plan as you can see. So, one of the things that we did is we have a C-C area over there in that -- at the intersection of the collector Hillsdale and Amity Road. As Joseph indicated, we are proposing a C-C zone within that quadrant and, then, we transition from some four-plexes that back up to Amity Road,

which is an arterial and, then, we transition into a townhome product and, then, into our single family residential. The single family residential portion that was proposed on the eastern side of the project has not changed. Those lot sizes have not been modified and we -- we have those two mixed designations in your comp plan that mixed use neighborhood allows us six to 12 dwelling units per acre. The medium density residential allows us three to eight. As Joseph indicated, we are asking for R-8, C-C and R-15. Our overall residential density is 6.01 dwelling units per acre and that calculation does exclude the commercial. So, it's not skewed by the commercial, it is a net density. We have in the R-8 zone -- thank you. Is it working now? A dead mouse. A dead mouse. There we go. Oh, that's you. Okay. Go ahead. I thought it was me. Within the R-8 zone, which is on primarily the eastern side of the project, our density is still 3.45 dwelling units per acre. Within the western portion of the residential where we have the four four-plexes on the north side and the townhomes, our density is at 7.44 within the R-15 zoning designation. So, the lot sizes on the single family, we have a variety of lot sizes just as we initially proposed, ranging from 36 feet in width, all the way up to 90 feet in width, 95 feet in depth, to 123 feet in depth. We incorporated the townhomes. The average townhome is about 3,104 square feet, whereas the average single family lot is about 5,550 square feet and I want to mention from the last hearing our largest lots are all on the periphery next to Rockhampton and, then, next to the Howry Lane Subdivision No. 2. The development -- we propose both rear and front load townhomes to provide variety. So, 71 percent of the townhomes that we have will be rear loaded and only 29 percent will be front loaded. Obviously, this gives a better curb appeal where we are actually loading them and, then, it provides us the ability to have a MEW on the north portion of the -- of the project. You guys working over there or -- there you go. So, on the north -- on the north portion we still have our collector roadway with our -- with our landscaped entrance, detached walks, and -- go to the west. Sorry. And, then, what we have is -- we have what we call a MEW there that the -- the lots -- the front of the lots we have sidewalks coming out of the townhomes and, then, connecting to a sidewalk that goes both north and south. Along the south portion we ended up with a linear open space. We have a playground in there. We have pathways. We have interconnectivity to those townhomes and all the townhomes south of our entrance collector are on open space. They back up to open space, either in the linear open space or to the south where we will be piping the Cunningham Lateral and grassing and creating a little nature path that goes on out and, then, our collector buffer. As far as the -- the commercial component, we are at a little over four percent in our commercial component. We kind of racked our brains. We don't want to compete with Hill Century Farms commercial. So, one of the things -- the daycare was integral, because that's an essential service that will, obviously, benefit this neighborhood and -- and this project. But the flex space was one thing that we came up with as a great alternative to trying to compete with the -- the commercial that's to the west of us. So the flex space would be small business development and it would be -- there would be no exterior materials, everything being closed. Obviously, would have to comply with your design guidelines for the commercial. There will be no outdoor storage. And, then, on the -- the townhomes we have almost an acre that -- that is in that linear open space. We have approximately a half acre that is the transition from the commercial to the townhomes. That ranges in width from -- I think 35 to about 55 feet. We will have pathways. We will have picnic areas. But when you come into the development the first

thing you are going to see is our primary amenity and that primary amenity is significant in size. I think it's -- hold on. Got to get to my amenities. It is 1.93 acres. So, just a little bit shy of two acres. We will have a pool facility. We will also have a pickleball court. We have play -- a central playground for the kids and, then, we have pathways that link out through our pedestrian pathways for the project portion that is to the east. We have retained our pocket park to the north. I'm not doing that. We are having a great time tonight, aren't we? So, this -- this shows you what our qualified open space is. So, we have six acres of qualified open space. That's 15.4 percent. Previously we were at about 4.48 percent. Our central amenity with 1.93 acres. We are going to have a plaza, swimming pool, community playground, pickleball court, pathways, off-street parallel parking. We are proposing a ten foot sidewalk along Amity with micro path connections to our commercial component and our pocket park. Our entrance at Amity will have public art, a little plaza area, and, then, our MEW, like I said, is just a little less than half acre with two covered sitting areas and pathways and, then, our linear open space, another tot lot, gazebo, and, then, our micro path and a natural pathway. This was kind of a blow up of the landscape plan. We did submit a revised landscape plan that shows you what -- what we are proposing here. So, we are going to have a significant amount of open space in this project. Far more than was required. When we submitted the application the requirement was ten percent and, as I indicated, we are at 15.4 in our qualified open space. We have done a great job of -- of really spending a lot of time reworking this and working on elevations. These are our farmhouse elevations. This shows you the alley load townhomes. You see every elevation. You can see that there is articulation in the roof lines. Different materials. Different -- different angles to, obviously, provide a visual interest. Oops. This shows you our front load townhomes. They are more of a modern style. But we are still going to have them mesh in with -- with the architectural styles that we will have with our traditional craftsman, modern, and farmhouse styles. Here is the four-plexes. We only have four of those. So, there is 16 units. They back up to Amity. You know, that's going to be a -- that's a major intersection. It's going to be signalized. As you recall, we have to signalize that at there -- our 61st lot. So, basically, you know, we can get one phase in and, then, we have got to put the light in. So, it's almost like we need to go into design on that with the first phase, so that -- that's in there. As you can see with the four-plexes, there is, you know, roof articulation. They don't look like your standard four-plexes. There is a lot of variety. We only have four of those. Our sample elevations for the homes -- and you can see we will have a combination a two story, three car garage. Single story, three car garage. And, then, on the smaller 64 foot lots will have two story with a two car garage. Single story, two car garage. And, then, on the 36 foot wide lots -- this is a new product. So, they have kind of farmhouse styles. They have craftsman. They have modern. So, there is a variety of styles that fit on those lots to, obviously, meet the diversity that we need, especially in today's marketplace where everybody is struggling to meet that affordability that our community desires desperately in these times. I saw the other day the average price of a home in Meridian now is, what, 555,000, which is just like -- it blows my mind. I remember, you know, when -- when you struggled to get a 227,000 dollar house and the hoops you had to jump through. So, this -- this particular project I think hits the mark. It meets the -- the mixed use as far as an anchor on that corner, providing some type of employment opportunity. Maybe someone that lives in here will be able to put up their business there. Walk to work. Bike to work.

