

**Public Hearing for Hadler Neighborhood (H-2022-0064) by Laren Bailey, Conger Group, located at 7200 S. Locust Grove Rd., approximately 1/2 mile south of the Locust Grove and Lake Hazel intersection on the east side of Locust Grove Rd.**

A. Request: Annexation and Zoning of approximately 20.5 acres of land from RUT to the R-15 zoning district.

B. Request: Preliminary Plat consisting of 145 building lots (52 single-family attached lots & 93 detached single-family lots) and 11 common lots on

Seal: Appreciate that. Ready? Okay. At this time I would like to open the public hearing for file number H-2022-0064, for Hadler Neighborhood. We will start with the staff report.

Dodson: Thank you, Mr. Chair. As noted, the first one for me tonight, one of two, is going to be for Hadler. The site consists of 20 acres of land, currently zoned RUT in the county, located at 7200 South Locust Grove, which is approximately half mile south of the Locust Grove and Lake Hazel intersection. It is designated as medium density residential in the future land use map, which allows residential uses at three to eight dwelling units per acre as a gross density. The request before you tonight is for annexation and zoning of approximately 20 and a half acres, with a request for the R-15 zoning district. It also includes a preliminary -- preliminary plat consisting of 145 building lots and 11 common lots on approximately 20 acres in the requested R-15 zone. Of the 145 building lots, 52 are single family attached and 93 are detached single family. The subject 20 acres currently contains a large home and other outbuildings, with access being from a private driveway to Locust Grove that is in the location of the future Via Roberto land that is proposed along the north boundary. The subject site is abutted by an arterial to the west, which is Locust Grove, and a future collector street along the north Via Roberto Way. Sorry. Via Roberto Lane. Access to the site is proposed via a new local street to Via Roberto in alignment with an approved access on the north side of this street within the Apex Southeast Subdivision. Abutting the property to the east and south are large county parcels that share the same future land use designation of MDR. The city's newest park Discovery Park abuts the property at the northeast corner of the site, offering close proximity to one of the largest parks in Meridian. The applicant is proposing 145 lots on 20 acres within the R-15 district, which constitutes a gross density of 7.25 units per acre, which is near the maximum of eight for the MDR designation. The average lot size is approximately 3,600 square feet. Staff finds that the proposed project complies with all UDC dimensional standards and generally complies with the Comprehensive Plan. However, this project does lie just outside of the West Ada School District boundary and is, instead, within the Kuna School District boundary. Unfortunately, there are conflicting reports regarding the capacity at the Kuna schools, specifically the high school. City staff has reached out to Kuna School District and according to these interactions the high school is over capacity and cannot accommodate additional children. Staff will further clarify this point prior to City Council, but notice that the city of Kuna has not stopped approving applications based on the school capacity and the district has accommodated

