

A Meeting of the Meridian City Council was called to order at 6:00 p.m., Tuesday, March 10, 2026, 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, Linda Ritter, Nick Napoli, Berle Stokes 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 the meeting to order. For the record it is March 10th, 2026, at 6:00 p.m. We will begin tonight's regular City Council meeting with roll call attendance.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Simison: If you would at all, please, rise and join us in the pledge.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

COMMUNITY INVOCATION

Simison: Up next will be our community invocation, which tonight will be delivered by Pastor Rick DeMichele with the Treasure Valley Baptist Church. If you would all, please, join us in this community invocation or take this as a moment of silence and reflection.

DeMichele: Let's pray. Father, we are grateful to be here tonight. Your word tells us in Romans Chapter 13 that government is ordained of you for order, for safety and for peace and that good government secures these things for us and to that end we pray for our honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council tonight, that you give them clarity of thought, wisdom, discernment and understanding and good judgment in all the matters that they must consider tonight, to the glory and honor of our Savior Jesus Christ and to the blessing of those that live in this great city, for it's in your name we pray, amen.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Simison: Thank you. Up next is adoption of the agenda.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: There are no changes to tonight's agenda, I move that we approve the agenda as published.

Little Roberts: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

PROCLAMATIONS

1. Aging Out Awareness Month Proclamation

Simison: Our first item up is -- will be a proclamation for Aging Out Awareness Month. I don't know if Alexis is here or JEMFriends. If you want to come and join us up at the podium, please. Turn this around to get on the other side of this. So, Council, we are here tonight, as I mentioned, to do a proclamation for Aging Out Awareness Month. This is an issue that I think has got a lot of attention over the last few years, especially if we have seen some fundraisers and donations from members of our community happening. But we will go ahead read the proclamation, then, turn it over for any comments you all may have, so -- whereas, there are approximately 1,200 Idaho children in foster care in 2025, five percent of the children in Idaho foster care will age out every year and whereas aging out describes a time when foster children in Idaho reaching the age of 18 will leave the system of formal care and face the transition to independent living as legal adults and whereas many foster children who age out don't have the skills and support necessary for transitioning to productive adulthood and whereas all aging out youth should have the opportunity to transition into a society that understands their adversity and supports them in becoming a loving adult and whereas a successful transition for aging out youth requires a community of supporters, mentors and friends who will assist these youth in securing safe and stable housing and transportation, furthering education, finding employment, learning life skills and building healthy relationships. Therefore, I, Mayor Robert Simison, proclaim March 2026 as Aging Out Awareness Month in Meridian, Idaho, and urge all citizens to learn more about the adversity faced by aging out youth to spread knowledge about these youth to volunteer or partner with local organizations that provide education, housing, employment, support, mentoring or other programs for aging out youth, dated this 10th day of March 2026. So, on behalf of the City of Meridian I want to present this proclamation to you and, then, invite you up for any comments you have.

Flores: Okay. Hello, everyone. For those who may not be familiar JEMFriends is an organization that serves youth who have aged out of foster care or maybe they are facing other at risk situations like homelessness, so they are 18 now and we seek to help provide stability through housing and a lot of independent services. So, employment, transportation, community, a lot of things that are super important to make that transition well to be independent and so we just are excited to be here and get to raise awareness that these youth exist. On average in Idaho 60 youth are aging out of care every year. So, it is a relevant issue, but there is things that we can do about it. And so that's what we are doing. So, if you have questions we will be here. I brought brochures and different things that I can leave, but we will be here if you have questions. Thank you.

Thompson: Yes. Thank you. This is the first city that has brought a proclamation with the state of Idaho. Thank you to the citizens that take this cause on. We do have pins that you can wear through the month. We encourage you to shout us out over social media. Speak to your neighbors about this. Talk to your children and they can talk to their schools. There may be individuals in their schools that need a resource like JEMFriends and, then, we would also encourage you to follow our social media. We have an amazing event coming up on March 27th where you are going to hear the stories of some of these young adults that have aged out of the foster care system and just blooming into independence and we would love you to come out. It's called the Art of Becoming and we will have information through our social media page and our website for you guys to join us there. We would love to have you and anyone else from the Council come out for that event as well.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND RECOGNITION

Simison: Well, we will move on to announcements and recognition. Any announcements or recognition? Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, two I think just important announcements and maybe some recognition. This last weekend Cole Valley Christian's 4-A boys -- men's basketball team won the state championship. So, want to give them a shout out and I don't think we touched on it last week, but it should come as a surprise to nobody that Meridian High School men's wrestling set yet a new state record when they brought home another state championship. So, hopefully, Mr. Mayor, looking forward to having them be recognized at future City Council meetings. Always good when our high school students continue to make our community proud. So, thanks, Mr. Mayor.

Simison: In the works.

Cavener: Wonderful.

PUBLIC FORUM

Simison: Anything else under that item? All right. Then with that, Mr. Clerk, anyone signed up under public forum?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, nobody signed up.

PUBLIC HEARINGS [Action Item]

2. Public Hearing for Tong (H-2025-0049), by Dara Tong, located at 485 E. Overland Rd.

- A. Request: Annexation of approximately 0.496 acres of land from R1 in Ada County to the R-4 zoning district. The applicant entered into an agreement with the city to annex within six months of receiving City Utility Services due to a failed septic system.

Simison: Okay. Then we will move on to our public hearings for this evening. First item up is public hearing for Tong, H-2025-0049. We will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Ritter: Good evening, Mayor and Council. So, tonight we are here for an annexation. This site consists of 0.496 acres of land. It's zoned RUT and it's at 485 East Overland Road. So, the septic system for this property was failing and the applicant had to hook up to city water and sewer service. No new development or redevelopment of the property is being proposed at this time and it will remain a residential use for the foreseeable future. There is a non-conforming structure that is on the property that the applicant is requesting to remain and have it as a legal non-conforming structure grandfathered in based on the fact that they are not planning on doing anything else with this property. So, there were no written testimony on this property. The Planning Commission approved this with the understanding that the applicant wanted to keep that non-conforming structure and we have not received any written testimony prior to this hearing and so, basically, straightforward annexing, because it's part of the agreement with the city and so at this time I will be more than happy to take any questions that you have.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions for staff? Okay. Is the applicant here? Good evening. State your name and address for the record and be recognized for up to 15 minutes.

Tong: Okay. My name is Dara Tong and I'm a resident of 485 East Overland Road in Meridian, Idaho.

Simison: Do you have anything you would like to add to what the staff said or did they sum it up pretty good?

Tong: Pretty good.

Simison: Council, any questions for the applicant? All right. Thank you. Mr. Clerk, anyone signed up to provide testimony on this item?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, nobody signed up.

Simison: Okay. Is there anybody present who would like to provide testimony on this item or if you are online you can use the raise your hand feature. Seeing no one coming forward, does the applicant waive any final comments? No more comments from the applicant? Okay. The applicant waives final comments.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Seeing as there are no more public comments, I move we close the public hearing.

Little Roberts: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: This seems like not only just a simple application, but a very logical procession and what they have needed to do for this property since they have to come into the city. I would move -- after considering all staff, applicant and public testimony that we approve File No. H-2025-0049 as presented in the staff report for the hearing date of March 10th, 2026.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a -- have a motion and a second to approve Item H-2025-0049. Is there discussion?

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Do we also need to note the legal non-conforming use as approved in the motion itself?

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I would like to add to the motion that we are acknowledging the legal non-conforming structure that is being grandfathered in under this approval.

Little Roberts: Second concurs.

Simison: Second concurs. Thank you for that. Is there any further discussion on that revised motion? If not, clerk call the roll.

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

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

3. Public Hearing for Shafer View Ridge Subdivision (H-2025-0047) by Gregg Davis, Breckon Land Design, located at Lot 18 of the Shafer View Estates Subdivision at the intersection of S. Meridian Rd. and E. Shafer View Dr.

- A. Request: Annexation of 15.2 acres of land from RUT in Ada County to the R-4 zoning district.
- B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 38 lots (29 building lots and 9 common lots) on 13.437 acres of land.

Simison: With that we will move on to Item 3, which is a public hearing for Shafer View Ridge Subdivision, H-2025-0047. We will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Ritter: Mayor and Council, so the applicant is requesting annexation of this property of 15.2 acres of land from RUT in Ada county to R-4 zoning districts. A preliminary plat consisting of 38 lots, 29 buildable lots and nine common lots that will be on like 13.437 acres of land. The minimum lots are proposed -- lot size proposed is 8,300 square feet and the largest lot proposes 24 hundred -- I mean -- I'm sorry -- 24,000. The minimum lot size in the R-4 district is 8,000. Access to the property will be via Meridian Road, which is an arterial road, and Mont Meadows, which is a collector road. So, a waiver that the applicant is asking for is for the block face as a proposed development on the south side of the existing street exceeds the 750 feet requirement that's between Snowden and Mont Meadow Way. Because this is an existing road and, then, also sewer is not available at the eastern portion of the development at this time. Sewer is dependent on Mont Meadows Subdivision bringing sewer to and through their development to Shafer View Ridge Subdivision. Mont Meadows has had their final plat

approved, so they will be coming in with their final plat submittal signature at sometime, so they can get that going and get that -- all the improvements in. Unless they are working on it now. So, this -- they are proposing one common driveway that meets the requirements of the -- the UDC and they have noise abatement for this particular subdivision, because it is adjacent to Meridian Road, so they have to provide a -- a wall and berming, which they are proposing. See if I have it in here. Sorry. This is their proposal for the noise abatement along Meridian Road, because they are in close proximity to a state highway. So, they did provide building elevations. Six elevations were submitted for this proposal and, then, as some of the homes back up to or have the sides of the homes facing Meridian Road or collector roads, staff recommended a DA provision requiring these elevations incorporate articulation through changes in two or more of the following: Modulation, projections, recesses, stepbacks, pop-outs, bays, banding, porches, balconies, material or other integrated architectural elements to break up monotonous wall planes and roof lines that are visible from adjacent public streets. As always single family -- single story homes are exempt from this requirement. So, the Boise-Kuna Irrigation District has requirements for this project and the purpose of these requirements is to ensure that the patrons have use of their water as they have historically and that no harm is being incurred from the newly proposed development. Adjoining land owners will not have their conveyance ditches, which is live water or drainage, altered or restricted regarding water entering or departing their perspective properties. So, the applicant is aware that these are conditions from the irrigation district. So, again, we have the landscaping. They are providing a landscaping to -- along with their open space as required by the UDC. There is a 35 foot landscape buffer along Meridian Road and they have a landscape buffer that is adjacent to the Mont Meadow Subdivision that's here and this is their open space area and they are adding -- this is an area that was of concern with some of the comments that were from the public about having the vision altered from everything coming from the south along Meridian Road and the applicant will go into more detail about some of the things that they will do to try to mitigate that. Even though this an -- Shafer View is an existing road, so these are existing conditions there that are there and things happen on Meridian Road, some of the -- like the speed and stuff is out of the control of the applicant, so as mentioned from the Planning Commission these are things that are existent that are out of the developer's control. Again, this is their open space amenity. So, they are adding a playground and some benches to make this area -- incorporate this area for the development. I did a site for the West Ada School District just showing what the capacity of the schools are for the middle school and the high school and elementary school there. Just wanted to add this to the slide. I put a table in your outline also. As you can see the high school is over capacity and so is the middle school, but the elementary school still has capacity. So, we did receive a written comment from Debbie Boyd. It was on behalf of the Shafer View Homeowners Association. She was talking about safety regarding traffic on Shafer View Drive with the addition of the homes and that was kind of the theme throughout the testimony was that Shafer View is not considered a safe speed limit. The width of it -- so, we did not receive any other written testimony. We did receive comments from several of the homeowners in the area at the hearing. We had about four people that testified at the hearing and their main concerns were the roadway design capacity, on-street parking

hazards, road width limitations, blind spots invisibility concerns, sight distance limitations and the need for traffic analysis. The Ada County Highway District is on line tonight to answer any questions that you may have and, again, these are existing conditions for when this road was built in the county to different standards than what the city has. So, the city did not have a say in how that road would be designed. So, we can't really change a lot for this road, because it is an existing roadway and we can only control what's on our side and what is annexed into the city. So, the -- oh, these are just some pictures of that area on Meridian Road and you can see that there is a lot of stuff that is in the vision for the south traffic that is in the site distance triangle. There is a lot of landscape in there and, again, the applicant will discuss this further when they do their presentation. So, the Commission did recommend approval with no changes to staff recommendation and they had no outstanding issues for Council to address at this time. So, with that I will be happy to answer any questions that you may have regarding this application.

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

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Linda, just a quick question and I'm trying to -- I was trying to find it. I remember reading something from the Planning and Zoning minutes about a concern about not being sidewalks on both sides of the road. Can you refresh my memory about -- is that something that was resolved at P&Z or is that still an existing issue?

Ritter: Staff did recommend sidewalks on the north side of Shafer View. We did have a conversation with the highway district and based on what they were saying it wasn't a requirement and there was not enough room to add sidewalks on that side without going on to private property. So, we did ask for a striped area for pedestrians to walk along to -- until they get to the next segment of sidewalk and even with that they said that it would not fit within the existing roadway.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Linda, can you pull up on maybe one of the maps and show us kind of where you -- where that's occurring?

Ritter: So, these three lots -- there is no sidewalks along these three lots and we wanted something to connect, because there is sidewalk here and there is a sidewalk over here. So, there will be a connection here, sidewalk all along here and there is sidewalk here. So, we wanted something along here to get people safely on that side, because there is a bus stop down here somewhere for the kids. We did not have the

support of ACHD on that, so the Planning Commission didn't think it was an issue. Kind of -- but leave it up to you guys to decide if that is something that you wanted to do.

Cavener: Thank you, Linda. I appreciate it. Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Linda, can you just maybe expand a little bit on your comment about the road being built in the county and not to city specifications, but not being able to do much about it. As I went through the comments -- and you have noted it here -- that if there is two way traffic and there is cars on both sides of the road, that 32 feet isn't wide enough to get passage through there. Is there any ability to not allow parking on one side of the road or can there be parking on both sides of the road and there is nothing we can do about it?

Ritter: If that is something that -- it still meets fire requirement to -- in order for fire to get through there. The -- I think the width of a local street is like 33 feet or something like that. Bill will clarify. So, I -- I think it may be wide enough, but I'm not sure. I guess it depends on what is parked out there. But, then, again, it could also be like traffic coming, so people won't go through there so fast and I will also have ACHD speak on that also, because -- since they are like the experts for this. I don't want to speak out of turn. So, if KaraLeigh is on -- KaraLeigh, can you kind of give some guidance on this?