The townhomes will all be on separate lots, so they can be sold and, like I said, we have a combination of front load and alley load to meet different -- different tastes, different lifestyles. Smaller lots. Larger lots. This is a great project and with an overall gross density of just 6.01 we have reduced the -- the impact on the schools, the impact on the transportation system significantly and I ask the Commission to support it. Thank you. Any questions?

Seal: Do we have any questions for the applicant or staff? Commissioner Wheeler, go ahead.

Wheeler: Can you -- staff, can you tell us just one more time what the net gain or net loss on the total number of units is again?

Dodson: Yes. Commissioner Wheeler, that would be a total loss of 108 units. Three hundred and twenty-seven is what was approved before and now there are 219.

Wheeler: Thank you.

Dodson: If that math is right.

Wheeler: Okay. Thank you.

Seal: Quick question of staff or the applicant can answer. The -- I'm interested in the parking for the multi-family. I think we have to have at least a minimum of 24 parking spots here. How many are available?

McKay: Yes. For the four-plexes we are required to have 30 spaces. Of those 16 will be covered. For the commercial flex space we have 42 spaces. For the daycare we have seven. And, then, staff asked us to include parallel parking along our MEW area that's on the west side of the townhomes north of our collector and we have 12 parallel parking spaces there. Each townhome will have a two car garage, plus a 20 by 20 parking pad in front and, then, we also have guest parking on the south end. There are nine spaces for guest parking and, then, we also have four parallel spaces along our central amenity feature that's outside the right of way. And, then, the townhomes that front on the public street we will have detached sidewalks and the ones -- or excuse me. The ones that have the alley load they will be parking on the public street north of the collector roadway.

Seal: Okay. Thank you.

Dodson: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Go ahead, Joe.

Dodson: I would like to just add to that as well, just to visually show the -- all of this -- this right here, because -- oh, should say, actually, this north portion here, that's a public road. This entire length on both sides can have parallel parking. Can have on-street parking

because there are no driveways. So, that's in excess of code requirement. In addition, they are -- all the private streets they are proposing, especially here, as long as they are wide enough, which I believe it needs to be 29 feet wide, they can accommodate the parallel parking on that as well. So, again, this would all be in excess of code for the off-street parking. So, I did not mention that, because they are exceeding all of the parking requirements.

Seal: Thank you. Commissioner Grove.

Grove: Mr. Chair. Joe, could you remind us -- just kind of give us an overview of what was continued and kind of if there is any parameters on the discussion tonight?

Dodson: Commissioner Grove, Becky actually outlined that way better than I did, admittedly, about why we were continued. The majority of it was as discussed, the overall density, including more commercial and, frankly, removing all the apartments -- or some and per some of my recommendations and analysis in my staff report. Those are the -- really the main issues. I guess a secondary one is just overall compatibility with the adjacent neighborhoods, but that was based largely in the inclusion of apartments versus townhomes or single family. From my perspective they have responded to each of the comments that were in that previous hearing and have answered -- well, I do not have anymore concerns based upon my previous analysis.

Grove: I guess my question is -- I know when we do some continuances we will have, you know, pretty limited discussion points that we are actually bringing forward to discuss. I didn't know if there was anything that we are, you know, asking the public testimony to focus on as -- as we have a fairly full house. So --

Dodson: Right.

Grove: Just trying to make sure that we are all on the same page before we get started.

Dodson: That's a great question, Commissioner Grove. It was my understanding because of some of the major revisions that are going to occur, it was not limited. That the overall project was going to be basically still open for public testimony. That was my understanding. I hope -- the residency -- the work the applicant and staff have done.

Seal: All right. If there is no more questions, we will go ahead and open this up to public testimony. Do we have anybody signed up? A rhetorical question, more or less, but --

Weatherly: Mr. Chair, we do. Online the first to sign up was Rebecca Prestwich, representing Hillsdale Creek.

