

**Public Hearing for Touchmark (H-2025-0012) by The Land Group,
generally located on the south side of E. Franklin Rd. and the north
side of I-84, midway between S. Eagle Rd. and S. Cloverdale Rd.**

- A. Request: Modified Development Agreement to update the conceptual development plan for the overall site, which consists of approximately 121.50 acres of land to consolidate the existing agreements (AZ-99-021 Touchmark (recorded in 2001, Inst. #101048096); April 2001 Addendum (Inst. # 101048097); May 2003 Addendum (Inst. #103137119); AZ-02-018 (Bair Property AZ-02-018, Inst. #102143308); MI-07-006 (Meadowlake Village North 3rd Addendum, Inst. #108022885) into one new agreement that replaces all previous agreements.
- B. Request: Rezone of 63.34 acres of land from the L-O to the C-C (55.17 acres) and C-G (8.17 acres) zoning districts.
- C. Planned Unit Development Modification (Meadowlake Village CUP-03-005) to update the concept/use plan and include 4.6 acres of additional land, a deviation to the maximum building height allowed in the C-C district from 50ft. to 64ft. for the hotel and inclusion of 2 and 3 story townhome dwellings.

Lorcher: With that we will start with item -- Item No. 3 on the agenda for H-2025-0012 for a modified development agreement, rezone and a planned unit development modification for Touchmark and Meadow Lake Village and we will begin with the staff report.

Allen: Thank you, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. The development agreement modification does not require action from the Commission tonight. That is only a City Council decision on that. Modification of the existing planned unit development and rezone. This site consists of 121.5 acres of land. It's zoned L-O, limited office. It's generally located on the south side of East Franklin Road on the -- and the north side of I-84, midway between South Eagle Road and South Cloverdale Road. I will go through a little history on this property and the approvals. The majority of this property was annexed back in 2000 with a development agreement and a conditional use permit for a conceptual planned unit development. A smaller 4.6 acre portion of property was later annexed and included in an amended development agreement and conceptual development plan. The original conceptual PUD was approved for a continuing care retirement community comprised of 250 to 300 units of independent and assisted living, 450 units of residential, including single family, duplex townhomes and multi-family. A community senior health and fitness center. Medical office parks. Commercial and retail businesses. Since that time approximately 428 residential units have been built in the retirement community, along with the senior health and fitness center and many amenities, including open green space and walking trails, a community garden, coffee shop and bistro, salon and barber shop, a library, theater, dining venues, pickleball courts and other on-site amenities. In 2003 the development agreement and planned unit

development were amended to allow the development of 318 residential units and approximately 600,000 square feet of commercial and office space on a larger 138 acre area with reduced building setbacks in the L-O zoning district. The Comprehensive Plan future land use map designation is mixed use community. A modification to the development agreement is proposed to update the conceptual development plan for the overall site, which consists of approximately 121.5 acres of land and consolidate the existing development agreements into one new agreement that replaces all previous versions. A rezone of 55.17 acres of land to the C-C zoning district and 8.17 acres to the C-G district is proposed from the L-O zoning district to the undeveloped -- excuse me -- for the undeveloped portion of the site, included in the master plan to accommodate the proposed uses. So, everything that they are proposing is C-C and, then, just that parcel in their piece up in the upper northeast corner is C-G. The proposed project consists of - - let me back up for just a minute. I didn't have my slide on when I was talking about the original existing concept plan that's approved for this property and that is in your staff report as well if you want to look at it a little closer. This plan is proposed to be replaced with a new plan and that's this plan right here. The proposed project consists of 121.5 acres of land within a larger mixed use community designated area, totaling approximately 164 acres and includes a mix of uses consisting of commercial, office, light industry and a variety of residential housing types as shown on this bubble plan here before you and that is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan for mixed use community designation. A couple of areas on the concept plan. The ones -- the two with the star symbols are shown with two possible uses, the medical office and townhomes along the southwest boundary of the site and the community -- commercial and multi-family along the north side of the site along Franklin Road. If the demand for office space doesn't come to fruition the applicant proposes an alternate use of townhomes, 50 to 55 units in that area. Commercial uses similar to the commercial proposed to the west along Franklin Road is proposed on the other area with the flexibility for multi-family residential. The number of units and density is not specified on the plan, but the applicant states the area could support 115 to 140 units, using the same density as the other multi-family area. The multi-family use would be at a larger scale than the townhomes and an increase in density. Staff does not recommend approval of the optional residential uses, because residential uses, as the comp plan allows for up to 65 percent of the development area to be comprised of residential uses with the provision of transit, which the applicant is providing, which does exist and the applicant is proposing approximately 68 percent, not including the optional multi-family and townhome style units. Additionally, the commercial uses are desired in the mixed use community diagram and the comp plan along arterial streets transitioning to lesser intense uses. Therefore, staff recommends the concept plan is revised to only reflect commercial uses on those portions of the property prior to the City Council hearing. A modification to the existing planned unit development for Meadow Lake Village, CUP- 03-005, is proposed to update the concept plan and includes a request for deviation to the maximum building height allowed in the C-C district from 50 feet to 64 feet for the hotel measured to the highest point of the structure and inclusion of the townhome dwellings as a permitted use in the C-C district. Staff is amenable to the building height increase as proposed. However, is not in support of the request for townhomes to develop in the C-C district, because townhomes, where each unit is on its own property, are a prohibited use in the C-C district and, therefore, aren't allowed