Troyer: Hi. For the record KaraLeigh Troyer, ACHD, 5800 North Meeker Avenue. I'm here on behalf of -- representing ACHD tonight. To answer your question, Councilman Whitlock, about the roadway width, it is approximately 32 feet of pavement on Shafer View Drive out there. However, we measure back of curb to back of curb, so the roadway width is a little larger than that and it does currently accommodate parking on both sides. It has a designation of a collector roadway and if parking is a concern for the neighborhood or for the Council, then, we can do a traffic investigation to reduce the parking to either be parking on one side or on both sides of the roadway. However, as Linda already said, the parking does create traffic calming and allows motorists to slow down through this area creating a safer environment for pedestrians and cyclists. However, as I said, the current street width does accommodate parking on both sides.

Parsons: Mayor, Council, may I just elaborate just a little bit more to -- for Councilman Whitlock? So, you are correct, the -- this is a -- Shafer View -- this is a non-buildable lot that was created when the first phase of Shafer View came in. So, ACHD has different street sections for rural street sections. This is one of those where they just have blacktop and no sidewalks. Going back to Councilman Cavener's question about the sidewalk, the reason why it would end up on private property in this particular case is because when these rural street sections are constructed there is borrow ditches on each side of the roadway to handle the drainage. So, that would push -- that would impact -- require the applicant to redesign all of that drainage, forcing the sidewalk

potentially on the private property owner and we didn't want to impede the -- the county residents. So, it's -- it's one of these instances where we are integrating city all around this one acre county enclave, which we have done throughout the city, but just at least wanted to give you some context that it's just -- to allow that roadway to drain it's just impossible and get those property owners to agree to sidewalk on their properties when they are already landscaping on their trees, driveways, it's just -- it didn't seem feasible. So, ACHD kind of said they would not require that and so we brought that issue up to Planning and Zoning Commission and they felt with the pedestrian crossings at those intersections and having sidewalk on one side of the road, that that could potentially suffice and provide adequate pedestrian connection in the area.

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

Breckon: Jon Breckon. Breckon Land Design. 6661 North Glenwood Street. Have a little presentation to go through. This one's just for reference. This is an overview plan. Shows a little more detail. Here is -- just going to jump to some of the circulation questions and concerns. So, this is a little more of a zoomed out view and shows existing circulation -- or I guess also proposed circulation routes. There -- this Shafer View Ridge project connects to the Mont Meadows project on the -- to the southeast and there was some comment about that. That one we -- we just received land development approval today and we are working to schedule a pre-con. So, schedule wise that one should be moving forward just as soon as possible with construction. The Mont Meadows project there -- and that will extend sewer and water to Shafer View on that east side and, then, as you can see here by the dashed line, dashed line, would also connect up roadways to the east over to Sublimity Road, which is existing, and around to Quartz Creek on the north. Here is just an image of the block length variance that we are requesting. You can see that we are exceeding the 750 feet along the Shafer View Drive and, then, this one speaks a little bit more to that -- that visibility issue where Shafer View Drive connects to Meridian Road and so that -- that whole hillside is to be graded down and you can see that by the -- the aerial image there on the right with -- with the red showing that all being cut out and, then, graded back. Here is a few looking to the south on Meridian Road, which is a lot of the trouble, I'm sure it has been discussed. And so this is that hillside that we are proposing to cut back and address that -- that visibility issue. This is some additional information that we were able to find and show a little graphic there on -- on the west. What it depicts is a vision triangle -- what would be appropriate based on speeds and you can see that blue line on the graphic to the left is -- would be that -- the edge of that vision triangle that would extend to the south. Here is a road section where it's proposed road section. Well, it's existing and proposed of Shafer View Drive. Shafer View Drive is existing and, then, we are proposing to add on on the south side with a detached sidewalk and I believe it's back of curb, back of curb 34 feet. Just for reference. These are just the utility slides. Proposed amenities. Open space. And, then, this is a section that we added. This is the common area on the south side. There is a 30 foot landscape buffer with a pathway. Building elevations. And so that -- that 30 foot landscape buffer is on this south -- south side to provide separation to Sky Ranch down there. One of the things I

would -- I would -- I guess there has been a lot of discussion about this connection to Sky Ranch and -- and the future traffic that will potentially be cutting through here and in the short term, if this is approved, there will be a hammerhead turnaround here with -- with a gate and I would I guess support -- or maybe ask that -- that Council add a condition of approval that would keep that gate in place until which time the Meridian Road improvements that ITD is planning are installed and that would prevent cross-traffic from Sky Ranch happening prematurely, which is -- I think you will find a lot of the concern. Stand for questions.

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

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: Can you just walk me through the western side of this property then? Linda mentioned noise abatement and a berm and a wall, but I'm hearing that you are going to probably scrape some of that berm for visibility purposes. So, on this map just walk me through what the -- the noise abatement wall and -- and the berm would look like.

Breckon: Yes. Mr. Mayor, Councilman Whitlock, the -- the -- per City Code there is a 35 foot landscape buffer with a ten foot pathway and, then, also a berm and wall to be installed at the back of the lots and so what this plan is depicting would be in full compliance here on the southerly piece and, then, the plan is -- what we are showing is to cut this berm -- cut this hillside back, so we would have that increased visibility and, then, have that landscape buffer and wall kind of wrap around to the back of these lots and so that it doesn't obscure the view and so this would be a very open landscape to promote that -- that vision triangle and also meet those landscape buffer requirements at the back of the lots.

Whitlock: Thank you.

Simison: Council, additional questions for the applicant? Okay. Thank you very much. Mr. Clerk, do we have a few people signed up?

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, we do. First representing an HOA is Dave Morgan.

Simison: Good evening. If you would state your name and address you will be recognized for ten minutes.

Morgan: Dave Morgan. 498 East Shafer View Drive. And I am the HOA president for Shafer View Estates. So, yeah, our biggest concerns here -- I know you have just -- some of them here that sidewalk on the north side there of Shafer View, nobody knows the residents were in favor of that. Doing the crosswalks I think that would be an acceptable thing. I do think putting the crosswalk maybe more down at the corner of Snowden and Shafer View, so it's away from the entrance, that might be a little bit safer,

as opposed to having people coming in right off -- especially if you are making a left in there, you don't have much room to work with. So, that might be a suggestion for you. I know with the view corridor, the biggest thing -- it's not so much that your view coming out, it's -- if you noticed on the one map that they had it's your elevation change. So, you were like 27-45 on our end, but, then, you kind of peak and, then, it goes to 27-33 at the other end. So, when you have traffic coming over it's hard to actually tell whether it's in the far lane or the near lane to you and I know -- and especially depending on what time of the evening it is, if people turn on their lights when they should, it's quite a safety hazard and that was one of the reasons that we wanted the entrance moved more south, because there is not so much of that. You are a little bit more on a level playing field than being -- as opposed to -- you know, you are on this end of a peak type of deal with that. So, that was kind of our biggest safety concerns on that. As far as your parking goes on both sides of Shafer View there, probably a traffic study would be a good idea and maybe limit that just on the first -- just like I said, not putting the crosswalk in that far down, because you don't have a lot of space coming off there. Cars are coming off it. You know, it says 55, but I know when I go to pull out everybody's doing say -- it's -- it's Interstate 69, it's not Highway 69, but -- and we have actually had people hit that corner too fast coming in in the winter and actually end up where they want to tear out. They have actually not made the corner. They are going, you know, too fast, but still -- so -- yeah. As far as -- like I said the parking lot may be limiting that off, so it's got to be down and maybe down on one side of the street or whatever just to make it a little bit more safe for people coming in and out of there. And, then, I'm also worried a little bit about -- depending on how much traffic you have, especially from that Sky Ridge, if that eventually goes in and you have got 20 people all trying to make a right turn out onto Meridian Road, that's going to go -- see if I can -- you know, you are going to have cars lined up from here and, then, over to here trying to get in from there, because, you know, now it's just us, there is only 15, so it's really not that bad coming out and we all have different -- different times and stuff and now you are adding 39 more and I don't know how many other ones -- 77 for Sky Ridge or something like that. It's quite a -- quite a large number. So, I know for future traffic that is really a big concern. I do know that that eventually be -- 69 will be seven lanes. That will change a lot of things. Right-in. Right-out. I know it only one allows left out right now. Everything else -- Quartz Creek and all that have dividers they put in, because it's -- it's new, but we are kind of grandfathered in. So, that's just kind of where we are at there. So, I appreciate your time. Any questions for me?

Simison: Council, any questions?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Thanks for being here and kind of providing a perspective from the neighborhood. I guess perspective. I'm kind of tracking a little bit of some of the -- it sounds like some of the neighbors' concerns about traffic and traffic backing up. Help me understand where the opposition from your neighborhood is about sidewalks on

both sides. It sounds like you said that your neighbors are opposed to sidewalks on both sides.

Morgan: Well, no, it's just we would have to put it now -- you are turning into the people's yards and that is an -- and I mean we have all walked our neighbor in, what, for the last 25 years now without a sidewalk. It's not a big deal and I understand the new subdivision would have walkways, but I don't think you necessarily need that on -- on both sides. We even have access to Shafer View Terrace that's down further from here. Let's see. Right about in -- well, actually, it's right -- oh, this area down here. But the other corner of the map you can see that it's a fire access road. That connects to that and that goes around Shafer View Terrace and, then, that connects into Pinnacle. So, there is -- so, when you are walking and all that -- so, if you are coming from the other direction, yeah, it's -- everything should just stay on the south side, because I understand the whole subdivision lacks sidewalks there, but I don't think we need to, because we have -- not just like a single light post going into the ground, they are all done up with stone and the mailbox is there -- I mean there is a lot of trees and all kinds of things to tear out, then, for three homes, so -- folks would just have a crosswalk there that automatically puts you to a sidewalk on the other side of the street, so -- yeah.

Simison: Okay.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor. Dave, would you mind showing us where you would think a better idea for the crosswalk is, because it's --

Morgan: Oh. Okay. Yeah.

Little Roberts: -- getting to the bus stop --

Morgan: Yeah. And I will explain that, too. So, right here is where Snowden and Shafer View would be. This kind of funny axe-shaped lot is actually an open area -- collection water area. That's where the sidewalk ends. So, if you connect there -- the bus stop -- they don't really meet anymore there. They meet right down here -- well, it's actually just outside of the map. But on Quartz Creek, because there is a sidewalk continues all the way down Meridian Road and, then, there is Quartz Creek and Meridian Road. So, the bus stops there instead of up at -- at ours. So, in fact, my neighbor even takes most of the kids over there and just drops them off, so -- yeah. Yeah. Okay.

Little Roberts: Thank you.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Okay. I think I'm tracking. So, on the north side --

Morgan: Uh-huh.

Overton: -- there is a sidewalk coming back from Meridian Road on the northside to the lot that looks like the axe.

Morgan: Yes. If you can -- so it starts -- you can see it right here. If you are able to look on where I -- and, then, it ends right there at the start of that. There is an access road for the ditch company right there. So, the sidewalk stubs right there and, then, that's where Snowden would come in. So, basically, you could come from the crosswalk and, then, you are right on to the sidewalk right across the street and it's a couple of hundred feet back from the Meridian Road entrance.

Overton: Mr. Mayor, follow up.

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: If we continue to the east --

Morgan: Uh-huh.

Overton: -- on that north side, it's -- the road just kind of goes into a recessed area for water runoff. There is no sidewalks to the east past that point.

Morgan: Just -- yeah. Right. There is the little bit of an access road and, then, we have got a -- there is two trees with rocks in between them and, then, the first house is Shafer View Estates starts right there and, then, of course, there were just gutter -- street and gutter at that point.

Overton: Okay. Mr. Mayor, one more.

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: In the area where you have sidewalks I'm assuming county street there is a sidewalk, but there is no streetlights on that side -- on that north side or are there?

Morgan: No, we don't have any -- we don't have any sidewalks in the subdivision. Streetlights, no, we don't have streetlights. Everybody -- we all have our yard -- what do you want to call them -- ornamental light or whatever, but everybody has. That was a requirement when the subdivision was put in, everybody had to have a light in the front of their property for that. So, we don't have the tall -- tall ones per se. Yeah. Yeah.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor, can I ask one more question?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I appreciate Councilman Overton's question about sidewalks had me interested -- other sidewalks anywhere else. And so when you look at the -- the Google map of the roadway network for your neighborhood, it appears like there is a lot of cracks in -- in the road. Do you guys feel like that -- is your road any different than any other neighborhood road and is it -- was it designed differently with --

Morgan: No, I don't think so. I mean -- and it gets resurfaced periodically.

Cavener: Okay. It seems weird.

Morgan: Yeah. It's been a few years since ACHD's been in there, but, yeah, they do resurface and seal coat that. Yeah.

Cavener: Thanks.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I was just thinking -- I loved your feedback on this concept of potentially having a gate -- kind of gating off the Sky Ranch area until the improvements are complete. I would love to hear your feedback on that. I also would love to hear ACHD's feedback on the viability of that and staff's feedback, so --

Morgan: Okay. Yeah, I do think a gate -- now -- now, granted, I will -- I will tell you what -- what the neighborhood would have liked the entrance to just -- we were even willing to close our entrance off and have a new entrance put down more to the south. For whatever reason I don't think ACHD, ITD -- I think that's ITDs in that their -- their deal there. But, yeah, to keep -- because, you know, you are adding -- what is this, 20 -- 29 home sites, which isn't too bad overall, but, then, you add in that subdivision and I think that's upwards of, what, high hundreds, two hundred new homes and, of course, if you are going to go right onto Meridian Road you are going to go that direction, you are not going to go all the way out to -- to that other collector road up to Quartz Creek over. Everybody's going to cut through there. So, I think the -- to kind of keep it in a long term situation, unless they figure out something to get traffic out of that Sky Ridge, so it will feed more out toward Meridian Road, everybody wanting to go through there, then, that is probably at least a good temporary solution for right -- for right now just to kind of keep it limited.

Strader: Thank you.

Simison: Did you also want ACHD to comment?

Strader: Mr. Mayor, that would be fantastic.

Troyer: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, this is KaraLeigh Troyer from ACHD. I think for the gating of the connection between Sky Ranch and Shafer View here, I think we run into the issue of having private utilities within public right of way and restricting public access to a public roadway. Typically that's not something that we would approve and if the Council is interested in that, then, I think that that's something that we could further discuss. However, typically that's not something that is allowed and, additionally, for the traffic that is coming from Sky Ranch onto Shafer View Drive here, we don't perceive that to be above ACHD's threshold for this roadway.

Strader: Thank you.

Morgan: ACHD doesn't live there, but their definition of threshold and my definition of threshold are probably different, as they are all yours where you live, but it is what it is, so -- okay. All right.

Simison: Council, any additional questions? All right. Thank you very much.

Morgan: Thank you.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, next is George Hawkins.

Simison: Good evening. State your name and address and be recognized for three minutes.