Seal: Good evening. Just to set -- right. Just -- just to set this up, we have had several public hearings where people come forward to represent a larger group and nobody yields any time to it. So, that is one of the requirements that you are speaking for a larger group and the people that you are representing are yielding their time to you. So, who in the



audience will be yielding their time? Okay. If you would state your name and address for the record.

Prestwich: Can you hear me?

Seal: Yes, ma'am.

Prestwich: All right. Thank you. I don't know who to address, because Madam Chair is not present, so to --

Seal: Chairman.

Prestwich: Mr. Chairman, I'm Rebecca Prestwich. I live in the Hillsdale Creek Subdivision on South Bleachfield Way and I am representing the HOA for this meeting. There is a couple of things that I wanted to point out is that I'm an ordinary citizen, I don't have 25 years of planning experience, as Ms. Becky does, and I haven't been before the Commission -- only once before and that was in the last meeting. However, my observation in this meeting and in the last is that the developer's representative tends to embellish her opinions of her own -- of their own presented plan and the community's response to them and so that is something that I would like you to keep in mind as you hear all the members of the community give their testimonies today. The request from Madam Chair as I remember was to the developer to reduce the overall density of the overall proposal, quote, end quote, and that didn't really say we were particularly happy with one plan or one piece of the plan or the other, we were unhappy with the entire proposal and we did want the density reduced and that's why we are here today to see that -- that can be further addressed. Now, with the FLUM, which has been referred to, we understand that the City of Meridian has invested thousands upon thousands of dollars engaged in the research of feasibility studies and engineering towards the Comprehensive Plan and the citizens have invested their hours and time in participating in this planning development process and the citizens feel vested in doing that and, quite frankly, we had ownership in that plan and we endorsed that plan as it exists in the written FLUM and it was an eye opener to me to come to the meeting last time and to have the feeling -- and I was really grateful to Madam Chair for voicing it -- that our voice wasn't being heard and she did say, yes, your voice is being heard and she handed it back to the committee to -- I mean to the developer to further reduce the density and that doesn't mean by a small percentage, it meant to us by a significant percentage that actually represented what we understand the -- the acreage to be developed -- you know, to be designated as in the FLUM. So, I want to discuss what that is. The subject property area presently -- presently consists of two future land use designations. The mixed use neighborhood consists of 9.97 acres, according to the county assessor parcel -- and I won't list that out. It's written out and approved in the land use. Medium density residential, R-8, consisting of two parcels totaling a total of 28.98 acres. That's 12 acres for one parcel and 16.98 acres for the other. That's 75 percent of the comprehensive FLUM land use proposal. Now, the Planning and Zoning -- in Idaho Code 67-6115, Subsection A, states: Planning and Zoning Commission shall evaluate the request to determine the extent and nature of the amendment. Particularly they shall consider the

given effects of any proposed zone changes upon the delivery of services by any political subdivision providing public services, including school districts within that jurisdiction. The existing conditions report of the City of Meridian Comprehensive Plan designated that parcel as mixed use neighborhood. That is not what the developer put forward. The developer put forward a much more dense plan than mixed use neighborhood. The intent of a mixed use neighborhood is predominantly single use developments and that means they are supportive of proportional public and quasi-public spaces, places such as parks, plazas, gathering areas, open space -- and I know Ms. Becky would argue -- argue with you that they have provided that in their plan, but if you take a look at that plan and the small spaces and the number of people that are going to live in that community, you will find that it is a relatively small number compared to all of the neighborhoods in the surrounding area. The land uses are supposed to be supporting nonresidential services. Nonresidential service -- excuse me -- services should blend in with the buildings and their uses to provide goods and services that people typically do not travel far for and some employment opportunities. The proposal had a daycare in it and now they have put other commercial proposals into it. Now, there are services, as she mentioned, on the other side. There is actually a pediatric doctor's office, a separate children's dental office, adult dental office and a separate orthodontic office and there are a few vacant commercial building spaces. Those are what the mixed use neighborhood should be consisting of. R-8 houses in the majority, the 28.98, and in that 9.68 a few commercially -- commercial opportunities for business -- businesses to establish. Now, the community does want further additional serving uses to be developed on that parcel, the 9.97 acres. What they would like to see is -- a daycare is a good idea. Possibly a preschool. It was also suggested that perhaps additional elementary school facilities that could be used by Hillsdale Creek to further support the community could be donated by the developer. A coffee shop. A sandwich shop, dog grooming, and service providers that they would visit typically once a month or less and frequent -- and frequent -- or even a less frequent basis. That's not the proposal the developer is putting forth at this moment. The community respectfully requests the Council to follow the Comprehensive Plan and to maintain the current mixed use neighborhood designation for the 9.97 acres of land. We request the City Council to deny the developer's application for 2.5 acres of C-C zoning. I don't believe that most people understood until we really read through this document that that meant that they could include one warehousing unit with -- building within this community and in a -- in a community that exists only of low density urban family housing and they are now trying to place this dense and -- and all the commercial on that place -- on that small 40 acre lot. Furthermore, the community requested -- uh, my mouth is drying out. The developer not -- not be allowed to calculate the common area -- and this is another problem I have is the common area, the buffers, the green space are all calculated into their gross density, which, then, lowers it below the six. But if you go back down to their report, the last page, you will see that they report the 6.1 gross density, but the actual net density is 9.1 and that's far beyond what the FLUM designates. Let me get to the other part and I will be done. So, now that -- that is addressing the 9.69 acres. The other 28 acres -- I think it's 20 point what? Six eight? If memory serves me right. Is -- according to the original staff report at maximum allowable density and all they did was add a little bit more -- just little few more strips of green space and, then, they calculated it gross and they came out with a 6.1 density and that is not a true number for what will