through the planned unit development. This would require rezone to a residential or a traditional neighborhood zoning district in which the use is allowed. Because the applicant isn't proposing to subdivide the property, the use is considered multi-family residential, as all of the units are on one property and is allowed in the C-C district. The new development plan includes approximately 114,000 square feet of medical office space, approximately 300 to 400 non-age restricted market rate multi-family units, both apartments and townhomes, with the possibility of 165 to 195 additional units through the alternate uses proposed. Twenty to 25 single family attached units, also known as villas, three single family detached units, also known as cottages on the plan; 75,546 square feet of self-storage, i.e., light industry; 45,000 square feet of general office space; 45,000 square feet of commercial retail space and an approximate 126 room hotel. Conceptual building elevations for the proposed structure as -- are as shown there on the sides of that plan. A pedestrian pathway plan was submitted as shown there. The green lines represent ten foot wide pathways. The blue five foot proposed sidewalks and the pink five foot wide existing sidewalks. A phasing plan is proposed as shown, which depicts four phases of development. It's anticipated to be completed between 2030 and 2040. Phase one is the villas and cottages, which is two to five years. Phase two is the apartments and townhomes, which is three to ten years. Phase three is the commercial, self-storage, additional multi-family and hotel along Franklin Road, which is three to 15 years. And phase four is the medical office and daycare, post-acute care and townhomes, four to 15 years. Staff recommends a subdivision application is submitted for each phase of development and recorded in order to have a legal parcel for development purposes. The existing community is proposed to remain unchanged, except for the small golf course and that is this pink area right here around their water feature here, which at some point in the future may redevelop with villas and that's the single family attached units. The open space amenities are also evolving and as the golf course is redeveloped the required open space amenities will be reprogrammed in other areas of the project. Before changes can be approved to this area the applicant must demonstrate compliance with the terms of the previously approved PUD in regard to site amenities with removal of the golf course. Per the city code in effect at that time at least ten percent of the gross area of the PUD was required as open space, exclusive of required street buffers and buffers between incompatible land uses. The development area consists of 61.5 acres of land. Therefore, a minimum of 6.15 acres of qualified open space is required to be provided. An exhibit should be submitted showing the existing qualified open space without the golf course area prior to the City Council hearing. No written testimony has been received from the public. The applicant did submit a response to the staff report and they will go through that in their presentation. Staff is recommending approval per the recommendation in the staff report and I would just like to make a note that with development agreements and planned unit developments, the decision making body is able to place additional conditions on development applications that may not typically be required in the UDC in an effort to provide exemplary site development in accord with the purpose statement of the planned unit development. Staff will stand for any questions. The applicant is here to present.

Lorcher: Would the applicant like to come forward? Hi.

Thompson: Hi, Madam Chair, Members of the Commission. My name is Tamara Thompson. I'm with The Land Group. Our offices are at 462 East Shore Drive in Eagle. With me tonight I have Kendra Lackey and Ryan Benson from Touchmark and Gary Sorensen from Pivot North. So, we have our full team here to answer any of your questions and I do have a presentation. I will try not to be redundant with -- with Sonya's presentation. She was -- she was very thorough. But just to give you a brief overview, the development site is located on the south side of Franklin and east of Touchmark. The -- the west side is the Ridenbaugh Canal and we are just north of Interstate 84. North of Franklin Road are industrial uses that are zoned I-L and west is medical office, which includes St. Luke's. Those are all zoned L-O. Currently the site is zoned L-O and in order to align better with what the uses are the staff has recommended that we do that rezone, although the -- the proposal that we have before you is not much different than -- than what is currently approved in our PUD. Again we are in the MUC future land use map designation. Here is that zone -- or zoomed in and the reason I wanted to show this is just to show how close we are to the city of Boise. City of Boise is just right on the other side of the Ridenbaugh Canal. That is that dashed line there. With industrial across on the north side of Franklin. Just to give -- I'm sure you have all driven this area, but just to give a little overview of what it looks like, the -- the top photo is looking west along Franklin that has the industrial properties there to the right and the bottom is looking east along Franklin Road. The properties were developed in 2003 and at that time Touchmark did all of the public roads to their facility to and through the facility, and did all of the beautiful fountains and water features, all the landscaping and I just have some pictures of -- of all of that and you can tell on this bottom left one all of the sidewalks, even back in 2003, were the detached sidewalks, which weren't -- weren't common back then. And, then, I will point out also that all of the utilities were stubbed at that time as well. As Sonya mentioned, this was the -- the concept plan with the development agreement. So, Touchmark has owned this property since the late 1990s and it opened its first phase of the retirement community, which was Touchmark at Meadow Lake Village in 2003. Touchmark has been a member of the Meridian community for over 20 years, collaborating with local businesses, nonprofits, schools and government organizations to provide employment and volunteer opportunities, as well as provide much needed service for elderly residents of the Boise and Meridian areas who moved to the Touchmark at Meadow Lake Village. The properties were annexed and zoned L-O with a PUD and a development agreement in 2001 and, then, there were multiple development agreement modifications after that. The development agreement states the construction and development of a continuing care retirement community comprised of 250 to 300 units of independent and assisted living, 450 units of residential, including single family duplexes, multi-family, townhomes, medical office parks, commercial and retail businesses and community and senior health and fitness center. Our proposal today is not much different than that. We are just going to define it a little bit better, since what was defined back then it -- it lists all those, but it doesn't really define well the exact acreage or the exact square footage of those types of -- of -- of uses. Again, there is the development agreement and three subsequent addendums to that development agreement. The most recent development agreement was recorded in 2008. As you can see on this aerial, approximately 62.8 acres of the 121.5 total acres or 52 percent of the original master plan has been constructed and is operating as Meadow Lake Village, a Touchmark