Hawkins: George Hawkins. 7034 Catfish Creek, Meridian. I'm here just representing my mother-in-law and father-in-law that live in Shafer View. I know we frequently go and visit them and with having that many more houses proposed to come into a subdivision that the road was designed for the houses that are there, not for more to feed into it. I believe, Council, we are looking at something that -- once that starts we start feeding that kind of traffic into there that it's just going to be a bad situation. I personally had an incident at a prior residence where a friend of mine come and visited me and similar situation on a roadway and I had no idea after he left he was crossing the road just like Meridian Road, a major highway, and that's what he -- and it was flat, there was no elevation change like there is there at Shafer View and you could see really really well and through my years I have also been part of road building and I also understand of them trying to dig back some to improve the view, but with the elevation of that that's not going to help that out that much and I just know once that road system is set up that way, it is hard to make a change. Luckily, after my friend got in an accident there after he left my house, there had been several accidents due to the traffic allowed to be on that road in that manner. They blocked the road to where you could -- you couldn't access out to the highway anymore that way, you had to sit there and go a different way. But it took several accidents and almost my friend's life, because we all know people are going to go the shortest route possible no matter what. I mean with everything that I have been around, between -- I work in the trucking industry and just being around all different types of industries out there that people are just -- that's just human nature to sit there and go that shortest route. So, if we leave that open to that

new subdivision, they are going to use it and I'm just scared that it's -- once it's going -- to take several accidents in the area and, then, something is going to be done to where, Council, we have a chance to preventing it right now. Thank you.

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

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, next we have Gail Ward.

Ward: My name is Gail Ward. I live at 152 East Shafer View Drive and I'm the first existing home in the subdivision. So, I have been there 21 years. So, I have seen a lot and know lot there. I -- I brought some pictures. I'm sure a lot of you haven't been there. If you -- a lot of what I have to say is going to be repeat I'm sure, but you can tell that's going to be a real concern of us in the subdivision. With these pictures you can scan through it and just kind of see what it's like to have traffic on both sides. You can't eliminate one side or the other, because if you look at the map again those houses are facing Shafer View just as we are facing -- facing Shafer View. If you have company they are going to park on the street. You can't tell -- oh, you can't have company in front of your house. You need to park someplace else can come see us. You can't do that. They are going to park in front of their house and you can see there is a sharp corner -- when you come in off of Meridian Road there is a sharp corner there and the visibility to see around that corner to see what's coming and if there is cars there you can't see and just even when the construction was going on when I took these pictures, it just gives you an example, I mean there is -- a lot of times you come close to hitting another car because of the visibility and also on Meridian Road I know that developer wants to cut the berm -- or the -- the -- the corner off, so we can have better visual access, which is great, but the thing is there is an incline right there on Meridian Road. You can't take it out and like was -- what was said before, you don't know which lane people are in. It's so hard until they are coming off that slope down to our subdivision to say is it safe to go out or not safe to go out. Darkness makes it even worse. One of our friends turned into the subdivision and got hit and the car was going a hundred miles an hour. Luckily he is alive, but that just shows you the traffic and you cannot see it until it's coming up on you and if we have got 29 lots in front of us being built and, then, 188 beyond that and they are all coming out or have access -- I can't say everybody will come out that way, but a lot of them will to get right to Meridian Road -- our road is going to back up -- be backed up a lot. I have sat there and clocked at three, five minutes and, then, finally you take a chance and try to get out on Meridian Road. So, you take that times how many cars are going to try to get out there, it's just going to be crazy. But, anyway, like they said, you know, we were more than willing to even shut off our street and be inconvenienced that way and make a -- a road between the two new subdivisions or it could be straight, it can be straight out to Meridian Road. Meridian Road is straight up there just south of us and better visibility and we would still like to consider something like that and have, you know, some traffic studies done with this. One last thing. I know my time is up. I would be one with that sidewalk -- it would take a bunch of my yard out and I'm not willing to do that, you know. It's already an inconvenience to have so many homes built across from us, you know, but I know that's progress, but, please, do not let a sideway affect that and put it on our side. I appreciate it. And thanks for your time.

Simison: Thank you. Council, any questions?

Ward: Oh.

Simison: Okay. Thank you, Gail.

Ward: Thank you.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, next is Marv Ward.

M.Ward: Haven't recovered from knee surgery yet. Mayor, Council, it's good to see you again. It's been a couple years since we were here in this situation before. But, anyway, you have heard the testimony of my wife of those things. Traffic access is -- is -- is a big -- is a big issue. As we talked about trying to mitigate that in some way that -- the gate thing was a great idea. That's the first time I had heard of that. But if -- if you had the -- the picture of Sky Ranch there, about half that subdivision is going to feed into our -- our street and subdivision, just because of the way the roads in that Sky Ranch are laid out. This picture doesn't show that, but -- and, then, the other thing is this crosswalk that's -- I'm pointing at the thing and you can't see it. This crosswalk right here is at the top of that -- that hill there that has that six or seven foot elevation incline. So, as you are coming off there -- if that's a crosswalk, somebody coming off that highway at 40 or 30 miles an hour isn't going to see that until it's kind of late, because there are no streetlights at this point in that area. I don't -- I don't know if there is one proposed in the new subdivision or not. But moving it down to where that hatchet shape is is what makes sense. At least for that. And, then, you know, you get a sidewalk down and this -- where the other sidewalk is there is only two houses on that street. I'm not sure why we are putting a sidewalk there with no sidewalk on the -- or a crosswalk with no sidewalk on the other side. But anyway. And, then, you come to the line of sight. When you come down here the berm being taken out does help, but you still have that elevation change, what was what -- almost ten feet that we have from the edge of this subdivision on the -- on the south side to where that street is that -- it's -- it's hard to see certain times of the day you can't tell how fast they are going. There is several people that think that when that light changes at Lake Hazel that it's a drag strip and it gets pretty interesting. Just as a funny note there is a motorcycle that hits that light every night about 6:00 o'clock and I know that when he hits that road he is doing at least a hundred miles an hour and you can hear it. It's one of those crotch rocket things and he's got it all wound up. But, anyway, that's just a funny side note, but -- and also Quartz Creek has a deceleration lane to get into that other subdivision and we are not getting one here. We really -- with this amount of homes going in there should be a deceleration lane to get into there, so that we are not pulling into the -- the emergency access side road there to -- to make our turn. Any questions?

Simison: Council, any questions?

M.Ward: I can talk more if you want. No? You know me.

Simison: I think we are good. Thank you, Matt.

M.Ward: Okay.

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, next is Debbie Boyd.

Simison: Good evening.

Boyd: Debbie Boyd. 493 East Shafer View. Council Members and Mr. Mayor, I think if you -- as you have noticed from the testimony that this is the -- this subdivision ends up being the piece that connects all of the Lake Hazel, Meridian Road area together and as it's proposed it makes Shafer View Drive, the road that was developed for 15 homes 20 years ago in rural Ada county -- well, it's just not that anymore, but that's what it was developed for and it turns it into the main road for anyone wanting to go out to the Interstate that's in Sky Ranch or in Shafer View Ridge. It just becomes that road. So, you add 150 homes -- and I don't know how many -- I don't know how many trips that is in a day, but that was a lot more traffic onto a road that wasn't designed for that. As others have noticed there -- have mentioned there are issues with the view corridor as it is today. I like what the developer is wanting to do with cutting back on the south side. Nobody ever did anything to the north side, so it is still in that same condition. So, when you are pulling in you can't see coming from the -- if you are driving south on Meridian Road you can't see where you are turning into, because it's blocked. There are issues, as others have mentioned, with the way that the road is set up. There is an immediate rise as you come into Shafer View off of Meridian Road. It's a rise and a turn and it's blind for anybody coming the other direction. At one point the Shafer View developer -- Shafer View Ridge developer looked into moving the road, instead of using -- cutting off our road and moving it down to the south. That eliminates all these conditions that we have going on right now. That was one of the homeowners, including myself, would prefer to have done here. Close off our road. We are fine with that. Move it on down to a safe spot where people can access the road -- you know, we can access the road at a flat spot and not be at this weird rise, so we can be able to see where traffic is at and how fast it's coming. They decided not to do that, because that would be -- if -- if they move the road there would have to be safety conditions put into place, but, instead, they have moved the road back to using Shafer View and they don't have to put in the safety mechanisms. There is no decel lane, no protected central lane, you are just a sitting duck sitting out there waiting to come in. I don't understand why that makes sense to anybody, how you can use the road, but if you put in a new road you have to put in safety conditions. It just doesn't make sense to me. Sky Ranch was approved without an impact study to the roads, because it wasn't connecting directly to Meridian Road, but it is the piece that's going to connect that to now all those homes out onto Shafer View and we still don't have an impact study being done. So, I would like to see an impact study done at a bare minimum.

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

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, that was everyone that signed up.

Simison: Is there anybody else that would like to provide testimony on this item, either if you are in the room come forward or if you are online use the raise your hand feature. Seeing no one coming forward or raising their hand online, would the applicant like to close?

Breckon: Mr. Mayor, Members of -- Members of the Council, I'm going to come back to this map here. This -- this helps explain some of the overall traffic circulation and plans that will be in place very soon. This Mont Meadows project is a key element there, because it provides a release aisle for -- for traffic and connects over to Sublimity, which is a collector and also Quartz Creek, which is on -- on the -- the half mile collector onto Meridian and so in the -- in the big scheme of things that will allow connection to these future lights on Meridian Road, both at Lake Hazel and -- and at Quartz Creek and, then, this -- this plan also shows the layout of -- of Sky Ranch and the roadways there and the connections to Sublimity, as well as to Lake Hazel. This -- I think these are phase lines here, so you can see, you know, the -- from a phasing standpoint -- phasing will start at the southeast corner, that's where the utility connections are, and extend over and so anyone living down here in the southeast quadrant would come out to either Lake Hazel or -- probably Lake Hazel or Sublimity and, then, Lake Hazel and, then, go to the light at Meridian and Lake Hazel to either go north or go south. ITD's plan is -- is to do three lanes, both directions, with a center median and, then, the access at Shafer View Drive will become a right-in, right-out only. As far as the connection to -- to Sky Ranch, we would love to see it go away. I mean if we could we would just like to see a -- a turnaround there. But based on what we are being told that's not allowed. So, we would love to explore that option if it wasn't -- if it was an option. Okay. So, that's just kind of a general overview there. We are open to Council's recommendations on -- on the Shafer View Drive. There was many comments on that road width and that it wasn't built to support this traffic, but, indeed, it is. ACHD has attested to the habits of -- it is built to current standards and so it -- it is -- it is wide enough. We -- but, you know, if -- if it would be appropriate would be okay with, you know, no parking on one side or, you know, what we could do here to -- to work with -- with the neighbors. As far as moving the crosswalks, we are open to that as well. That's -- that's not a problem. We have been sliding them around the whole time as we have been working through concepts, so open to those suggestions as well. There will be streetlights being installed per city standards throughout and along Shafer View Drive just for reference. I will stand for questions.

Simison: Thank you. Council, questions for the applicant? And if you want to wait, I'm going to go to Bill for a question. Yeah. We are going to ask you to reach back into your stuff that you may or may not have been the staff member for, but this has come up on more than one occasion over the years where Council has made this request, frankly, I think we have had an ACHD director make the request about not making connections into other streets. Why in this -- in this case could a cul-de-sac not be considered based upon historical decisions or by, frankly, ACHD and Council request? Especially when it's not connected yet.

Parsons: Yeah. So, Mayor, Members of the Council, I think I recall the one you are probably talking about. In that particular case it was a private street and it was gated off. Historically I don't ever recall us -- no, there are instances in Meridian where public streets are stubbed to properties and they -- they don't get extended. I see that quite frequently with our parks. I see where subdivisions have stubbed to the backside of a park. They don't get extended. What -- from staff's perspective and ACHD's perspective -- and I'm only talking about our discussions that we have when we meet with our ACHD counterparts -- is when there is a road we extend it to be -- we expect it to be extended. Those are the policies that we have. Again, if Council wants to have that road terminate in a cul-de-sac that's certainly within your purview. I would almost argue the other way, that as a -- as a planner, as a staff member, I would say we should think about closing off access from Shafer View to Meridian Road and allow the local streets to connect in that and getting people out to the lights and dispersing the traffic and making that so that it's not a right-in, right-out in the future. To me that's the safer alternative, realizing we don't -- we don't control that. We don't know when all these things -- roadways are going to come online and do that. But, certainly, there has been instances where roads did not connect until a certain threshold was met. I have seen that in other instances as well what councils like. We are not opening up -- one of those is off of Overland Road there is that commercial development that ties into that county sub at the end the -- ACHD recommended that it be gated. Council supported that and, then, there is a provision in the DA that says this gate may go away if the Council deems it's necessary. That's off a Rolling Hill. There was an instance when Red Feather came in. There is a Duane Lane, long straight county road in a cul-de-sac and that had a gate at the end of it and it did not open until other roadways were -- were put in place and now that -- that is done and -- and opened up. So, again, if that's something Council wants to do as part of the timing I think it's something that we can continue to have that discussion with ACHD. I know KaraLeigh is taking notes of what's transpiring at this hearing and she goes back and shares that with her counterparts over at ACHD. But that's something that we can entertain. Also mention going back to Council Woman Strader's question and kind of adding on to what the applicant's discussing, that phase is not until phase four of Sky Ranch. So, it's -- it's a long ways before that road even stubs to Shafer View in the future and Council was very adamant on Sky Ranch that they brought -- bring a certain amount of homes on each year because of the overcrowding of the schools. So, we were very methodical in that development agreement that says you can only bring on so many number of lots and comply with your phasing plan as part of that development. So, a lot of things are happening in this area. We are getting a lot of connectivity in the area. I heard one of the residents say there wasn't a traffic study for Sky Ranch. That was because all of those roads were being constructed and Brighten actually did a cooperative development agreement to widen Lake Hazel and do all those improvements ahead of the required time frame, that's why that traffic study was already done and that development was feeding into those roadways. So, just want to give the Council all of that context. But, again, if that's something that you want to think about as an interim measure, I'm not sure what it achieves given the fact that phase four isn't coming on for several years and this project is designed to be built in one phase and I think the win here is the applicant stated is going through Mont Meadows and giving these residents

another way out of their subdivision, rather than a dead end cul-de-sac that they currently have now.

Simison: And maybe even take it back to one other -- because I don't recall, but the development to the north that was cul-de-sac'd off and not make -- did not connect. There is an emergency access connection. Do you recall why that was -- what was the rationale? Was that the rationale? Because we didn't want people on Shafer View? Because -- and that's what I'm trying to equate -- is like it seems like a decision was made at some point in time and I just don't recall if it was a traffic access concern or something else.