happen in that community. Can you imagine 214 households -- individual households on 40 acres? Two hundred and fourteen. That's -- that's -- in my opinion gross. It is just too dense and it doesn't pattern this community. And the other thing I want to address is that originally the developer representative suggested that we were just upset about how many households were going to be there and how much traffic there was going to be and all these things, when, in fact, that wasn't our original concern. Our original concern was the overall impact of a development that dense in a community that is already overburdened in all of the aspects that we were told we could not discuss today.

Seal: Ma'am, you will need to wrap up real quick.

Prestwich: I will. I'm just about there. So, with regards to the 28.9 acres, the community requests that the -- the developer not be allowed to calculate common area, buffers, green space, et cetera, to be calculated in their gross density calculation. I don't think that developers should be allowed to do that. They should base their calculations on net density and that's the actual house on the actual lot and how that affects the overall plan. The community would rather the developer be able to -- to calculate the net density. We believe that if you did that, the calculations would provide a greater possibility for proposed development to conform with the surrounding subdivisions. The community respectfully requests the City Council to return this proposal back to the developer to further reduce the density of the 29.8 acres parcel to R-8 calculated at the net density calculation and I appreciate the time that you have given me and I thank you.

Seal: Okay. Thank you.

Weatherly: Mr. Chair, next we have James Phillips signed in as a representative of the Southern Rim Coalition.

Seal: Okay. Thank you. Good evening. We need your name and address for the record, please.

Phillips: My name is James Phillips. I live at 4140 East Rockhampton Street, Meridian, Idaho. 83642. And like was mentioned, I'm representing the Meridian Southern Rim Coalition. Just as a quick preamble, I can appreciate the passion and motion shown already today. There has been a lot of public anxiety, frustration, and concern, not to mention loss of sleep that could have been avoided had the currently revised preliminary plat as we see today had been the version first proposed. I feel that the public is still smarting a bit from the original plan and it actually hurts the public's ability to see and appreciate the revised version. Today I will be focusing in on a number of public concerns where the revised plan continues to fall short of Meridian's vision. This was mentioned before, the importance of having a FLUM and it's super important to underline that. The FLUM is -- is what's used to set general public expectations and we trust P&Z and the City Council to enforce this vision. The FLUM also is used by public entities, like ACHD, West Ada, COMPASS, for planning roadwork, updating school boundaries, projecting community growth that inform city strategic planning. The FLUM also is used by developers for making decisions of whether they should buy a land for development. It

informs them of the zoning, dwelling units, property types constraints -- constraints that developers are to respect. As you can see there is a large latitude at which development can operate. You can see that swing in number of units in the MUN. The swing in the number of units that are okay for the MDR. This is where P&Z and the City Council come into play. They have the responsibility to be good stewards of public trust by reconciling developer plans with suburban-urban planning development best practices, the expectation and needs of the public and the expectation and needs of the city. Developers are free to accept or reject P&Z recommendations, but City Council has the final say, particularly in cases of annexation and rezoning. Developers take a calculated risk when they purchase the land knowing full well that getting annexation and rezoning of their ideal liking is not a foregone conclusion. So, what are these public expectations being set by this FLUM, this nine acres of MUN, this 30 acre of MDR? These are some of the areas where -- where we still see the revised -- even the revised version falling short. This slide was taken out of the original slide deck. A few things to note. A number of concerns that break public trust had been reduced enough to actually now enumerate them here and you can see I have got a few bullet points around that. I will go into detail about that. But also a number of major red flags found in the agency comments that had been addressed by removing the three story apartment buildings, adding more commercial, adding an entryway into the commercial area. Not to say that there are any additional red flags still, but these red flags will be raised -- we can raised at the city and not necessary here at P&Z. So, let's look at this. This is, again, just outstanding concerns that we have around the MUN component, that nine acres there. In the revised we can see there is three things, actually. The fact that commercial lots are not fronting that East Amity Road is a concern for a few different reasons. One, it's vital for businesses to have patrons come in and when it -- when they are not located off of main transportation corridors they get less patrons. The other thing to note here is when you have it -- that commercial tucked in a little bit things like the public really wants, like a restaurant and cafes, they are likely not to risk their business in putting it in there. Also there is a missed opportunity of increasing some more commercial, reduce what's really needed in South Meridian, which is our employment-to-resident ratio. It's super super low. If you look at the COMPASS reports it's terrible. Absolutely terrible. We are in a restaurant desert in south Meridian. The other thing to note is around adequate parking. For the workers and the patrons of the businesses, guests and visitors of the four-plex, guests and visitors of the 40 townhomes. Possible solution there would be to actually look at Lot No. 52 and make that into a mailbox with -- with additional parking there. A possible solution. The other concern that the public has is a little bit of nuance here, but the awkward traffic flow for those townhome residents that live just south of that -- that would come out of that private alley, that Redding Lane, they can only turn one way. So, if they want to go -- lug some equipment to the park in their car, they can't turn left, they have to do a U'ee or go around. Have to keep an eye on both screens I guess. See if I can coordinate this. So, this guy right here. So, again, removing one of the four -- four-plexes for more commercial off Amity. Removing one of the lots for parking. And, then, address the awkward traffic flow. This is pretty bad to navigate. Okay. I won't get into -- I will just kind of skip this slide. Just note that -- that the ideas that we will propose in the next slide are based off of coming off the Comprehensive Plan and that's where the slide come from. You can revisit it if you have any questions, but -- so, one of the -- let's start with the most glaring