community. Since that time approximately 428 residential units have been built and much of the -- all of the public roads have been built and the utility infrastructure and landscaping along those public roads. Sonya mentioned all of the amenities that have been -- that go along with it as far as the green space and walking trails. You can see there is a pond and numerous water features for the residents. The pond and center community area is planned to be part of the entire community, not just for the senior housing. Currently there are over 12 acres of qualified open space and part of that then -- which is over 20 percent of the existing community that part of that will be for -- for everybody and, then, we will be adding even more for -- for -- for the new development. Here is some photos of just some of the existing. All right. Now, to the Touchmark mixed use development. This includes approximately 114,000 square feet of medical office, 500 non-age restricted market rate multi-family units. These will be both in the form of apartments and townhomes. As Sonya mentioned, they won't be fee simple townhomes, they will be townhome style, but they will be designated multi-family, because they will all be on one lot, but they will look like townhomes. There will be age restricted villas and cottages. So, there is 24 of those, which will be -- I don't know if I can point on this thing. Don't know how to do that. So, it's -- it's -- if I just point to it does it do it? Yeah. Right in that area around -- around the -- the pond area. Forty-five thousand square feet of general office and 45,000 square feet of commercial retail space. A hundred and twenty-six room hotel. And the development is planned to be phased over the next five to 15 years. We -- we have included concept plans and concept elevations and with those we have -- we have added that the city's design standards are what are to be met. So, those will be -- will go through the city's CZC and design review process. Throughout the project additional pedestrian sidewalks and multi-use pathways will be utilized to create a better network to ensure safety and efficient mobility through the site and as intended with the original master plan a multi-generational project where residents of the existing Touchmark retirement community can maintain a sense of security, while benefiting from the adjacent diverse uses is intentional. Future occupants of the multi-family and townhomes, as well as users of the future commercial and retail, will benefit from generous new connectivity and green space throughout the interior of the master plan, as well as from the existing pedestrian infrastructure along Franklin Road and Touchmark Way. Extensive pathways will be accompanied by recreational areas for children and adults to enjoy daytime leisure activities, such as playgrounds, open spaces, dog park areas and functional spaces, that promote general health and wellness. The existing monument sign and fountain at the entrance, that fountain amenity will -- that exists will be maintained and remain and, then, at least one amenity per amenity category within the Meridian City Code is proposed. So, that will continue through the CZC process and that's something that we provided in our application with -- with the PUD. And, then, the -- with each of the areas -- or each of the zones we provided a sub area with dimensional standards for that -- for each of that sub area. Accesses to the project -- most of those are already existing. There is only one new access to Franklin here that aligns with Truckee Avenue to the north. An updated traffic study was required and it was conducted by Kittelson and Associates and both -- both ITD and ACHD have comment on -- commented on that and the -- there are no new conditions that are required. The Touchmark development can be development -- developed with minimal impacts to the surrounding roadway system. We do have a couple of requested revisions. We have reviewed the staff report and agree with staff's

recommended conditions with the following revisions. There is a reference to wrought iron fence. We would like to replace that with metal picket fence to make that just a little -- instead of wrought iron, a lot of times those are metal picket or full privacy to match the existing. What we are showing here is what the existing fence is around the perimeter of the existing development. So, we are asking to stay consistent with that. And I'm sorry if you want that number I can give that to you. That is condition A.1.ii. And, then, condition -- conditional use permit and the planned unit development modification I, the drive private street from Truckee, there is a condition to have an internal drive that connects to the east to that existing drive and let me go back here. That would be to -- from that Truckee one here to this existing drive at that location and there -- that may not be possible and let me just give you a few items here. So, what I have here on the right-hand side is the topography of that area and there -- there is an existing ditch that runs at the top of the grade. So, on the bottom there is a 27 foot grade difference from that approach to the top of that hill and, then, there is a ditch that runs across there, which is a gravity irrigation ditch and -- and, then, the -- the top left is an aerial of that. So, all the engineering hasn't been done for this area yet, but in maintaining flows for that ditch and having to address 27 feet of fall from the top of that down to that existing access, it may not be possible to have a street access at that location, which is why we didn't put one initially and, then, I just wanted to show -- so, this is that access and you can see that for this one -- can I -- can I finish, please? Okay. Just coming in initially they had to put retaining walls immediately once -- at this one. So, this -- what we would like to do is be mindful of that request and work with staff during the CZC process and that if it's possible we will -- we will make that connection, but -- but not have that as -- as a requirement. And, then, lastly, our plan as proposed is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and we respectfully request the ability for up to 65 percent of the land to be allowed as residential uses. When I did the math at that -- what -- what Sonya mentioned as the 68 percent, I incorrectly did that with the rezone, which those go to the center line of the roads, but if I just use the land area -- so, the way that that goes is right now with the -- with the layout the commercial uses are 41 percent of the -- of the master plan. The residential is 36 percent and the areas that we have laid out as the flex areas comprise 21 percent. So, if a hundred percent of that flex area were to go to the commercial side, then, that would be 62 percent to the -- to the commercial. If a hundred percent of that flex area were to go residential, it would be 58 percent. We are not asking for more units, we are -- we are sticking at that -- at the 524 units, we are just asking for more flexibility on that land area. It's been 20 plus years that they have had that frontage as -- as commercial and should they need it they -- they just want that flexibility to extend in those two areas.

Lorcher: Thank you very much. Commissioners, do we have questions for Tamara?

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Good to see you.

Thompson: Good to see you.

Perreault: Yes, I do have some questions for you. So, am I to understand correctly that the only age restricted residential units will be the cottages and, then, some of the townhomes?

Thompson: Madam Chair and Chair -- or Council -- Commissioner --

Perreault: Commissioner.

Thompson: Commissioner Perreault, the -- a hundred percent of the current community is age restricted, 55 and older, and 24 of the new units that's adjacent to that would be age restricted. The -- the new ones will not be. That is correct. Because it has always been the plan for it to be multi-generational.

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Is there a market need for the additional age restricted or are you not seeing that often?

Thompson: I would need my -- my client to answer that question, but I'm guessing if -- if they are not going that direction, then, there wouldn't be.

Perreault: Okay. And, then, I just want to get clarification. So, the way I read the staff report is that the limitation on the 65 percent residential for the development area I was under the impression that was for the entire original project, like the master plan, and you have calculated it as just this area that is being rezoned. So, did I misunderstand that? Would you like to answer that?

Thompson: That's true. I am calculating on the -- on the new area and I can give a little bit more history on that, too. Is that -- and -- and a few years ago we did this on other projects in the -- in the vicinity and in the mixed use community area most of those developments, especially south of I-84, do not get developed with 20 percent or even 50 percent residential uses and so if you blend the entire mixed use community area it doesn't -- it doesn't even get to ten percent in the audit that we did a couple years ago for -- for a different project south of the freeway. But on this one we were just looking at the new development area.

Perreault: So, if I'm understanding you correctly, you are saying that the 164 acres within the full MUC designated area has much smaller percentage of residential? If you looked at the entire picture that MUC designation, you are saying that it doesn't come close to the 65 percent?

Thompson: And -- and if we looked at the MUC area within just this quadrant even south of the freeway we wouldn't even come close to that.

Perreault: Okay. I think that's all the questions I have for you for now. Thank you.

Thompson: Thank you.

Lorcher: Commissioners, any other questions before we take public testimony? I did have a question in regard to some of the last slides where the city asked you to have some connectivity and you said that there were some topical restrictions based on the way the topography works. The drainage ditch that goes, you know, south to north that draining down, is that run by Nampa-Meridian -- or the irrigation district or is that just part of that parcel, because it used to be a farm?