Breckon: Mr. Mayor, I'm not sure which development you are talking about, but I think Bill brought up an interesting point. I wonder could we turn Shafer View Drive into an emergency vehicle only access at some point in the future and -- and everybody get rid of that connection point. The -- the connection is -- is -- is needed in the short term, so we have two points of access for emergency vehicles and we certainly have plenty of circulation to the east and around Quartz Creek and -- and Lake Hazel.

Parsons: So, Jon, I think -- Mayor, I think you were talking about the cul-de-sac just to the north with the -- with that other out parcel that was developed. If I'm -- I don't have a definite answer for you. I can look into the record a little bit more, but I'm speculating that they probably had adequate access to the collector that they had to build with this development and, potentially, there is the irrigation district that's kind of a confluence of a bunch of waterways happening in that area. So, I'm not sure if Jon could have designed a roadway over that or not, but I think ultimately the city decided that emergency access would suffice in that case and that could have been also due to some of the public testimony you heard as part of that application, because it was -- again, a lot of these neighbors were here talking during -- that this particular application as well -- or that previous application when Shafer View North or whatever it was called then happened. But I know -- I believe Jon Breckon worked on that one, so Jon may have a little bit more context into that one as well.

Breckon: Okay. So, Mr. Mayor, you are talking about the -- the one there just directly to the north?

Simison: Correct.

Breckon: And so --

Simison: And I'm just trying to understand what decisions were previously made about connection or connectivity in this area and why? And --

Breckon: Yes. So, that development to the north -- the main connection is to Quartz Creek and they were -- I'm going off of memory here. I think that was -- we were limited to 30 lots until which time the Quartz Creek connection was made to the east for secondary emergency access connection.

Simison: Yeah. My question is why a cul-de-sac and why not connect to Shafer View?

Breckon: Oh. I see. At the -- at the end there, so that there is -- this -- it -- it just wasn't physically possible. There -- there are -- there is a -- there -- there is a large irrigation ditch that comes through this route here and -- and, then, there is grade change as well and I -- I don't -- as I recall this was not wide enough to negotiate all that and get roadway in.

Simison: Okay. It just looks like it's emergency access from above. I won't dwell on this. Again I'm just -- just trying to understand the connectivity decisions and how much they matter towards this application, the past versus the present, and maybe they are not relevant, which is fine. So --

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Bill, I'm going to kind of stay along that line of thinking. I was actually pulling up the Sky Ranch application. I think -- it looked like we approved in 2024. So, I was kind of going through that. Can you walk me through, if you do remember, Sublimity Road, is that -- what -- when is that going to be built? Is that -- because I do recall phase one of that project is that bottom corner by Lake Hazel. Do you recall when that road is going to be completed and when does it connect with East Quartz Creek Street?

Parsons: Yeah. It's -- it should be built now. Yeah. So, Mayor, Members of the Council, it should be constructed now.

Taylor: Okay.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Just -- can you refresh my memory. What is the timing of the improvements on Meridian Road? When is that going to occur?

Breckon: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Strader, I'm -- I'm not sure. I don't know that we have that information. Yeah. Mayor, Members of the Council, looking at ITD's letter, they -- they voiced some concerns about additional homes following on this road, but they did not give us any indication of any improvements warranted with this development.

Simison: I think she's talking about the STARS agreement that's being done to make improvements to this area.

Parsons: Yeah. I --

Simison: Do we know when that's occurring?

Parsons: Brighton is currently negotiating with ITD on those improvements, but it does not include any improvements along this segment of road, but it does include a phased -- yeah. The signal at phase -- on phase three at the mid -- the mid mile.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Just feedback and just to check in with you where my head is at so far, just what -- as one individual Council Member. I'm really struggling with kind of the lack of feedback from ITD on this application. I feel like if I had a better sense of the timing of the improvements on Meridian Road and I had a better sense of the timing of the Sky Ranch phasing, maybe the two items together could kind of give me some visibility as to what kind of acute traffic situation would occur here and for how long. Right now, without a decel lane and -- and just with what's happening here it just feels to me like a really tough -- just a premature decision without more input from them. Like I -- I really would have appreciated if they could have joined the meeting, if they had additional feedback. I'm also -- frankly, I'm surprised that our road agencies are not taking the opportunity to close Shafer View. Usually they do prefer that, like it would be better for everybody if people started funneling all this traffic on to the collectors and less here in this extremely dangerous area. Like I recall us having a bus stop here. I think that that's been a disaster. It sounded like that got moved. This has been a problem and like this just feels to me like it's -- it's just accelerating a path into an acute traffic situation without a lot of visibility. I just need a lot more homework to be done I think with ITD on what they are thinking here, when the improvements will happen, what they think about -- you know, and with ACHD probably weighing in on closing Shafer View, if that's an option. It just sounds to me like you are -- I -- I liked your idea of gating off the Sky Ranch Subdivision, but that just doesn't sound viable right now based on feedback from ACHD. So, I just think there is a little more that needs to go into this to get me there on it. I'm not a no, but I'm not a yes today I guess. This is just -- we are just to check in on -- on kind of how I'm thinking about it.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Probably a lot of similar comments. I know that KaraLeigh -- and I hope she is still on. She made a comment that this was -- Shafer View was a collector street, but I believe for the purposes of our conversation that is a rural collector street. That is not a collector street as we would build one anywhere in our city, because it would have curb, gutter, sidewalks and streetlights on both sides. So, I probably don't need her to comment on that as much as I think she is looking from the standpoint of how much traffic and how wide the road is. To me that's unacceptable without a traffic study that does some sort of modeling that looks at the potential down the road of what Sky Ranch

would dump into this, as well as Mont Meadows. I think we owe it to the future people sitting here that we look down the road and see a potential problem and stop it tonight, unless there is something done that changes this application substantially. I really struggle anytime -- I mean I have voted no on a project where it was only six houses going down a county road that was unimproved, let alone the number of houses we are talking about right here. I really struggle with what we are talking about and the fact that a traffic study was not required. I think it should be mandatory in this case. I think it's got to have modeling that takes into account everything that would be dumping onto this. The decal lane with this type of density I think should be required and it -- it's -- it's -- I don't have words for the fact that we don't have any input for ITD there. They are a partner who is not at the table and we have got ACHD here tonight and I think that's great, but we need ITD at the table explaining their role and how this becomes a successful project, because like there is no way with missing pieces tonight that I could support this.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I know we are not at deliberation, but I think in -- in fairness to Mr. Breckon and I -- I concur with my colleagues on this. I -- I know there is some of these challenges here are not your own making and you are trying to find the best solution. I -- I could not for our future residents approve an annexation that doesn't include curb, gutter, sidewalks on both sides. You have other challenges that's impacting the -- the schools. That's always going to be a hang up for me, but we do things a certain way in our city and I -- and I -- and I think this is shortchanging our future residents. So, just for -- you have got good feedback. It sounds like there is maybe three of us probably aren't going to be there tonight, so I think that's good information for you at least to have while the public hearing is still open.

Breckon: Maybe -- maybe, Mr. Mayor, we could pursue a continuance. Get some additional information.

Cavener: Yeah. Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Mr. Breckon, I -- I support that. I think it's a good request. I know there is lots of -- my crystal ball has not been clear lately, so I -- I don't know how much time you think you would like. I always like to try to balance of certainly, you know, giving you enough time to solve the problem, but also not being so rapid that we come back and say, okay, we need more time. I would like to at least put the ball in your court if there is -- how much time you -- you think you would like and how much time you think you may need.

Breckon: Well, Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, we -- we -- I think part of the challenge here is getting ITD to the table, quite honestly. You -- you may or may not know that they are difficult to get a hold of generally. There is -- there is staff that is responsive, but as far as getting timing questions or commitments out of them it's kind of a black hole. I -- so, I mean as far as timing -- and we could certainly get some answers to the questions -- work with ACHD and -- and maybe come up with a better solution for closing off Shafer View Drive that would not include ITD and an amicable solution for everyone. I think that could happen fairly rapidly and not clear when our next options are for Council dates.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Jon, maybe I guess a question for you and may be a question for our staff. I -- I'm sympathetic anytime government gets in the way and I think you have got a situation where it's government times government times government and that -- I don't got much more hair left to lose when it comes to that level of frustration. So, I'm sympathetic. Would it be beneficial -- and, Mr. Mayor, could perhaps maybe our staff put together a joint request for the applicant, our planning staff, ACHD and ITD to meet -- I will buy the lunch sandwiches if we need to incentivize with the sandwiches, but I just -- I -- I think having everybody together around the table addressing -- and I recognize from a statewide standpoint this is, you know, a very, very, very, very small issue. But here in our community this is a big issue and I think that we can rely on them to be responsive to the feedback that they are also hearing from us.

Simison: Well, I -- I also think it's important that you talk -- I don't know that the neighbors are waiting -- that they all agree that closing off this road is the appropriate action. I -- we have heard challenges about -- I think that there is another conversation that should occur, not just an assumption that that's what is the right occurrence. In my opinion. So, while, yes, I think our staff can work to help coordinate a -- a conversation, because doing the pull aside of the transportation commission may -- and may -- you know, have -- have folks show up and -- and have an offline conversation, but I -- I think there is a conversation with the residents along this road as well about what they would like to -- what -- what's -- I mean they may have their preference, but what are they okay with understanding that development is going to occur and what's the way that you went to access in and out of this property, because right-in, right-out versus closed, those two very different scenarios. Then I don't know if this Council has a viewpoint right now on those two things, you know, closing an access to Meridian Road versus closing an access that goes between this and another subdivision. I'm sixes is on that one, you know, personally, you know. They -- they both have their -- their value and rationale. If you can leave an access open for fewer people to go in and out on a right-in, right-out only compared to leaving some -- you know, creating a connection that doubles the amount of people that are going to exit through that. These are all great conversations for the community to have and we can work with our staff to arrange a conversation, but I don't think you are talking two weeks. Think you are talking longer.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Thought I would take a minute and provide some feedback I have. I -- I would probably be open to this application as it is if you close off the access, because I do believe we will have a real problem there and even though it's a few years down the road when that northern portion of the Sky Ranch is approved, you can just -- just knowing how people operate, they are going to cut through there and I think we are going to have some real problems and so I agree with what Council Woman Strader said, like it's -- you know, without knowing what ITD has envisioned there, the only acceptable option to me would be to close it off, but, then, to the -- the neighbors that live there that means a significant change in traffic pattern. Maybe you like it that way, but it would require you to -- everyone to go the other way and it is a little bit not desirable to not have any kind of mid mile sort of access point there, because I do remember with Sky Ranch there is no access to the state highway. Then you have the lateral and, then, I think we are going to -- we are looking at a small commercial in that bottom corner. So, just sort of a really kind of a strange place there. So, again, I -- I would be -- if the residents like it, I know that would be what I think is a better alternative is to close it off and force people out back through the other way, if that's what the residents are acceptable with. So, I just wanted to add that to your contemplation where I'm -- I'm thinking about it.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I like where this is going. I think that ultimately with Sky Ranch it almost has to be shut off to keep it safe and I think for the folks that live in Shafer View now, it causes you to drive further to get out, but it reduces the traffic flow substantially and I'm all about looking at traffic safety and where that's going to put us. Another question that needs to be answered is how that's going to affect West Ada and how the bus routes pick up any kids in that area because they are not going to be able to come off Highway 69. So, there is a lot of moving pieces here that have to be figured out and I'm kind of in this torn spot between wanting to continue this for a significant amount of time to give you time, but also not unnecessarily delay your application. So, I think we are -- we are kind of looking for your best estimate right now to put this back on a future calendar.

Breckon: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, I maybe probably need to chat with staff and -- and see when we could get this big round table meeting scheduled and also get -- get some correspondence out to the neighbors, so that they could show up and not just tell them it's tomorrow. I -- I mean I guess I'm -- I'm not sure what our options are for hearing dates. Thinking maybe a month to six weeks or somewhere in that neighborhood.

Parsons: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, Linda knows her schedule best, but I think six to eight weeks will probably -- is where we are landing on it to make sure we can get the information and get the meeting scheduled, make sure the applicant -- the -- the residents feel comfortable with that potential solution. Again, like I mentioned, the road won't be closed overnight. It -- it takes time. There is a lot of connectivity that has to happen in the area. A lot of it's in place currently. I know Mont Meadows has been approved by this body, so that road is happening at some point, either this spring or early fall. So, there is a construction schedule out there. So, again, a lot of moving parts here. But I don't want to do a continuance just to do a continuance. So, the -- I think the more time the better, to be honest with you, because I think it's important to check in with ITD, ACHD and, then, also the school district I think makes some sense as well. So, either -- I'm looking at either two months -- six weeks to maybe 12 weeks, somewhere in that range. I know it's a wide range, but I will leave it up to -- to you guys to determine how long you want to push this out.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Cavener: Just a question. Maybe it's a legal question, maybe it's a planning question. I don't know. Do we need a date for me to continue to indefinitely until they let us know they are ready? Is there some kind of a method where we have -- we have to lock this in now? It's just very hard to know how long it would take.

Simison: Mr. Nary, could you -- could you continue it out two weeks and, then, come back and continue to another date certain at that point in time?

Nary: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council and Council Member Strader, we do need a date certain of something. The further out you put it the potential of having to re-notice it is always a concern, but having no date with just a re-noticing is more problematic than -- either doing it like the Mayor said of setting it in two weeks, not for a hearing, but to figure out if other hearings have been set and what a realistic time frame is fine, as long as, again, everyone says we are not going to have a hearing in two weeks, we are just going to check in and, then, look at a more future date certain for a hearing or, again, the other option is to send it out six or eight weeks.

Breckon: Mr. Mayor, Members of the Council, I would request eight weeks as a hearing date.

Simison: And I have ACHD and ITD in my office on Thursday morning. I will make sure that they are aware of this request to encourage their attendance of the conversation forthwith to help meet that eight week deadline.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: We have a date in that approximate time frame from the city clerk. If there is no further discussion I would like to move that we continue the Shafer View Ridge Subdivision, H-2025-0047, until May 12th.

Little Roberts: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to continue this item until May 12th. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed nay? The ayes have it and the item is continued to May 12th. Thank you.

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

- 4. Public Hearing for St. George (H-2025-0004), by Shaun Wardle and Jason St. George, located at 3870 E. Overland Rd. and 1545 S. Topaz Ave.**
 - A. Request: Annexation of 2.0 acres with the R-15 zoning district to construct nineteen (19) multi-family units, 7,987 Sq. ft. of commercial space and four (4) vertically integrated residential units.
 - B. Request: Two Conditional Use Permits, one for the multi-family residential and one for the vertically integrated residential project in the R-15 zoning district.

Simison: With that we will move on to Item 4, which is a public hearing for H-2025-0004. We will open this public hearing with staff comments.