issue that I see and that has to do with the 39 attached townhomes that continue to extend into the MDR designated area. We ask that we swap those -- those attached townhomes for single family residents, again, to meet that expectation of medium density residential area. Next glaring concern is actually more going further south, is that those -- again, those 11 townhomes just south of West Lachlan Lane. Taking a step back you can see a plan -- you can see how there is a natural east-to-west density being transitioning until it hits up against Rockhampton neighborhood, which is great to see that. We don't get the same thing going north to south going into the Rockhampton and while Becky paints a picture that there is no need for that transitional density there, that simply is not the case. There is two considerations that have to be -- have to be made. One, the extreme difference in density between the townhome lots and the neighboring single family lots, one of which my home is. The other one is -- actually has to do with elevation. You can't really make it out, but the elevation on those is -- it's higher there and so having those two story attached to townhomes tower over the homes that are just adjacent across the street and over the entry is not appropriate. It's not cohesive with the surrounding neighborhood. So, the proposed solution would be make those single family -- single story family lots. Now, kind of putting it all together, there is a few things I would want to highlight. One is on the red. I will just walk through the different colors. On the red ones here in the comp plan talks about density transitions and where they should take place. Over alleyways or roads. Here they are taking place across back fences. This is problematic. This is -- does not meet expectations. And so the red actually puts it into alignment with the Comprehensive Plan by adjusting the lots to be aligned and density with their back neighbors. The purple, like I mentioned in the slide before, addresses the neighborhood compatibility issue and the surrounding areas to the south. The orange, again, to meet MDR expectations set by the FLUM we ask that these townhomes be replaced with single family residents. Lots for the green. This is to address walkability within the neighborhood. There are some good things of walkability east to west, but not going north to south, particularly as it goes to those neighbors walking to the main park there. And, finally, the last thing I want to highlight is actually the entire areas of blue. Propose that this should be R-8 zoning. Right now the smaller single -- the smaller lots you see in that area they are on average 3,500 square feet. By having an R-8 zoning it would require that to be a minimum of 4,000 square feet. And why is that? Why does that matter, just 500 square feet? Well, a couple different things. First, when it comes to real estate, just remember what they say, location, location, location. It's not lot size. Price is impacted more by surrounding neighborhoods, amenities, build cost, quality than would be by 500 square feet of lot size. The economic factors out -- there is economic factors outside the control of one builder in one preliminary plat that's going on in Meridian right now. The existing surrounding neighborhood -- exuberant home values have bigger impact on the prices of these homes than the square lot. So, why -- what is that difference? What does that 500 square for --

Seal: Sir, you will need to wrap up quickly.

Phillips: That 500 square feet lot will allow individuals to have -- to make their house a home. Front porches for neighborhoods. Patios for family to gather in. Additional living space to watch Boise State games, areas for a family getting started. Additional storage

so they can actually park in their garage. And so that's why I request that that be made R-8 zoning. Thank you.

Seal: Thank you. Madam Clerk, do we have any -- who else do we have signed up?

Weatherly: Mr. Chair, we had several people sign up in house. Only one indicating a wish to testify and that's Thomas Dayley.

Seal: Good evening. Please state your name and address for the record and --

Dayley: Thank you. Thomas Dayley. 4892 South Willandra Way, Boise. 83709. I guess I would -- first of all, I would like to thank the Commission for extending their time for consideration. We appreciate the fact that you have done that. You asked them significant questions in the August meeting. Some of those were addressed and I would like to talk about some of those as well and appreciate the developer as well trying to accommodate some of the issues that were brought forward by the Commission, as well as the community. However, I don't think all of those were addressed and that's where I would like to get to. I am a very supporter of private property rights. I think the developer has his property and he has a right to develop it. That's not what we are talking about here. It's how it's developed. By the same token, the people who own the homes adjacent to that property also have property rights and they are going to be impacted negatively by the proposed -- proposal as it's being developed and I think that's part of what the Commission needs to be considering as well. Not only the developer's property rights, but the land -- other landowners' property rights as well and try to -- try to accommodate both of those. We have had significant questions asked here by the -- by the people that have been brought forward and I think -- one of the questions I would like to ask to the Commission is do you feel that all of the questions have been appropriately answered as you consider approving this or not? And another question is are there other alternatives that a developer could use to reduce the density and one of the options that I would like you to consider is -- in my previous work I worked with the National Resource Conservation Service, which has what they call an urban farming program and that dedicates places within an urban environment where a developer or a landowner can actually get an easement -- paid money for an easement. That easement, then, dedicates property for urban farming for plots for -- for gardens -- urban gardens. Education. You have a school right next to part of the -- the plan there, as well as it's an educational purpose for kids in a school where they can see farming, how it's done, et cetera. So, there are lots of options like that a developer could have, which will reduce the density and also provide a very good use. And the developer gets paid for this. There is an easement and they get paid current land values for that property and I know this developer has owned this property for a long period of time and is now finally getting to develop it. So, I understand that. But for the last 20 years that they have owned it and haven't been able to develop, it -- it's increased in value. They haven't lost value and that's what this urban farming program would do as well, it would allow a time period and at the end of the 20, 30 years for the easement, they can still come back and develop it and it would actually do more in keeping with the Comprehensive Plan of transitional. Twenty years from now that portion of the City of Meridian will be much more attuned to the