Thompson: Madam Chair, it does -- it is run by the irrigation district. It -- its headgate is on the Ridenbaugh and it -- it goes through the property, but it does serve downstream as well. It's not just for this property. So, we do need to maintain it and so, you know, we can't drop it too much, maybe we can drop it a little bit. Like I said, the -- the -- the engineering and all that for this -- for it hasn't happened, but one -- when you are looking at 27 feet of grade change and needing to maintain flows, it -- it -- it's going to be difficult at best. So, I would like to have it as a please look at, but not a hard and fast requirement.

Lorcher: And did they say they wanted it tiled once it gets development or that -- or did they want it open?

Thompson: They haven't said, but typically we can tile that size.

Lorcher: So, if you tiled that size would it be a challenge to, then, put a road on top of it, at least the portion that it cuts across, because you are a diagonal and the cross-street would go in perpendicular?

Thompson: I don't think it would be as much of a problem with putting a road on top of it, it's just however those flows are going to be.

Lorcher: Right.

Thompson: Yeah.

Lorcher: And, then, finally, cross-access to the eastern property, which is the city of Boise. So, is the city of Boise requiring connectivity, like typically Meridian asks for connectivity between, you know, parcels and subdivisions, so that there is always an escape route?

Thompson: So, I looked at the plat for that property. That's an industrial plat that's in the city of Boise and I -- ACHD constructed those access points prior to that development when they did the improvements along Franklin years ago and -- but the -- the plat for that industrial property does look like it has a -- an easement around it that goes back at least a little bit. So, it doesn't go all the way back, but it goes back enough for just a little

bit of -- for the shared access, so that we can at least get to the access point and it does split the property line, so half of that access is already on our property, but it does have a little bit of an easement around it on both sides, so they are using it on our property currently and we can get to it to get to theirs. But it doesn't go like all the way back to have like a big road coming in if -- if that's what you are asking. Yeah.

Lorcher: Okay. Any other questions before we open public testimony? Okay. Thank you very much.

Thompson: Thank you.

Lorcher: Oh. Wait. Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: I found a few more. So, if we are understanding the phasing plan correctly, you could -- you could have all four phases going at the same time. I mean the first three years you could potentially have all different types of construction going on. Have you -- do you have or have you thought through how that will work with -- just with that entrance -- or with the entrance that comes off of Franklin Road and the entrance to Touchmark, how will that flow if you have construction going on in all different areas?

Thompson: We will need to -- we will definitely need to work through that with -- with what becomes fruition first. I don't know that all four would happen at the same time. We just kept that flexibility that -- that any one of those could go first.

Perreault: Okay. And are the calculate -- the square footage calculations that you used for the office and retail, does that include those areas that you want to keep flexible or does it not?

Thompson: Let me find it. So, in my calculation I have the commercial, hotel, light industry and medical office the ones that are solid colors on the concept plan. Those come out to 41 percent and, then, if I take the villas, cottages, townhomes and multi-families, the ones that are solid colors, those come out to 36 percent and, then, if I take the medical office slash townhomes, the one that has the striped color and the commercial, multi-family striped color, that's 21 percent.

Perreault: Okay. So, where it says there is potentially 45,000 square foot of commercial retail space, this -- is that counting that area as commercial or is it counting that area as multi-family -- I mean is it included or not?

Thompson: I was -- I did my calculation off of the land area on the concept plan.

Perreault: To calculate square footage of the commercial.

Thompson: To calculate the -- the -- because that's what the 65 percent is is land area. So, I was doing land area.

Perreault: Okay. I'm just referring to what was in our presentation tonight, so --

Thompson: Yeah. I -- we may be talking apples and oranges, because I was looking at the land area, because -- because that's what the -- the comp plan talks about, land area of up to 65 percent if you are in proximity of a transit -- of transit.

Perreault: Thank you.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you very much.

Thompson: Thank you.

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

Lomeli: Thank you, Madam Chair. No one has signed up. You can come forward.

Lorcher: Yeah, you can come forward. If you can state your name and address for the record that would be great.

Cruise: Okay. Thank you. I apologize, I did not know I needed to sign up.

Lorcher: No. That's fine. That's why we have big Chambers here, so there is plenty of room for people to come.

Cruise: My name is Sandra Cruise. C-r-u-i-s-e. My address is 210 South Winthrop Place, Boise. 83709. I live in Edgeview Estates, which is the subdivision on the east side of the Ridenbaugh Canal and my house is -- my property is adjacent to the development. We live right on the canal and so I have several questions or issues that I wanted to make sure were in your -- under your consideration and I don't even know if I have a voice in this, because I don't live in Meridian, but, first of all, there is a tree -- I live right where -- where the Ridenbaugh wraps around my subdivision. I would be most adjacent to commercial light industry there where you were just talking about how there is a 27 percent gradient. There is a very large very old black locust tree. I believe it's black locust tree that's home to many raptors and other birds and many animals. It's habitat for red tails, kestrels -- we have got Coopers now in the neighborhood -- Cooper hawks also. I would hate to see -- see us lose that tree. I would hate to see the birds lose that tree. They are losing their feeding grounds with this development, but they -- they have managed to hang on all of these years -- for 25 years as their -- their land, their opportunity for hunting has decreased they have managed to stay in the area and I would hate to lose them and see them go. At the very very least I would be -- if you -- if that tree is taken down that it be taken down not in a nesting season. Oh. And there is owls, too, there sometimes. So, just be -- be mindful that raptors live in that tree and other trees. Number two, the development to the east, the light industrial development to the south side of Franklin Road, when that went in the Ridenbaugh Canal was paved, because it's up above all of that, and I wonder if the Ridenbaugh will need to be paved for that -- I would call it the yellow commercial slash light industry piece that -- that eastern most piece will it need to be paved also. So, that is a question I do not have -- do not expect you all to

have an answer for that, but that's a Nampa-Meridian Irrigation question that I would hope would be addressed.

Lorcher: Is it your preference to have it open or closed?

Cruise: It's my preference that the Nampa Irrigation District is mindful of it and that -- the reason they paved it is -- they paved the part that was getting developed below is because what if the -- what if the canal is breached --

Lorcher: Right.

Cruise: -- everything below it would be flooded.