-- accommodated recent growth. The applicant is proposing two housing types within this project. Single family detached and single family attached units. So, the single family attached are two units attached with a common lot, but they are on separate lots, so they are not a duplex. The addition of different sizes and housing types is a plus for the project and the general area as it introduces two different housing types in this area. However, staff has had some concerns with overflow parking, because of the combination of the proposed density, the building lot frontage as being relatively small, 32 to 38 feet wide, when you account for a 20 foot wide driveway and because the applicant is proposing a 27 foot wide street section that allows parking on one side of the street versus both on a typical street section. I will note that the 27 foot wide street section, as well as 33 foot in other street sections, are still considered standard street sections by ACHD. Staff has recommended that the applicant provide a parking exhibit showing where on-street parking would be available and they have provided this here. According to this exhibit there appears to be space for at least 82 additional on-street cars. Staff finds that this exhibit shows that there is adequate on-street parking for the development and appreciates that it is not located in just one area of the project. Staff has discussed within the staff report adding an additional stub street -- well, I will use this old map. Additional stub street and location of Lots 28 and 29, Block 2, for the dual purpose of increasing visibility on Lot 30 and adding an additional pedestrian and vehicular connection in this area. After discussing with the applicant staff is recommending that the condition, which is 8.2A, be modified to reflect adding Lot 29 to the open space area and adding an additional micro pathway for future pedestrian connectivity, removing the requirement for the vehicular connection. The applicant has revised the landscape plan to reflect this change and staff is supportive of this revision. Staff has met with the developer of the adjacent property to the southeast and they do plan to add open space adjacent to this area, which is why staff wanted this area to be opened up and not be tucked behind lots, as well as include an additional pedestrian connection. The proposed project is approximately 20 acres in size and requires a minimum amount of open space based on the zoning. Per the R-15 zone, the project requires a minimum of 15 percent qualified open space. Further calculations. The minimum amount required is three acres. According to the submitted plans the applicant is proposing approximately three and a half acres of qualified open space or 17.45 percent, which exceeds the minimum amount. The qualified open space consists of half of the arterial street buffer to Locust Grove, the full collector street buffer to Via Roberto, the large central open space, as well as the smaller open space at the southeast boundary already noted. However, staff is not sure if the landscape buffers to the adjacent public streets meet the enhanced buffer requirements outlined in 11.3G3B to count towards the open space. Previously these areas qualified towards the minimum open space automatically, but this is no longer the case with the latest open space updates. The -- the newest updates desire for more than the minimum to be included within the buffer in order for the -- this area to count towards the overall qualified open space. The applicant appears to comply with the two required points, but may not comply with the last two, which are enhanced amenities with social interaction characteristics and enhanced context with the surroundings. The burden of proof proposed for the proposed common open space two qualify does fall on the applicant and not on staff. Staff does recommend that the applicant provide evidence that these buffers are enhanced beyond the pathway trees and grasses. For example,

with additional boulders, additional vegetation, decorative elements, decorative fences and walls, additional pathway connections, et cetera. Those examples are pulled exactly from code. If these buffers do not count, the minimum qualified open space -- they do not count towards the minimum qualified open space, approximately one acre would be -- need to be removed from the calculation, leaving approximately two and a half acres of qualified open space under the minimum requirement. Therefore, the applicant should provide that the proposed street buffers are qualified or apply for alternative compliance to reduce the amount of qualified open space required due to the proximity to Discovery Park, which I guess on the record at this point staff is amenable to that option, but understands if the applicant wants to provide evidence that the existing proposed open space is fully qualifying. The project size of 20 acres also requires four amenity points, one point for every five acres. This is also part of the new open space and amenity code. According to the submitted plans the narrative -- and the narrative, the applicant is proposing the following qualifying amenities. A picnic area, playground, a water feature that's a fountain and two segments of the multi-use pathway equaling approximately a half mile in length. The proposed amenities are worth 11 amenity points, exceeding UDC requirements. Further, staff does note, again, that Discovery Park is easily within walking distance to the northeast and will offer multiple additional recreational opportunities for the project. On the screen here are the two recommended revisions. One being the 8.2A regarding the Lots 28 and 29, which now should be just 29 and, then, the second one -- I forgot to add this, that's my fault, into the staff report regarding the temporary emergency access out to Locust Grove. There was no written testimony on this as of about 3:00 o'clock this afternoon and so I will stand for any questions.

Seal: Thank you, Joe. The question I have is on the street that they are going to enter and exit from, does that street go directly into the park or is -- is there any direct access into the park off that street?

Dodson: Mr. Chair, at this time there is not and this would be between Brighton, the developer on the north side, and this side. This would be the first segment of this collector -- this east-west collector street being constructed. So, currently they cannot drive there. On the east side of the park, the city, as well as the adjacent developer, are working to create the -- finish the half mile of the north-south collector over there. So, we are getting there, but we are not quite there yet to get there by car.

Seal: Okay. I was more focused on bikes, but I just wanted to make sure that there was at least future planning in place in order to have that connectivity directly into the park.

Dodson: Oh, absolutely. Future plans absolutely have that. There should be a multi-use pathway on the south side all the way along -- all the way out to Eagle and it will connect to the -- be adjacent to the collector streets that's going to go east-west as well.

Seal: Okay. Thank you.

Lorcher: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Commissioner Lorcher, go ahead.

Lorcher: Joe, when you discussed with the developer about eliminating Lot 29, is it?

Dodson: Yes, ma'am.

Lorcher: Even with my glasses I -- I don't know which one that is, but did you consider some of these tiny little driveways to possibly eliminate those instead? You know, can it be there or does it have to be up top or can they adjust that so we can eliminate some of these private drives?