development of commercial and the other things and this developer would still have the ability to retain it -- retain their value and also be able to have a transitional development process and it would also reduce the impact at this point in time with the adjacent landowners. So, I think -- I guess my request to the Commission is to -- there has been significant questions asked here that I still don't think have been addressed. Like the parking. The traffic flow. The commercial development where there is a warehouse. A warehouse does not fit in this community. But that's part of their commercial -- commercial proposal.

Seal: Sir, you will need to wrap up here real quick.

Dayley: So, just to wrap up, the townhouses to single family homes. That's a significant impact that I think that the Commission should deal with. Request for zoning. Parking. When they said -- at least my understanding is 219 homes and nine guest parking. That's why I just -- and maybe I misunderstood what she said, but that is not sufficient. There is some quite -- there is still unanswered questions I think that the Commission should be asking of the developer that we should walk through. Thank you.

Seal: Thank you.

Weatherly: Mr. Chair, that's all we have signed in indicating a wish to testify and I don't see any raised hands online at this time.

Seal: Anybody in Chamber, if you would like to testify, please, raise your hand. Okay. If there is nobody else online, would the applicant like to --

Dodson: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Oh. Go ahead, Joe.

Dodson: I would like to go first, if I don't -- if you don't mind. If the applicant doesn't mind. Just a couple things to clarify for the Commission. On the proposed flex space is not -- how do I put this? It cannot be all warehouse that's for sure. There are minimum requirements that are specific use standards that require a minimum of 30 percent office, no more than a certain amount of retail, but that does not mean that the remaining 70 percent is always warehouse. Largely these flex space units are a pretty even mix of kind of an office, warehouse type of deal that some small business uses to have a little bit of product, I guess, and, then, they have their offices there. I have seen this work really well throughout the city and throughout the valley. It's becoming more and more popular and they are generally low impact on both vehicle trips, as well as overall traffic. So, I do think that that's why the applicant chose that. If the Commission so desires additional -- like we discussed previously -- multi-tenant building for some kind of retail, commercial, restaurant, coffee shop kind of use, that will increase traffic compared to a flex space building for sure in the area. So, that kind of goes against some of the other issues that we have been discussing -- discussing. So, I do want to make that clear. And, then, the -- the density conversation has -- and the future land use map has come up repeatedly,

not just with this project. That's every project. I do want to be clear that the -- the area shown on the future land use map for the future land use designations is not parcel specific. So, it's very difficult to say that certain parcels should have certain future land use map on it or certain acreages and things like that. That's not how we do that. Secondly, to make this applicant utilize the net density versus gross density is completely against what we have in our Comprehensive Plan. Our Comprehensive Plan specifically designates that the density is based off of gross. That's every single project, including the existing that's already there. It's all based on gross density. This does happen to have a fair amount of area that's buffers and they have a large amount of open space. Regardless, they are absolutely meeting their density requirements. Commission and future hearings at the Council can disagree overall and that's fine, but minimally code and future land use they are complying with those density requirements. I just wanted to make that clear.

Seal: Okay. Thank you. Would the applicant like to come back up. Or did Joe steal all your thunder? I stole some of his tonight, so I'm feeling bad about that.

McKay: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission. Becky McKay. Engineering Solutions. As far as the density of this plan -- I mean we -- when -- after we heard the Commission's comments and the neighbors comments -- none of the comments were ignored. I mean we sat down and we spent a couple hours basically going through my detailed notes of not only your comments, but the neighboring comments. We reduced our density by 108 units. We have dropped our density 33 percent. At the same time we have increased our open space significantly and I'm not even counting the eight foot landscape buffer that's on my detached walks along my local streets, which you are allowed to count. I have excluded that. There was a comment about -- that we are embellishing our plan. I mean we have been working really really hard over the past couple months on this plan. We even sent some drafts to the staff to get feedback. We have provided 104 parking spaces. Staff said, hey, we want some parallel parking spaces. So, we -- we have them inset. They are not on the private drive or the alley, they are inset to the landscaping to give that more traditional neighborhood look, that more integrated look. The FLUM was brought up. The FLUM, the UDC, every other municipality in this state looks at density from a gross density standpoint. We provide the gross density calculation. We also provide the net density calculation. That R-8 zone allows three to eight dwelling units per acre or 3.45. The R-15 allows 15 dwelling units per acre and we are 7.44 and our overall density, excluding the commercial area -- so, all we are talking about is the residential zoned area, we are at 6.01 gross density, which is within that medium density designation. There was comments made about mixed use. Mixed use doesn't mean commercial. Mixed use doesn't mean townhomes. If you look at your Comprehensive Plan, your definitions within your ordinance, mixed use talks about townhomes. It talks about -- it talks about four-plexes. Detached single family dwellings. Attached single family dwellings. Neighborhood commercial. Flex space. Flex space is not warehouse. A flex -- I -- there is property on the northwest corner of Hill Road and Highway 55 that has sat vacant for -- it's pushing probably 15 years. Finally a use went on it and it's a mixture of some flex space, where it's a business, but they have -- they have material storage in their -- in their building and, then, next door to them is a