Lorcher: Okay.

Cruise: So, that's -- you know, of course I would rather the Ridenbaugh Canal -- it's not paved over, it's just the sides are paved.

Lorcher: Got you.

Cruise: Yeah. It's -- so it's reinforced.

Lorcher: Got you.

Cruise: And, then, of course, we are -- we are used to our unrestricted view and I know progress happens and people lose their views, but we would hate to have three story housing just staring into our backyard, even though it is across the canal and I would hope that there would be some consideration for easements from one story to two story to three story, because there is a residential area around us. We are -- I know that there is not many houses that would be affected by this multi-family three story development, but there are some of us and we were expecting over the years that Touchmark would continue to develop one story housing, which is what we were told 20 some years ago, that it would be senior development one story. Well, the central part -- the central buildings are tall, but that we could expect one story building.

Lorcher: Okay.

Cruise: That's what we were told.

Lorcher: All right.

Cruise: Whether that's what they thought I can't speak to that.

Lorcher: All right. Well --

Cruise: Those are my issues.

Lorcher: Okay.

Cruise: Thank you very much.

Lorcher: Thank you for your time. Anybody else in Chambers that would like to speak as part of the public testimony? And is there anybody online?

Lomeli: Madam Chair, there is one person attending online. They have not raised their hand.

Lorcher: Okay. Tamara, would you like to come back and respond?

Thompson: Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, Tamara Thompson again. So, I wrote down three items. If you will let me know if there was something that I -- that I missed here. So, the questions are the black locust tree. I think I know which one that is. I believe it to be the one where the headgate is for that canal -- or that ditch that we were just talking about. So, I do not know on that one currently, but if we can retain it we always like to retain trees. We are -- first and foremost The Land Group is landscape architects, so we retrain -- retain trees where -- where we can. So -- so we would like to do that. It is on the perimeter of the project. So, we are hoping that we can. As far as the Ridenbaugh and paving the sides and those types of things, we will not have anything to do with -- with the Ridenbaugh. The Ridenbaugh -- we will go up to right at their easement line and, then, we won't have anything to do with it past that. So, I don't have an answer for that. That will be the irrigation district. And, then, as far as the two story, three story housing, we can definitely take a look at that. We have -- we were doing that stair step with the -- with the townhouses and, then, to the multi-family and so there is just a small little area right in -- right in this -- right there that we can -- we can look at that, too. It's probably going to be frankly parking garages there first and then -- and, then, get to the -- get to the units. So, the -- the apartments will probably be back a little ways.

Lorcher: Okay.

Thompson: So, did I answer everything? I think I got it.

Lorcher: I believe so. I believe so. I mean, you know, it's impossible to guarantee any unrestricted view, but being conscious of the people who always live there is always a nice consideration.

Thompson: It is.

Lorcher: I do have a few questions for you in regard to the golf course. So, you are suggesting of eliminating the golf course and turning those into villas.

Thompson: So, the way that it's colored in it looks like all of it goes. It's just going to be reprogrammed. There will be some open space around that. There is -- there is -- there

is a small number of villas that go in there. There is 20 villas that go in there. So, there will be a considerable amount of open space that -- that retains. What's -- what's left there is going to be around six acres with the current pond and what's over on the -- on the west side as well and, then, there -- they will -- typically their -- their programming and what they have has some sort of putting green or pitching green -- you know, pitching area, those types of things. So, it's -- it likely won't a hundred percent go away, but it's just going to be reprogrammed.

Lorcher: And does that satisfy -- because I don't know the exact wording, so, Sonya, you might have to help me with this, but does that satisfy the original PUD of open space that was required if the golf course is amended?

Allen: Madam Chair, I don't have those calcs from the applicant. She said she did some preliminary calcs and it appears to comply with those standards, but I would like to see an exhibit showing exactly what areas are being counted in order to determine that.

Lorcher: Okay. So, before Council you will have to have --

Thompson: Yeah. So -- and I'm sorry I did not -- I didn't bring that, but we do -- we did do some calculations and there is 12 acres. So, there is pickleball courts as part of this -- of what's -- so, what's constructed currently is around 12 acres of qualified open space. So, there is pickleball courts. There is pathways that go to benches and gazebos. There is -- there is little waterfall areas with seating areas. There is the pond. There is -- there is all kinds of different areas. There is a dog park area and, then, that -- there is the golf course area. So, with eliminating the golf course area we are still well over what was required for the original PUD. Like almost double what was required.

Lorcher: Okay. One final question from me. When you had your neighborhood meeting with the community people bought in this community based on senior living and the amenities, possibly even the golf course, you know, being part of it. What has been the response from the community for your adjustments to the open space and, then, the flex space of turning some of that into villas and that type of thing, what kind of response -- I mean the fact that nobody is here complaining leads me to believe that it -- it's not a huge concern, but it is a difference to what they were committed to when they purchased in that community.

Thompson: I would like my client to answer that question, because they have been working more closely with their tenants, if -- if that's fine.

Lorcher: Hi. If you could just state your name and address for the record that would be great.

Benson: Sure. Ryan Benson. Touchmark. Our address is 5150 Southwest Griffith Drive in Beaverton, Oregon. 97005.

Lorcher: Okay.

Benson: Thank you all for your time this evening. I personally hosted a town hall with our residents a few months ago. It was very well attended. We had 50, 60 people there. We went through this entire master plan and we received plenty of comments. We have incorporated all that into our programming. Our executive director at this community, who couldn't be here tonight, we have -- we have registered all of their -- their questions and, to be honest, the golf course is pretty lightly used as is. So, our intent is to reprogram into a more activated space that's going to be used on a day-to-day basis and benefit everybody in the community. So, we are actively engaged with all the residents on this project.

Lorcher: Okay. So, nobody feels like you are taking away anything in particular, especially because if -- with the golf course, if it is being limited attended, but you put something else in there so the community can use it more on a daily basis that could be a benefit to your group.

Benson: Right. Our -- our operations team will probably go through a really thorough process with them to kind of talk through, you know, what -- what more can we do as we start to program out the villas and what that looks like, so I don't have an answer as to like what it will become --

Lorcher: Right.

Benson: -- but we will be factoring in all of their -- their comments and their thoughts into that.

Lorcher: And what did the community say when you were going to invite families that are not age restricted into your community?