Dodson: Commissioner Lorcher, are you referring to putting a stub street in place of a common drive? Is that what you are referring to?

Lorcher: Well, I -- I know this particular Commission is not a huge fan of these little private driveways that come off these curves.

Dodson: Uh-huh.

Lorcher: So, the -- the more opportunities we can eliminate those the better it is for the community and being good neighbors. I don't know if that can be adjusted at all or have you discussed it at any time?

Dodson: It was discussed. It was discussed to -- my original recommendation to have the stub street was to replace the common drive in the southeast corner with the stub street, but it doesn't help the pedestrian connectivity or the visibility of the open space on the north part that I was referring to and with the sub street being right here this road -- it's -- it's a private road right now, but likely -- at least some portion of it will be a public road in the future, too, so we didn't see that there was a need to have another stub street there. Having it over here makes a little bit more sense, just because it's further away from this one, as well as where ever this could go to the east, but, again, between the two connections, one to the east, one to the south, we do believe that should be enough connectivity for vehicles in the future, but I do understand your point regarding the common drives.

Lorcher: So, with these three common driveways, the one at the bottom right-hand corner --

Dodson: Uh-huh.

Lorcher: -- are you suggesting that that could be a stub street at some time or is it not wide enough? It would always be a private drive.

Dodson: It would always be a private drive. But I'm saying that it was discussed as an option to request that the stub street -- a new stub street be proposed there instead, but --

Lorcher: Would be the next development that would have to do that then?

Dodson: No. No. What I'm saying with this development as a discussion point with the applicant I noted that we -- we were going to require it there, we discussed moving it up to 28, 29 instead. We settled on Lot 28, 29.

Lorcher: Got you.

Dodson: So, if we requested that or Commission recommended that, that would be done at that location. At least stub it to the property line.

Lorcher: Okay. Thank you.

Dodson: You're welcome.

Seal: Anybody else? All right. Would the applicant like to come forward? Good evening.

Clark: Hello, Commission. Hethe Clark. 251 East Front Street in Boise with the law firm of Clark Wardle representing the applicant and I will just get my stuff settled here. Okay. Well, I appreciated Joe's presentation and I'm going to just jump right in and start by talking about annexation. Oops. Are we going to come back here? There we go. So, let's talk about that first to kind of give everybody a little context about where the city currently located is -- is located around the project and how the services fit. So, we are firmly within areas that the city has already annexed or -- and are important to the city's growth. It's just south of Lake Hazel, just east of Locust Grove and borders Discovery Park, which you can see in the green. You also have Brighton's Pinnacle Subdivision that's just north of us. It's an area where the city is investing with Discovery Park and with the -- the fire station that's within just a half mile, which you can see on this slide here. The fire station is there in yellow. This has been a very active corridor of development. Again with Discovery Park you have the Gem Prep Academy that's gone in recently. Significant residential development with Lavender Heights, as well as Pinnacle and The Keep. And in addition to that I would point out that there is a wall of city annexed property on our west. So, this is certainly not extending beyond any existing resources that are available for the city. I want to talk briefly about the Comprehensive Plan. As we look at the approved planning for this project, the Comprehensive Plan shows it under the medium density residential category, which identifies densities between three to eight units per acre and we are squarely within that proposed density with our site plan, which you can see on the screen now. As Joe mentioned, 20 acres, 144 homes, overall density of 7.2 units per acre. So, within what's permitted under the Comprehensive Plan. As Joe also mentioned, we are above the minimum open space requirements at 17.5 percent and -- and I will talk a little bit about those factors that Joe mentioned about the -- the qualified open space here in just a minute when I have another slide. I -- I do want to point out the large kind of Central Park area and I want to note that the -- the zoning that we have proposed at R-15 is what really makes this possible and I'm going to talk about that here in a moment as well. But before I do I kind of want to place this in context. The