coffee shop. So, it's kind of integrated and I thought, you know, that's -- that's unique and the -- the elevations of the building meet all of the design guidelines for commercial. I mean we are trying to figure out -- one of the comments was the transportation. The lowest traffic generator is something like a combination flex space, maybe a little retail component and a daycare, so that we are not generating so much traffic. Absolute retail generates a significant amount of traffic. A comment was made why don't you have an approach out to Amity Road? Amity Road is a major artery -- or minor arterial. ACHD will not allow us to have any access to Amity. We did add another access to Hillsdale Avenue, which is a collector, to make our commercial component more viable and if you look at that site plan -- if Joe could bring it up -- you can see that it has -- the commercial node has its own access and that will be a full access. We only asked for a right-in, right-out. ACHD came back and said, no, that will be a full access, because it's a full access that you are aligning with on the west side at the Hillsdale commercial. So, you can see that we have added another access to make that commercial component viable and allow it to have transfer -- or access outside of the neighborhood and within the neighborhood. It was mentioned this plan falls short of the vision. This is a priority growth area that the city has spent a significant amount of money for the regional park. They wanted the South Meridian YMCA, elementary school. West Ada School District owns additional property north of Amity. There is a charter school that's going to come online next fall that will also serve the same area as Hillsdale Elementary and at the same time that we are being bashed, we are also going to have to install the signal at Hillsdale Avenue and Amity, which is going to benefit not only us, but everyone in this community and allow them to make left-hand turns more easily. We are also going to be widening all of our frontage along Amity. We are going to have a turn lane. We are not solely depending on Hillsdale Avenue, an intrusion into this neighborhood, and it's not intrusion, because that is a mid mile collector that was intended to handle a significant amount of traffic. But we also have our Amity Road approach. So, that gives us an opportunity for our residents to go eastbound and make a right-hand turn on Amity. We have connected to the stub streets. I have nine and ten thousand square foot lots all around my perimeter, matching them lot line for lot line. And, then, transitioning the lots across from those lots, so that we have different variety of lots. That is the whole objective of mixed use, that we provide a variety of home products, a variety of mixed uses. The traffic that we were initially going to generate was 2,600 vehicles per day. I have got that traffic down to about 2,025. That's at build out. That's over four phases, which will probably be built over a four year period. So, this -- this project will come online incrementally. My overall landscaping is seven acres and that seven acres -- I mean you got to remember the size of the property is 38 and I have 7.19 acres of common area. That's 18 and a half percent of this property is in landscapable area, with pathways and significant amenities for these residents and we -- we have done -- we have -- we have put plazas in. We have art. We have pickleball courts. We have a swimming pool. We have -- we have pathways. Picnic shelters. Multi-use pathways. Nature pathways. I mean for a piece of property that's this size, we have really worked to make sure that it incorporates the vision that's in your comp plan and we missed the mark with the first version. The density was too great. The three story was not appropriate. And I believe the Commission made the right decision to say, hey, Becky, take another look at this. Go back to your client, see what you can do. Come back with a good -- a better plan. A better plan that fits this area. This plan fits this area.

This plan complies with your Comprehensive Plan and to just say, hey, we got to all be single family, that -- that defeats the whole purpose of the land use map and what we are trying to create in Meridian in this particular area and if you can't get density, how do you build the signals? How do you afford to build all the amenities? How do you afford to put in the pedestrian signal to improve the safer route to schools? I mean we are doing everything -- everything we can to not only make our development the best it can be, but to improve this overall neighborhood and make it safer for everyone and I ask the Commission to support it and recognize the effort and the time that's been put into it and the recommendation of your staff. Thank you.

Seal: Thank you. Any final questions? If not I will ask that I get a motion to close the public hearing for Item No. H-2021-0046.

Grove: So moved.

Wheeler: Second.

Seal: Okay. It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing on Item No. H-2021-0046. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? So, motion carries.

**MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.**

Seal: All right, Commissioners, who wants to go first?

Grove: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Grove, go ahead.