Benson: I think it was -- it was mixed. I think some people were excited. They liked the idea of having more activity around, you know, a mix of uses is fun and engaging and there were some concerns with safety and security. So, we received mixed reviews and we intend to be very thoughtful in addressing their concerns. But overall I would say it was mixed.

Lorcher: Okay. All right. Any questions for Touchmark?

Garrett: Yeah. I'm sorry, what is the demographics of the hotel? What are you looking for -- I mean it seems to be off the beaten track.

Benson: You know, we haven't programmed what exactly that hotel will look like, but I do think that users might be visitors of family members. They could be people using the hospital services nearby. We haven't exactly programmed what the hotel will look like.

Garrett: Well, that's what I assumed.

Benson: Yeah. Maybe those two would be primary users.

Garrett: Yeah. Okay. Just a question.

Benson: Thank you.

Lorcher: Any other questions for Touchmark while he is up? Okay. Thank you very much.

Benson: Thank you, everyone.

Allen: Madam Chair, may I clarify an item that was discussed?

Lorcher: Yes.

Allen: So, the percentage of residential versus commercial uses in the Comprehensive Plan for mixed use designated areas, that is based on the overall larger designated area. It's not on a project specific area. So, that's where staff got our calculations and what the original calcs were based on. So, anyway, just wanted to clarify and explain that. Thank you.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you. Tamara, did you have any other final thoughts before we close the public hearing?

Thompson: Madam Chair, Members of the Commission, I think I got through everything. The Touchmark mixed use, I think they have been an excellent neighbor in -- in Meridian. They have -- they have shown -- you know, what they currently have constructed is very very high quality and that's what they want to bring to the community and -- and providing an additional service to -- and -- and something that complements the adjacent residential commercial and office uses and this project will provide a vibrant, livable development with a variety of housing options. This fits every single -- checks every box on the mixed use community with all the multiple uses that are being provided for and the commercial component will provide easily accessible and convenient services for residents in the general vicinity. The development agreement modification, the PUD modification and the rezone request comply with the applicable provisions of the Comprehensive Plan and tonight we request your recommendation for approval with those three modifications that I walked you through. We thank you for your time.

Lorcher: All right. Thank you very much.

Perreault: Madam Chair, may I ask a couple more questions?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Thank you. I wanted clarification on the townhouse areas. We had discussion about there being townhome style units, but they are not actually townhomes. Is that just in the multi-family section or would that be in the section that's labeled townhomes?

Thompson: Madam Chair, Commissioner Perreault, that is the areas that are called townhomes. So, those will look like townhomes, they just won't be platted where they can be sold fee simple.

Perreault: So -- so, that's the area where there is the request to raise the height to 64 feet?

Thompson: No. The height request is just for the hotel.

Perreault: Oh. Okay. That's not -- that's not what it stated I believe in the staff report. So -- okay. So, the areas that are light blue that are townhomes --

Thompson: Let me make sure I have that correct. I have -- I have that. So, the townhomes -- the -- the asterisk for the townhomes is -- so, we were trying -- we just wanted to make sure that townhomes were approved and -- and they are, but they -- they are designated as multi-family, but they are going to look like townhomes, so -- but -- because they are all on one lot. So, that's what that asterisk is for. But the height -- the building height is just for the hotel, just for the salmon pink -- dark pink color.

Perreault: Okay. Thank you for clarifying that. The staff report says that there is a request for a deviation to the maximum building height allowed in the C-C district from 50 to 64 feet for the hotel and inclusion of townhome dwellings as permitted use in the C-C district.

Thompson: Yeah.

Perreault: And inclusion of the townhomes --

Thompson: That's separate. We are not talking about -- those are separate. What we have for the height of the townhomes is -- 35 feet is proposed, which fits within the height of that zone.

Perreault: Okay. One more question. So, with the -- when you come in for -- I don't know what the requirement will be in the PUD when you do the multi-family, if you have to come in and have a hearing like you do with a CUP. I don't think you have to. It sounds like it can just go straight to the zoning compliance process; is that right? So, can you chat with us a little bit about -- and so say that the villas come in and we take some of the open space away from that central area, what is -- what is that multi-family open space going to look like? Is it going to be another smaller version of -- of that where you have got the -- you know, a dog park or you have got seating areas, plaza areas? And it sounds like we are not going to have a whole lot of say in that right now and that's okay, but I just want to make sure that, you know, those open areas are being replaced.

Thompson: They are. So, you -- through the CZC and the DR process -- so, there is a -
- I want to say it's a pretty rigorous checklist of -- through the design review where we
have a point system for open space and we have -- we have outlined where we are going
to have points in every single category for the multi-family and so we are going to have
clubhouses and we are going to have a pool and we are -- you know. So, we have
outlined what -- what those are going to be and we have given an example in our
application of what all those points could be -- will likely be, but we have also committed
to having points in each category that will meet or exceed the minimum requirements.

Lorcher: My only other comment is the use of the word townhomes during this entire
conversation has been very confusing --

Thompson: It has been.

Lorcher: -- because the city has a very solid definition of what a townhome is and what
that looks like on being a single unit, whether it's for purchase or rent, whereas multi-
family is one big parcel divided up into other things. So, I don't know if you and the
planning department can come up with another word other than townhomes, because I
have been trying to wrap my head around it during this meeting and you are going to have
the same challenges when you go to Council.

Thompson: Yeah. I agree.

Lorcher: So, between now and then where it says townhomes that should be labeled
something else. Villas. Cottages. Whatever comes up to be multi-family, but not under
the definition of townhomes. Because every time you talked about townhomes I'm like,
okay, this is not where it's supposed to be and it's not working, but you are telling me,
well, it's like a townhome, but it's not a townhome. So, if you can adjust that for Council
that would be great.

Thompson: Yeah. That's -- that's -- that's fabulous feedback. Thank you. We will -- we
will try to make up a word.

Lorcher: Yes. Come up with something clever. I'm sure we will find something. All right.
With that thank you very much. I appreciate your patience. May I have a motion to close
the public hearing?

Smith: So moved.

Rust: Second.

Garrett: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing for Touchmark and
Meadow Lake Village. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: Would it be possible for staff to maybe address any of the things that came up during the hearing that -- it seemed like what I was reading was maybe a little different than what they were presenting and if there is anything that you want to clarify with us?