Napoli: Good evening, Mayor, Members of the Council. Next item on the agenda is the annexation and conditional use permits for St. George. The applicant requests annexation of two acres with the R-15 zoning district to construct 19 multi-family units and one vertically resident -- vertically integrated residential building consisting of 7,987 square feet of commercial space and four residential units. Both uses require a conditional use permit in the R-15 zoning district. The site is located at 3870 East Overland Road and 5045 South Topaz Avenue. As shown on the screen the existing zoning is R-1 in Ada county and the FLUM designation is mixed-use regional. So, the site is currently surrounded by R-1 residential county properties to the north and west, with an annexed residence directly adjacent on the west and the west would actually be the bottom of the screen and the north would be the left-hand side of the screen and a mix of commercial and multi-families in the surrounding area. Additionally, commercial space is located at the north end of South Silverstone Way, including a Top Golf facility, commercial office -- offices, restaurants and the Eagle View Apartments, consisting of 396 units. To the south directly across Overland Road are the Silverstone Apartments consisting of 112 residential units and the Movado Village Apartments consisting of 60 residential units. The property across the street on Topaz Avenue was recently approved for a multi-tenant commercial building with a restaurant located in the C-G zoning district. So, the concept plan depicts 19 multi-family residential units, four

vertically integrated residential units and 7,987 square feet of commercial space across the two acres of land. The vertically integrated residential building is proposed to front on Overland Road. The applicant states that the development is providing a mix of housing types, promoting connectivity and encouraging walkability and efficiency through these mix of uses. In addition, the applicant is providing open space -- open space south of Five Mile Creek and amenities in the form of a barbecue grill, picnic area and a bike repair station. And that's the correct orientation. Might be a little bit easier to visualize it there. So, the development agreement currently has a provision that prohibits restaurants and drinking establishments in the commercial space due to parking concerns and not being able to meet the correct parking ratio that's in the specific use standards of code at the -- at the Planning and Zoning Commission staff expressed concerns regarding the functionality of the open space and as a result the Planning and Zoning Commission instructed the applicant to leave Five Mile Creek open and move all the amenities south of the creek. In addition to this it resulted in a piece of land to the north of Five Mile Creek to remain natural until the future pathway gets extended and that would be this corner up here. Five Mile Creek bisects it right here. So, the applicant did explore options of putting a bridge over Five Mile Creek, as well as piping Five Mile Creek. However, the UDC requires all natural waterways to be left open and improved as natural amenity and, in addition, putting a bridge in the floodway because this portion of the property -- this is flood plain and that red hash is the floodway. Putting a bridge in the flood -- floodway could pose significant challenges with permitting. We did talk with our flood plain coordinator here at the city and it would be a significant process with the irrigation district that may or may not get approved. So, we didn't want to go on hypotheticals on whether it may. So, that's why Commission recommended that they leave the northside unimproved and move all the amenities to the south. Other concerns that staff brought up at the Planning and Zoning Commission include overflow parking -- overflow and guest parking, functional integration with the surrounding area and a lack of connectivity to a park. Ultimately the Commission determined that there is ample opportunity for recreation. The project allows for future integration with the surrounding area and defer to City Council's decision or discretion on overflowing guest parking. The applicant has provided -- provided parking that meets the minimum UDC requirements, but any overflow parking will likely be pushed onto Topaz Avenue, which is designated as a future collector roadway. One full access is proposed on the south portion of the site via South Topaz Avenue. Additionally a one-way access is proposed on the north portion of the site for the multi-family residents to use. According to ACHD staff report the applicant should construct Topaz Avenue as half collector roadway with a five foot detached sidewalk and an eight foot parkway. In addition, ACHD is asking the applicant to dedicate a total of 62 feet from the center line of Overland Road for the Overland widening to seven lanes in the distant future. Staff is asking the City Council to carefully consider traffic and the impacts of this development on the surrounding area and more specifically Overland Road. The applicant has provided a stub street, to the property to the west, which is currently an annexed parcel in the city that is a R-2 -- is zoned R-2, because it did remain a single family home. The applicant has submitted elevations that consist of two story home style in the two family buildings and a two story vertically integrated building with more of a commercial look. This is the townhome style multi-family buildings. The total height of these are

approximately 23 feet. So, it is within the comp plan's to -- or the transition of a two to one, because the neighboring residential is a single story homes and these would be two story. In addition, the vertically integrated building does have a higher parapet on portions of it that would be approximately 30 and still be within the restriction of the industry of 40 feet. So, at the Planning and Zoning Commission hearings -- there were several of them. Four neighbors came out in opposition of the project citing concerned traffic, overflow parking, lack of pedestrian connectivity, the overall density of the project and height difference from the proposed development and existing homes and, in addition to this, there was a realtor representing five of the nearby property owners that are in support of the development and they are supportive of this, because they are actively looking to sell their properties and would like to see theirs redeveloped similar to this one. Commission is recommending approval of this application and I have not received any written testimony since the Planning and Zoning Commission and I will stand for any questions you have.

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

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Nick, if I recall, staff initially recommended denial on this. Did the applicant make any changes to the design or layout either after staff -- the staff report or after Planning and Zoning?

Napoli: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Cavener, that is correct. So, this -- as you can tell this is an early on 2025 project. There was a lot of conversations back and forth with the applicant and ultimately late last year -- or not late -- fall of last year -- I still don't have a few things that I had been looking for. So, ultimately, we had to move forward with the project, which was the reason -- one of the reasons for the recommendation for denial. You probably saw in my staff report some of those were X'd out because of provisions that the applicant did make. So, after the first Planning and Zoning Commission hearing the applicant -- Planning and Zoning Commission continued it for the applicant to work further with staff to fix some of these -- some of the outstanding issues. They did some significant revisions primarily with Public Works regarding where sewer and water was going to go, because -- and maybe this will show you. The sewer line originally was going to run down the middle of this between the units, which would, essentially, not allow the majority of the landscaping that was going to be there. There was also a sewer -- or a water line. You can see the water coming in currently as it is and the sewer is actually coming in this way and stubbing right here. There was also issues with infiltration trenches, separation requirements as far as Public Works was concerned and, ultimately, you know, staff had concerns with that, but there was also concerns regarding, you know, traffic as cited. There was concerns regarding, you know, the functional integration and how this could integrate in the future with the surrounding area. This is, as you guys know, a very challenging in-fill area for the city and, you know, the staff didn't get a lot of the answers that we needed from the applicant. Like

there were some requirements about like balconies, because there is private usable open space requirements in multi-family. We -- eventually we got those from the applicant. We got revised open space and some of those things. There still is concern from staff regarding the functionality of the open space. Ultimately our recommendation did not change to the Planning and Zoning Commission, but the Planning and Zoning Commission did feel that the changes that the applicant made between the hearings was adequate.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Nick, again, you got to remember I'm not the brightest bulb in the room, so I just want to make sure I'm -- I'm tracking. Staff is still recommending denial then. If this was before you today staff would recommend denial.

Napoli: Mayor, Councilman Cavener, that is correct.

Cavener: Thank you.

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

Wardle: Mayor, Members of the Council, Shaun Wardle. 2239 East Griner Street in Meridian. On behalf of the applicants Jackie and Jason St. George, who are Idaho natives. Jason and I actually met just across the street attending elementary school not too far from here, so -- and his mother Marlene worked for the city attorney's office, as a matter of fact, I believe when Mr. Nary was there. So, I appreciate your time this evening. I have got a brief presentation. One of the things that I will mention is Jason and Jackie are currently residing in Donnelly, but they will be taking residence in one of the vertically integrated units. They -- they really like that concept and so they are going to make their -- their home here is the Treasure Valley there. I mentioned that for a couple reasons. We don't have a manager's office on site. Not required for this level of multi-family, but the owners will be there and be very involved in -- in the project on a -- on a daily and weekly basis and so -- we have two acres on the corner of Overland and Topaz. As mentioned the site has a number of constraints. The first of which is Five Mile Creek. I can tell you that we spent lots of time at the irrigation district and -- and believe that we have come up with the correct answer. We are leaving that an open waterway. We are not piping and covering or putting a bridge at that facility. Our other major challenge, frankly, was no access to Overland and we understand the highway district's policy there, but we are also required to provide access to the neighboring property to the west and so it makes -- makes the site just a little bit tight. We have got a Comprehensive Plan designation of mixed-use. We are meeting those mixed-use goals by integrating neighborhood with housing, employment and services. We are using an efficient in-fill of existing infrastructure and, then, we have also got a diversified housing and business opportunities. Before you today is an annexation application of

R-15. We have also got a conditional use permit for the 8,000 square foot and vertically integrated. We feel like the commercial tenants in this space will be very consistent with what we see along Overland. I think that this will provide an opportunity for some professional services, insurance services, physical therapists. As noted there are some restrictions in the conditional use permit there. So, we -- we believe that the project will also provide parking in area -- in times when the businesses are not open for -- for that cross-parking agreement. Site amendments. As noted we provided the barbecue area. We have moved that and bike repair station. The other amenity that the owners really feel that -- they are adamant about having garages and so they -- they were adamant about having a garage style -- oops. Where am I at here, Nick? Sorry. About garages within the -- within the development. They feel that -- they own a number of properties. This will be their largest project to date, but they feel that that keeps -- keeps the -- the development clean, puts the -- the trash receptacles inside and they are also providing electric car charging within those garages as an additional amenity. Surrounding uses in Overland we have got -- as noted we have got -- very near Top Golf, a number of large multi-family projects, as well as some office projects there and, then, directly across Overland Road we have the Silverstone development and the amenities there. So, this is a potential area redevelopment. We just -- we just had the engineer take a look at what -- what the connectivity would look like. There -- there is a concern with traffic in this area, but this is a potential. We -- we don't own or control any of the properties to the west, but just give you an idea what that could potentially look like. As noted directly to the east there is a restaurant building that has been approved. I know there was quite a bit of discussion, both at the Planning and Zoning level and at the Council level on on that particular application, as well as, frankly, the rest of Overland and what's developing along -- along that site and so one -- one item to note is that the Parks Department -- in talking with the Parks Department the -- the pathway designation is for one side of the street. Parks doesn't know -- I'm sorry. Part of the -- the creek. They are not sure where that -- where that is going to go and they have asked us not to construct the pathway as part of this application and so we have had that discussion with them. I would note just quickly that staff had a number of constraints and alternative compliances in our early application. We worked pretty hard between that and our Planning and Zoning application and then -- and subsequently the only alternative compliance that we are looking for is a two foot versus five foot strip along the western border of our property and -- and to note that that property will also redevelop in the mixed-use designation in the future. I'm going to ask our project architect Jim Escobar to come up real quickly and talk a little bit about what I think are some nicely drawn buildings.

Escobar: Mayor Simison, Members of the Council, my name is Jim Escobar, P.O. Box 1277 in Eagle, Idaho. Yes. And long term -- time Meridian advocate and supporter. Love to see great growth and great developers come into our town and I'm in this point now in my career path where I get to select my partners and this is a partner that is advocating for the Idaho values and it's something that's important to me personally and I love to see development come together like this. This development we feel like has incorporated the identity of the area, that it's a more modern, more -- getting developed today sort of development -- a higher density of living opportunities, higher density of --

of life opportunities out there. So, we -- our goal early on with the staff was to actually do a mixed-use project, not just propose a mixed-use project. So, we -- we are advocating -- or allocating for this 8,000 square feet to have multiple tenants that would be fronting Overland Road, as well as the attractive building that you see and the styles and the upstairs residential living with some outdoor patios that can take opportunities of some of the verandas that you have as you look out to the east and north from this site and, then, we have developed a -- on the community front our idea was not only do we have the community area to the north of Building A, that's the building that fronts Topaz, we have got an approximate 35 foot long area by about 25 feet wide that would be dedicating towards that use, as well as we would have the mailbox set up there. We have this other area between buildings B and C that would be an outdoor gathering space, a space where I can see children running up and down in that area playing and we have focused on that area specifically with landscaping that can accommodate and encourage some of those types of activities as you can be proud of the place that you live. So, all in all in a nutshell that's the theory and ideology behind the building designs and behind who your team is that's putting together this project and we hope that you find in your favor and in support. Thank you.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: I think they are still doing their presentation, so -- Jim -- Jim's not going to go very far. It's been a while since we have seen him, so he is going to stick around.

Wardle: Thank you. That concludes our formal presentation. So, yeah, I would stand for any questions.

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Mr. Mayor. Jim, just a quick question. Because we have got to ask it these days. On these two-story buildings is the roof a roof? Does it not have any amenities on top of the roof? There is no other equipment up there?

Escobar: No, there would not be an intention of having equipment. Thankfully we now have these ductless mini splits that we can put in that aren't giant rooftop mounted units to control the atmospheres. They can be easily shielded on the ground on the condensers. No, the idea would be that the roofs would be -- you know, you would have your normal pipe penetrations, but otherwise a roof.

Overton: We are just trying to ensure that we don't have any rooftop activities taking place. Yeah. I -- I wasn't going to say that word, but rooftop activities occurring on any of these buildings.

Wardle: Correct. Probably more concerned with the vertically integrated portion on Overland and we are not anticipating any rooftop activities that -- any access to the roof, frankly, other than -- than construction.

Escobar: The vertically integrated building, however, does have some rooftop patios. They are shielded by parapets. There might be some mechanical equipment located up on those areas, but they would be fully screened behind parapet walls. But this is the building that fronts Overland and I don't know -- do you guys have the ability to see what I'm seeing right here?

Simison: Not very well.

Escobar: There -- there is basically a balcony on this backside that accesses all the units off of a stair tower and this is the parking lot on the north side of this vertically integrated building. Beyond that there are a couple of little pocket patios. There is a pocket patio right here, here, here and here and here around the building. But in the design you can see those patios fade away and blend into the makeup of the two stepped -- two stage building. That's giving some identity to the commercial space on the ground level and, then, identity to the residential space happening above it. So, they are -- they are not huge areas. They are -- I want to say 90 square feet, a hundred square feet, something like that. But they are on that vertically integrated mixed-use building that's facing Overland. There are nothing else happening on the roofs on that three other buildings.

Overton: Mr. Mayor, quick follow up.

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Direct this to staff. Does that stay within our height limitations if they have rooftop activities on top of that vertically integrated building?

Napoli: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Overton, that is correct. So, the height limit in the R-15 zoning district is 40 feet. The parapets actually on this building, from the drawings that I received, were 31 feet. So, those balconies are actually below the actual roof line. So, it would be below that. That is correct.

Overton: Thank you.

Parsons: Mayor and Council, if I can just elaborate a little bit. Nick get it spot on, but just wanted to let the Council know that vertically integrated buildings require minimum 50 square feet of private patio area per unit. So, that's why it's showing on -- above the ground floor area. Just -- just wanted to let you know that's a code requirement.

Simison: Council, additional questions for the applicant? Okay.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Mr. Mayor, thank you. Could you just walk us through your parking and just why you feel it's sufficient and just kind of an overview? I think that would be helpful. I know that was a staff concern.