-- the Commission -- you know, several of you have been around for a little while, you have seen some of the projects that are very similar to this one, so we have done five of these in Meridian, one in -- in Boise. They have been very successful, because in -- in our view they cater to an underserved portion of the market. These are folks who are looking for low -- small lots with low maintenance, high quality finishes, and we -- as we have done these we study them, we follow up and we know what -- who the typical buyer is and the typical buyer is a young professional who is looking for a -- a lock it and leave kind of a situation. They don't want to do yard maintenance on the weekends. They want to go head to the foothills and go mountain biking. It's also empty nesters who are looking to downsize, don't want to take care of that half acre lot any longer and, then, it's also, you know, like the divorced parent who, you know, no longer has the same resources, wants to keep their kids in the same school district, that's -- that's typically who we see in these projects. It's been in high demand since the applicant started doing it about ten years ago and it's been very successful and satisfies a need in -- in the city. So, how do we get there and -- and primarily it's with that R-15 zone. We use that zone's setbacks and dimensional standards and, then, make the project more inviting by increasing the open space and, then, arriving at the -- at the density that we have identified that's within what the Comprehensive Plan calls for. So, we can deliver the small footprint, low maintenance type product, but still respect the Comprehensive Plan's identified density of no more than eight units per acre. Again, we are at 7.2. And what you see on the screen is -- is a screenshot from the Comprehensive Plan confirming the -- the three to eight dwelling units per acre of measurement. So, that R-15 zone is, again, what allows this product to be available. Without it you don't get the small footprint type that folks want and need and particularly now with the -- you know, unfortunately, a recession looming and interest rates spiking, it's -- it's critical that we have a variety of housing types in Meridian to be able to accommodate that and I wanted to point to a few key Comprehensive Plan policies that support that. You know, we need to have a variety of housing types in Meridian, we want to avoid the concentration of any one housing type or lot size in any geographical area. We have also taken into account design in light of the area. We have provided the open space in the center of our project that's just a Frisbee throw literally away from Discovery Park. It will connect as we -- as Joe mentioned, as we understand it, to open space that's being proposed to the southeast of us. The design also includes the -- the regional pathway system. We got about a half mile of new regional pathway that's -- and it also -- and it does connect into Discovery Park, which we think is going to be a great thing for the city. We also have our internal pathways and sidewalks. Our amenities -- we exceed the project amenities requirements with 11 points. We have the two acre central park. This has seating, play areas and structures, shade area and landscaping and, again, those -- those regional pathways are also very important. So, let's talk about the qualified open space. We do have the 17.5 percent and I don't know if you will recall, but when we were looking at the landscape ordinance -- well, when was that, a year ago or so, to make the modifications, one of the concerns that the development community had and -- and I mentioned on the record was with these four standards for qualified open space, that a lot of us just didn't know what they meant. They are -- they are kind of hard to -- to deal with and I -- and I think that's where this comes from. But as Joe mentioned, there is -- there is four things that you have to qualify for to -- to qualify as qualified open space. You have to have enhanced landscaping. You have

to have -- you can have multi-use pathways. And, then, the two that were a little more difficult to interpret were enhanced amenities with social interaction characteristics, which is a huge mouthful and, then, you have enhanced context with the surroundings. So, those are the two that -- that Joe mentioned that we need to approve of. So, when it comes to our landscape buffer, our landscape buffer includes the regional pathway. The -- the staff report is already confirmed that we have landscaping that goes above and beyond what's required. So, if we -- if we -- but if we focus on the regional pathway and the concept of an enhanced amenities with social interaction characteristics, obviously, a regional pathway qualifies for social interaction characteristics. That's where people are going to walk their dogs, they are going to see each other as they head over to Discovery Park, all of that. So, we think that that's pretty clear. And, then, with regard to the enhanced context with the surroundings, again, regional pathway is what does it. It's -- the context of the surroundings is we are right next to Discovery Park. We are in a location where the -- where the regional pathway is contemplated. It -- it satisfies that context planning requirement. So, we think that that 17.5 percent qualified open space should stand. Quickly there is going to be two types of homes in the project, as Joe mentioned. Single story attached against the project to the north and Discovery Park and, then, in the pink internal to the project we have the two-story detached. These are the elevations. And so I -- I just want to wrap up and summarize here real quickly. So, again, we are proposing a product type that's been done before in the city and that's desperately needed. We need more of it. Our density is, again, consistent with what's provided in the Comprehensive Plan. Our annexation is consistent with the growth pattern in the area. There is no issue with public services. They are all already there. The city has invested in the area with the new fire station and the park and, again, we meet the -- the open space standards. And, then, Joe beat me to the punch on this. We are in agreement with the -- the conditions of approval in the staff report. This is the same language that Joe showed on his slide before. We are also in agreement with the additional condition related to the emergency access that he showed on his slide. So, with that I'm happy to answer any questions.