Allen: Madam Chair, Commissioner Perreault, I can't think of anything other than the percentage of residential that I already clarified in the MUC designated area in the -- you know, the -- in response to the -- Madam Chair's comment, I think townhome style multi-family would be appropriate on the concept plan, as well as -- you know, villas and cottages are something that the city code doesn't recognize either, so -- and as long as those units aren't being platted on individual lots, which I understand they aren't, then, that would also be multi-family and like the villas would be single family attached style multi-family and the cottages single family detached style multi-family. Other than that if -- unless -- unless you are thinking of something I'm not thinking of that needs clarified,

Commissioner Perreault. I can't think of anything else.

Perreault: Well, the only other question I had was in the presentation this evening about the 45,000 square foot of office and 45,000 square foot of retail space, it sounded like the applicant didn't provide those numbers and I'm trying to understand if that's the total proposed -- I realize that might not be what it ends up to be, but if that's kind of the total proposed idea with the concept --

Allen: I believe there was a total of 114,000 square feet of medical office.

Perreault: That was for medical office.

Allen: And, then, 75,546 square feet of self-storage, 45,000 office space and 45,000 commercial retail space. Is there --

Perreault: Yes. The question I was trying to have answered is are the -- the bubbles that show a commercial there in the northwest and potentially commercial light industry in the northeast, is that enough space to build 45,000 square feet or would the applicant need to use the commercial multi-family flex space? I guess that's what I'm trying to understand is when they came up with this calculation of 45,000 square feet commercial retail, is that just supposed to fit in that northeast corner that's purple? Is that spread out over the whole --

Allen: The purple --

Perreault: -- development?

Allen: Each of those colors in each of those areas on the concept plan -- you can't see it, because the prints too small on the screen, but there are notes on each color coded thing saying how many square feet, approximately, is proposed.

Perreault: Okay.

Allen: And I assume that's a multi-family -- or a multi-story, excuse me, square footage. But it is a concept at this time, but that's what they have guesstimated to fit on those areas.

Lorcher: Any comments about this development?

Rust: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Rust.

Rust: Yeah. I appreciate the effort that's gone into this. I think Touchmark has been aware of them as the business for a number of years. This has been a long-term development. I mean the history -- it's not often we get a history that starts in the '90s and I think there is, obviously, a lot of thought and care that has gone into the development of the existing development. The fact that they had a really well attended town hall as part of their community and we didn't see anybody from that town hall here tonight, I think just speaks to the overall level of care that's gone into this. This is not a development that they are looking to slam things together in the next three or four years. This is going to be phased. This is going to be thoughtful. I'm inclined to give deference to Touchmark and give them wide latitude to fill this out as they see fit. This is they have been good stewards of this property for 25 years now and so I would be inclined to recommend approval to the Council and grant them the three conditions that they are asking for. The wrought iron fence. Let's look at that side connection, but not necessarily require that and, then, give them the flexibility that they are asking for on the commercial slash multi-family piece. I think that they have, again, been good stewards. They are the kind of people that we want to partner with as the city and I want to give them as much latitude as we can.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you. Any other comments? I like the idea that there is a hotel. My -- my -- my mom lives in an adult -- or a senior community back in Illinois and she doesn't let me stay with her, so -- but, then, she is like but I want you close by, but there is nothing there. So having a hotel close by is -- would be a benefit to your community I would think and, plus, the proximity of the hotel -- you know -- excuse me. The hospital would also benefit from that as well. The only thing that kind of threw me off today was the labeling and I'm sure we will come up with some good terms before Council. You know, the market has changed quite a bit since 1995 or '3 or whenever you kind of started this and my only concern is that, though, the people who already live there -- I would hate to see them purchase a property and committed to one thing and it turns into something else with the understanding that things do evolve. So, like if the golf course isn't working

and maybe only ten percent of your community uses it, but, then, you change it to something else and, then, now 80 percent of your community can use it. So, I totally get that part as well. Because this is over the next 15 years and it's not going to be all done tomorrow, I'm inclined to approve it as well, with those conditions, so that as -- over the next 15 years as things change and as the market deems necessary they have the flexibility to be able to serve our community.

Smith: Madam Chair?

Simison: Commissioner Smith.

Smith: I think I generally direction on -- on that direction -- or that's where I'm heading. There are two kind of things that I'm a little bit not -- you know, not the biggest fan of. I think there is -- we are leaving a bit of an open question on that connection -- on that -- that eastern side that I don't love kind of leaving unanswered. I'm okay granting deference. It seems like this is, again, a longer term period -- you know, longer term development, but there is just some unease that gives me. The only other thing is -- that I recall from -- kind of -- is that -- a question for staff I guess, just having seen the image of the proposed fencing. Along the canal there needs -- does there not need to be like an open view for that fencing or is that -- is -- would you say that that -- what's pictured is adequate in this open view, since there are kind of slats? It doesn't -- it seems kind of obstructed to me.

Allen: Madam Chair, if I could respond. So, our code requires either open vision or -- typically open vision along waterways and that's for -- so, that the irrigation district can maintain their -- their ditches and their easement areas and burn -- burn weeds if necessary and vinyl fences are kind of frowned on along there. I wasn't aware that there was existing vinyl fence along there and I'm not sure that the city ever approved that fencing. Anyway, that's the reason for the requirement for wrought iron. I'm not sure what the metal picket fencing is that the applicant is possibly -- one of the two options they proposed to me that would be the same, but I haven't seen a picture of that, so I'm unsure.

Smith: So, Madam Chair, I guess what I would say is an addendum to maybe that is that just ensuring that whatever goes there along the canal might be -- is open vision in compliance with code is my only maybe sticking point. But beyond that I think I'm -- I'm in agreement with everything. Yeah.

Allen: Madam Chair. And just to add a little bit to that, if -- if that's the motion you make that would allow the possibility of chain link fencing along there. So, typically we don't allow that. More for esthetic reasons than anything, but, anyway, just wanted to clarify. Thank you.

Lorcher: Does the irrigation allow -- district. Thank you. Allow chain link fence?

Allen: As far as I know, yes.

Lorcher: Okay. So, maybe where it ensures that the fencing complies with city code, whatever that happens to be?