Escobar: Sure. I would be happy to, Council -- Council Member Strader. The parking site layout -- what we have are -- sorry. Let me get to the site plan here. Okay. That's a little small. That's a little messy. Okay. So, what we are looking at here is every one of these units has a two stall garage underneath it. This is for the three buildings in the rear. We have four parking stalls back here. And, by the way, this is an older plan, because I don't believe there is four. I believe there is three right here and, then, we have two more right here and, then, we have two additional units in a -- in a garage that's occurring on the north end of Building A. It's not a living unit. From the street side you don't feel like it's anything different, but from the use side the owner is going to be using that for equipment maintenance, material storage, things of that nature, storing the lawn mower, everything else that requires -- that's required for being able to keep a site like this up kept. But the point I'm trying to make is we have actually exceeded our parking I believe by two stalls. That's required by code. And those are actually occurring inside this garage space here. And we have guest parking that's allocated, as well as -- did we retain the EV stall? I don't think we -- we got rid of that. So -- okay. So, we do have guest parking that's allocated both for the -- the -- specifically for the residents and guests of this vertically integrated building and, then, separate guest parking for the users of the facility. Everything's meeting city code requirements for parking standards. Wouldn't anticipate we have overflow going out onto the street, like you would see with the restaurant or other high -- high use vehicle traffic areas. I don't know if that answers your question, but happy to answer more.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Maybe what would help me wrap my head around it is how many residential units do you have and how many parking are associated with that? Maybe just kind of mapping out, you know, how many to how many.

Escobar: Absolutely. And I don't have those numbers as far as what's required and what we have specifically. They are noted on the civil site plan and they are denoted to how they are going to be signed and used. We have 19 townhome units comprised in three buildings. Those are the three buildings we are calling Building A, B and C on the north side of the site. Then we have four more units that are a part of the vertically integrated building. Basically what we have is an 8,000 square foot space on the ground level and an enclosed stair tower that leads you to the second level to an open balcony, that leads you to the four units above that building that fronts Overland Road. And, then, we have the -- you know, required guest stall counts, which I think is one per three bedroom -- yeah. I'm sorry. Staff might be able to speak better to the requirements, because it's all math in the back end as we develop -- develop the plans -- that I just know that we had met it and I think we even exceed it by one or two stalls.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah. If we could hear from staff that would be super. I'm looking for like a count of parking spaces relative to the count of units, bedrooms, so forth.

Napoli: Mayor, Members of Council, Council Woman Strader. So, yes. So, they are proposing a total of 23 residential units. With that they are including 38 parking stalls and two guest parking stalls. So, the two that you see -- these two right here will be designated as guest parking stalls. These three right here would actually be for the three bedroom units. They do have three -- or they have three three bedroom units that require three parking stalls instead of two. So, most of these are getting their two parking stalls from the garages and, then, I believe this one, the middle one and the far one, are three bedrooms and that's where their third parking space would be. Then on the vertically integrated you do have a little bit different of a parking requirement and so there is 16 parking spaces that are required and they did provide the 16 that are required for the vertically integrated uses. So, they are technically meeting the UDC requirements for parking. The main concern from staff is Topaz is going to be a collector roadway, which typically does not allow parking and if there is overflow parking, depending on what commercial users -- I know that they anticipate more of a professional office space from my conversations with the applicant -- or there is, you know, someone decides to have a party at their apartment or something along those lines, there is concern about where that overflow parking will go, you know, on the site and it probably won't be on the site, so --

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: A quick question just to confirm kind of the layout with the -- the residential units and those parking spaces there is no driveway kind of, it's just -- is the little alleyway or roadway there straight into their parking; is that correct?

Escobar: That is correct.

Taylor: So, you wouldn't have any parking potential outside of those garages, because that would be a through way for the traffic to flow.

Escobar: That is correct. There is no parking. That would be your typical alley load back-to-back garage door setup.

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

Escobar: Thank you.

Simison: Mr. Clerk, do we have anyone signed up on this item?

Johnson: Yes, Mr. Mayor. Robert Taylor.

Simison: Wait until you -- wait until you get up to the microphone, please.

R.Taylor: Thank you. Robert Taylor. 3840 Overland Road. So, if you look at the map I'm right next door to this. Right on the west side. My -- we got a skinny acre, so my whole backyard runs right along this proposed development. I have lived next door to this proposed development for 30 years in this neighborhood and have experienced everything from the Overland Road expansion, to the farmland development at Silverstone and beyond. Some of you might remember me having to get annexed into the city not too long ago, because my well water ran dry and the well drillers were booked up one to two years leaving me no choice for my family. Back in 2007 all of the property owners on the frontage of Overland Road were part of a proposed multi-million dollar development. A package deal of around 23 properties in the valley. Because of the banking crisis this deal fell through. Twenty years later a millionaire comes and buys two properties on the cheap and proposes this development in a residential neighborhood. Back, then, all of us living on the frontage were in agreement to sell our one acre properties and the surrounding neighbors were okay with this. This current proposed development, however, only encompasses two out of the seven properties and we are not all in agreement. Everywhere you go in this valley there is new development. Our road system and infrastructure isn't keeping up. It's already a hassle getting in and out of my property, especially during peak driving hours. The center turn lane on Overland, which I use along with the businesses at Silverstone, will now -- will now have to accommodate traffic going to the new restaurant currently being built on the corner across the street and this development, if approved. I'm only three houses down from Topaz. I can't imagine how frustrating and dangerous this is going to be, not only for me and my family trying to get into our driveway, but everyone else. With a new restaurant and this development, coupled with all the new and future development near Top Golf, this small stretch of Overland Road from beyond Topaz to Eagle Road is going to be a nightmare and is only going to get worse and more dangerous. I really don't think ACHD has had the chance to fully consider the impact of all of this. Please put yourself in my shoes. How would you like this being built next to your house? Going from having one neighbor to now having 23 neighbors, not to mention two commercial businesses next door. That is a lot of neighbors that are now two stories tall with a bird's eye view into your backyard. We have a beautiful eight year old daughter who just got to swim in her first big girl's pool last summer. She had privacy. We have privacy. In conclusion, consider the impact not only to me and my family, but to the folks in this neighborhood. Think about the safety concerns and difficulty to everyone that will need to enter and exit off Overland Road. Our only sanctuary is our backyard. Besides the roar of the freeway we at least have privacy and a buffer from the noise and eyeballs from Overland Road. If approved the privacy and peace me and my family have will -- will be gone. Don't take that away from us. Please vote no on this proposal. Thank you.

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

Johnson: Mr. Mayor, that was everyone that marked that they wanted to speak.

Simison: Is there anybody else present that would like to provide testimony on this item, either in the room or if you are online use the raise your hand feature. Seeing no one coming forward and no one raising their hand, would the applicant like to close?

Wardle: Mayor, Members of the Council, we empathize with -- with the neighbor and -- and with traffic. Growing up in this community I -- I understand, but we have someone here that is looking to take an economic opportunity further. We believe that we are developing a good project for the community. We really feel like we are meeting that mixed-use designation and -- and that providing interconnectivity will allow walkability, not just for the residents, but for the businesses, and I think it -- it provides something unique in terms of the community that we -- that we are going to see more of with that vertically integrated opportunity. I can -- I can tell you that in doing this project and, then, looking at other projects, that there are a number of -- of people that are becoming older that don't want to do yard work and there are a number of younger people that didn't grow up doing yard work that don't want to do any of that either and so this -- this product I think provides a difference in housing types and business types for our community and -- and that is really the goal of the Comprehensive Plan. So, I know it's a little unusual to have a Planning and Zoning Commission recommendation and a staff recommendation for denial, but we feel like we worked hard to get to -- get to where we needed to be and -- and that, frankly, the Planning and Zoning Commission took all that into -- in -- if -- if you -- if you review those minutes they took all that into consideration and -- and ultimately moved us forward with an approval and so we would ask for your approval and stand for any questions.

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

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Could you just walk me through -- you were looking for a waiver on a buffer. I just wanted to further understand that, where that is exactly located on this project.

Wardle: So, this western property line is -- we are looking for right in this particular area two feet versus five feet for that -- for that landscape buffer.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: And am I understanding correctly that that is your -- that is where that gentleman's property borders yours?

Wardle: Correct.

Strader: Uh-huh. And can I just ask a question. Like what are you doing to try to address his privacy concerns and other concerns that he mentioned? Mainly privacy is what I heard. Besides traffic and so forth.

Wardle: So, we -- we are providing -- fencing there? Yep. So, we have got -- we have got privacy fencing here. In a -- that -- that was one of the concerns with the strip. The reason for two feet is because we need to put the fence in there; right? Versus it's -- it's -- we are not using it as a drainage swale or -- or -- or anything that would require from the Public Works. Again, we -- we empathize, but we also understand that, you know, many of these properties, especially along Overland, are redeveloping and they are -- they are redeveloping quickly.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I understand that, but not everyone wants to redevelop their property and what really kills me is your -- I don't -- my kids watch this cartoon, Big City Greens. It's like a little house and it's surrounded by skyscrapers. I'm not saying that's what's happening here, but even -- even with just -- looking at the heights and considering that there is a single family home here on the west that does not intend to redevelop at this time, I have to be sensitive to that as well. I -- I just want to understand what you guys could do to enhance privacy and stuff to -- to be a good neighbor.

Escobar: I love the question, because I did contemplate this as I laid out the site and I laid out the design. It got blew up a little bit when we have this connection piece that we are being asked to provide to the adjacent parcel and where his home sits is actually to the west of the -- the vertically integrated building, which is on the southernmost portion of the site. Someone that fronts Overland. And what I did in the design was pulled the building back from that property line and out there we actually have our drainage swale occurring, as well as some landscaping around it and, then, we have the fence in as well. We are going to have -- it was the best way I could address -- knowing that there is a single family home next door, knowing I wouldn't want that in my own backyard, too. I did try to address that. I also didn't put any balconies out there on the west side, specifically with that home in mind.

Simison: Council, additional questions for the applicant?

Wardle: Thank you.

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Nick, can you remind me the plan for Topaz becoming a collector and is there a light planned on Topaz and Overland? Can you just give me the time frame for looking at those improvements?

Napoli: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Taylor, so, yes, you know, the applicant's going to be required to construct their half of Topaz for that first portion to the collector standard for ACHD. I believe that the restaurant that fronts on Overland did as well. So, this front portion would be constructed to that full collector with -- you know, with the parkways and the trees. There won't be a signal at Topaz. The signal as of right now is actually going to be in alignment with Movado, which is quite a distance away. The future collector roadway -- it's a little hard to see with this master street map -- actually does do this kind of horseshoe or U -- upside down U. You know, it's definitely not set in stone there and I think that's one of the biggest challenges with this area is the connectivity. But to answer your question, you know, and as development comes along Topaz that is when we will get the improvements for that collector roadway. Typically collectors are development driven and -- and ACHD does not actually construct collectors. That's correct.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor, follow up real quick?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: So, Nick, I think you are jogging my memory from an application we had maybe a year, 18 months ago. Close by. And I do recall -- well, I don't think ACHD had it in their -- their master street plan, but conceptually we had -- I remember talking about Movado going up and kind of coming around and maybe connecting at Topaz somewhere or maybe was Rolling Hill Drive. Can you remind me or refresh me of some of the connectivity plans that are in place or are we -- we just don't even have them? And I think -- my memory is -- was we don't have any plans.

Napoli: Mayor, Councilman Taylor, you know, it's a great question and before I was even in with the city -- I guess I haven't been here that long, so I shouldn't say even, but, you know, I got some feedback -- or I got some -- I talked with our team, because a lot of them have been here a long -- a lot longer than me and our experienced and I know back in 2016, 2017, you know, the city looked at, essentially, doing a -- a master plan for this area to, you know, solve some of those issues with the connectivity and ultimately at that time it -- I guess we didn't get a lot of buy-in from the residents at that time. It just wasn't something that was -- they didn't feel that it was, you know, necessary at that time and, you know, I think we respected that and kind of didn't go with that plan to kind of create this as a master plan or an overlay district is what I should say to, you know, really solve some of those connectivity problems. So, as you see it now is really solving those transportation issues are going to be kind of as development comes in and that is some of the challenges that you are going to see here in the future as well. I can't talk about it. We have -- we have other applications coming in in this area as well that are going to have similar challenges. So, I think that's where staff's going to lean on you as well and your opinions on how you guys want to

see and how you think we can address this transportation -- primarily the transportation concerns out here and how -- you know I know you guys have the development agreement for Rolling Hill to be emergency access here. Eventually Topaz and Rolling Hill is going to have a connection. Hopefully. That's the goal and we have had some of those preliminary conversations. But don't actually have an active application that would bring that forward at this time. So, you know, it -- it is a little bit piecemeal and it's challenging and I -- I feel for the residents out here and I feel for the developers as well, because it is not an easy situation to figure out. So, I don't know if that fully answers your question, but we don't really have a -- a -- a -- we have a plan, but we don't have one that is going to be easily executable that will show it without other developments coming in or other properties. If we had all the properties together we could definitely make it work and we could get this figured out right now, but that's the challenge.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Just a thought here. I feel like we are just really stuck in this whole area. You know, we looked at a few things and if there is more coming along. I think everyone needs to be treated the same, which is really hard, because the unique aspect of each project that we might see and kind of where it lies and with respect to some of these roadways where the lights are and Overland is an incredibly challenging road, especially this close to Eagle Road. I just -- I really struggle with this, because I just feel like we are just really stuck without really a plan and what we want to do. What's hard is it requires the residents in this area to really help us work through it and everyone's got their own interests and desires and wishes and so it's really really challenging to do that and the lack of a -- a plan for what the roadway system would look like through there -- because we can't dump all that traffic out onto Overland. That's just not acceptable. I really feel stuck. I -- you know, my own observations -- I really think this is a very attractive project. I really like the design. I think the parking's not good. That's my only -- biggest hang up is I think that's not a realistic parking expectation. But as far as what you have laid out I -- there is a lot I like about it and I do agree with your argument that it fits the area -- well, it fits the area in terms of what we kind of envision there, but there is also a lot of, you know, acre, small farms and animals and -- and rural neighbors. It's a really rural neighborhood in inside of one of the -- the largest, most commercialized areas we have in the Treasure Valley. So, it's a very unique thing and I'm -- I'm really perplexed as to what's the best way forward. I think development is required to help us move through and work through it, but we don't have a clue what the next couple applications will look like and how they might connect. So, I'm really struggling with this on -- on that regards. But there is a lot I like about it, aside from the parking.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor. My colleague is right. It's -- it's such a unique area, because we -- it's not like Movado, we don't have a big comprehensive area to put a plan and so it almost feels more like in-fill than really what it is, which is individual properties and -- but it does fit really well in the scope of the other things that you mentioned, like Silverstone and Movado and we are going to be dependent upon developers to get connectivity through there. So, I appreciate you leaving the stub area, but I do support the -- support it. I think it's a great -- it's kind of what we are looking at I believe in that area, but it is kind of tricky to -- our crystal ball is not clear, but this is a way that we can move forward.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: I'm struggling a lot with this project. I like the project itself. I'm struggling a lot with the project's integration in this location. I think some of the same issues that staff was hung up on I'm also hung up on. I think that the parking plan leaves some -- some work to be done or some -- maybe additional spaces to be desired. It's tricky I think anytime you are trying to park something like this and just making sure that -- that those spots are in a convenient place, because without -- without on-street parking nearby, especially if the commercial areas are successful, I think we are going to have a real like situation here. I also think Overland Road is a nightmare right now in this location. This is something that's come up in numerous projects in this area. I'm not inclined to grant the waiver on the western part of the property. I don't think a waiver is appropriate in this case, considering the privacy concerns of the neighbor. I'm -- I'm just struggling. I -- I really echo Councilman Taylor's point. It -- I -- I do want to be consistent in this area. I want us to try to come up with some kind of a plan for this -- for this sub area, whether it's an overlay district, whether it's, you know, working closely with ACHD or whatever we need to do. But we just -- we need some kind of an overall vision for how to develop this area. I think that these piecemeal developments really set us up for a nightmare. That's my fear. So, still chewing on it, but I do have some concerns.