Seal: Commissioner Yearsley?

Yearsley: Mr. Chair. How wide is that regional pathway? I didn't see anywhere on that screen how wide that was planning to be.

Clark: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Yearsley, it's a ten foot pathway.

Yearsley: Okay. That's all I had.

Lorcher: I'm good.

Seal: I will save mine for later.

Clark: Okay. Sounds good. Thank you, everyone.

Seal: Thank you very much. Madam Clerk, do we have anybody signed up to testify?

Hall: We have Robbie Reno.

Seal: Good evening, sir. Just need your name and address for the record.

Reno: Robbie Reno. Kuna School District. 711 East Porter Street, Kuna, Idaho. 83634. We are the school district that staff represent in there and I serve as an agent for our school board that has brought me here because of what has gone on in the city of Kuna where things have been approved and we are at -- we are -- we are over capacity if you go off base on things that are to be -- to be built. The conflicting information about the overcapacity at Kuna High School and the Swan Falls High School is when we -- when we did our capital planning in 2017 to pass a bond we built a CTE high school to take the growth off of Kuna High. Well, those combined schools have a capacity of 1,900, 1,862 was the confirmed enrollment as I checked this morning, because I also serve as the principal of that high school -- of Swan Falls. But we -- we were late in the submittal of a letter, because I think we submitted one to Miranda Carson, who was on jury duty yesterday and so knowing your process, as we are -- we are learning them as being good -- good neighbors. But we simply state now that we -- we just cannot serve that development and being an annexation, we know that city -- commissioners on Planning and Zoning can reject annexations and so we just simply say that we cannot serve this development, even though it is 145 homes, with the -- with the amount of -- of homes that already -- that are already plotted on there, we just cannot serve.

Seal: Okay.

Reno: Stand for questions -- stand for any questions.

Seal: Any questions? No? Okay. Thank you very much. Appreciate that.

Hall: Mr. Chair, there is no one else signed up to speak.

Seal: No one else signed up to speak?

Hall: No.

Seal: Anybody in Chambers want to come up and testify? I see no hands going up in the air. Nobody's raising their hand online. All right. With that would the applicant like to come back up?

Clark: Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission, Hethe Clark. 251 East Front Street. So, it sounds like school is the only thing for me to talk about. So, we had our -- a member of our development team Laren Bailey had met with the school district about a year ago. We had another follow-up meeting with them in the -- the recent past. There has been a number of e-mails back and forth to try to lock down what is actually going on in terms of the -- the capacity for Kuna School District and -- and what, you know, can be accepted now, what may be acceptable in the next ten years. Joe's point about not stopping



development in Kuna is -- I think a good one. But I -- this is what I would say. We have attempted to meet with -- with the -- with the school district. Hadn't gotten to that -- that comment that you heard tonight. What we had heard was that there is current capacity, that over the next ten years if there is no development -- or, excuse me, no bonds passed and no additional capacity created, that they would at that point be running out of capacity. What I would suggest to the Commission is let us go and talk to the school district, see if there is maybe an alternative solution that can be identified that -- here on that point and condition us that way and -- that we have a -- that conversation before we get to Council and, then, that way we can report to Council on that issue, because we understand that it's important. I just don't want to hold up the train at this point given kind of the -- the -- the last minute element of this, so --

Seal: Okay. I will give you one more thing to talk about. Can we pull up the parking graphic? So, I will just walk you through it. So, as stated -- and -- and we know you are -- you are well within code for the shared driveways. My concern with this is we have parking on only one side of the street. We have pretty significant density going on in here and we have shared driveways. So, this looks fine, you know, except for probably, you know, mornings, evenings gets a little crowded, then, you throw a Super Bowl party in here and the next thing you know you have no parking. So, why -- why would we go with a street width that's -- like this that doesn't allow parking on both sides of the street, knowing that we have the shared access driveways?