Grove: Where to start? The -- the applicant did make some significant improvements and the reduction -- I mean that's one of the biggest reductions that I have seen on a project this size for a continuance. Just kind of throwing that out there. So, the two years I have been here I haven't seen that big a reduction on a continuance before. So, kudos to your team for -- for doing that. I definitely see and have read and can feel the palpable emotions of the audience and the residents on this. So, I definitely understand, you know, what is being said and why it's being said. I -- I have some things that I like about it. I have some things that I don't like. I would say the likes that I have on this, with this revision, the second edition connection to Hillsdale to get that commercial, that definitely increases that -- the value for everybody just in terms of reducing traffic and making the commercial more accessible. I like that you have included the commercial. I think that having a better narrative on what that is in terms of -- I don't think most people will understand what flex space is, so as you go forward and making sure that that is better communicated as to the intentions, so that the current residents understand a little bit more of your intentions with that space, so that there isn't hesitancy and confusion and misunderstanding. I think anytime that misunderstandings can be cleared up it works in everybody's favor. This is not a process where we are going to get everything that everybody wants. It's a compromise and just because there is pieces that the developer

likes and the residents don't and vice-versa doesn't mean that the process is wrong. It means that it's a compromise. I like that you have improved the entrance. The amenities look great. I think that there is room for improvement on some of the -- as -- I think -- let me see if I had it right here. James mentioned some of the north-south connections. I don't know if there is any ability to squeeze those in to get additional north-south passages, but well -- well made point and think that's where I'm at for right now. But I'm sure I will come back on in a minute.

Seal: All right. Commissioner Wheeler, go ahead.

Wheeler: Thank you, Chairman. I'm -- I am, too, with Commissioner Grove on this, that -- that to go ahead and reduce your -- when a developer comes out to go ahead and purchase a piece of property, obviously, he is doing his proforma and he is trying to figure out, okay, how much can I make per acre and to go ahead and reduce that size -- or that amount by a third, that's -- that's significant and still want to move forward with the project. That's -- that's significant. I'm also seeing that a lot of the stuff that we talked about and suggested the developer did put into practice or into this -- into this plan here in order to -- so, it seems like he was responsive and wanting to listen to what was being shared from the Commission. The -- the flex spaces -- yeah, I -- as I look at this you are -- you are next to a daycare, you are going to be next to a school, you are next to the Y. There is no doubt in my mind there is going to be a coffee shop here. It just seems like this is just a perfect little spot for it, somewhere in here on this flex space. One of the things I was looking at, too, was just the traffic pattern, but -- and this is maybe where this might have some jurisdiction over on ACHD side of things, but coming in most likely they will be coming in off a Hillsdale, turning left into the full access that's at the most north -- yeah. Northwestern part of the project and, then, turning right. You got a daycare there. Right again. Right again. And a back. And that landscape buffer that comes in off of Park prohibits people from coming into the daycare with a left-hand turn, going ahead and jamming up traffic within the interior drive aisles and so there seems to have been some good thought on that, on even just the traffic flow pattern on that, so -- and the reduction in the height coming down from three stories down to two, it seems to have accommodated some of the concerns of the neighbors on this. I'm -- I like the adjustments that were done here. I like the way that there was a lot of thought put back into what was said from both the Commission and also written testimony. A lot of open space, comparatively speaking, to other projects of the same size and at the same time I'm with Commissioner Grove on this. There is some things maybe I would do different, but all in all all of this has been put together pretty well with a lot of willingness to listen to the input that was given.

Seal: All right. Commissioner Yearsley, you want to jump in on this?

Yearsley: Thank you very much. I might be the only one in the room, per se, saying I think Becky did a great job. This looks so much better than it did before. It just -- you know, to come in with that much of a reduction in home -- units is -- is amazing and I think she did a very good job laying it all out and making it look good. So, like I said, I think it looks good. I am one in full favor of property rights and -- and having the developer

develop as they would like within reasonable limits, with -- as set by the city and I think they have done that and I am in full support of this project.

Seal: Okay. Thank you. I'm kind of with Commissioner Yearsley, I think they have done a good job of listening to the concerns, reducing things overall. Like -- like Commissioner Grove said, this is one of the largest reductions I have seen. So, hopefully, a third is -- is enough. I mean if any one of you were asked to give up a third of anything that you have with potential, it's probably a hard pill to swallow. So, they have swallowed it and acted on it. So, if anybody has questions on flex space and what that might mean, you might want to stick around for the Red Aspen presentation we have next -- coming next as far as what a commercial space can do. Flex space can do. It will be enlightening for you. So, they are -- they are good for our communities. I guess one of the things I'm -- I still get a little discouraged about is there is a lot of talk about how, you know, everybody's -- nobody's against development, but they just don't want it in their area, so -- I mean, unfortunately, Meridian is -- it's a big area and it's growing. I mean we are the fastest growing city in the United States. So, it's -- it's coming, it's here, and we do have to manage it well. I applaud the applicant for listening and doing what was asked. I think to ask for more at this point in time is not appropriate, to be perfectly honest. So, with that I will -- oh, go ahead, Commissioner Wheeler.

Wheeler: I would like to go ahead make a motion.

Seal: Absolutely. Motions are always -- always admired here.

Wheeler: After considering all staff, applicant -- staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move that we recommend approval to the City Council of file number H-2021-0046, as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of October 21, 2021, with the --

Grove: With the -- with the changes in the staff memo; right?

Wheeler: Do we need to put that in there, too? Okay. And also with the changes per the staff memo.

Seal: Okay.

Yearsley: I will second that.

Seal: Do I have a second? Oh. Commissioner Yearsley, thank you. It's been moved and seconded to approve Item No. H-2021-0046 with -- with the modifications in the staff memo. All those in favor say aye. No opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. THREE ABSENT.

**6. Public Hearing for Elsinore Daycare Facility (H-2021-0061) by 814 Development, LLC, Located at 4818 and 4858 N. Elsinore Ave.**