Simison: So, I'm going to make a few comments on this one, because I -- yeah, for -- for me the challenge when I look at this is it's -- we kind of took a -- took a chance on a restaurant right across the street from this. So, in a lot of ways we have started the process for what this area is going to develop through. This is right across the street, same roadway, components are being shared. So, to me it's not that much different in we are starting -- we are beginning this process. Yeah, I mean we -- we have had other applications where we have said no to other ways that, you know, could have helped to find this answer and don't know when they are -- when -- when they may or may not come back. But this is -- is taking access from the same place that we said yes to the restaurant. So, that issue to me is very similar in context, traffic count versus the two -- or you all determine the traffic count issues, whether not that's relevant or not. I tend to agree, I think -- I think it's got a few too many units for the parking. It's -- it's -- it's right on the -- it -- it meets code, but when you are the first -- first thing you don't have anybody else to share. If you are successful you are going to have a problem and I

think that's the question. Do we hope that you are not successful, so you don't create a problem or do you want to be successful and, then, you don't really have any place else for people to park in this area. You can't cross-park on the other side of Overland Road if you have actually got a successful business and successful place the people want to live. So, to me that's -- that is the -- my perspective the biggest challenges is it adequately parked being the first one through here where you don't have a real good -- I know you are cross-accessing with the business, but it -- it still can be quite challenging, unless you are going to assume that everyone here only uses a storage unit to put all their recreational equipment, these garages are going to have more than just cars in them, which means you don't necessarily have other -- and that's the challenge. That's the reality of Idaho life. We talked about the Idaho life. I'm going to look at the owner of the property and say -- but I'm sure that you don't have any toys that you worry about where you are going to put them and you don't have any kids and -- or family members, no -- people only have two cars. So, that's the challenge when you -- when you look at a place like this is can you act -- is it going to reflect the Idaho lifestyle with the parking realities of Meridian, Idaho, or families and our enthusiasts that are here and that's -- that to me is the biggest challenge that I personally see with this, but it is to me in the right place for where you want to start this conversation. I think if you were two properties over this would be a nonstarter. I don't think -- I don't think Council would be having a conversation if it wasn't these two parcels and so it's like if you don't start here, then, are you saying you are not going to start anywhere or you going to wait for all seven of them to come back like the gentleman mentioned before you ever have another conversation about this property? So, the only other place that makes sense is to go over by the Zamzow's and come from that direction and, then, you might run into people on the other side and have some more problems on that. So, I -- I'm not opposed to moving -- to seeing something like this develop in this location. The people that move here are going to deal with the traffic and I -- I -- I hate the approach that -- and I know it's -- it's life, but -- well, there is not any problem here, so we can't let anybody else do anything and, you know, I drive through this area as much or more than anybody else and, quite frankly, I find my way around without any problems. Now, I don't have to access out of my property on onto Overland Road. I -- I -- I get that one hundred percent in those seven properties, but, frankly, they shouldn't be doing that. That's not the way we want long term to happen. So, we got to start creating that cross-access to get them to the roadway network somehow eventually, because I guarantee you if you are not familiar with what Boise is doing on Overland Road to the east, they are creating more density, they are creating more in-fill, they are putting more people on this road and they are -- they are coming this direction as much as our people are going that direction, so, I -- I don't think it's fair to say they -- the traffic is the reason why we shouldn't allow this when others are not going to take that approach along this corridor and I will be quiet.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: And may be ask the applicant. I'm curious is there a way to get more parking on there? Obviously, you have to remove a unit. Does that make it financially unfeasible? I mean -- because the reason I asked -- we are going to be stuck doing nothing for a very long time until we finally decide we haven't -- we either figure out -- go through a very long process to create a plan and get all this buy-in for neighbors or we start with a project that seems good. There is a lot I like about it, but your parking is going to be a mess. Is there anything you can do to accommodate some additional parking? Because what you have listed, 23 units, 38 stalls with two guest parking. I know it meets code, but it doesn't feel like it's going to work, but what -- just want to throw that out and see what feedback you have and I know you are designing the property, I'm sure you went through many revisions and we impose some things on you with the cross-access that probably change it up and you are really limited on what you have to work with and I get it. But can you -- I just wanted to throw that out there and see some of your feedback.

Escobar: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Taylor, we have gone through numerous iterations. One of the things that satiates me on the parking front is the fact that we have the office spaces and when you do have that nightly party there is going to be some overflow that eventually falls into those empty office space stalls. So, I ask that you keep that in mind as you consider the integration and the overall layout of this facility. It's not four separate parcels, it's one parcel. So, the idea is that it could be available to them. Furthermore, there would be five guest parking stalls and we have an additional two stalls that have been provided beyond the code on those -- those required five and they are allocated up there with those townhomes. On the vertically integrated we have dedicated stalls, just complying with code, and, again, we have the potential usage of the overflow stalls for the 8,000 square foot tenant space requirement of parking stalls associated to those. Now, maybe there could be conditions where that doesn't function the greatest, but I would say in the majority that's probably going to function pretty well to service this overall development. We have been through this numerous times. Lots of iterations. That's why it's been so long for us to even work with staff to get to this level and we have tried to accommodate the best we can and certainly comply with code and even go beyond it.

Taylor: Okay. Mr. Mayor, real quick follow up.

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: And I appreciate that and thank you. One question on the management of both the residential and the commercial aspect. Same management, I mean those that own it are they envisioning managing both? Because just in -- I don't disagree with the idea that there is some additional parking may be available on site in our commercial space. I'm also envisioning the folks managing the commercial space complaining to the residents, you get out, this is for commercial, this isn't for you. How do we avoid that?

Escobar: Councilman Taylor, yes, it is the same manager. It's the owner of the parcel and they will be living on site, so have pretty direct access to the challenges and management that's going to need to occur on -- on the development.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Cavener: What's the width of the garages?

Escobar: The garages are all at 16 foot wide. So, it's a two car garage. Typical residential garage. The width of the units are all at 20 feet wide.

Cavener: So, the width is it 20 -- it's 20?

Escobar: The width of each individual unit on those rear townhomes is 20 feet wide.

Cavener: But the width of the garage you said is --

Escobar: The width of the garage is -- well, it's a 20 foot wide building, 20 foot wide garage.

Cavener: The garage is the same width.

Escobar: And the 16 foot door goes into the wall, so that you can park two cars in through that door.

Cavener: I park two cars within 20 feet is what you are telling me?

Escobar: Yes. Your typical garage will have either a 16 foot wide garage door or an 18 foot wide garage door.

Cavener: Okay.

Escobar: And, no, a 16 foot wide garage door will not park two F-350s.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I think that's what I'm getting to is a lot to -- to the Mayor's point is -- we see this a lot; right? People are filling their garages full of their stuff. I mean that's why we have got tons of storage units, too, because they have got tons of stuff and I -- and that's not your problem to solve, but we are trying to solve that problem that we have seen play out time and time again with developments like this, which is that well intended, designed to accommodate traffic, but human need overrules that and we find

a lot of cars choosing to find alternative places. We are trying to avoid that I think which is where some of that -- that concern is coming from. So, I appreciate that.

Escobar: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Cavener, I just wanted to add that most of these are two-bedroom units. These are in a denser location, a more urban location. It's not going to be your typical subdivision development, multi-family area, and I guess what I anticipate is most of these are probably going to have one car, potentially two cars associated with them and we do have three units that are -- that are a three bedroom unit, but -- and I would -- I would look to see that the city code certainly gets updated to address these concerns, because that would be my desire as well in our -- in our town.

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Help me understand kind of how you draw that conclusion about the use. You know, we are seeing more and more of roommate situations; right? So -- so, a two bedroom apartment actually having three vehicles; right? We are not seeing necessarily that the people who are choosing to live in these types of products come with less. It's usually they are coming with -- with more. And so that -- I'm -- I'm interested in kind of how you have drawn that conclusion, because it's just -- it's contrary to a lot of what we have seen in the market in Meridian lately.

Escobar: Mr. Mayor, Councilman Cavener, my idea with that is that usually these urban developments tend to draw a different type of living style. They are not the ones with the playground and the kids running around and the single family homes that are surrounding it. So, they -- they tend to have a different demographic and I do work across the United States, so I am in a lot of different backgrounds and I would say that you are going to be more of an expert on that than I will be. It's just the vision that I carried when I did develop the site as I looked at the integration with the commercial lots, as I looked at the parking challenges and I tried to get landscaping in areas where there can be some communal development occurring and, of course, meet the code and even go above it. So, I would hope we can address this in the code and get it solved if this isn't meeting the needs.

Cavener: Yeah. So, Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: Maybe one more, because I get a call I kind of ask the question about reduction of units to increase the parking count. Is that something that your employer is amenable to, opposed to?

Escobar: Councilman Cavener, I -- I'm not sure what the owner would be willing to -- I -- I do know that if we reduce a unit off the site we will add two additional stalls. That's the gain that we can gain the way that it's designed, because all we are doing is shortening

the length, so we only have a spot to be able to fit in two stalls and northern most unit already is two stalls. So, the quick answer is -- I apologize, but I don't -- I mean if you remove a unit you are going to gain two stalls, so that would be the benefit loss scenario.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor? Jim, don't go too far, please.

Simison: Council Woman -- and I just blanked on your name.

Cavener: Little Roberts.

Simison: Thank you.

Little Roberts: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. So, Jim, will what you have designed work if we don't approve the reduction from five feet to two feet next to the neighbor?

Escobar: Mr. Mayor, Council Woman Little Roberts, it's a challenging tight site. Will it work? Yes, I can make it work. Does it improve the quality of the site? No, because I actually have to shift the building over three feet closer to the other building and my goal is to maximize that area between those two buildings to maximize the usability of that grassy area with the sidewalks leading up to every one of the units. I'm trying to create more space and more separation in those buildings, which is part of the reason why we are asking for it.

Little Roberts: Follow up? So, tell me how five feet versus two feet impacts your neighbor?

Escobar: Council Woman Little Roberts, basically what it -- oh, how does it impact the neighbor? Well, we are still installing privacy fence. We are still putting some landscaping in through that area and the majority of this area is into his -- he is a long lot, so the majority of my attention was such as I have no residential windows on that west facing side of the vertically integrated mixed-use building, because I know that there is a home right there with the yard right behind it that would be visible. So, most of what he has happening is, unfortunately, happening around where that required access point occurs on the site.

Little Roberts: So, follow up question.

Simison: Councilman Woman Little Roberts.

Cavener: So, what you have happening to protect his property and his privacy can happen within two feet, as well as it can five. Your privacy fence, what landscaping you are doing and things can all be contained equally within two feet, as well as five; correct?

Escobar: Yes. Council Woman Anne Roberts. It is a -- a future ideology with that narrower strip there as well, because the idea if you saw that future phase plan is that when you have that connection to cross you are probably going to have more commercial development happening that's going to be fronting Overland and something else happening on the rear set of the site, but there is a good chance that there could be a parking lot back there, that's basically going to be integrated into the design of the future phases. That was another reason why we worked with staff to consider that two foot instead of the five foot, which I do believe staff was okay with when we were having those conversations and supportive of.

Little Roberts: Thank you.

Escobar: Yes.

Simison: Jim, maybe just to stay on that topic. What does the three -- I know increase more space between -- in that green. Well, your program in that space or you have something in there that if you take away the three feet that can't be there or is it just for the feel of the space? Because in some regard just saying we wanted the people that are going to be here to feel like they got more space, so we are going to take it away from this one over here.

Escobar: So, Mayor Simison, in response what it does is it pushes our Building C, which is that westernmost building, it pushes it three feet closer to Building B, which is just going to make it feel a little bit more tall and narrow in that space between those two buildings, which everybody's front door is faced onto. So -- does that answer the question? I apologize.

Simison: Yes. And there is no program space -- there is nothing that you have in that that goes away, except for feeling.

Escobar: Yes. That's correct.

Simison: And how much space is between two buildings in theory?

Escobar: We vary from 20 feet up to 22 or 23 feet, depending upon the undulations of the various buildings as they oppose each other.

Simison: And you know how far away the structure is on the neighbor's property to the west?

Escobar: To the west? I don't know how many feet away from the property line he is, but I do know that where his -- where his home sits is more in this realm where my cursor is, not necessarily up here where this narrow strip is. Now, he probably uses his rear yard and -- and has attention there, but I'm trying to -- to plan the future, as well as deal with the present, so I'm trying to be respectful of where he is at today, as well as what the future development goals and -- and ideas are on how to access and manage

through this site. That is a unique challenging in-fill site. I think that's a great way to look at it.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: You just hit the nail on the head for me. A unique challenging in-fill site and that's what I'm struggling with and similar to other conversations this evening, I mean you didn't create Overland, you didn't create Topaz, you didn't create Five Mile Creek through the middle of your property that makes the -- the northwest piece unusable. It is unique and challenging and in-fill and a struggle.