Clark: Yeah. Mr. Chair. So, the shared access driveways, that goes back to a -- a conversation at the same time as the landscape ordinance when the shared driveway ordinance was also updated and we do meet code on the shared driveways. When it comes to parking, the -- another bit of background there is that ACHD is really promoting the use of 27 foot right of way -- or not right -- total right of way -- the 27 foot paved surface for these roadways. There will be signage on it to confirm the parking on the one side of the street, but, then, to your particular question with regard to the -- the proverbial Super Bowl party, which, you know, is an example that we have talked about in -- in other applications here. You are just not -- this type of product doesn't lend itself to the big bash where you are going to have 40 people there. These are 3,600 square foot lots. So, you are not going to have 40 people showing up for a Super Bowl party at one person's house. You may have a couple people show up, but you are not going to have the -- the massive parties that you are talking about here. Now, we have been doing these for ten years and at prior hearings we have presented studies that we have done with drones where we have gone out at various points of the day and looked at whether there is a -- a parking problem and that has not been our experience on any of these projects -- on any of these projects. So, I -- I would -- I think my response would be that we -- we do meet code and that ten years of experience shows that parking is not an issue, including with the -- the -- the shared driveways, which, in turn, meet code and with the -- the -- the single -- or excuse me -- the parking on a single side of the street.

Seal: Okay. I appreciate that opinion.

Clark: Well, I think -- I mean to your point, Commissioner Seal, there is a -- a question of opinion and a question of code; right? And we do meet code.

Seal: I understand that. It's just the combination of both of these seems to be -- in my mind is a -- is an issue and you have -- you have a smaller street, you have parking available only on one side of that street and you have shared driveways. So, to me that's -- you know, that's a recipe for a lot of contention there and -- and it doesn't have to be a Super Bowl party, it just has to be Halloween. You know, we just went through this. Our streets were packed and we have 30 foot streets.

Clark: I hope they would be on Halloween

Seal: Yeah. And -- and that's -- and that's what I mean. This -- you know, we are -- we are kind of creating a whole lot more contention here than that needs to be to save, you know, a little bit of roadway, so I -- I can't quite wrap my head around why those two things should coexist. You know, again, if the shared driveways weren't here, then, I get it, but with the shared driveways and the limited parking, I -- I just don't see it.

Clark: Can you help me understand the -- the shared driveways? I mean the -- the shared driveways is nine lots that are affected by the shared driveways.

Seal: Sure. Well, you have more than nine lots. I mean there is other lots that are affected by it, because, you know, you are just counting the lots that are right on it, not the ones that -- you know, the other ones that are actually using it. So, there is more than nine that are involved in that and the fact that you have the shared driveways where nobody can park in them, so if anybody comes over to visit them they are going to park out in the -- you know, in the shared parking that's along the street. So, that's going to impact, basically, everybody. So, you know, again, the two -- the two things just in my mind, I -- I would prefer they not coincide.

Clark: And I would just remind you that there is two garage spaces, two spaces in front of the house. So, you have got four spaces meets code and, then, you have 82 additional on-street parking spaces for the entirety of the project. I -- it's -- you know, experiences have shown us that that is more than adequate to address the parking. But we will take you to it.

Seal: Commissioner Yearsley, do you have something?

Yearsley: Well, I was just going to laugh, because out of a 3,200 square foot lot the -- the garage is going to be storage. They are not going to park in that garage, I will guarantee you. So, they have two parking spots in the front of their house and nothing else and so I -- I totally agree. I don't -- I don't like the -- the shared driveways or the number of shared driveways in this facility, so I -- I think it's a recipe for disaster in my opinion.

Seal: Commissioner Lorcher, anything?

Lorcher: Agreed.

Seal: Okay. So, thank you, sir. Appreciate that.

Yearsley: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Go right ahead.

Yearsley: I move we close public hearing on H-2022-0064.

Seal: Do I have a second?

Lorcher: Oh, yes. Second.

Seal: It's been moved and seconded to close the public hearing on file number H-2022-0064 for Hadler Neighborhood. All those in favor, please, say aye. None opposed and motion carries to close the public hearing.

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

Yearsley: Mr. Chair?

Seal: Go right ahead.