Smith: Yeah. Madam Chair, I would be supportive of that.

Lorcher: Okay. Any other comments from Commissioners in regard to this or I will take a motion.

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: Commissioner Perreault.

Perreault: So, I agree with -- with the open -- or that the fencing that city code and keeping that wrought iron. With the townhomes versus the multi-family, I kind of got the feeling - - and I apologize if this is incorrect -- that the townhomes were just kind of apartments, but the outside looked different and so I don't know if that actually is the case or really is a home that has multiple levels and it's just attached. I -- if -- if it is apartment style, but just has an exterior that looks different, I would encourage the applicant to maybe reconsider that, because I'm pretty sure that Council will -- will want to have that conversation. I just -- I think it would be good for the applicant to be really specific and distinct about the difference between the townhomes and the multi-family, how they are going to look, how that -- how they are going to be lived in and how they really are going to be distinctive from each other and, then, act as that buffer. For me that wasn't as clear maybe as it could have been. I realize we are just doing a concept plan here, but, you know, it is important, because you -- we are defining specific things that are going in those bubbles. I'm also sad to hear the golf course may -- or part of the golf course may go away, but I understand, as the chairwoman said, that if that's not an efficient use of that space for the residents, then, I understand wanting to make the change. What I would like to see is whatever acreage that is turned into villas, that that -- an equivalent amount of that be created in the new -- the new areas and I don't mean whether it meets the 15 percent qualified open space, I mean an actual acre-for-acre replacement. I would like to really see that. I think that that would be honoring to the existing residents that had that expectation of a certain amount of space to use, so I assume that is a condition we can request and, then, I would like to say -- I would like to see a follow up on the concern over the old tree. I would recommend that the applicant have some sort of response for City Council on that. Hesitant to put a condition on it, but never -- never try to put a condition on the -- had a few applications that have requested a tree to remain, but I agree with -- with the neighbor that that's a really important piece of nature for our -- for our ecosystem really. So, yeah, those are all the things I wanted to mention. Thank you.

Lorcher: Okay. Any other comments?

Stoll: Madam Chair, if I may?

Lorcher: Commissioner Stoll.

Stoll: I have watched this development sadly for many years and I remember thinking that I was way too young and now I'm --

Lorcher: Right there, uh?

Stoll: I'm at that age and looking at my own mother in law's place down in Arizona, we are seeing a transition where it is getting young -- it's no longer 55 plus, they are going down to 40 plus with the market and in some cases it's causing a reinvigoration of the communities and a greater dynamic with the folks that are living there. Following up on your comment regarding the hotel, my mother in law probably would not be appreciative of the hotel. I would have been appreciative of the hotel --

Lorcher: Right.

Stoll: -- many times, but overall I support what the applicant has submitted and I think there is some aspects of it that I really do like. I caution them to make sure that they preserve the open space and maximize that and the opportunities for the residents. The one that I was surprised was the comments from ACHD and ITD regarding the traffic impact. Franklin and Eagle Road are congested roadways in that area and that they felt that there was -- in one case with ITD there was no comments provided and with ACHD they said it was added level of service E and that -- that was acceptable and that there would be negligible impacts regarding the development. We have a lot of units that are going to be going in here. It's going to have an impact and something that our community is going to need the leadership from the transportation agencies on providing input to the land use agencies on the traffic impacts. But based on the comments that we have today I'm inclined to recommend to Council approval with the conditions that staff have laid out. I -- I'm okay with saying -- allowing the condition that they can work out the 27 foot drop on potential connection. I have concerns regarding wrought iron fence versus not wrought iron fence. I think we need to make sure that -- we only have this opportunity to put in the type of treatments that we want and what was put in or -- and approved or not approved 27 some odd years ago doesn't necessarily have to dictate what we have now.

Lorcher: Right.

Stoll: So, that --

Lorcher: Okay. Any comments? Are you good? Oh, you already commented. Okay. All right. Let me give this a go. After considering all staff, applicant and public testimony, I move to recommend approval to City Council for File No. H-2025-0012 as presented in the staff report to include ensuring the fence complies with city code. The flex space to be -- or the -- yeah. The flex space for commercial and residential be fluid. Define the word townhome as multi-family residential and include an exhibit for open space without the golf course. Did I forget anything?

Perreault: Madam Chair?

Lorcher: The road connection?

Pearreault: Could you just clarify -- staff have recommended that the flex space not be flex space. Are you saying that we are recommending that it's -- that it is?

Lorcher: Because this is, in my opinion, a five to 15 year build out, that the market may deem that residential ten years from now might be more advantageous to our community than the commercial. So, I'm recommending that -- that the flex space be open to either. But that's my motion. And, then, we wanted to add work with the irrigation district for a connective -- was it a connective street? Do you remember?

Smith: Madam Chair, regarding the -- like that cross-connection --

Lorcher: Yeah.

Smith: -- I mean I think the applicant was asking for just the ability to continue working with staff. I guess I think what I would like to -- what I would like to have more in terms of what we can require is maybe something more fleshed out before it gets to Council specifically. I'm not trying to lock them into anything, but I would like maybe Council to be able to discuss the different possibilities more specifically than kicking it down the road.

Lorcher: Okay. One second. Okay. I'm going to try this again, because I have my notes. All right. The modifications include the -- ensure the fence complies with city code. That the commercial space be recommended, but be flexible to residential for long-term future growth. Define townhomes as multi-family residential. Include an exhibit for open space without the golf course and work with the irrigation district and the city for connectivity to the east boundary.

Allen: Madam Chair, may I clarify if your motion included any changes to the applicant's request for the office use in the southwest corner of the site to be allowed to possibly develop with townhome uses?

Lorcher: I did say the commercial to be flexible for commercial or residential.

Allen: Okay.

Lorcher: Does that -- does that cover that?

Allen: There is commercial, as well as the office. There is commercial along Franklin --

Lorcher: Right.

Allen: -- and, then, the office was along the west boundary of the site. So, you meant for both -- both of those areas?

Lorcher: I did.

Allen: Thank you.

Lorcher: Okay. Do I have a second?

Rust: Second.

Lorcher: It's been moved and seconded to approve File No. H-2025-0012 with the modifications listed. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much.

MOTION CARRIED: SIX AYES. ONE ABSENT.