Escobar: Councilman Whitlock, may I follow? Or, Mr. Mayor, may I follow -- follow up with that? This owner even went so far as -- we started the design on just the one parcel and he saw that it wasn't going to be cohesive and -- and as good as what the development could be and with his ability and his private property rights and him advocating for him being, you know, in our economy and -- and taking the risks that we know that are in the planning and zoning code and managing a design and dealing with the tricky situation, you know, he even acquired a different -- a secondary parcel to be able to do this development with a whole different design that functioned much better, because we just couldn't make it make sense with the first parcel. So, again, I lean back on the fact that we don't have a big developer out here that's just going to sell this product in two and a half years once capital gains allows him to do so -- or her to do so, but we have a developer here who really is a member of the community and is going to be living here and wants to invest and has a great product and I just -- I hope that our city can see these are the types of developers that we want -- we want to encourage who are asking their architect how do we make this a more livable, enjoyable space. I'm going to live here. So, that's -- that's the idea with it all. Just to support your thought process with the challenge of the site, we -- we did even go through that.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: Really this isn't just for you, Jim, and for Shaun. We have got a couple projects in this area and I made the comments on the first one, but this is a blank canvas. A blank canvas that you can't go north on, because there is an Interstate, you can't go east on, unless you are going to get into -- or, excuse me, west on unless you are going to try to get onto the other road that comes out to a signal, which is very close to Eagle Road. But it's a blank slate. So, I have trouble with the concept that this is an in-fill project. To me it's not. An in-fill project to me means it's one of the last things we have got left and we are trying to fit that puzzle piece in to make it all work. This is one puzzle piece in a much larger picture and what I said on the first project and I said no to that one was we need a master street map so -- and we just dealt with this on other projects. We need a master street map from ACHD that tells us what and where we can

develop and how it can develop and how we are going to move traffic through this area, because this particular area has such a restriction on it on which ways we can push traffic and Movado was the one that was lined up for that signal when we first heard it. But it was a conceptual plan. It wasn't on an Ada County Master Street Map. I wish it was. I wish it would give us the authority to sit here and say, hey, we know how this is going to work. We know where we can put houses. What really concerns me is you front Overland Road, probably one of the least worrisome lots, but some of the comments made were made by a realtor representing five of the other homeowners that want to sell their lots. A yes vote on this is going to send a message that, hey, we are ready to develop this. Well, I'm not ready to see this developed until we have a plan and we need to have a plan that knows exactly how this is going to work, so we don't back ourselves into a corner that we can't get out of down the road, because we can't get the transportation network to work to move the vehicles. I know these old county roads well. I mean Topaz goes around to Jade, comes all the way back out, but every afternoon, especially during school time, Overland Road backs up past both of them and it's -- it's tough, it's tricky, it's very very busy and we still -- even if this gets approved we don't have a roadway network that is eventually going to have to handle all this traffic. We don't have that signal down the road on Movado that's going to handle that traffic and I'm -- I'm -- I know you heard me earlier, but we have got to think about the future and making the right choices now for how these projects get allowed to be built, so that we are making the right choices down the road as we look at these other projects that come in front of us and -- and I'm -- I'm truly struggling with this one. The parking issue -- we have a development that's been there for several years. It backs up on Records right off of Ustick and they got two car garages. Most of them have one vehicle in them and they have one or two vehicles on their little driveway blocking the sidewalk, bumpers in the street. It's compact, but it didn't come out to be how it was proposed and how it was going to be used, because there is a lot of big rigs and there is some rigs that are just -- they -- they want one in a garage, because they have got all their stuff in there and -- and I sit up here and I drive through the city and see those things and I don't live in that utopian world where I can say a two car garage is going to have two cars in it. Come to my house, I will talk to my next door neighbors, he has got a three car garage. It's full of stuff. Four cars on the street. I have a perfect example I wake up to every single day. Blocks my mailbox half the week. So, quite familiar. But that's the real world and we have to be prepared for it and we have to think about it and I think the rest of Council has made comments about the parking and I get it that you are over by two. Guest parking I understand what you are saying about the -- the -- the commercial building up front. That would be good. I'm more worried about the parking that's going to be needed by the residents when they need more than just what they have got. So, I -- I honestly, bottom line, I think you are trying to fit too much into this lot. I think it needs more room and I don't know what that answer looks like.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: This will be a question maybe for the old heads who have been around Meridian for a long time. How do we develop a plan for this area? Is that something that the city should say this is what we want to do? Is this something that planning could propose? I -- I just -- I really don't know. I'm just so stuck here with -- with this. I feel it's very unfortunate for people who come in with really great applications, we -- and we can't say yes, because we don't have a plan, but I don't know that I have ever seen a process where we have gone in and say here is what we want to see. I know we need to -- might plan to use, but we don't plan how it should look, so -- but I'm newish here. How would we -- how would we plan this area? How would we lay this out? What -- what does that even look like? Because if we don't know how we are going to handle this I'm more inclined to say this is a good project and a good way to start, but I'm jumping into the void that I cannot see the -- the end and so I may come back in 20 years when I'm like Councilman Overton and I'm wise with grandchildren and may say that was a dumb idea. Wish I didn't do that. I just don't know. So, how -- could someone help me here?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I think here is -- here the challenge is our planning staff tried to do that a decade ago and the -- the residents in that area said, no, we don't want that. We are going to live here for time and eternity. We are never selling, we are never moving, we are never leaving and I think even as recently as, what, maybe four or five years -- before we went to do a revision of the Comprehensive Plan we went back and said are you sure and they said, yeah, we are sure and so that's the part that I -- where I have wavered back and forth is we as a city have tried to address that -- that same concern that you have, that I have, multiple times and the residents weren't interested and now we have one who is and the part that I struggle with is it is a lot easier to support if it's the last piece of the puzzle. It's more challenging for -- when it's the first piece. Not because of this project, it's because it's the real first piece of the puzzle and if I had a sense as to what everything else would look like this may or may not be complimentary, this may generate what the rest of it looks like. We don't know. And that's -- that's the hard part as I -- I wish these other five property owners and the folks that live in the area all would have come together. I'm sure the applicant wishes that, too, to have a sense about what -- what could be achieved, because I think what could be achieved could be even bigger and better than what's before us. But to answer your question, Mr. Taylor, what it would take is I guess a willing partner and the residence in that area and until very very recently there has not been any interest on their part to do that.

Simison: And maybe I'm going to take a little slightly different thing. We have had a plan. We had a plan developed. Council didn't like the project of the plan and I think that's -- that comes into the question, the private sector has put forward a -- a way to develop this, but we didn't like what came with it and so you are -- you are right in that there is not something on a map that -- that is a master street map showing an exit, but -- but we know what the plan is. We know where this is going for the most part. It's just

a matter of when is that going -- when are the rest of the domino's going to fall and who is going to take those steps to create that access point. I mean there is a connection that can go to this south -- or north to a property eventually, you know, make that connection. They are going to make it up to Overland and Movado or one of those other two locations. This U-shape is a problem, you know, this -- this road network in this area is a problem. It's about how do you punch the other direction and that was part of the conversation with the restaurant and cross-access to open up for those things. So, to me this is not a master quandary of how does the traffic flow happen, it's a matter of when does it happen and what -- how does it develop. That's -- that's just, you know, what I have seen. But, you know, eventually, like all things, you have to start taking those steps -- and that's what I felt Council did the last time you -- you allow the development here you start taking that first step. Maybe you don't want to go to the left for your next step then -- then you got to go to the right for the next step. I don't know. But I feel like there is a plan, it's just not drawn on a map the way we want it to be drawn on a map.

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: This is a puzzle piece and this is that easy corner piece that you always start with, not that awkward one you stick -- that you can't find and figure out where it goes or that you can't find it. I -- you know, I think -- I think I appreciate your comments, Mayor. I think that's probably the way I want to start viewing this. I have struggled with this as I have seen other projects just to know what does the future look like. I don't have a high level of confidence that at anytime while I'm serving on this Council that there will be a plan approved by -- with the neighbors and sort of the grand plan, so I do think it's going to have to be piecemeal in some way. So, I think I would probably end up -- I would be supportive of this tonight.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: Unless we have any other comments or anything I would move we close the public hearing.

Taylor: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

Little Roberts: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Little Roberts.

Little Roberts: If we don't have any more discussion, I will make a motion. Are you ready for that? I move that we approve File No. H-2025-0004 with the request of two feet, instead of five and noting all the comments in the staff report and the hearing date of March 10th, 2026.

Taylor: Second.

Simison: Have a motion and a second to approve Item 4, H-2025-0004. Is there discussion on the motion?

Cavener: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Cavener.

Cavener: I think I have come to the conclusion that I'm supportive of annexation in this property, but I will not be voting in favor of the motion. I -- I do think there are still some parking challenges that need to be resolved. This is just seeing what I believe are seeing more and more in our -- our valley without a long-term plan for where to put that traffic. So, motion passes, great. If not, I may be open for a substitute motion, but I -- I'm okay with the annexation, but I think there is some -- some work that still needs to be done on this project.

Simison: Any further questions, comments?

Taylor: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Taylor.

Taylor: Let me make a comment. Just some thoughts I had earlier that I didn't get out. What's interesting in -- in -- that we are seeing a lot of movement towards -- and I'm not sure if I like where it's going in terms of -- of not just Meridian, but in development, is less parking. Some of the larger cities are -- are moving this direction. Some of the things I have read that's been successful in making things more affordable, more accessible to folks, didn't envision how much we would have to discuss parking as a city councilman, but I totally understand it, because I'm sensitive to it. I do think in this particular part of Meridian Top Golf, some fantastic office space, some really nice multi-family, some medical space coming on, this is the kind of area that I'm not going to move to. I'm not looking to live in a -- kind of a place where it's kind of a walkable, there is things close by, I kind of like my, you know, single family home and that area, but there is people who are looking for something like this I think and I'm -- I'm going out a little bit on -- into the void of the unknown with this -- with some of the parking. Again, I think what's -- to be fair they are complying with city code. They have done what was asked and so to say parking is insufficient is a -- is a gut feeling and certainly we have the -- that's well within our ability to make that determination. If we feel it's not quite

right we -- we -- we have that right to vote that way and when I have done that myself. So, I -- I do feel like I have been convinced enough that in order for this area to start moving forward and, hopefully, slowly, hopefully thoughtfully, we do have to take that first step. But I do really like how the project is laid out and designed. I think it's very fitting for the area. I think it's well done. I remember seeing a project at one point, not -- you know, a year or two ago that I didn't think fit very well at all and this is quite the opposite, so just wanted to share those thoughts before we did vote.

Whitlock: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Whitlock.

Whitlock: I still struggling internally on where I will be with this. I remember with the restaurant I was okay approving that, because there was commercial to the east and I saw this -- I saw that application as just a continuation of what was there. This piece is harder for me, because it is the first piece, it's that corner piece of the puzzle and as I look at those seven acres that front Overland I'm just -- I'm stuck on the Five Mile Creek going through there and this is the easiest piece to develop I think out of those seven and -- and maybe this dictates what happens with the other five, but I -- one side of the fence I'm saying you got to start somewhere, the other side of the fence saying where does that fence lead to. I just don't know what's on the other side of that fence. So, I just wanted to voice some of the struggles that I have had with this, but also trying to be consistent with, okay, let's have progress, let's move forward and that's what I felt we did with the restaurant to the east of this. So, I will listen to what everybody else says and see where I land.

Overton: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Councilman Overton.

Overton: I'm in the same boat. I'm -- I'm going back and forth on -- on -- part of this I really like and part of this I just want to see what the future is and I want that crystal ball right now and it's not here and what I keep coming back to is probably the aspect that I have heard many times. We require quite a bit of parking in our city and I have been thankful for it and on this application we required quite a bit of parking in this and you exceeded it by two, plus with the mixture of commercial in front I think if there is any after-hours parties I think that will swallow up that extra traffic. I think it will help the residents that still live there, because now we will have the roadways that approaches Overland being built out to collector status from both sides. If there is going to be a first piece on this west side I'm glad that it fronts Overland and I'm -- I'm at the point that I can be supportive of this project, but with a warning to the next one we have got to start having a plan to go forward, so that we know what to expect and how we are going to deal with that traffic.

Strader: Mr. Mayor?

Simison: Council Woman Strader.

Strader: Yeah, I think I -- you know, I kind of explained where I was -- where my thoughts were at earlier. I'm still not there. I -- I think with annexation, you know, we have a lot of discretion. Sometimes it's a question of timing. I think this is really close, but my parking concerns are -- are still there. I still think there might have been some changes you could have done to try to help shield your neighbor to the west. I think, you know, I -- I have lived on the City Council long enough to have seen some of -- some similar developments with similar style of kind of garage challenges where we are not seeing people use our garages the way they are intended and what ends up happening in this kind of a site where it's so constrained is -- especially if you have success, right, which we hope for is, you are going to have a huge nightmare that's going to spill onto the neighboring roadway and I just -- yeah, I just don't think that the parking is there for me. I get it that we have our code, but we also have, you know, common sense and just what we are seeing in the city and probably our code needs to be looked at. We -- we have looked at parking again and again. I -- I don't think we have built the best mousetrap, but it's always something evolving. But we have -- we have seen a total nightmare with similar developments and very similar parking situations. I just really question how this is going to function. I also think, you know, getting that first piece of the puzzle right is really important. I think we are really close, but I just don't think it's quite there. I'm not going to be in favor tonight. I wish I was. Hope to get there at some point and it may very well pass, so let's just see.

Simison: Well -- and I will -- you know, I -- I didn't know where you all were going to be and I still don't know where this is going to go. I figured I may be in a place where I vote tonight on -- on this topic and originally I was concerned over the -- there is too many spaces and not enough by Councilman Taylor, you are right, it doesn't meet code and, you know, if that's the issue -- and, quite frankly, I mean part of it is like ask for a continuance, see what the legislature does, you might be able to get three times this density in a month at the rate they are going and, honestly, I mean that's part of the reason why I -- I -- I came back, like how -- how can I go -- how can I be opposed to what the legislature is doing if I tell people no because they meet our code. So, that's -- that's ultimately where it is I have been dealing with -- dealing with bills before the legislature tomorrow on this very topic, as I have been looking at my e-mails is like I can meet the code and everything else seems to -- it's hard for me to sit here and say that and if I said no they could come back and do something three times as dense with the way the legislature is looking at things here in four months and fear is not a good rationale to make a decision, but consistency is something that I think we have to live within, especially when we understand what the legislature is looking at. So, that's my two cents into this direction. So, with that clerk call the roll.

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

Simison: Four ayes. Two nays. The item is agreed to. Good luck. Be successful. Don't put any businesses in that place that go beyond 5:00 p.m. or you will have

problems and we will -- we will make sure towing is strictly enforced on Topaz and your residents will not like that, so --

MOTION CARRIED: FOUR AYES. TWO NAYS.

FUTURE MEETING TOPICS

Simison: So, Council anything under a future meeting topics? Then do I have a motion?

Overton: Mr. Mayor, I move that we adjourn.

Little Roberts: Second.

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

MOTION CARRIED: ALL AYES.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:08 P.M.

(AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE OF THESE PROCEEDINGS)

MAYOR ROBERT SIMISON

_____/_____/_____
DATE APPROVED

ATTEST:

CHRIS JOHNSON - CITY CLERK