Yearsley: So, I was involved with the Movado Subdivision and I -- I did approve that subdivision and I still think it's a good subdivision. He had multiple different -- I mean it was a huge subdivision that had multiple different type uses. I -- I don't see the -- the same comparison between Movado and the subdivision. I think this is way -- it's a -- it's a -- in my opinion it's a -- how do I say it? How -- how dense can I put the -- how many homes can I put on a -- on 20 acres is my opinion. If this was actually a little closer to other facilities -- this is out in the middle of nowhere and to have this dense of a product way out there in the middle of nowhere where there is no services, there is nothing, I just -- you know, it's -- there is -- there is not a lot of good connecting streets yet. Traffic's going to be horrible. I -- I could go on and on, but I just -- I think this is a horrible location to put this type of product. If they had more diverse -- you know, some R-8s and R-15s maybe, but 20 acres of R-15 is -- I -- I can't support.

Seal: Thank you. Commissioner Lorcher?

Lorcher: Mr. Chair -- sorry. I'm conflicted on a couple of things. Mr. Clark said empty nesters, young professionals, possibly divorced families were the target market, but they are living across from the largest park in probably Ada county that supports families. So, a product that would be right next to the biggest park I think would want to be one that supports, you know, families with children that are going to play there, play baseball, soccer, whatever amenities that they have, as well as you had 20 acres to work with and

you still put shared driveways in there. And, thirdly, as a -- an executive officer of the Idaho PTA I have high concerns with the school capacity. So, I don't know if we want to have them talk to the school board first and have a continuance or deny it and they can go to City Council and, then, kind of work it out. I'm not really sure what to do with that. But we don't know where the money from the legislature -- from the surplus is going to go for the schools. That's not going to be decided until the beginning of the year. Pretty convinced it's not going to go to build buildings. This subdivision is not proposing to have a school built in their community, so -- and I don't know where the nearest elementary or middle school is for Kuna. I know they have the two high schools and the professional high school with all the proposed communities they already have and the worst thing that we can do for our families is provide overcrowding in our schools. So, to me as soon as that gentleman from the school board from Kuna came up, that's a huge red flag for me.

Seal: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner Stoddard, do you have anything to add?

Stoddard: No. I just agree actually with everything that you guys said. I agree that it's a really dense product with a lot of houses crammed into a small area. So, I actually shared a lot of the same concerns.

Seal: Okay. Thank you for that. Yeah. I struggled with this one. You know, as I have shared in previous meetings, I have a son that he can't afford to live in Meridian anymore. He lives in Boise. So, I agree, we need product types like this that are less expensive and he kind of fits the bill. He's the guy that, you know, doesn't want a big yard, doesn't want a lot to maintain and is going to go do other things, you know, outside of work -- work time. I do like the fact that you are putting in the regional pathways along there. You are making it walkable, bikeable, more livable. I -- I do like that. You know, obviously, hearing directly from the school, a lot -- most of the time we hear from West Ada they send us a form letter and say, yep, we are overcrowded, but we can't say no, so -- but hearing directly from the school that, you know, we are overcrowded and we can't take anymore, that's a little bit different for sure. And, then, I do have a lot of reservations about parking. I mean I -- I don't feel that it's -- I feel that you should have one or the other, either reduced parking capability or shared driveways, but the two of them combined, I -- I -- I just don't feel that I can support that. So, there is a lot of good things that are happening in this. I mean your, you know, ability to work with staff and remove the lot and everything is good. The pathways. The product. But again, I just have reservations about the parking and the schools. And with that if anybody else wants to make a motion or further comment, I'm all ears. Commissioner Yearsley, you want to take a stab at it?

Yearsley: Sure. Mr. Chair, after considering all staff, applicant, and public testimony, I move to recommend denial to City Council of file number H-2022-0064 as presented in the hearing date of November 3rd, 2022, for the following reasons: One, for the city of -- or the Kuna School District's overcrowding. The -- the density of the -- of the subdivision I don't think fits the surrounding areas with lack of access and lack of -- of -- of public services around there, like stores, restaurants, other facility -- you know, facilities. Parking is an issue and -- and just -- just over -- overcrowding of the area.

Stoddard: Second.

Seal: Okay. It's been moved and seconded to recommend -- recommend denial of file number H-2022-0064. All in favor of denial, please, say aye. No opposed. Denial is carried. Thank you.